

# TED CRUZ ON VOTING RIGHTS

## Highlights:

- Ted Cruz voted to overturn the 2020 election.
  - Cruz led efforts to overturn the 2020 election results.
  - Cruz voted to throw out Arizona and Pennsylvania's electoral votes.
  - Cruz refused to say whether he would unconditionally support the results of the 2024 election.
- Ted Cruz opposed legislative efforts which would make it easier to vote.
  - Cruz voted against the John Lewis Act.
  - Cruz voted against the Freedom to Vote Act.
  - Cruz opposed funding voter re-enfranchisement efforts.
- Ted Cruz supported making it more difficult to vote.
  - Cruz supported voter ID.
  - Cruz supported requiring proof of citizenship to register to vote.
- Ted Cruz opposed funding efforts to secure elections.
  - Cruz voted against election integrity funding.
  - Cruz voted against election security grants.
  - Cruz voted against funding to combat Russian hacking.
- Ted Cruz opposed reforming the electoral college process.
- Ted Cruz voted to confirm nominees with a history of opposing voting rights.

## Cruz Hoped To Overturn The 2020 Election

### CRUZ LED EFFORTS TO OVERTURN THE 2020 ELECTION IN THE SENATE

**Cruz Hoped To Overturn The 2020 Election.** According to the Washington Post, “In the plan Cruz laid out to the Fox News host and her producer, if a majority of the House and the Senate objected to electoral certification on Jan. 6, 2021, then an electoral commission would be stood up immediately, commencing a 10-day review period to be completed before the inauguration. If the commission found ‘credible evidence of fraud that undermines confidence in the electoral results in any given state,’ then the state would then call a special session and recertify results, according to Cruz. ‘Is there any chance you can overturn this?’ Bartiromo asked Cruz. ‘I hope so,’ he responded.”

**Cruz Advocated For A Committee To Audit Unsubstantiated Claims Of Voter Fraud** According to the Washington Post, “Sen. Ted Cruz advocated the creation of a congressionally appointed electoral commission ahead of the Jan. 6, 2021, attack on the U.S. Capitol to make a credible assessment of unsubstantiated claims of voter fraud in the 2020 election, according to a recording made by Abby Grossberg, a former producer at Fox News.” [Washington Post, [4/25/23](#)]

**Cruz Said He Organized Senators To Object To The Certification Of The 2020 Election.** According to the Washington Post, “Cruz says in the recorded conversation that he successfully organized 11 senators to object to the electoral certification as the mechanism to establish a commission. Cruz was the first senator to object to the electoral college results, joining Rep. Paul A. Gosar (R-Ariz.) in challenging Arizona’s electoral certification. The Post has previously reported on Cruz’s proposal of delaying the certification of the electoral college results to spark a 10-day ‘audit’ that could enable GOP state legislatures to overturn the election results.” [Washington Post, [4/25/23](#)]

### CRUZ SUPPORTED THE ARIZONA VOTE COUNT OBJECTION

**2021: Cruz Voted For Objecting To Arizona’s Vote Count From The November 2020 Elections.** In January 2021, according to Congressional Quarterly, Cruz voted for an “objection to the counting of electoral votes from the state of

Arizona during the joint session of Congress, on the grounds that they were not, under all of the known circumstances, regularly given.” The vote was on agreeing to the objection. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 6-93. [Senate Vote 1, [1/6/21](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/6/21](#)]

- **The Debate On The Arizona Vote Count Was Interrupted By Trump Supporters That Raided The U.S. Capitol.** According to Forbes, “The debate was interrupted by Trump supporters who violently stormed the U.S. Capitol building, causing lawmakers to be moved to an undisclosed secure location.” [Forbes, [1/6/21](#)]

## **CRUZ SUPPORTED THE PENNSYLVANIA VOTE COUNT OBJECTION**

**2021: Cruz Voted For Objecting To Pennsylvania’s Vote Count From The November 2020 Elections.** In January 2021, according to Congressional Quarterly, Cruz voted for an “objection to the counting of electoral votes from the state of Pennsylvania during the joint session of Congress, on the grounds that they were not, under all of the known circumstances, regularly given.” The vote was on agreeing to the objection. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 7-92. [Senate Vote 2, [1/7/21](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/7/21](#)]

