United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *119th* CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2026 *No. 54*

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 24, 2026, at 12 p.m.

Senate

MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2026

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, who does wondrous things, blessed be Your glorious name forever. Remake us in Your image, and bring our hearts under Your control.

Lord, infuse our Senators with a love for You that will make their obedience willing, joyful, and consistent. Astound them with Your limitless resources and supply all their needs from Your bounty. Keep them humble with the conviction that they can't breathe a breath, think a thought, or speak a word without Your mercy, grace, and power.

And, Lord, as the former chaplain of the U.S. Marine Corps, I thank You for the life and service of Robert S. Mueller III.

We pray in Your great name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Budd). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of MARKWAYNE MULLIN, of Oklahoma, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

NOMINATION OF MARKWAYNE MULLIN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Today, I will vote for the new Secretary of Homeland Security. The entire Senate will confirm our colleague the junior Senator from Oklahoma as the Department of Homeland Security Secretary.

Senator MULLIN is a welcome addition to the Cabinet. He is a consensus builder and, most importantly, has Oklahoma dirt under his fingernails. I am confident that he will use his business experience—and, more importantly to this farmer, his rancher experience—to get things done in the Department of Homeland Security.

I am confident, as I talked to him today about the importance of congressional oversight, and I hope he will take congressional oversight very seriously.

My advice to him is: Be transparent and responsive to the American people. Answer our letters. Protect whistleblowers. Hear whistleblowers out.

There is no way a Secretary can know what is going on in the bowels of the Department; and that is why, when people come to you saying, ''Things aren't right, money is not being spent right, and the law is not being followed,'' listen to them.

And as I always say, run the Department; don't let the Department run you.

I wish Senator MULLIN all the best as he takes on this new role. I know he will serve his country with distinction. I urge my colleagues to support his nomination.

HOME FOR EVERY CHILD INITIATIVE

On another matter, Mr. President, in my years in the U.S. Senate, I have been a person very interested in the foster care system serving the young people. So I would like to recognize a meaningful initiative that the Administration for Children and Families, or ACF, launched called A Home for Every Child.

ACF's A Home for Every Child initiative ''sets an ambitious goal of achieving a foster home-to-child ratio greater than one-to-one in every state.'' I applaud this very ambitious goal.

I also have been working to beef up foster parent recruitment and retention efforts because kids in foster care deserve qualified, well-trained, and loving parents.

My bipartisan Recruiting Families Using Data Act complements ACF's A Home for Every Child initiative by enabling State child welfare agencies to

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

integrate best practices along with quality data. This will help ensure that foster youths and parents are best supported.

When referring to raising a child, a common phrase is used: It takes a village. That phrase rings more true when a child experiences foster care.

So I want to take this opportunity to thank First Lady Melania Trump for her work to modernize the child welfare system. It will strengthen partnerships for youth aging out of foster care through the program entitled Fostering the Future for American Children and Families initiative.

I also want to thank Assistant Secretary Adams for following through on his commitment to tackle the foster recruitment and retention challenge that is tainting child welfare agencies nationwide.

I look forward to continuing to work with the Senate Committee on Finance to advance the Recruiting Families Using Data Act.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we have been debating the SAVE America Act for 7 days now, and what has been made clear in this debate is how out of touch Democrats are with most Americans.

Polls show that the commonsense policies in the SAVE America Act have support from the American people, but Democrats have repeatedly demonstrated they don't share the American people's interest in securing our elections.

And despite Americans' concerns, Democrats continue to embrace transgender ideology that allows men to compete in women's sports and children—children—to undergo irreversible, life-altering gender transition procedures.

At the start of this debate, the Democratic leader had the audacity to say that the SAVE America Act is a ''radical bill.'' ''Radical''—that is what he said.

Well, what is radical, I would say, about ensuring that only American citizens are voting in American elections? What is radical about asking voters for a photo ID?

And I don't know what world Democrats are living in, where keeping biological men out of women's sports is a radical proposition.

What is radical is men lining up alongside women at the starting line and winning medals and trophies meant for women. What is radical is telling female athletes that they have to share a locker room with a biological male. That is radical.

Now, perhaps what is most radical about Democrats' position is that they seem to have no problem with gender transition procedures for minors. Democrats are more than happy to let transgender ideology reign, even when there is little to no evidence to support gender transition procedures for minors and increasing amounts of scientific evidence about the harms of these procedures for children.

But Democrats ignore the science. They ignore the fact that multiple European nations that have looked at the science have reined in gender transition procedures for minors.

They ignore the stories of Americans who underwent irreversible procedures as minors and have long lived to regret it.

So the SAVE America Act is not radical—radically common sense, maybe—so common sense, in fact, that only congressional Democrats could oppose it.

NOMINATION OF COLIN MCDONALD

Mr. President, as debate continues on the SAVE America Act, Republicans are also working to advance two nominees for important posts in the Trump administration.

One of those is Colin McDonald, whom President Trump has nominated to lead the new National Fraud Enforcement Division at the Department of Justice.

Fraud is a serious issue. Last year, it became clear that widespread fraud had taken root in the State of Minnesota. Prosecutors are working through cases and indictments related to at least $9 billion in fraud, impacting 14 federally funded programs in that State alone.

And Minnesota is just the tip of the iceberg. The Government Accountability Office estimates that as much as $500 billion in Federal funds is lost each year to fraud.

Now, needless to say, Mr. McDonald has his work cut out for him; and he is well suited to the challenge.

Colin McDonald is a career Federal prosecutor, which means, for his entire career, he has had only one client, and that is the American people.

Until coming to Washington to work at the Department of Justice, last year, Mr. McDonald spent 10 years as an assistant U.S. attorney in the Southern District of California. In that position, he spent a considerable amount of time trying cases in Federal court, including cases dealing with fraud, money laundering, and public corruption.

And his work has received notable praise. During one case in the Ninth Circuit, the judge actually interrupted proceedings to praise Mr. McDonald. None other than Judge Harry Pregerson, a notably progressive judge, said of Mr. McDonald:

I want to commend you on your candor, your openness, and your honesty with the Court.

Colin McDonald is well suited to provide justice for American taxpayers in this role, and I look forward to confirming him swiftly so he can get to work.

NOMINATION OF MARKWAYNE MULLIN

Mr. President, the other nominee that we will be confirming this week is somebody we all know well—our colleague MARKWAYNE MULLIN.

President Trump has nominated MARKWAYNE to be the Secretary of Homeland Security. It is a tough assignment—made all the more challenging right now by Democrats having shut down DHS for 5 weeks.

But we all know that MARKWAYNE isn't afraid of a challenge—far from it. As a young man, MARKWAYNE left college to take over his family plumbing business. He grew that small enterprise into a large and successful business in the State of Oklahoma.

Just a few weeks after being elected to the House, when the Oklahoma delegation was touring storm damage, MARKWAYNE cut away from the other congressmen and climbed through debris to try to shut off water shooting through the wreckage. See a problem? Take action to solve it. That is MARKWAYNE. It is a big part of what drew him to public service.

I think all of us are familiar with MARKWAYNE MULLIN's seemingly unlimited supply of energy. His workout class in the House gym is the stuff of legend. In the halls, you can find him bouncing a little pink ball to get out some of his energy. And that energy doesn't come from coffee; MARKWAYNE does it all on decaf.

No, MARKWAYNE's energy is all him, but his strength, he will tell you, isn't his own. MARKWAYNE's strength comes from his wife and childhood sweetheart Christie and his rock-solid faith in God, both of which have made him an outstanding public servant and, most importantly, a loving father to their six children.

