St. Johns Republican Presidential Executive Committee
5122 A1A South · St. Augustine, FL 32080 · (561) 946-1000
info@stjohnsgop.org

May 29, 2026

Sharon Demers
Chairwoman
Republican Party of Florida Congressional Caucus for District 6
395 Palm Coast Parkway SW, Suite 5
Palm Coast, Florida 32137

Re: **The Combination of FISA and the SAVE Act**

I am writing to request an emergency meeting with the Republican Party of Florida Congressional Caucus for District 6. We have already put the matter of the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act, the SAVE Act, before the leadership of the Republican National Committee in the form of a demand for debate and vote by the Republican National Executive Committee. We here in Florida's Congressional District 6 must take the lead.

Our nation needs us. I know I can trust you.

The SAVE Act is on life support. It is stalled in the Senate. The House passed the amended SAVE Act by a narrow vote. The Democratic members of Congress who openly oppose even the most basic constitutional principles appear to have succeeded. As incredible as it sounds, Congress may fail to act on the nation's most fundamental proposition that only United States citizens can vote in United States elections.

Democratic opposition to that principle is not simply irrational and indefensible; it is a brazen violation of fundamental binding constitutional law. Why is this happening, and why is this happening? Because Chief Justice John G. Roberts's judicial-independence ideology has been allowed to function as judicial supremacy. This powerful idea is ours and belongs to Florida Congressional District 6.

President Trump and congressional Republicans are tying the SAVE Act to the pending reauthorization of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISA. That is not a gimmick. It is exactly where the issue belongs. Election integrity, FISA abuse, and federal judicial power are now *finally* the same constitutional crisis. We have had standing in this matter since June 25, 2021.

The SAVE Act and FISA reauthorization are in the same battlefield. We must help save the SAVE Act from political defeat and from falling into Roberts's dangerous hands. Roberts's conduct in *Roe v. Wade* explains the danger. Justice Samuel Alito did not merely overrule *Roe*; he erased *Roe* and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* from the law books with one act. Roberts not only washed his hands of the matter, like Pontius Pilate at the basin. Roberts condemned it as "dramatic and consequential," "unnecessary," and marked it as a "relentless freedom from doubt." Roberts made constitutional clarity look reckless, long over-due finality look excessive, and his failure to own the consequence look like humility. The fact that is not generally known is that Roberts was one Reagen's top lawyers who stopped Reagan from vacating *Roe* in 1981. Also, relevant but forgotten is that Roberts took control of the investigation into who leaked Alito's opinion, which already contained imaginative rant in opposition, and has buried the result.

We must pass the SAVE Act and protect it from the federal judiciary machinery. If enacted without binding constitutional protection, it will face immediate political class lawsuits, injunction requests, emergency motions, and appellate maneuvering and fall under the cover of judicial supremacy. The bill can pass Congress, be signed by President Trump, and still be placed into Roberts's judicial machinery — the same machinery that helped create the crisis in the first place.

FISA proves the point. The FISA court converted the Steele dossier, a piece of political opposition research funded through Hillary Clinton's 2016 presidential campaign and the Democratic National Committee, into judicially validated national-security allegations through secret judicial proceedings. That was not merely a surveillance scandal. It was an election-integrity scandal 4 years before anyone called it one. Roberts unilaterally appoints every judge to the FISA court, including the presiding judge. Congress cannot honestly debate the SAVE Act while ignoring Roberts's centralized control over the secret court machinery that validated the Carter Page warrant process.

Our actions reached Roberts directly on June 25, 2021. More importantly, on December 31, 2025, we filed the McFadden Consideration, which was incorporated, not merged, into the pending June 25, 2021 proceedings. This provides us in political and legal standing. The issue we placed before the Judicial Conference is structural: whether Roberts and the Judicial Conference have converted laws enacted by Congress to restrain federal judges into internal administrative processes controlled by the same judicial institution subject to those restraints.

For years we have followed the same judicial machinery through the Carter Page FISA controversy, the 2020 election litigation, and the later Judicial Conference controversies involving Chief Judge James Boasberg. Roberts appointed Boasberg to the FISA court and

later elevated him to presiding judge during the institutional fallout from the Carter Page warrants. Boasberg then appeared in the 2020 election litigation where he shifted attention away from the judges failure to provide American citizens with public adjudication into an act on the lawyers themselves. He later reappeared in the 2025 controversies involving deportation flights, contempt proceedings, and Judicial Conference discussions concerning President Trump and his Administration. That continuity matters because it reveals the same judicial machinery operating in the same manner across controversies that is being treated by observers as unrelated.

Through this work, President Trump became the first President to use the Judicial Conduct Act. His deputies also sued Roberts. But they did not move against the structural machinery Roberts operates inside the judiciary. Trump's lawyers proceeded narrowly. They challenged individual judges based on immediate injuries. They did not challenge the structure. They did not put before Congress and the Judicial Conference the full issue of Roberts's control over the statutory machinery Congress created to restrain federal judges. Our record does.

This is why we here in Florida's Congressional District 6 have the standing to lead this fight. We have the record, the history, and the legitimate direct challenge to the structure. We must help save the SAVE Act from being buried in Congress and from being attacked by the judicial machinery after passage. We here in Republican Party of Florida's Congressional Caucus for District 6 must supply the substance. Roberts is dangerous.

Roberts himself has supplied the language that exposes the danger. He praises John Marshall as a "genius" and gets away with it. He openly presents Marshall as the heroic inventor of judicial supremacy, tells the nation that disagreement with lawless political rulings is not a basis for impeachment, and describes judicial independence as the Constitution's "only real political-science innovation." Those statements reveal the problem. To Roberts's judicial independence means judges can control FISA court appointments, judicial conduct proceedings, ethics disclosures, FOIA-related records, and the machinery that will review the SAVE Act. This shows Congress has not protected judicial independence. It has permitted judicial government.

The same danger appears in Roberts's misconduct toward Alito discussed above.

The history behind this problem begins with the Judicial Conduct Act of 1980 and the Reagan-era failure to make that Act a real weapon of judicial accountability. The Act was presented as a congressional answer to judicial misconduct. But the decisive question was never whether there would be an effective impeachment process. The decisive question was on who would control it was left open. Thus, judges themselves absorbed the process into

its own machinery. The law that should have restrained judicial misconduct became the architecture of judicial self-protection.

That history matters to the combination of the FISA reauthorization with the SAVE Act. The same structure that internalized judicial discipline, protected judicial supremacy, and placed judicial administration of FISA beyond constitutional control will be used to interfere with the SAVE Act after passage. The federal judiciary cannot be allowed to judge the legality of the most basic principle to protect election-integrity while its own administrative structure, records, disclosures, conduct proceedings, and FISA appointments remain controlled internally by the same Chief Justice whose authority is implicated in the controversy.

Republicans in District 6 must lead. We can show President Trump and the people of America that the SAVE Act is not merely an election bill. It is a test of whether Congress will pass a law that protects the most basic constitutional principle and keep it away the judicial administrative machine that created the election integrity crisis. The Save Act cannot be secured while the federal judicial machinery remains unexamined, unrestrained, and administratively controlled by Roberts.

Saving the SAVE Act means passing it. But passing it will not be enough. The real work is to assure that Roberts's judiciary cannot continue to convert laws enacted by Congress to restrain federal judges into internal administrative processes controlled by the same judicial institution subject to those restraints.

Respectfully,

Manuel P. Asensio
Chairman