## **CRUZ REFUSED TO RECOGNIZE THE LEGITIMACY OF THE 2020 ELECTION**

**2022: Cruz Would Not Say Biden Was Legitimately Elected.** According to the Texas Tribune, “Nearly two years after former President Donald Trump’s supporters attacked the U.S. Capitol and delayed certification of the 2020 election, U.S. Sen. Ted Cruz still won’t say President Joe Biden was legitimately elected. During a confrontational appearance Monday on ‘The View,’ the Texas Republican was grilled about his continued support for Trump, his onetime opponent for the Republican nomination to be president. Alyssa Farah Griffin, a former communications director in Trump’s White House who has since become fiercely critical of the former president, pressed Cruz on whether he believed Biden had legitimately won the 2020 election. But Cruz redirected, instead focusing on Democrats who had previously bemoaned their own electoral losses. ‘Biden is the president today,’ Cruz said. ‘There are a lot of folks in the media that try to, anytime a Republican is in front of a TV camera, try to say the election was fair and square and legitimate. You know who y’all don’t do that to? You don’t do it to Hillary Clinton.’ ‘So it’s illegitimate when Republicans win but not when Democrats win?’ Cruz added.” [Texas Tribune, [10/24/22](#)]

## **CRUZ REFUSED TO SAY HE WOULD ACCEPT THE 2024 ELECTION**

**Cruz Refused To Say If He Would Accept The Results Of The 2024 Election.** According to CNN, “Republican Sen. Ted Cruz refused on Wednesday to say whether he will unconditionally accept the results of the 2024 election, the latest in a series of comments by prominent Republicans that seek to cast doubt on the legitimacy of the upcoming presidential contest. ‘I think that’s actually a ridiculous question,’ replied Cruz when asked by CNN’s Kaitlan Collins on ‘The Source’ whether he will accept the results of the 2024 election regardless of who wins. ‘So you’re asking, ‘Will you promise, no matter what, to agree an election is legitimate regardless of what happens?,’ and that would be an absurd thing to claim. Like, we have an entire election law system: that people challenge elections, elections get overturned, voter fraud gets proven. That happens all the time,’ Cruz said.” [CNN, [5/23/24](#)]

## **Cruz Opposed Efforts To Make It Easier To Vote**

### **CRUZ OPPOSED THE JOHN LEWIS ACT**

**Cruz Opposed The John Lewis Act.** According to the Texas Tribune, “Texas’ U.S. senators, John Cornyn and Ted Cruz, are on track next week to help deliver what could be the final blow to Democratic hopes of passing a federal voting bill that would shut down many of the voter restrictions the Texas Legislature passed into law last year. The U.S. Senate is expected to soon address a House-passed bill that would reinstate parts of the 1965 Voting Rights Act and push back against sweeping voting changes passed by Republican-controlled legislatures across the country. [...] The Democratic legislation at hand passed the House in a party line vote on Thursday, and Senate Democratic leaders are expected to put the bill on the floor in the coming days. Known as Freedom to Vote: The John Lewis Act, the legislation is named for the late civil rights leader and member of Congress who died in 2020.” [Texas Tribune, [1/14/22](#)]

### **The Bill Would Improve Native American Voter Access**

**The John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act Of 2021 Would Have Improved Voter Access For Native Americans By Authorizing \$10 Million Yearly Through FY 2037 For A Native American Voting Task Force Grant Program To Improve Voter Turnout, Ballot Access, Address Internet Issues And Provide Information In The Community's Native Language.** The John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2021 would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “also include several provisions intended to improve voting access for Native Americans. It would authorize \$10 million annually through fiscal 2037 for a Native American voting task force grant program for activities to increase voter turnout and ballot access in Native American communities, including to address internet connectivity issues and provide information in the community's dominant language.” [Congressional Quarterly, [11/3/21](#)]