Heading up the Department of Homeland Security is a serious job, and I am proud to cast a vote for MARKWAYNE MULLIN, knowing with confidence that he is up to the work and to the task. I know how much I have depended on MARKWAYNE as a colleague and friend during his 3 years here in the U.S. Senate, and I am profoundly sorry to lose him. But the Senate's loss is the Department of Homeland Security's gain.

I want to thank MARKWAYNE for his service here in the Senate and wish him the very best as he continues to serve our country at DHS, and I hope whoever gets assigned to his security detail is ready to keep up.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, the Senate will soon confirm Senator

MARKWAYNE MULLIN of Oklahoma to be our Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. The sooner he is on the job, the safer, the stronger, and the more secure America will be.

Markwayne is a servant leader in the truest sense. His hometown is Westville, OK, a population of only 1,300 people. He is the youngest of seven children. When he was 20 years old, he stepped up to save his dad's plumbing company. He turned it into one of the largest in the State of Oklahoma.

Markwayne is a father, a fighter, a Christian, and someone that others have known they can count on. He has served in both the House and the Senate of the United States. I am fortunate to have worked closely with MARKWAYNE on a day-to-day basis because he is a trusted Member of our whip team. MARKWAYNE is tough. He is hard-working. He works with others to solve problems. You always know where he stands. That is the way MARKWAYNE MULLIN is.

On the whip team, he has played a critical role in passing the largest investment in American security in 40 years. He has been consistent in his commitment to enforce our laws and to strengthen our border. Once confirmed, he is going to bring the same focus and urgency and consistency to lead that Department of Homeland Security.

At his confirmation hearing, MARKWAYNE laid out a clear vision. He said:

My goal is for people to understand we're out there, we're protecting them, and we're working [with] them.

That is exactly what he should do, and it is what he will do.

The Department of Homeland Security exists to protect the American people from danger. From counterterrorism to disaster relief to border security, that Department protects our communities from terrorists, from illegal drugs, and from cyber attacks. MARKWAYNE understands fully the full weight of that critical mission.

Markwayne also understands the importance of trust. He has made it clear that he will be open, communicative, cooperative, and committed to working with others to get the job done.

Even Senate Democrats have said they like MARKWAYNE—they may have disagreed with him politically, but they acknowledge his stellar character. Senator BRIAN SCHATZ of Hawaii said this month:

I like him personally.

Senator Chris COONS of Delaware says MARKWAYNE is ''well liked.'' Senator PETER WELCH of Vermont served with Senator MULLIN here in the Senate as well as in the House, and he said of MARKWAYNE:

He's respected, he's honest, and he's competent.

At the confirmation hearing, Senator RUBEN GALLEGO of Arizona said MARKWAYNE is ''upstanding'' and qualified. That kind of respect speaks to MARKWAYNE's character.

As the Senate considers MARKWAYNE's nomination, we cannot ignore the situation facing the Department of Homeland Security today, right now, this very moment because, right now, the Department of Homeland Security is shut down. Senate Democrats shut it down by withholding its funding. That is the cruel fact. It is the undeniable fact. The fact is, Senate Democrats have voted five times to block full funding for the Department of Homeland Security.

Many employees are working without pay. Others have been furloughed. Families are struggling to meet basic needs. TSA agents are quitting. They are calling in sick in rising numbers. And as a result, wait times at major airports are rising as well.

We have seen terrorist attacks in New York, Virginia, Michigan, and Texas. Pro-Iran cyber hackers successfully attacked a major medical company in Michigan. The situation remains dangerous today. The warning lights are flashing red. And Democrats would rather pander to protect illegal immigrant criminals than pay to protect American people. MARKWAYNE MULLIN is ready to lead.

He is ready to serve with seriousness and character, and he is going to be a leader who makes our country safer, stronger, and more secure. He will secure our borders. He will fight terrorism. He will protect our cyber space. He will safeguard our communities. And he will support the individuals who keep our country safe.

Today, this Senate will confirm MARKWAYNE MULLIN. Then the Senate must fully fund the Department of Homeland Security because the safety and security of the American people depend upon it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

LAGUARDIA AIRPORT ACCIDENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me begin today by saying that my deepest prayers are with the families of the two pilots who were killed in a terrible collision at LaGuardia Airport this morning. The video and audio of the collision were heart-wrenching. It is like a punch to the stomach when you listen to it. It leaves you gasping for air.

I spoke with Chairwoman Homendy of the National Transportation Safety Board, which has always done an outstanding job, impartial, in investigating these tragedies. I spoke to Chair Homendy earlier today, and she told me the situation is under investigation.

She told me that over 25 investigators are on their way to LaGuardia right now to get to the bottom of what happened. We owe it to those pilots and their families to find out exactly how this accident was permitted to happen, and I will remain in constant communication with Chair Homendy and the NTSB as well as local authorities as the investigation unfolds.

My heart goes out to all of those affected by this tragedy. My heart goes out to the two pilots who were killed and to all the passengers who were injured at LaGuardia.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. President, on Homeland Security talks. Over the weekend—and for weeks now—Democrats have engaged Republicans in good faith to pay our TSA workers, to fund DHS, while also enacting commonsense safeguards to rein in ICE.

Both sides talked all weekend long. We had some constructive conversations, but there is considerably more work to be done, and Democrats are ready to keep negotiating. Democrats believe TSA staff should be paid now—now.

We tried to move forward this weekend to pay these workers, but Republicans have blocked pay for TSA workers in a rollcall vote where they all voted no on Saturday; and additionally, they have blocked pay for TSA workers seven times when Democrats tried to bring it up.

It is preposterous because the chaos at our airports is simply unacceptable. Still, Democrats are going to keep working in good faith.

Donald Trump, meanwhile, is trying to sabotage negotiations, demanding that talks stop entirely until Congress passes the SAVE Act, a bill that has nothing—nothing—to do with paying TSA workers and nothing to do with ending the shutdown.

That is right. Donald Trump is now saying: We will pay TSA only after Congress passes voter suppression.

What a ridiculous thing to do. What a callous thing to do. He doesn't give a damn about the American people. He cares about his own election. He thinks this SAVE Act—which isn't going to pass—will change how the election comes out, and he uses millions and millions of Americans as hostages.

How can our Republican friends on the other side of the aisle go along with this? It stinks on its face. You don't need any deeper explanation.

This morning, unfortunately, Trump doubled down in Memphis, saying explicitly as possible he won't pay TSA workers and he won't end this shutdown until the SAVE Act is passed.

Let's make it very clear: Donald Trump is the one standing in the way of paychecks for TSA workers with this ridiculous attempt to pass the SAVE Act; the SAVE Act, which would destroy a lot of what we know about democracy; the SAVE Act, which would disenfranchise 20 million American citizens in all likelihood from voting in the next election; the SAVE Act,

which is designed to do as Kristi Noem said, to allow people to vote who we like how they vote as opposed to others.

Well, Donald Trump, your latest temper tantrum is not going to work. The SAVE Act does not have the votes to pass this Chamber, and Democrats will fight it every step of the way. The SAVE Act has nothing to do with DHS, Homeland Security; it has nothing to do with TSA workers or making sure ICE follows the same rules as every other Federal law enforcement Agency in the country.

Every other law enforcement agency uses warrants when they bust—needs a warrant when they bust into your home. Every other law enforcement agency doesn't wear masks.

Trump and the Republicans are insisting that continue, and they are saying we are holding TSA workers and millions and millions of passengers hostage. And now all of the sudden, in addition to that, Trump says: I won't move forward unless we pass the SAVE Act, which isn't going happen, Mr. Trump. It is not going to happen.

