

TO PROHIBIT INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE NOT CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM VOTING IN ELECTIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND TO REPEAL THE LOCAL RESIDENT VOTING RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022

JUNE 4, 2025.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. COMER, from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 884]

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 884) to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia and to repeal the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

CONTENTS

|                                                                            |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Summary and Purpose of Legislation .....                                   | Page<br>2 |
| Background and Need for Legislation .....                                  | 2         |
| Section-by-Section Analysis .....                                          | 3         |
| Legislative History .....                                                  | 3         |
| Committee Consideration .....                                              | 3         |
| Roll Call Votes .....                                                      | 3         |
| List of Related Committee Hearings .....                                   | 5         |
| Statement of Oversight Findings and Recommendations of the Committee ..... | 5         |
| Statement of General Performance Goals and Objectives .....                | 5         |
| Application of Law to the Legislative Branch .....                         | 5         |
| Duplication of Federal Programs .....                                      | 5         |
| Federal Advisory Committee Act Statement .....                             | 6         |
| Unfunded Mandates Reform Act Statement .....                               | 6         |
| Earmark Identification .....                                               | 6         |
| Committee Cost Estimate .....                                              | 6         |
| New Budget Authority and Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate .....   | 6         |
| Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported .....                | 6         |
| Minority Views .....                                                       | 9         |

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. PROHIBIT VOTING BY NONCITIZENS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS.**

An individual who is not a citizen of the United States may not vote in an election for public office in the District of Columbia or in any ballot initiative or referendum in the District of Columbia.

**SEC. 2. REPEAL OF THE LOCAL RESIDENT VOTING RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022.**

The Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Law 24–242) is repealed, and any provision of law amended or repealed by such Act shall be restored or revived as if such Act had not been enacted into law.

**SUMMARY AND PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION**

H.R. 884 prohibits noncitizens from voting in D.C. local elections and repeals the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act (D.C. Law 24–0242).

**BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION**

On November 21, 2022, the District government enacted the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act (D.C. Law 24–0242), which allows noncitizens, including illegal immigrants, to vote in D.C. local elections. The Act makes no exception for foreign diplomats or agents voting in the District. These individuals often have interests separate from, or opposed to, the interests of Americans. This D.C. Act dilutes the votes of American citizens and could have a ripple effect across other large U.S. cities.

Backlash to the D.C. Act was swift, including among Democratic policymakers. Mayor Bowser expressed opposition by withholding her signature on the Act—something she has done only a handful of times over the course of her tenure. Even The Washington Post editorial board opposed the bill, writing that “voting is a foundational right of citizenship.”<sup>1</sup> On February 9, 2023, 260 Members in the House voted in favor of Chairman James Comer’s resolution of disapproval (H.J. Res. 24) to block enactment of the D.C. Act. The resolution received bipartisan support, with 42 Democratic Members voting with Republicans. However, this bipartisan resolution was not voted on in the Democrat-majority Senate, and D.C.’s noncitizen voting law went into effect.

The U.S. Congress has a constitutional duty to oversee the District of Columbia. H.R. 884 represents the exact role Congress should take regarding matters of the District’s governance. Specifically, under the U.S. Constitution Congress is granted “exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever” over the District and, under the Home Rule Act, Congress maintains a critical role to scrutinize and approve of District legislation.<sup>2</sup> Free and fair elections are a prerequisite for a healthy republic, and the American people deserve confidence in the safety and security of their election system.

<sup>1</sup>D.C. is considering legislation to let noncitizens vote. *That’s a bad idea*, The Wash. Post (Oct 17, 2022), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2022/10/17/dc-voting-noncitizens-legislation>.

<sup>2</sup>U.S. Const. amend. I, § 8; District of Columbia Home Rule Act, § 1–204.01–1–204.115, (1973).

## SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

*Section 1. Prohibiting voting by noncitizens in District of Columbia elections*

Prohibits noncitizens from voting in D.C. local elections for public office, including any ballot initiative or D.C. referendum.

*Sec. 2. Prohibition on federal employee censorship*

Repeals the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act (D.C. Law 24–0242).

## LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

H.R. 884, To prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia, was introduced on January 31, 2025, by Representative August Pfluger (R–TX), along with Representatives Nancy Mace (R–SC), Jake Ellzey (R–TX), Byron Donalds (R–FL), Jodey Arrington (R–TX), Abraham Hamadeh (R–AZ), William Timmons (R–SC), Derek Schmidt (R–KS), Lauren Boebert (R–CO), Claudia Tenny (R–NY), Michael Guest (R–MS), Doug LaMalfa (R–CA), Craig Goldman (R–TX), Jefferson Van Drew (R–NJ), and Ryan Mackenzie (R–PA). The bill was referred solely to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The Committee held a legislative hearing on March 5, 2025. The Committee considered H.R. 884 at a business meeting on May 21, 2025, and ordered the bill as amended favorably reported by a recorded vote. In the 118th Congress, on May 23, 2024, the House passed an identical bill, H.R. 192, with a recorded vote of 262–143.

## COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

On May 21, 2025, the Committee met in open session and ordered the bill, H.R. 884, favorably reported with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, by a roll call vote of 25–17, a quorum being present.

## ROLL CALL VOTES

In compliance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following roll call vote occurred during the Committee’s consideration of H.R. 884.

The roll call vote was on final passage of H.R. 884. The bill was agreed to in a recorded vote of 25–17.

## COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

119TH CONGRESS

RATIO 26-21

ROLL CALL

Vote on: Final Passage – H.R. 884, To prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in elections in the District of Columbia and to repeal the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022

Date: 5/21/2025

VOTE #: 5

| Republicans                         | Aye | No | Present | Democrats                                    | Aye | No | Present |
|-------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|----------------------------------------------|-----|----|---------|
| MR. COMER (KY)<br><i>(Chairman)</i> | X   |    |         | MR. CONNOLLY (VA)<br><i>(Ranking Member)</i> |     |    |         |
| MR. JORDAN (OH)                     |     |    |         | MS. NORTON (DC)                              |     | X  |         |
| MR. TURNER (OH)                     | X   |    |         | MR. LYNCH (MA)                               |     | X  |         |
| MR. GOSAR (AZ)                      | X   |    |         | MR. KRISHNAMOORTHY (IL)                      |     | X  |         |
| MS. FOXX (NC)                       |     |    |         | MR. KHANNA (CA)                              |     | X  |         |
| MR. GROTHMAN (WI)                   | X   |    |         | MR. MFUME (MD)                               |     | X  |         |
| MR. CLOUD (TX)                      | X   |    |         | MS. BROWN (OH)                               |     | X  |         |
| MR. PALMER (AL)                     | X   |    |         | MS. STANSBURY (NM)                           |     | X  |         |
| MR. HIGGINS (LA)                    | X   |    |         | MR. GARCIA (CA)                              |     | X  |         |
| MR. SESSIONS (TX)                   | X   |    |         | MR. FROST (FL)                               |     | X  |         |
| MR. BIGGS (AZ)                      | X   |    |         | MS. LEE of PENNSYLVANIA<br>(PA)              |     | X  |         |
| MS. MACE (SC)                       | X   |    |         | MR. CASAR (TX)                               |     | X  |         |
| MR. FALLON (TX)                     | X   |    |         | MS. CROCKETT (TX)                            |     | X  |         |
| MR. DONALDS (FL)                    |     |    |         | MS. RANDALL (WA)                             |     |    |         |
| MR. PERRY (PA)                      | X   |    |         | MR. SUBRAMANYAM (VA)                         | X   |    |         |
| MR. TIMMONS (SC)                    | X   |    |         | MS. ANSARI (AZ)                              |     | X  |         |
| MR. BURCHETT (TN)                   | X   |    |         | MR. BELL (MO)                                |     | X  |         |
| MS. GREENE OF GEORGIA (GA)          | X   |    |         | MS. SIMON (CA)                               |     | X  |         |
| MS. BOEBERT (CO)                    | X   |    |         | MR. MIN (CA)                                 | X   |    |         |
| MRS. LUNA (FL)                      | X   |    |         | MS. PRESSLEY (MA)                            |     | X  |         |
| MR. LANGWORTHY (NY)                 | X   |    |         | MS. TLAIB (MI)                               |     | X  |         |
| MR. BURLISON (MO)                   | X   |    |         |                                              |     |    |         |
| MR. CRANE (AZ)                      | X   |    |         |                                              |     |    |         |
| MR. JACK (GA)                       | X   |    |         |                                              |     |    |         |
| MR. MCGUIRE (VA)                    | X   |    |         |                                              |     |    |         |
| MR. GILL (TX)                       | X   |    |         |                                              |     |    |         |