### **The Bill Provided Protections For Election Workers**

**The John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act Of 2021 Would Have Been Similar To The House-Passed Version But Would Add Provisions That Expand Protections For Election Workers Against Violence And Threats.** The John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2021 would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “The text of the bill is largely similar to that of a bill (HR 4) passed by the House on August 24. Among other differences, the bill would add provisions that would expand and clarify protections for election workers against threats and violence.” [Congressional Quarterly, [11/3/21](#)]

### **The Bill Would Restore Preclearance Requirements Under The Voting Rights Act**

**The John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act Of 2021 Would Have Effectively Restored Preclearance Requirements Under The Voting Rights Act For All Voting Changes In States And Localities With A History Of Voting Discrimination In The Last 25 Years.** The John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2021 would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “effectively restore preclearance requirements under the Voting Rights Act for any changes to voting practices in states and localities with a history of voting rights violations within the previous 25 years.” [Congressional Quarterly]

- **The Measure Would Have Sought To Authorize The Justice Department And Federal Courts To Preclear State Election Laws, Including Before They Take Effect, By Restoring Provisions Of The Voting Rights Act That Were Struck Down In 2013 By The Supreme Court.** According to The Washington Post, “The John Lewis bill instead seeks to empower the Justice Department and federal courts to review state election laws — in some cases, before they take effect — restoring provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that have been struck down by the Supreme Court in a series of decisions since 2013.” [The Washington Post, [11/3/21](#)]
- **The Measure Would Have Updated The Voting Rights Act To Reinforce Provisions That Were Thrown Out And Weakened By The Supreme Court Decision On Shelby County V. Holder In 2013 And The 2021 Decision On Brnovich V. Democratic National Committee.** According to The Hill, “The voting rights bill named after Lewis would update the Voting Rights Act (VRA) to strengthen sections of the 1965 law that were gutted by the Supreme Court’s 2013 Shelby County v. Holder decision, which focused on Section 5 of the VRA that required Justice Department preclearance before some states could change voting laws, and the 2021 Brnovich v. Democratic National Committee decision, which advocates believe weakened Section 2 of the 1965 law focused on racially targeted voting policies.” [The Hill, [10/20/21](#)]

### **The Bill Would Reinforce Anti-Discrimination Authorities**

**The John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act Of 2021 Would Have Reinforced Anti-Discrimination Authorities For Voting Practices.** According to Congressional Quarterly, the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2021 would “include a number of provisions to strengthen anti-discrimination enforcement authorities in relation to voting practices.” [Congressional Quarterly, [11/3/21](#)]

- **Republicans Blocked A Third Major Voting Rights Bill, Which Was Another Democrat Priority Measure In Response To Voter Restrictions Passed In Republican-Majority State Legislature After Former President Trump Falsely Claimed Fraud In The 2020 Election.** According to The Washington Post, “Republican senators on Wednesday voted to block debate on the third major voting rights bill that congressional Democrats have sought to pass

this year in response to the state-level GOP push to restrict ballot access following former president Donald Trump's false claims of a stolen 2020 election." [The Washington Post, [11/3/21](#)]

## CRUZ EFFECTIVELY VOTED AGAINST THE FREEDOM TO VOTE ACT

**2022: Cruz Effectively Voted Against The Freedom To Vote Act.** In January 2022, according to Congressional Quarterly, Cruz voted against the "motion to invoke cloture on the Schumer, D-N.Y., motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill, with a further Senate amendment." The vote was on a motion to invoke cloture. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 49-51. [Senate Vote 9, [1/19/22](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/19/22](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 5746](#)]