Democrats' position has not changed. We want to pay TSA workers today. We are ready to meet with the White House today to keep talking. In fact, we were going to meet this morning with Tom Homan, but apparently the White House pulled that meeting because of Donald Trump's temper tantrum.

They are all scrambling around there in the White House. They don't know what to do. Their boss, the President, comes out with these idiotic statements every day, whether it is related to the war in Iran where he contradicts himself, whether it is related to the SAVE Act where he doesn't even know what it does, or related to what is happening in Homeland Security.

We hope that Donald Trump will stop derailing these talks and let negotiations continue. Democrats want to be reasonable, and we are going to keep working in good faith to reach a solution. We need to pay TSA workers ASAP. The American people want ICE to change its violent ways. They do not want to repeat the kind of violence we saw earlier this year in Minnesota. They certainly do not want to see ICE detaining passengers at airports and making things worse.

Donald Trump is tying himself in a triple knot on the Iran war, on the SAVE Act, and on TSA workers. And he makes—he tightened that knot around his waist last night by saying ICE should go to the airports, then by saying that he would not go forward unless the SAVE Act passed.

He is making it harder and harder for himself. He is making himself less and less popular with the American people, and he is causing tens of millions to wonder: What is going on in that man's head?

So that is the dilemma we all face, and it is the American people who suffer. They suffer at the airports. They suffer as gas prices go up because of the Iran war. They suffer because he is threatening their democracy.

Now, let me talk about ICE at the airports. This morning, Tom Homan from the Department of Homeland Security said ICE agents have arrived at 14 airports—New York, Chicago, Atlanta, Pittsburgh, and elsewhere. Everywhere ICE goes, trouble follows. We have seen that, and it is highly likely the airports will be no exception.

No one trusts that ICE is going to make things better. Patrolling airports is not in ICE's job description; it is certainly not what they are trained to do. Let's be clear: ICE agents performing the work of TSA officers are not going to make our airports any safer.

It is going to make them less safe because ICE agents aren't trained in airport security. These agents aren't familiar with the layout of the airports they are walking into. They don't know the protocols and procedures in the same way TSA workers do.

It is a simple solution, Donald Trump: Pay the TSA workers so you don't have to bring ICE agents in there.

ICE agents are going to miss things, and that is assuming they focus on security. What if they do what they have done in other cities and start harassing travelers, asking to check papers, check their citizenship, detain them without due process even if they are American citizens, just as we have seen them do for months now?

And I wouldn't be surprised if Donald Trump and Stephen Miller would encourage them to do just that at the airport.

In any case, ICE's mere presence is going to inflame the situation at these airports where tensions are already high. Every time a traveler walks to their gate or stands in line at security and sees an ICE agent lurking about, they are going to be reminded of Donald Trump's chaos. They are going to be reminded of Minneapolis, and they are going to think: The chaos is now coming to my city too.

So, Donald Trump, the more you keep ICE agents at our airports, the more you will be reminding people of how much chaos and fear ICE has already caused. It is a terrible idea that could backfire on the country and on Donald Trump.

Instead of trying to replace TSA workers with ICE agents, Trump should pay TSA workers right away, get Republicans to come to a deal before the chaos gets worse.

Let me repeat that because it is so simple. Instead of trying to replace TSA workers with ICE agents, Donald Trump should simply pay TSA workers and get Republicans to come to a deal before the chaos gets even worse.

IRAN

Mr. President, on Iran, Donald Trump's war with Iran now enters its fourth week. There is no end in sight. Instead of giving the American people a clear plan for how to move forward, the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, continues, unfortunately, to flail.

Over the weekend, Trump threatened to destroy Iran's major power infrastructure if Iran did not come to the table. Then this morning after all the blustering, all the threats, he appeared—Trump appeared—to retreat, suddenly claiming there are major points of agreement with the regime, even as Iran flatly denies it and there are no diplomatic talks.

What is going on here? This is not leadership from the Commander in Chief. He is either confused, lying, or both. That is what always happens. Whatever pops into his head at the moment, he speaks; and 2 hours or 2 days later, if he has a totally contradictory thought, he says that one.

That is not the way to solve our problems. That is not the way to get Iran to do what we want them to do.

He must look like a flailing fool to many of them.

A month ago, the national price of gasoline was $2.93 a gallon. Today, it is $3.94, up roughly a dollar in a month. Who is to blame? One man, Donald Trump. And this increase in gasoline is one of the sharpest monthly spikes Americans have seen since Putin's invasion of Ukraine.

Prices have been coming down. Then Trump started a war that most of the American people did not want, and he sent prices shooting back up.

Enough is enough. Senate Republicans need to hold hearings and bring members of the Cabinet under oath to explain what is exactly happening in Iran. We need accountability. We need transparency, but most of all, we need strategy and an endgame, something Donald Trump's war with Iran is dangerously lacking.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today is the 16th anniversary of an amazing event in the history of the United States.

Millions of Americans can remember a time when access to affordable healthcare was just not a reality in America. There was a time when, if you had a preexisting condition—you or your family—you could be disqualified from any health insurance coverage because of it. And being uninsured was a reality for those who just weren't healthy and wealthy enough to afford it.

Sixteen years ago today, it all changed when President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law, opening the door to quality, affordable health coverage for more than 30 million Americans. This transformed our healthcare system. Suddenly, no one could be denied insurance coverage because of a preexisting condition. Addiction and mental health coverage were no longer optional; they were required in the health insurance plans. Young

adults could remain on their parents' plans until they reached the age of 26.

Casting my vote for the Affordable Care Act is something I am proud of and will never forget, but now that law is under attack. Donald Trump and some Republicans in Congress have tried relentlessly to appeal the Affordable Care Act. They called it ObamaCare, mocking it. And while they haven't succeeded outright, they have jeopardized its benefits for millions of Americans.

Last summer, Republicans in a majority in Congress passed their so-called One Big Beautiful Bill—the Trump budget which cut Medicaid by $1 trillion and slashed the Affordable Care Act by $300 billion, which will result in more than 10 million people in America losing their health insurance.

Have you ever lived without health insurance with a family? Have you ever had a child who was sick and you had no health insurance? You will never forget it as long as you live. I have been there.

To make matters worse, Republicans in Congress also refused to extend the ACA's enhanced premium tax credit last year. The fallout of that Republican decision has been devastating to millions of American families. They have contacted my office and the office of every one of us, both parties, and explained to people what happened to their health insurance premiums because of that decision in the Trump big beautiful budget bill. Millions of Americans have had to forgo insurance or watched their premiums double or triple.

The peace of mind that the Affordable Care Act brought to millions of Americans is fading away, and we must build the momentum to reverse these cuts and address the shortcomings of our healthcare system.

I want to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to improve healthcare for everyone, but we need buy-in from our Republican colleagues to move forward—something they have refused to do to this point.

NOMINATION OF MARKWAYNE MULLIN

Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote on the nomination of our colleague from Oklahoma Senator MARKWAYNE MULLIN. If confirmed, he will serve as the next Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security.

His predecessor Secretary Kristi Noem presided over a Department that steamrolled civil rights and violated court orders to carry out Stephen Miller and the President's mass deportation campaign.

In pursuit of that campaign, communities, including my city of Chicago, were terrorized by masked, militarized agents whose presence did not establish the ''law and order'' that the President promised. Instead, indiscriminate, violent roundups swept up citizens, legal residents, American citizens, people with no serious criminal record, not just the ''worst of the worst,'' which the President had promised.

In the State of Minnesota, two American citizens were killed by these occupying paramilitary forces, the so-called ICE agents, simply for exercising their constitutional rights.