Roll Call Totals:

Ayes: 25

Nays: 17

Present:

Passed: \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_

Failed: \_\_\_\_\_

## EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

During Committee consideration of the bill, Representative James Comer (R-KY), Chairman of the Committee, offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute that made technical changes to the bill. The amendment in the nature of a substitute passed by voice vote.

## LIST OF RELATED COMMITTEE HEARINGS

In accordance with House Rule XIII, clause 3(c)(6), (1) The following hearing was used to develop or consider H.R. 884:

On March 5, 2025, the Committee held a hearing titled “A Hearing with Sanctuary City Mayors” with The Honorable Michelle Wu, Mayor, City of Boston; the Honorable Brandon Johnson, Mayor, City of Chicago; the Honorable Mike Johnston, Mayor, City of Denver; and Mr. David Bier, Director of Immigration Studies, the Cato Institute.

(2) The following related hearing was held:

On March 5, 2025, the Committee held a hearing titled “A Hearing with Sanctuary City Mayors” with The Honorable Michelle Wu, Mayor, City of Boston; the Honorable Brandon Johnson, Mayor, City of Chicago; the Honorable Mike Johnston, Mayor, City of Denver; and Mr. David Bier, Director of Immigration Studies, the Cato Institute.

STATEMENT OF OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII and clause (2)(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee’s oversight findings and recommendations are reflected in the Background and Need for Legislation section above.

## STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

In accordance with clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee’s performance goals or objectives of this bill are to prohibit individuals who are not citizens of the United States from voting in local elections in the District of Columbia.

## APPLICATION OF LAW TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Section 102(b)(3) of Public Law 104–1 requires a description of the application of this bill to the legislative branch where the bill relates to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services and accommodations. This bill does not relate to employment or access to public services and accommodations in the legislative branch.

## DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

In accordance with clause 3(c)(5) of rule XIII no provision of this bill establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program, a program that was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public

Law 111–139, or a program related to a program identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

#### FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT STATEMENT

Pursuant to section 5(b) of Public Law 92–463 (5 U.S.C. 1004(b)), the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the Committee finds that this Committee Print does not direct the establishment of an advisory committee.

#### UNFUNDED MANDATES REFORM ACT STATEMENT

Pursuant to section 423 of the *Congressional Budget Act of 1974* the Committee has included a letter received from the Congressional Budget Office below.

#### EARMARK IDENTIFICATION

This bill does not include any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the House of Representatives.

#### COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee includes below a cost estimate of the bill prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the *Congressional Budget Act of 1974*.

#### NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY AND CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of House rule XIII, the Committee adopts as its own the cost estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 402 of the *Congressional Budget Act of 1974*.

#### CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

With respect to the requirement of clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

#### CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

**LOCAL RESIDENT VOTING RIGHTS  
AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022**

*Be It Enacted By The Council Of The District Of Columbia, [That this Act may be cited as the “Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022”].*

**[SEC. 2.** The District of Columbia Election Code of 1955, approved August 12, 1955 (69 stat. 699; D.C. Official Code § 1-1001.01 et seq.), is amended as follows:

**[(a)** Section 2 (D.C. Official Code § 1-1001.02) is amended as follows:

**[(1)** Paragraph (2) is amended as follows:

**[(A)** Subparagraph (B) is amended to read as follows:

**[(B)** Is a citizen of the United States; except, that this subparagraph shall not apply in a local election;”.

**[(B)** Subparagraph (C) is amended by striking the phrase “any state or territory” and inserting the phrase “any state, territory, or country” in its place.