- **The Freedom To Vote Act Was A Broad Measure That Affected Congressional Redistricting And Campaign Finance.** According to NPR, "The second bill the Senate is considering is the Freedom to Vote Act. It's a more sweeping measure of the two, and would affect everything from the way congressional districts are drawn to how campaigns are financed." [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]
- **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Made Election Day A National Holiday, Permit States To Have At Least 2 Weeks Of Early Voting, Allow No-Excuse Absentee Ballot Voting, Require Greater Accessibility For People With Disabilities, Require States To Broaden Their Valid Photo Identification Requirements, And Require States To Offer Same-Day And Online Voter Registration.** According to NPR, "The measure would: make Election Day a national holiday, aimed at making easier for all voters to get to the polls that day; allow states to have early voting for at least two weeks prior to Election Day, including nights and weekends; allow voting by mail with no excuses needed, and voters could put their ballots in drop boxes; require that states make voting more accessible for people with disabilities; require that states that require IDs for voting would have to broaden the types of identification acceptable. States would also have to offer same-day voting registration and online registration and also make it easier to register at places like departments of motor vehicles." [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]
- **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Prohibited Partisan Gerrymandering And Limit How States May Conduct Voter Purges From Voter Checklists.** According to NPR, "The measure would also outlaw partisan gerrymandering — that is, drawing congressional boundaries to the political advantage of one party or another — and would limit the ways states can purge people from voting rolls." [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]
- **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Regulated Campaign Finance By Limiting Dark Money By Political Action Committees And Requiring Groups That Spend Over \$10K To Disclose Their Donors.** According to NPR, "It would also impose new rules on how campaigns are paid for by limiting the use of so-called dark money by political action committees. Any group that spends more than \$10,000 to influence an election would be required to disclose all donors." [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]
- **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Establish A Small Donor Matching System For House Candidates, In Which The Election Assistance And Innovation Fund Would Match Contributions Up To \$200 At A 6 To 1 Ratio.** According to NPR, "A small donor matching system would be set up for House candidates. A new Election Assistance and Innovation Fund would match contributions up to \$200 at a 6:1 ratio. The fund would not use taxpayer dollars and instead be financed through assessments paid on fines, penalties and settlements for certain tax crimes and corporate malfeasance." [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]
- **The Freedom To Vote Act Would Have Fortified The Federal Election Commission's Authority To Investigate Campaign Abuse Charges And Require The Replacement Of Outdated Voting Machines With Machines That Provide Voters Paper Receipts Of Their Ballots.** According to NPR, "The measure would also strengthen the Federal Election Commission's ability to investigate charges of campaign abuses and require that states replace outdated voting machines with ones that, among other things, provide voters with paper records of their ballots." [NPR, [1/18/22](#)]

### Cruz Backed Voter Suppression Methods

## CURZ VOTED TO REQUIRE PHOTO ID IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS

**2013: Cruz Voted To Support Requiring A Photo ID To Vote In Federal Elections.** In March 2013, Cruz voted to support requiring Americans to show a photo ID to vote in federal elections. According to a press release from Sen. David Vitter, “U.S. Senator David Vitter (R-La.) today offered an amendment to the Senate budget resolution to require a valid government-issued photographic ID to vote in a federal election.” According to the Congressional Record, the purpose of the amendment was to “establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to ensure election integrity by requiring a valid government-issued photographic ID for voting in federal elections.” The Senate rejected the amendment by a vote of 44 to 54. [Senate Vote 83, [3/23/13](#); Congressional Record, [3/22/13](#); David Vitter Press Release, [3/22/13](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 526](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Con. Res. 8](#)]

## **CRUZ OPPOSED FEDERAL PRE-CLEARANCE BECAUSE IT BLOCKED PHOTO ID LAWS**

**2012: Cruz Opposed A Provision Of The Voting Rights Act Designed To Protect Minority Voters In Southern States Because It Blocked A Law Requiring Photo ID To Vote.** According to the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, “It’s time to do away with the nearly 50-year-old federal rule that let U.S. officials block a new state law requiring Texans to show photo ID to vote. That’s what Republicans candidates running to replace Kay Bailey Hutchison in the U.S. Senate said during a forum Thursday night. They called for repeal of the Voting Rights Act provision that requires Texas and other Southern states with histories of discrimination to receive pre-clearance when changing election laws. ‘Right now, Texas is subjected to different standards than much of the country,’ former Texas Solicitor General Ted Cruz said during the forum, hosted by the Dallas Bar Association. ‘I think we need to be fighting to ensure the law is colorblind and fair to everyone. ‘The Department of Justice ... is acting to stop Texas from implementing ... common-sense law.’” [Fort Worth Star-Telegram, [3/16/12](#)]