Failure will be the defining feature of Secretary Noem's legacy at the Department of Homeland Security but so, too, will be the lasting pain she inflicted across the country, which still bears the scars left by rogue Federal immigration agents under her watch.

While Secretary Noem may be gone, she ought not to escape accountability for her actions. I have little hope that Attorney General Pam Bondi's weaponized Department of Justice will pursue that accountability, but the statute of limitations for many of these crimes, including deception before the Senate Judiciary Committee under oath earlier this month, will exceed this President's last day in office.

Senate Democrats have sought to rein in the lawlessness at DHS by recommending commonsense measures that are broadly supported by the American people.

Did you hear the White House announcement that they are going to take the ICE agents and send them to the airports to supplement the TSA? Well, the people with the TSA have said: They are not trained to do our job. They can't read the X ray machines. They are simply law enforcement agents of their own stripe.

Interesting enough, too, they have announced that they will not be wearing masks in the airports of America—thank goodness—so that traveling Americans and visitors to this country will not believe that this kind of justice really represents our country.

We have tried to rein in the lawlessness of DHS by recommending commonsense measures to change, but unfortunately, the White House and some of my Republican colleagues have allowed TSA agents and the Coast Guard to go without pay. On 9 or 10 separate occasions in the last several weeks, we have come to the floor of the U.S. Senate—the Democrats—offering to fund the entire Department of Homeland Security but for those two sections, for ICE as well as CBP. We were going to fund the others, which would include TSA agents who missed a paycheck. Each time, a Republican Senator stood up and objected. If they would not object, the payment would be made, and we could catch up with the payroll of these people who are performing these valuable law enforcement functions. The same thing holds true for Coast Guard and FEMA and CISA.

We are not asking for much. Democrats have said repeatedly that in the meantime, we will work with the administration on new standards for ICE that are consistent with law enforcement across the United States.

How many State troopers in your State wear masks when they stop people on the highway? None of them. So the demand that these ICE Agencies should be treated differently than professional police forces across America just doesn't make sense.

We said that while the negotiations continue, we will be prepared to fund the rest of DHS. Senate Republicans blocked us in that effort 10 times, all while the chaos at our airports grows.

Yesterday, the President reportedly rejected a bipartisan offer brought to him by the majority leader, the Republican leader of the Senate, which would fund all of the Department of Homeland Security except for ICE. President Trump wants Senate Republicans to hold DHS funding hostage until the Senate passes his SAVE America Act.

I will save my speech on that terrible bill for another day.

Instead of taking the deal, the President announced via social media that he would deploy ICE agents to airports, as I mentioned earlier. That directive caught officials at ICE off guard, and they were forced to scramble to piece together some plan.

This was just a musing of the President's. He announced it, and now they have to try to make it work.

In response, the flight attendants union said:

> The introduction of ICE agents into airports creates contradictory missions, as attempts to question passengers about immigration status may distract them from ensuring airport security.

They continued:

> There's one solution that immediately solves the problem at our airports. Pay the people who are already trained to protect us . . . today.

I support that completely. We have tried 10 times on the floor of the Senate. I hope this week we will try again. The people who are working for TSA deserve it.

I agree—people do not need more untrained ICE agents at this point; they need a paycheck to do their job.

Against this background, the Senate is considering whether Senator MULLIN should assume his new role as DHS Secretary. The problems at DHS are larger than any one person, and I remain concerned that my colleagues will not rein in the abuses.

Senator MULLIN has not criticized the Department's past violence or tactics in the President's mass deportation campaign. He has issues with managing his temper—we have seen that—and he has virtually no experience with DHS, a sprawling Agency that employs hundreds of thousands of people.

I cannot look in the eyes of my constituent Marimar Martinez, an American citizen who was labeled as a ''domestic terrorist'' after being brutally shot five times on Kedzie Avenue in Chicago, IL, by a masked border patrol agent. It is an outrage. It is a miracle that she survived. Or Lia, the high school student from North Lawndale High School who has spoken out against immigration raids after her community was tear-gassed and her friends and neighbors were arrested by masked ICE and Border Patrol agents. Lia is an American citizen. I cannot

turn to them and promise to hold this administration to account while also voting to install someone who might be another ''yes'' man who will only enable this President to continue.

For these reasons, I will not support Senator MULLIN's confirmation to lead the Department of Homeland Security.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this week, we kick off the 2026 Major League Baseball season. While fans across the country once again enjoy cheering on the Texas Rangers and the Houston Astros, I am reminded of the wise words of one of the great legends of America's pastime. Baseball Hall of Fame legend Babe Ruth once said:

It's hard to beat a person who never gives up.

For several days now, the Senate has been debating and considering the SAVE America Act. This bill would simply require individuals to present proof of U.S. citizenship when registering to vote as well as photo identification before voting in a Federal election.

To show how far the Democrats have gone in opposing commonsense measures, one of the amendments to this bill was one that would counter Democrats' dangerous and radical gender ideology by prohibiting men from competing in women's sports.

Our Democratic colleagues should be embarrassed by their opposition, but of course, they are not, and they did not agree. Poll after poll shows that Americans are strongly opposed to men competing in women's sports. Republicans will not give up on this issue, and the American people are with us.

We also will not waver on our support for the SAVE America Act because it will secure the Nation's elections. Voter ID is just common sense. We all know that. In this country, you need an ID for almost everything you do—from boarding a plane, to entering a Federal building, to buying a beer, to renting a car, to opening a bank account, to renting a hotel room.

Presenting an ID is a facet of almost every aspect of our daily lives. So why should it be prohibited in terms of exercising one of the most important prerogatives that American citizens can perform, which is casting their ballots? There is simply no rational explanation as to why Democrats are against this.

Of course, in trying to think of what possible reason they could have, one is, of course, the most obvious, which is Trump derangement syndrome. Democrats have made it their mission to deny, refute, and obstruct every single policy put forward by President Trump simply because he supports it. If President Trump supports it, they oppose it. Of course, they won't put it in those terms. Instead, they falsely claim that the SAVE America Act will disenfranchise voters. Well, it is a fascinating thing to me that anywhere from 70 to 80 percent of the people who are polled say they support the requirement for a photo ID. So I suppose, by logic, based on the Democrats' position, that 70 to 80 percent of the people polled are for disenfranchising themselves. Well, obviously, that makes no sense whatsoever.

Earlier this week, the minority leader, Senator Schumer, said the SAVE Act is not about election integrity; it is voter suppression, plain and simple. Well, it is really interesting. You know, we have videos of then-Representative SCHUMER who said 30 years ago:

[O]ne way to prove you are a bona fide person who can have a job is to ask for a driver's license and a Social Security card.

So my question to Senator SCHUMER is this: Which is true and which is false? Both statements cannot be true.

It seems that Senator SCHUMER is of two minds on this topic depending on political expediency, but we all know what is going on. We all know what is going on. The fact is that Democrats are masquerading their opposition to President Trump as voter suppression, but we all know that that is not true. The only votes that will be suppressed as a result of the passage of this bill will be those of noncitizens, who cannot legally vote in the first place.

Our Democratic colleagues may say: Well, it is already illegal.

There are a lot of things that are illegal that, if not enforced, deterrence will not occur; that accountability will not occur. So let me set the record straight. The only votes that will be suppressed by the SAVE America Act are those of noncitizens or illegal aliens.