**[(2)** A new paragraph (34) is added to read as follows:

**[(34)** The term ‘local election’ means:

**[(A)** An election for:

**[(i)** Mayor;

**[(ii)** Chairman or member of the Council;

**[(iii)** Attorney General;

**[(iv)** Member of the State Board of Education; or

**[(v)** Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner; or

**[(B)** An initiative, referendum, recall, or charter amendment measure on a District ballot.”.

**[(b)** Section 7 (D.C. Official Code § 1-1001.07) is amended as follows:

**[(1)** The lead-in language of subsection (c)(1)(D) is amended by striking the phrase “this paragraph and stated that the applicant is a citizen of the United States,” and inserting the phrase “this paragraph,” in its place.

**[(2)** Subsection (d)(14)(C) is amended by striking the phrase “that citizens” and inserting the phrase “that residents” in its place.

**[APPLICABILITY]**

**[SEC. 3. (a)** This act shall apply upon the date of inclusion of its fiscal effect in an approved budget and financial plan.

**[(b)** The Chief Financial Officer shall certify the date of the inclusion of the fiscal effect in an approved budget and financial plan, and provide notice to the Budget Director of the Council of the certification.

**[(c)(1)** The Budget Director shall cause the notice of the certification to be published in the District of Columbia Register.

**[(2)** The date of publication of the notice of the certification shall not affect the applicability of this act.

**[FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT]**

**[SEC. 4.** The Council adopts the fiscal impact statement in the committee report as the fiscal impact statement required by section

4a of the General Legislative Procedures Act of 1975, approved October 16, 2006 (120 Stat. 2038; D.C. Official Code § 1-301.47a).

【EFFECTIVE DATE

【SEC. 5. This act shall take effect following approval by the Mayor (or in the event of veto by the Mayor, action by the Council to override the veto), a 30-day period of congressional review as provided in section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 813; D.C. Official Code § 1-206.02(c)(1)), and publication in the District of Columbia Register.】

## MINORITY VIEWS

Committee Democrats strongly oppose H.R. 884, which would repeal a law duly enacted by the District of Columbia (D.C.) and establish a new D.C. law, because we strongly support local D.C. self-government.

### DENIAL OF DEMOCRACY IN D.C.

The principles of no taxation without representation and consent of the governed helped launch the American Revolution and are enshrined in the Declaration of Independence. Yet, D.C. residents, who pay all federal taxes, have no voting representation in Congress, and Congress has plenary authority over D.C.<sup>1</sup>

The Majority claims Congress has a constitutional duty to legislate on local D.C. matters. That is false, and Republicans legislate on local D.C. matters only when they think they can score political points.

Despite giving Congress plenary authority over D.C., the Framers expected Congress to establish a local government for D.C.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, Congress has established various forms of local government for D.C. since 1802.<sup>3</sup> The Supreme Court has held that “there is no constitutional barrier to the delegation by Congress to the District of Columbia of full legislative power.”<sup>4</sup>

In 1973, Congress passed the D.C. Home Rule Act, which established an elected chief executive (the D.C. Mayor) and an elected legislature (the D.C. Council) for D.C.<sup>5</sup> The purpose of the D.C. Home Rule Act is to, among other things, “grant to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia powers of local self-government” and “relieve Congress of the burden of legislating upon essentially local District matters.”<sup>6</sup> H.R. 884 contravenes the purpose of the D.C. Home Rule Act.

The D.C. Council passed the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022, which permits residents who are not United States citizens to vote in elections for local office and ballot measures, twice, as required by the D.C. Home Rule Act, by votes

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Const. art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 17.

<sup>2</sup> “[A] municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them.” Library of Congress, *Federalist Nos. 41–50* (online at <https://guides.loc.gov/federalist-papers/text-41-50>) (accessed May 26, 2025).

<sup>3</sup> Congressional Research Service, *Governing the District of Columbia: Overview and Timeline* (Jan. 29, 2024) (online at [www.congress.gov/crs-product/IF12577](https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/IF12577)).

<sup>4</sup> *District of Columbia v. John R. Thompson Co., Inc.*, 346 U.S. 100, 109 (1953).

<sup>5</sup> Pub. L. No. 93–198 (1973).