## **CRUZ SPONSORED LEGISLATION REQUIRING PROOF OF CITIZENSHIP TO REGISTER TO VOTE**

**2013: Cruz Sponsored Legislation To Require Proof Of Citizenship For Voter Registration.** According to Politico, “Ted Cruz didn’t wait long to mount a legislative response to the Supreme Court’s ruling against Arizona’s voter registration rule. An amendment submitted by the Texas senator on Monday afternoon to the Senate’s immigration bill would ‘permit states to require proof of citizenship for registration to vote in elections for federal office.’ Cruz’s measure would amend the National Voter Registration Act.” [Politico, [6/17/13](#)]

## **Cruz Opposed Funding Election Security**

### **CRUZ VOTED AGAINST ELECTION INTEGRITY FUNDING**

**2019: Cruz Voted Against The FY 2020 Minibus Appropriations Bill, Which Provided \$440 Million To The Election Assistance Commission.** In December 2019, Cruz voted against the FY 2020 minibus appropriations bill. According to Congressional Quarterly, the bill “provides \$440 million to the Election Assistance Commission, including \$425 million in new grants to improve the security and integrity of elections for Federal office.” The vote was a motion to concur. The Senate agreed to the motion by a vote of 81-11, thereby sending the bill to the president, who signed it into law. [Senate Vote 428, [12/19/19](#); Congressional Quarterly, [12/19/19](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R.1158](#)]

- **The FY 2020 Minibus Provided \$425 Million In New Grant Funding For States To Enhance Election Security.** According to The Hill, “The spending deal agreed upon by House and Senate negotiators includes \$425 million for states to improve their election security [...] [the bill] will also include a requirement for states to match 20 percent of the federal funds, meaning the eventual amount given to election officials to improve election security would reach \$150 million [The Hill, [12/16/19](#)]

### **CRUZ VOTED AGAINST ELECTION SECURITY GRANTS**

**2018: Cruz Voted Against Appropriating \$250 Million In Election Security Grants.** In August 2018, Cruz voted against an amendment that would have, according to Congressional Quarterly, “appropriate[ed] \$250 million for election security grants.” The underlying bill was an FY 2019 Appropriations bill for Interior, Environment, Financial Services, Agriculture, Transportation, and HUD. The Senate rejected the amendment by a vote of 50 to 47, where 60 votes was needed for

adoption. [Senate Vote 176, [8/1/18](#); Congressional Quarterly, [8/1/18](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 3464](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 3399](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 6147](#)]

## **CRUZ VOTED AGAINST FUNDING EFFORTS TO OPPOSE RUSSIAN HACKING**

**2018: Cruz Voted Against The \$1.3 Trillion FY 2018 Omnibus Spending Deal, Which Raised Spending By \$138 Billion Over FY 2017 Levels, Including \$300 Million To The FBI To Counter Russian Election Hacking And \$380 Million For The Election Assistance Commission To Help States Improve Election Security.** In March 2018, Cruz voted against the FY 2018 Omnibus spending bill. According to Congressional Quarterly, “Combined, the spending measures would provide about \$1.3 trillion in discretionary spending, with \$1.2 trillion subject to discretionary spending caps, and \$78.1 billion designated as Overseas Contingency Operations funds. The measure's spending levels are consistent with the increased defense and non-defense budget caps set by the two-year budget deal agreed to last month. That agreement increased the FY 2018 defense cap by \$80 billion and the non-defense cap by \$63 billion. Given that the previous caps were set to reduce overall discretionary spending by \$5 billion, the net increase provided by the omnibus is \$138 billion over the FY 2017 level.” The vote was a motion to concur. The Senate agreed to the motion by a vote of 65 to 33, thereby sending the bill to the president, who signed it into law. [Senate Vote 63, [3/23/18](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/22/18](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1625](#)]