One other theory I have heard suggested is: For 4 years, President Biden had open border policies. He let in literally millions of people into the country. As for many of them, we don't know who they are or what they are doing. Occasionally, we find out when they commit criminal acts against innocent American citizens. Now that President Biden has opened the borders, what we are attempting to do is make sure that only American citizens get to vote, but Democrats are opposed. The only reason Democrats, beyond Trump derangement syndrome, would oppose this is that they want the people who came in during the 4 years of Biden's open border policies to be able to cast a ballot.

If anything, voter ID empowers Americans to vote, and it protects the integrity of the voting process because every illegitimate vote that is cast undermines and dilutes a legitimate voter's ballot. By requiring voter ID, it will give people greater trust in our elections and faith in the outcomes. We need to restore the public's trust in our institutions, including elections. The more people believe that our elections are free and fair, the more they will participate in those elections, which is something we should all want.

President Abraham Lincoln famously laid out his vision for our Nation in the Gettysburg Address when he talked about a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Well, what he was talking about was government by American citizens—the people who are legitimately casting their ballots and no one else. Nowhere do these words read truer than at the ballot box where the American people cast their votes and make their voices heard. This, of course, is how our democracy works. It hinges on the belief that elections are free and fair and secure and ensure a peaceful transition of power.

Requiring proof of citizenship is the surest and safest way we can help build trust and confidence with the American people and instill confidence in our elections. Self-government itself means nothing without free and fair elections.

As I have said multiple times this last week, this is an 80–20 issue; but of course, our Democratic colleagues believe that 80 percent who support these commonsense measures literally want to disenfranchise themselves, which is ridiculous. Public opinion is clear: The American people overwhelmingly support voter ID and proof of citizenship for voting. In 2025, the Pew Research Center showed 83 percent of voters, including 71 percent of Democrats, supported requiring photo ID at the voting booth. The facts speak for themselves: Americans want and deserve photo ID.

We will continue to fight to pass the SAVE America Act and deliver on the mandate given to us by the American people.

NOMINATION OF MARKWAYNE MULLIN

Mr. President, on another matter, later today, we will be voting on the confirmation of Senator MULLIN as Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security.

In the Senate, MARKWAYNE has been a conservative warrior with a proven track record of supporting the ''America First'' agenda and President Trump. He has been dogged in advocating for the good of his home State of Oklahoma, and I have every confidence he will carry out the same spirit of zeal and unwavering determination in his new role in overseeing the Department of Homeland Security. As Democrats continue to hold funding for this Agency hostage, we need a strong hand at the helm more than ever.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. President, we know that what the Democrats are doing in blocking the payment of appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security is endangering public safety in a number of ways—first, at the airports, where

our TSA agents are overwhelmed and are not being paid. They have now missed two paychecks. This was a basic security measure put in place after 9/11, after the terrorist attacks of 9/11.

We know one component of ICE is the Homeland Security Investigations, which works hand in hand with the FBI to investigate domestic terrorism attacks. So, literally, by not funding Homeland Security Investigations, Democrats are making it more likely, not less likely, that we will have a successful terrorist attack on our home soil.

We also know that the TSA agents had nothing to do with the differences that separate Democrats and Republicans here. In fact, their complaint is with ICE because, again, they are for the open borders policy, and they don't want immigration laws enforced. They are going to do everything they can to block funding for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, but that also includes Homeland Security Investigations.

Then they come out here, and they offer unanimous consent requests, saying: Oh, we will pay for the salaries of the Transportation Security Administration, but we won't pay to support the rest of the functions of the Department of Homeland Security, including support for FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency; for the Coast Guard; and for ICE.

The irony is that we already passed funding for ICE in the One Big Beautiful Bill. So their blockade of the funding for the Department of Homeland Security is not going to have an immediate impact on ICE, but it does demonstrate how out of touch and how extreme the Democrats have become in their opposition to commonsense measures that protect public safety.

It is inexcusable to have the Department of Homeland Security—the very Agency whose duty it is to protect and defend the homeland—shut down amidst all of this chaos. At a time when global tensions are rising and the threat landscape is even more perilous, we can't afford to play politics with the safety and security of the American people. It is time for this to end. It is past time for this to end. This is not how the Senate is supposed to work, and this certainly isn't what my constituents in Texas or any American deserves.

My hope is that the negotiations that are ongoing right now will be fruitful immediately and that we will reopen the Department of Homeland Security not for the good of any political party but for the good of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF MARKWAYNE MULLIN

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, in just a little over a year since taking office, the Trump administration and the Department of Homeland Security have completely broken trust with the American people. In the last year, President Trump has made sweeping cuts to programs and personnel at the Department, undermining key missions from counterterrorism and cyber security protections to assistance following national disasters.

These actions are putting the safety and the security of Americans at risk at a time when many of the threats the Department was created to address—like terrorism and cyber attacks—are on the rise because of the President's war in Iran. These cuts to critical national security missions have all been at the expense of the Trump administration's singular focus on indiscriminate immigration enforcement that has led to serious disruptions in communities all across our country.

It was only 2 months ago when the country watched in horror as two U.S. citizens, Alex Pretti and Renee Good, were killed by Homeland Security law enforcement officers. We saw with our own eyes how officers have routinely deployed tear gas and pepper spray against Americans who were simply exercising their First Amendment rights.

Secretary Noem's leadership as the Department head has been a disaster, and Americans want to see a course correction, but I am not convinced that one change in leadership is enough to right the ship.

President Trump and advisers like Stephen Miller are continuing to drive so much of the chaos at the Department of Homeland Security.

When the President nominated Senator MULLIN to lead the Department, I came into the process with an open mind. However, I do not believe that he is the right person for the job. We need a Secretary who has a clear understanding of the Department's many different missions and a keen awareness of the challenges that the Department faces. We need a Secretary who is a steady leader, who won't rush to judgment without having all the facts, and who won't add fuel to the fire when there is a crisis. At a time when political violence is rising, we need a Secretary who will condemn violence, not encourage it. And we need a Secretary who can be trusted to be transparent and open with information to both Congress and the American people, especially—especially—when an emergency strikes.

Unfortunately, I have not seen the nominee exhibit these desperately needed characteristics in his confirmation process, and I urge President Trump to reassess his administration's prior record and nominate someone who will help return the Department's focus to all of its critical national security missions. We need someone who will be more than just another rubberstamp. We need someone who will be thoughtful, deliberate, and work to restore the trust in the Department.

Therefore, I will be voting no, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mrs. HYDE-SMITH assumed the Chair.)

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, as we enter spring and schools across the Nation approach their spring breaks, millions of families will soon be traveling. They will be relying on our airports to travel to visit family, to go on vacation, but unfortunately, they will be met with longer lines because Washington Republicans refuse to pay our TSA agents.

That is right—the Department of Homeland Security is currently without funding because Washington Republicans would rather see it shut down than pass commonsense—just commonsense—guardrails on ICE. In fact, every Senate Republican present voted just this past weekend against paying our TSA agents.

As a result, the American people are paying the price. When TSA staffing levels drop because officers aren't getting paid, wait times at airport security checkpoints—well, they stretch longer and longer. This doesn't just inconvenience travelers; it undermines security and directly threatens jobs and businesses and livelihoods.

The situation is so dire at our airports that the Trump administration is going to send untrained ICE agents to our airports—untrained ICE agents—to try to do the job of our highly trained TSA agents.

That is why I rise yet again with a simple, practical proposal to pay hard-working TSA agents, pay them right now. They deserve it. If we cannot move forward with funding for the entire Department of Homeland Security, we should at least be able to come together on this. The Trump administration and Senate leadership are having ongoing negotiations on the guardrails on ICE, and TSA officers should not be caught in the middle of that fight.