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*

of 12 to 1 and 12 to 0.<sup>7</sup> The D.C. Council opposes H.R. 884, and Congress should not act as a super-legislature for D.C.<sup>8</sup>

Instead of meddling in local D.C. matters, Congress should pass the D.C. statehood bill, H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, which would give D.C. voting representation in Congress and full local self-government. H.R. 51 would admit the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth into the Union and slightly reduce the size of D.C.<sup>9</sup>

The Admissions Clause of the Constitution gives Congress the authority to admit new states.<sup>10</sup> Congress has admitted all 37 new states by simple legislation.<sup>11</sup> The District Clause of the Constitution gives Congress plenary authority over the federal district and establishes a maximum size of the federal district (100 square miles).<sup>12</sup> Congress has the authority to reduce the size of the federal district, as it has previously done.<sup>13</sup>

The Constitution does not establish any prerequisites for new states, but Congress has generally considered three criteria in evaluating new states: (1) commitment to democracy; (2) support for statehood; and (3) sufficient population and resources.<sup>14</sup> There is no question that D.C. meets the historical criteria for statehood.

D.C. residents have been petitioning for voting representation in Congress and local self-government for more than 200 years.<sup>15</sup> On November 8, 2016, D.C. residents approved a referendum advising the D.C. Council to petition Congress for statehood by a vote of 244,134 to 40,779.<sup>16</sup>

D.C. has a larger population than two states.<sup>17</sup> D.C. pays more federal taxes than 21 states and pays more per capita federal taxes than any state.<sup>18</sup> D.C. has a higher per capita personal income than any state.<sup>19</sup> D.C. has a larger gross domestic product than 16 states and a higher per capita gross domestic product than any

<sup>7</sup>D.C. Law 24–242 (online at [https://lms.dccouncil.gov/downloads/LIMS/47374/Signed\\_Act/B24-0300-Signed\\_Act.pdf](https://lms.dccouncil.gov/downloads/LIMS/47374/Signed_Act/B24-0300-Signed_Act.pdf)).

<sup>8</sup>Letter from Council of the District of Columbia to Rep. James Comer, Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and Rep. Gerald Connolly, Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (May 20, 2025).

<sup>9</sup>The new state would consist of 66 of the 68 square miles of the current federal district, and the federal district would consist of two square miles, including the White House, the Capitol complex, the Supreme Court, the principal federal monuments, and the federal buildings adjacent to the National Mall.

<sup>10</sup>U.S. Const. art. IV, Sec. 3, cl. 1.

<sup>11</sup>Congressional Research Service, *DC Statehood: Constitutional Considerations for Proposed Legislation* (May 12, 2022) (online at <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R47101>).

<sup>12</sup>U.S. Const. art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 17.

<sup>13</sup>Congressional Research Service, *DC Statehood: Constitutional Considerations for Proposed Legislation* (May 12, 2022) (online at <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R47101>).

<sup>14</sup>Government Accountability Office, *Experiences of Past Territories Can Assist Puerto Rico Status Deliberations* (Mar. 7, 1980) (online at [www.gao.gov/assets/130/128964.pdf](http://www.gao.gov/assets/130/128964.pdf)).

<sup>15</sup>House Committee on the District of Columbia, *New Columbia Admission Act*, 102nd Cong. (1992) (H. Rept. 102–909).

<sup>16</sup>District of Columbia Board of Elections, *General Election 2016—Certified Results* (Nov. 8, 2016) (online at [https://electionresults.dcboe.org/election\\_results/2016-General-Election](https://electionresults.dcboe.org/election_results/2016-General-Election)).

<sup>17</sup>Census Bureau, *2020 Population and Housing State Data* (online at [www.census.gov/library/visualizations/interactive/2020-population-and-housing-state-data.html](http://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/interactive/2020-population-and-housing-state-data.html)) (accessed May 26, 2025).

<sup>18</sup>Internal Revenue Service, *Internal Revenue Service Data Book, 2023* (online at [www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/p55b.pdf](http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/p55b.pdf)).