- **The Bill Provided \$300 Million To The FBI To Counter Russian Election Hacking And \$380 Million For The Election Assistance Commission To Help States Improve Election Security.** According to the Washington Post, “The bill provides \$380 million to the federal Election Assistance Commission to make payments to states to improve election security and technology, and the FBI is set to receive \$300 million in counterintelligence funding to combat Russian hacking.” [Washington Post, [3/22/18](#)]

## **Cruz Opposed Electoral College Reform**

### **CRUZ VOTED AGAINST BIPARTISAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION REFORM**

**2022: Cruz Voted Against The FY 2023 Omnibus Spending Package, Which Included The Presidential Election Reform Act And Changed The Procedures For Casting And Counting Electoral Votes In Presidential Elections.** In December 2022, according to Congressional Quarterly, Cruz voted against concurring the Senate amendment with the House amendment of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023, which would “modify procedures for casting and counting electoral votes in presidential elections.” The vote was on a motion to concur. The Senate concurred with the House and Senate amendments by a vote of 68-29, thus the amended bill was sent to the House for final concurrence. Subsequently, the House concurred with the Senate and sent the final bill to President Biden. The bill was signed into law. [Senate Vote 421, [12/22/22](#); Congressional Quarterly, [12/22/22](#); Congressional Actions, [S.Amdt. 6552](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 2617](#)]

- **The Presidential Election Reform Act Made It More Difficult To Overturn A Certificated Presidential Election, Which Was The First Legislative Response To The January 6th Insurrection Led By Former President Trump.** According to CNN, “A provision in the legislation aims at making it harder to overturn a certified presidential election, the first legislative response to the US Capitol insurrection and then-President Donald Trump’s campaign to stay in power despite his loss in 2020.” [CNN, [12/29/22](#)]
- **The Provisions Clarified That The Vice President’s Role During The Certification Of Election Results Was Exclusively Ceremonial And Clarified The Accurate Slate Of State Electors.** According to CNN, “The legislation clarifies the vice president’s role while overseeing the certification of the electoral result to be completely ceremonial. It also creates a set of stipulations designed to make it harder for there to be any confusion over the accurate slate of electors from each state.” [CNN, [12/29/22](#)]
- **The Provision Raised The Threshold For Objecting To A State’s Slate Of Electors To 20% Of Members Of Each Chamber Of Congress, Instead Of Having Only One Member Of Each Chamber Challenge The Electors.** According to NPR, “Importantly, the measure also would raise the bar for objecting to a state’s slate of electors. As it stands now, it takes just one member of the House and one senator to challenge a state’s electors and send both chambers into a potentially days-long debate period, even without legitimate concerns. The new legislation would raise the threshold for an objection to 20% of the members of each chamber.” [NPR, [12/23/22](#)]

## Cruz Opposed Funding Voter Re-Enfranchisement

### CRUZ EFFECTIVELY VOTED AGAINST VOTER RE-ENFRANCHISEMENT

**2015: Cruz Effectively Voted Against Providing Funding For Voter Re-Enfranchisement.** In March 2015, Cruz effectively voted against funding for voter re-enfranchisement. According to Congressional Quarterly, the amendment would have “create[d] a deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow for legislation that would [have] provide[d] a funding stream for a voter re-enfranchisement initiative, which may include Bureau of Prisons notifications to released inmates of voting rights, notifications by U.S. attorneys of voting rights restrictions during plea agreements, and a Justice Department report on the disproportionate impact of criminal disenfranchisement laws on minority populations.” The underlying legislation was S.Con.Res.11, the FY 2016 Senate budget resolution. The vote was on the amendment. The Senate rejected the amendment by a vote of 47 to 51. [Senate Vote 133, [3/27/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/27/15](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 367](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Con. Res. 11](#)]