So today, I am asking my colleagues to take just a simple step: Pass my legislation right now to pay TSA workers so that commercial air travel remains safe and functional.

Let me say this: Claiming that you will not agree to pay TSA agents because this bill doesn't fund the entire

Department—well, it is, frankly, just an excuse because if Washington Republicans truly believe that, then why did they agree to literally fund everything else in our government except for DHS?

If it has to be all or nothing, like they are now claiming, then why agree to fund parts of our government where we have an agreement and leave DHS unfunded?

I can tell you why. It is that they know it is the right thing to do. They know that other government employees should not be penalized for the President's mass deportation agenda.

That is exactly why we are asking for this today. Don't penalize TSA and the traveling public for the fact that you refuse to rein in ICE. Have them be held accountable. Have them be trained, transparent, and accountable like every other law enforcement agency in this country.

So, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 362, S. 4127; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, my colleague from Nevada asks this floor to fund the TSA. She and her colleagues have voted against TSA funding at least five—if not six—times over the past several weeks. Republicans have voted to fund the TSA and to fund all of DHS. So this just seems a bit hypocritical, I guess.

As I think about the situation here, I would ask my colleague: Why did it take Democrats 30 days to come to the table and discuss this issue with Republicans—30 days?

Then we started negotiations. There were some talks on Thursday and Friday between the leaders of both parties. Then, over the weekend, Democrats refused to continue those discussions. Why? Was it because they wanted to go home?

Well, look, we all wanted to go home. TSA officers would like to have a paycheck as well. So it is not lost on me.

How in the world can we sit here and have you ask us to fund the TSA when Republicans have consistently voted to fund the DHS?

This is now the 37th day of the shutdown.

Remember, the DHS was formed out of the ashes of September 11, when we took 22 Agencies and brought them together—maybe there was some information missed that wasn't shared on September 11—so that maybe that day never happens again. So why would we start breaking up these Agencies now and break up their funding, since we are a stronger, more secure country when we fund all of DHS, not just a part of it?

Again, Republicans have voted to fund the TSA at least 6 times in the past 2 weeks, and Democrats have voted at least 6 times not to fund the TSA.

Therefore, I ask that the Senator modify her request so that the Senate may proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 156, H.R. 4553. I further ask that the substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify the request?

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

I think we would all agree that it would be better to fund the DHS as a whole rather than piecemeal, but you won't agree to commonsense reforms. In fact, the President himself said, this weekend, that he will not agree to any reform or funding of the DHS, and he is holding other bills hostage. So it is on the President's desk. The President has clearly interjected himself in this by putting ICE in our airports when we can fund the entire Department of Homeland Security and continue the discussions on ICE, which are going back and forth with the President and his team and leadership, and be done with it.

In the meantime, if we pass my piece for right now, we can at least pass the TSA, but the President has interjected himself again. He doesn't want guardrails. So I want to just, at least, prevent those TSA agents from missing another paycheck.

In the meantime, get ICE out of our airports.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. MARSHALL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, you know, I find this really disappointing. Paying our hard-working TSA officers shouldn't be controversial. It is not partisan. The funding isn't controversial. People in my State and in every State are waiting 3 hours, maybe more than that. They are missing their flights.

Everyone here has the power to do something about it. My Republican colleagues have the power to do something about it. They don't have to wait for the President. So, if Washington Republicans—my Senate colleagues—really wanted to do what was right by their constituents regarding the TSA workers, you would have passed my bill to pay the TSA officers, instead of punishing them and the American people because of your inaction.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the McDonald nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, we are talking again about the SAVE Act.

This is a simple piece of legislation that focuses on two key ideas: that if you are an American citizen, which is required by law, you just show it. I call that the ''trust and verify'' portion of the bill.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act begins with the statement ''all citizens.'' It is already required under Federal law that you have to be a citizen of the United States to vote. We have all agreed on that. There is no one disputing that—Republican, Democrat, Independent. We all agree American citizens are the ones who should decide the future of America.

What we disagree on is, Should we check or should we just trust that it actually is true?

I have shared in this body before, that, in Oklahoma, we passed a statute, several years ago, saying: If you go to jury duty and you tell a judge, ''I am not eligible to be able to serve on a jury because I am not a citizen of the United States,'' in Oklahoma, we then check to see if you are registered to vote. We have found quite a few folks who have told a judge, ''I am not a citizen,'' but have told the election board, ''I want to vote anyway.'' Well, that is not legal.

In Oklahoma, we purge the voter rolls when that happens in order to make sure those individuals who have already given sworn testimony that they are not citizens are not also registered to vote. That is not true everywhere across the country. Lots of folks just say: We just trust, but we never verify. We actually don't clean up the voter rolls at all.

There are some States—and it is really fascinating to me—like Arizona—Arizona has a State law in place right now that says: Every person who registers to vote must also prove their citizenship.

This already exists right now.

New Hampshire has a law that says: Every person who registers to vote has to show they are a citizen.

This is not crazy policy. This is already happening in some of our States right now, that they have to be able to show they are a citizen.

In Arizona, though, it is a very interesting thing. In Arizona, you can register to vote for a State election or a county election, and you have got to be a citizen. But if you want to vote in a Federal election, you don't have to show that you are a citizen.

If you want to talk backward, this was a case that broke out there, in a court case for them, where they established: Oh, no, you have got to show

that you are an American citizen to vote for the Governor of Arizona, but you don't have to show that you are an American citizen to vote for the President of the United States.

If we can figure out how to do registration to be able to protect the rights of the individuals in Arizona to be able to vote for their Governor if they are an American citizen, surely, we can do this all over the country.

The SAVE America Act is simple. It just says: It is already the law that you have to be an American citizen to vote. Let's just verify.

The State of New Hampshire is not trying to limit the number of people voting. They are just following Federal law.

Then there is the second part, which is pretty simple: You have to show ID to vote.

There are 36 States that already have this requirement. Let me just run through what this means. There are already 36 States that say you have to show an ID. Now, some of them are very narrow. They say you have got to have a specific type of photo ID on that. That is Arkansas, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Ohio, Tennessee, Wisconsin. They all have in their State laws that you have got to have a certain type of photo ID to actually qualify you to be able to show up and be able to vote.

Multiple other States have some other limitation where a photo ID is, maybe, preferred, but they can also bring other IDs. That is Arizona, North Dakota, Utah, Wyoming, Alabama, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Washington State, West Virginia, Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Oklahoma, Virginia, and Pennsylvania.

This doesn't seem very controversial to me. If you are keeping count on fingers and toes, you ran out a while ago. There are 36 States that already have some kind of requirement for ID to be able to vote. This has got to be the most noncontroversial proposal sitting out there to say: How can we disagree when 36 States already do this?

But, for some reason, in this body, it is controversial for us as a nation to do what 36 States already do. So we bring this to the body, yet again, as we have now for days and days and days.

The American people are just not offended with pulling out an ID at an airport to be able to get on a plane. They are just not offended by showing an ID when they walk into a Federal building. They are just not offended by pulling out an ID in some places where they are going to write a check—for those who still know how to write a check in America. It is just not that offensive to have to pull out some sort of identification.

State after State after State has shown that this doesn't limit the number of people who can show up to vote. It just limits the amount of fraud that can happen in that State when people vote.

You just can't walk up to a polling place and say, ''My name is,'' and pick a name. You have got to show something with your name on it to vote. It is pretty straightforward, and 36 States already agree and have already put this into practice.

So all we are trying to say is, Can we continue this as Federal law? I think we can—and not just saying it is Federal law but actually verifying that it is actually applied. I am a big fan of the phrase ''trust and verify.'' That is all that this does.