<sup>19</sup>Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, *Release Tables: Per Capita Personal Income by State, Annual* (online at <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/release/tables?eid=257197&rid=110>) (accessed May 26, 2025).

state.<sup>20</sup> Federal funds are a smaller percentage of D.C. government revenue than federal funds are of total state government revenue.<sup>21</sup>

#### NONCITIZEN VOTING HISTORY AND CURRENT PRACTICE

While D.C. permits noncitizens to vote only in local elections, the United States has a long history of permitting noncitizens to vote in local, state, territorial, and federal elections. At various points, Congress and 40 states permitted noncitizens to vote, including every state represented by the Majority, except for one.<sup>22</sup> Congress did not prohibit noncitizens from voting in federal elections until 1996.<sup>23</sup> Today, approximately 20 municipalities permit noncitizens to vote in local elections.<sup>24</sup>

The Majority is concerned that foreign diplomats might vote in local D.C. elections. We believe that is unlikely, both because foreign diplomats would have to renounce their right to vote in their country, and because D.C. has no authority over federal matters and has limited local self-government.

To be eligible to vote in D.C., a person must maintain a residence in D.C. for at least 30 days before the election and cannot “claim voting residence or right to vote in any state, territory, or country.”<sup>25</sup> In a letter to Congress, the D.C. Board of Elections (Board) made clear that to vote in a local D.C. election, a foreign diplomat would have to “effectively renounce their right to vote in their country of origin.”<sup>26</sup> The Board noted that a foreign diplomat would have “to swear under penalty of law through the D.C. registration application that the person is not claiming voting residence in another country.”<sup>27</sup> Under D.C. law, the penalty for voter fraud includes imprisonment for up to five years.<sup>28</sup> The Board also noted that an embassy address cannot be used to register to vote, since it is considered a commercial or business address, and a foreign passport cannot be used to register to vote since it does not contain a residential address in D.C.<sup>29</sup>

The Majority might not be aware that United States citizens who are required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act are allowed to vote in elections at all levels of government in the United States.

<sup>20</sup> Bureau of Economic Analysis, *Gross Domestic Product by State and Personal Income by State, 4th Quarter 2024 and Preliminary 2024* (Mar. 28, 2025) (online at [www.bea.gov/news/2025/gross-domestic-product-state-and-personal-income-state-4th-quarter-2024-and-preliminary](http://www.bea.gov/news/2025/gross-domestic-product-state-and-personal-income-state-4th-quarter-2024-and-preliminary)).

<sup>21</sup> The Pew Charitable Trusts, *Where States Get Their Money* (July 8, 2024) (online at [www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/data-visualizations/2024/where-states-get-their-money-fy-2022](http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/data-visualizations/2024/where-states-get-their-money-fy-2022)); District of Columbia, *FY 2022 Approved Budget and Financial Plan* (Sept. 17, 2021) (online at <https://app.box.com/s/5sz8y3wequcgtxqjfxsqugam8bpivy5m>).

<sup>22</sup> Alan Kennedy-Shaffer, *Voters in a Foreign Land: Alien Suffrage and Citizenship in the United States, 1704–1926* (2009) (online at <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5978&context=etd#page=10>); Ron Hayduk, *Democracy for All: Restoring Immigrant Voting Rights in the United States* (2006).

<sup>23</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 611.

<sup>24</sup> Ballotpedia, *Laws Permitting Noncitizens to Vote in the United States* (online at [www.ballotpedia.org/Laws\\_permitting\\_noncitizens\\_to\\_vote\\_in\\_the\\_United\\_States](http://www.ballotpedia.org/Laws_permitting_noncitizens_to_vote_in_the_United_States)) (accessed May 26, 2025).

<sup>25</sup> D.C. Code § 1–1001.02(2)(C).

<sup>26</sup> Letter from Gary Thompson, Chairman, District of Columbia Board of Elections, to Rep. Bryan Steil, Chairman, House Committee on Administration (May 15, 2024).

<sup>27</sup> *Id.*

<sup>28</sup> D.C. Code § 1–1001.14(a).

<sup>29</sup> Letter from Gary Thompson, Chairman, District of Columbia Board of Elections, to Rep. Bryan Steil, Chairman, House Committee on Administration (May 15, 2024).

The Majority is also concerned that undocumented immigrants might vote in local D.C. elections. We believe that is unlikely, because the D.C. voter roll is a public record and undocumented immigrants likely would not want to identify themselves, including their address.

#### CONCLUSION

We strongly oppose H.R. 884 and any other effort to undermine the will of D.C. residents and their locally elected representatives. Instead of interfering in local D.C. matters, Congress should grant D.C.'s statehood petition.

STEPHEN F. LYNCH,  
*Acting Ranking Member.*