## Cruz Voted To Confirm Opponents Of Voting Rights

### CRUZ VOTED TO CONFIRM JEFF SESSIONS AS ATTORNEY GENERAL

**2017: Cruz Voted To Confirm Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-AL) To Be The Attorney General.** In February 2017, Cruz voted for confirming President Trump’s nominee to be Attorney General, Jeff Sessions. The vote was on the nomination. The Senate confirmed Sessions by a vote 52 to 47. [Senate Vote 59, [2/7/17](#); Congressional Actions, [P.N. 30](#)]

- **1986: Sessions Confirmed That He Believed “That The Voting Rights Act Is An Intrusive Piece Of Legislation.”** According to the Washington Post, “Metzenbaum, noting that Sessions has not hired a black lawyer in more than four years in office, asked: ‘Could any black person come into your court and feel they had a chance of getting justice before you?’ Sessions also confirmed that he believes ‘that the Voting Rights Act is an intrusive piece of legislation’ but added that he thinks the law has been ‘effective.’” [Washington Post, 3/14/86]

### CRUZ VOTED TO CONFIRM ANDREW BRASHER AS A FEDERAL JUDGE

**2020: Cruz Voted For The Confirmation Of Andrew Brasher To Be A U.S. Circuit Judge For The 11th Circuit.** In February 2020, according to Congressional Quarterly, Cruz voted for the “confirmation of President Donald Trump’s nomination of Andrew Brasher to be a U.S. circuit judge for the Eleventh Circuit.” The vote was confirmation. The Senate confirmed Brasher by a vote of 52-43. [Senate Vote 36, [2/11/20](#); Congressional Quarterly, [2/11/20](#); Congressional Actions, [PN1325](#)]

- **2013: Brasher Filed An Amicus Brief In Shelby v. Holder Supporting The Effective Repeal Of The Voting Rights Act.** According to the Leadership Conference on Civil & Human Rights, “In 2013, in the infamous Shelby County v. Holder decision, five right-wing justices on the Supreme Court gutted the landmark Voting Rights Act, which had been repeatedly reauthorized by strong bipartisan majorities in Congress. Mr. Brasher filed an amicus brief asking the Court to do just that. He asserted that ‘Congress violated the Constitution’ when it reauthorized the Voting Rights Act in 2006.” [Leadership Conference on Civil & Human Rights, [12/3/19](#)]

### CRUZ VOTED TO CONFIRM ERIC MURPHY AS A FEDERAL JUDGE

**2019: Cruz Voted To Confirm Eric Murphy To Be A Judge On The Sixth Circuit.** In March 2019, Cruz voted for confirming Eric Murphy to be a Judge on the Sixth Circuit. The Senate confirmed Murphy by a vote of 52 to 46. [Senate Vote 39, [3/7/19](#); Congressional Actions, [P.N. 242](#)]

- **Murphy Has Argued In Favor Of Reducing Voting Rights.** According to the Huffington Post, “But Murphy is perhaps best known for defending Ohio’s notorious voter purge law before the Supreme Court in 2018, arguing that the state should be able to drop people from its voter rolls if they don’t vote for six years and don’t respond to a postcard asking them to confirm their address. The court upheld the law in a contentious 5-4 decision, with Justice Sonia

Sotomayor writing in her dissent that the law will disproportionately make it harder for ‘minority, low-income, disabled, homeless, and veteran voters to cast a ballot.’ That same year, Murphy argued in favor of upholding the so-called perfection requirement, allowing Ohio to discard ballots because of minor clerical errors. In 2014, Murphy defended the elimination of Ohio’s ‘Golden Week,’ a five-day period in which voters could register and vote at the same time. The state created the period in response to the 2004 election, when many Ohio voters were forced to wait in line for up to 12 hours to vote. The 6th Circuit ruled in favor of getting rid of the period, but Judge Jane Stranch wrote in her dissent that it would impose ‘a disproportionate burden on African Americans’ and ‘was linked to social and historical conditions of discrimination that diminish the ability of African Americans to participate in the political process.’ [Huffington Post, [3/7/19](#)]