I would hope, at some point, we would have a breakthrough here, but, in the meantime, I am going to continue coming back and saying: Why can't we all agree to what most Americans nod their heads and say, ''That is a pretty good idea,'' and just get it done?

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I could not help but respond in realtime to my very able colleague from the great State of Oklahoma. I really wish things were as simple as my Republican friends would have us believe.

They want us to believe that this is simply a basic voter ID bill. Let me say the same thing I said several days ago. I believe that you should have to prove that you are who you say you are before you vote. But this is not a voter ID bill; this is a voter suppression bill. They really ought to call it what it actually is. They ought to rename this bill: ''Your Driver's License is Not Enough to Register Bill.''

Not only is your driver's license not good enough in most States, except those States where your citizenship is a part of your driver identification—and that is literally a handful of States—you will not be able to register to vote using your driver's license. You will not be able to register to vote using your student ID. You will not be able to register to vote using your military ID.

Let's be very clear: The Republicans know that their policies are failing; that they have kicked 15 million Americans off of their healthcare; that they have doubled healthcare premiums for some 22 million Americans. They have dragged us or they have enabled this President to drag us into a war—and he can't even explain why we are there—and they want to make it difficult for everyday Americans to hold them accountable. This will not stand. It will not succeed.

This bill especially disenfranchises women. There are many people right now who are listening to me at home who are registered to vote right now, and you say: Well, I have never had to prove my citizenship in order to vote. If this bill is passed, you will. If you move, you will have to reregister. If you change your name if you get married, you will have to register to vote as we do, and all of a sudden your driver's license will not be good enough. Even though you have been voting for years—decades—that will not be good enough.

Imagine being a woman and your birth certificate does not match your current name, so you have got to go drag out documents you haven't seen for years in order to certify that you are a citizen.

And the question you ought to ask is, Why would they go through all of this? Why is this necessary when there is no evidence at all that we have some major problem of voter fraud through voter identification.

It is already illegal to vote if you are not a citizen. It is illegal. They will deport you. You will be prosecuted under law if you register to vote, and you are not a citizen. If you try to vote, and you are not a citizen, it is a crime. You can be deported.

And they are trying to convince us that there are droves of people in this country who are willing to risk deportation, risk being arrested, risk the abuse that we are seeing visited upon American citizens by ICE agents in realtime—that they are willing to risk all of that in droves in order to change the outcome of an election. It defies credulity, and it is simply not true.

Donald Trump wants to meddle with the outcome of the midterm elections because he knows that he is losing. And citizens who are watching this right now, not only ought you to reject this, as we are doing on your behalf, you ought to register in droves and put this nonsense to an end.

Democracy is the very house we live in. It is the place in which we get to fight for the things we say matter. And little by little, they are chipping away at the democracy itself.

Let the people speak. Let people cast their votes without having to jump over all kinds of unnecessary barriers. Why would you disenfranchise hundreds of thousands, millions of Americans, while chasing a problem that does not exist? Why are you so afraid of the voices of the people, I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle.

The most powerful words in a democracy are ''the people have spoken.'' And we must ensure that no voter suppression bill prevents them from speaking.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mrs. MOODY. Mr. President, I, like you, I know, am incredibly frustrated at the lack of funding for one of our most important Agencies in the Nation—the Department of Homeland Security. Due to my Democratic defund

disorder colleagues, the political antics they have thrown up to block funding for this incredibly important Agency is being done at the expense of protecting Americans.

We are now in week 6 of an ongoing DHS shutdown. While our country is actively fighting an adversary in the Middle East, it leaves our homeland vulnerable to attacks. Thousands of DHS employees have now missed multiple paychecks because of the show. At the same time, security efforts around the Capitol are being increased, so Democrats get to hide here in Washington, in the Capitol, safe and sound, while blocking funding to individuals around the Nation who can help protect Americans and keep our country secure.

Let's not fool ourselves. Floridians and Americans alike know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are pushing a shutdown of DHS funding because they don't want a secure border. They don't want to remove people that are here illegally and committing crimes. They have done everything they can to work against that.

This shutdown is about way more than what they profess it to be. This is about blasting apart the security structure President Trump has rebuilt after Biden destroyed the border. For 4 long years, we watched as the previous administration disregarded the law and sowed chaos and destruction at our southern border, allowing a historic surge—historic; some say up to 20 million people, many unvetted—to pour into this country.

The shutdown has been dragging on so long because my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle cannot stand that the border is now secure again and DHS is doing its job. They cannot stand that the border isn't wide open. They can't stand that unmitigated illegal immigration has been halted. Because of this, they are throwing a temper tantrum, disguising this shutdown as anything other than what it is, and that is a mission to defund police.

Under Biden's watch, approximately anywhere from 11 million to 20 million people flooded into this country. Narcoterrorist cartels were enabled to bring massive amounts of deadly substances like fentanyl into our neighborhoods. It killed hundreds of thousands of Americans.

As the attorney general in Florida, I was among the first to call attention to the disregard of law and fought in court against the massive security breaches and shed a spotlight on how Biden and his administration disregarded their duty and put us all at risk. I took legal action to force them to simply follow the law and stop releasing dangerous people and violent offenders into our country.

That once wide-open border was closed by Trump. It is closed. On day one, he took unprecedented action to close the border and started enforcing the law again. He took action against the drug cartels and the flow of fentanyl and other dangerous drugs to keep our communities safe. Under President Trump, DHS provided the most secure border in American history.

It is such a stark difference in what the border looked like under the Biden years to what it looks like today. In fact, during the last month of the Biden administration, every single month saw more than 100,000 illegal immigrant encounters at the southwest border. At the peak of the disaster, they saw upwards of 300,000 encounters a month. And we know that approximately 85 percent of those immigrants apprehended at the border were released into our interior.

The judge who sided with Florida's lawsuit when I took Biden to court and stood up against the illegal actions of his radical administration—that judge who sided with Florida said it best: Biden ''turned the Southwest Border into . . . little more than a speed bump.''

''[L]ittle more than a speed bump.''

Then the American people fought back and elected President Donald Trump. Speed bump met the wall. On day one, Trump ended catch-and-release, and we saw 10 straight months of zero releases—zero—compared to its peak in 1 month by Biden of 300,000. Total border apprehensions under the Trump administration's first year in office were lower than a single average month under the Biden administration.

In addition to the millions of unvetted illegal immigrants Biden let into our country, according to at least 1 recent report that, shockingly, the mainstream media isn't reporting, they allowed 18,000 known or suspected terrorists into the United States. This opens up our country to dangerous attacks from within.

The current DHS shutdown is affecting President Trump's effort to get the unprecedented number of undocumented immigrants that may be a threat to this Nation and to our people out.

Now with our country engaged in fighting in the Middle East and DHS hampered by my Democratic colleagues, we face unimaginable danger, and we have already seen violent attacks within our borders. In fact, DHS recently issued a memo warning Americans to be on guard against potential cyber or other violent attacks. Those attacks are already here.

It is going to take time to clean up the disaster of the last administration, but we are well on our way. We were making great strides, and the other side of the aisle hates that. We know that U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement has been instrumental in preventing terror threats, removing more than 1,500 known or suspected terrorists.

One of the saddest things that I think we learned after the last administration, and certainly as a mother—not just as Florida's attorney general but as a mother—we watched as hundreds of thousands of unaccompanied minors were trafficked across the border by cartels, and then the Biden administration took the last step—shipped them all over the country.

From a grand jury investigation, we know that some were put with people they didn't even know. One ended up at a strip club. One ended up in an empty lot. We know many went into trafficking. It is the saddest thing imaginable for a child. Too many of these children were exploited and abused before, during, and after they came across that border with cartel members. All told, it is estimated that the Biden administration lost more than 450,000 children.

Today, it is a different story. Under President Trump, DHS and the Department of Health and Human Services have located 145,000 of those unaccompanied children that the Biden Administration lost.

The American people expressed their will when they said: Trump is now our President. We want to secure our Nation.

They wanted to secure our border, and now my Democratic colleagues are obstructing the will of the American people by saying: Oh yeah? You have a President that is following the law? You have a President that is taking seriously his duty to protect this country and our communities? Well, watch what we do now. We are going to defund the police, we are going to defund those agents at the border, and we are going to defund those within that are protecting your communities and helping get those that are here right now—we saw this in Chicago last week; a murder by someone here, let in by the Biden administration—here illegally—of a young college student again. And they want to tie the hands of the law enforcement officials charged with getting them out. That is nothing more than defunding the police that have taken oaths to protect you and your family.

Someone needs to remind my colleagues across the aisle that the American people are our bosses. They want a safe border. They want safe communities.

The shutdown of DHS has gone on long enough. We are in our 38th day. People are going without paychecks, people that are doing very important jobs, like our TSA officers, like our law enforcement officers, like our personnel at the border, thousands that are charged with keeping this country safe.

Every day the Democrats on the other side of the aisle put politics above people, they show where their allegiances lie. I, for one, know who I am for. I am for the American people. I am for the people that wear a badge and keep us safe. I will always show up on this floor and make sure that the American people know who we are fighting for. The American people are our bosses.

It is time we stand up for this country and for its people and put it first.

Put simply, I implore my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to remember why they are here, to remember the country they profess to serve and the people they profess to serve. Put them first. And let's fund DHS.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise today to defend the heartbeat of our democracy, and that is and always will be the right to vote.

From the first National Women's Rights Convention held in 1850 in Worcester, MA, to Selma to Montgomery marches in 1965, Americans have been mobilizing and marching and chanting and fighting for generations to protect the right to vote, which is the most cherished right. And it is now under relentless attack by the Trump administration and the MAGA Republicans who sit right across the aisle here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

And that is why we are here today: because when you can't win by the rules, you have to sabotage. You have to manipulate the game. That is what this bill is all about. It is not the SAVE America Act. It is the ''Save Your Ass Act'' because the American public is rising up in revolution against higher healthcare costs, higher gasoline prices, higher home heating oil prices, higher prices for everything on Main Street because of the sales tax called a tariff, which is being imposed upon all those goods.

That is what they are afraid of because they know that the voters are coming with pitchforks toward them this November, and they have to do something about it. So they call it the SAVE Act.

But if there was a section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission of unfair and deceptive act provision here and it was applied properly, it would be called the ''Steal Act,'' the ''Steal the Election of 2026 Act.''

That is what they are doing on the Republican side. That is what they are trying to perpetrate upon the American people, upon our elections. They have to manipulate our elections through voter suppression, disenfranchisement, unconstitutional tactics to win in 2026 and in 2028 and beyond.

As Trump says, they will win every election if they can pass the SAVE Act. They won't have to worry anymore. And why is that? Because it is a craven effort to turn back the clock, institute a new modern-day Jim Crow, and take away the one right central to our democracy, and that is the right to vote.

This legislation is dangerous. It is anti-democratic, and it is wrong. The SAVE America Act would impose unnecessary and overly restrictive voter ID requirements. It would require Americans to present a birth certificate or passport in person whenever they register to vote or whenever they need to update their registration.

There are tens of millions of Americans without passports. There are tens of millions of Americans who don't have a birth certificate on them at all times. That is the goal of the Republicans: No, you can't vote today. We are going to make it impossible for you to vote.

Now the goal in America should be more people are voting. It is already too low. No, that is not the Republican Party's goal here. Their goal right now is fewer votes, lesser participation in our democracy.

That is what they are trying to perpetrate upon our democracy right now because most Americans, right now, they register to vote online, through the mail, or at their Department of Motor Vehicles.

Only 6 percent of Americans register to vote in person at an election office, and the Republicans know this. And that is why they want to establish the new standard for everyone. It is like forcing everyone to use a fax machine to register to vote. It makes no sense, it is unnecessary, and it would only prevent people from participating in our democracy.

The new requirement to present a photo ID at the polling place is more stringent than laws already on the books in all but one State in the country. If the SAVE Act—if the ''Steal Act''—passes, it would be easier to buy a gun in many States than to vote.

Can I say that again? The NRA does not want it to be difficult to buy a gun. Republicans go along with that. In red States, the standards are very low to buy a gun. But to vote, oh, now they are concerned. Now we need standards, which make it almost impossible for tens of millions of Americans to be able to comply.

So just let that sink in. It would be easier to buy a gun than to exercise the most fundamental right of citizenship in our Nation.

And who would bear the brunt of this law? The 146 million Americans who do not have a valid passport.

I had never been to Washington, DC, before I was elected to the U.S. Congress. My father drove a truck for the Hood milk company. I ran when I was 29 years old for the U.S. Congress, and I won.

And my first visit to Washington was to be sworn in as a Member of the U.S. Congress when I was 30 years old. I not only had not been to Washington, I had never been anyplace outside of our country. I didn't have a passport, and I was a U.S. Congressman.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, here is a bulletin for you: 146 million Americans do not have a valid passport. I know because I would have been one of them. That is nearly half of all American adults.

The 69 million women who have changed their names after marriage and lack an updated birth certificate, they are out. Sorry. Oh, you—that is not the same name. You must have gotten married. Sorry, can't vote today. Just using your maiden name here? I am sorry. Can't vote.

Elderly voters who would be forced to navigate bureaucratic mazes to renew their voter registration in person; an 85-year-old who helped build this Nation and has voted in every election for 60 years could suddenly be told: The ID you have been using your whole life is no longer sufficient. Prove it again or you don't get to vote.

Do you know who else loses big time? Black and Brown communities who already face preceding, already existing high barriers to their being able to vote in too many States in our country; young people who could no longer rely on their student IDs to vote; disabled voters who may face challenges in getting to polling places; Native Americans whose Tribal IDs may be rejected for registration to vote and then for actually voting. That is their goal.

You can see which one of the groups in our country they are trying to dissuade. You can see which of all of these subgroups of Americans—they are going to create barriers to their ability to go into the polling places.

How about a working American who would be forced to miss more shifts to exercise their right to vote, rural voters who would have to travel for hours to satisfy the strict in-person registration requirements, and LGBTQ+ Americans who face hurdles in obtaining accurate IDs that match their gender identity?

So instead of free and fair elections, it is bought and paid-for elections. Instead of one person, one vote, it is one White person, one vote. And everyone else gets shown to the door. So sorry, you can't vote here today.

Take, for example, a constituent of mine, a woman who legally changed her name nearly 50 years ago. Her birth certificate no longer matches her legal identity.

But now the President of the United States and Republicans want to force her to dig through decades-old documents just to prove she has the right to cast a ballot.

So give us a break. We know what you are doing here. You are trying to disenfranchise that woman. You don't want her to show up. We know what you are trying to do.

Or take a servicemember who has been serving their country bravely. Under the SAVE Act, under the ''Steal Elections Act,'' a military ID alone would not suffice to prove citizenship because noncitizens can also serve in the military.

Can you imagine that? Somebody has served for 2 years, 4 years, 6 years, 20 years, they show up to the polling place. They show their military ID. And they are told: Sorry, that doesn't count.

It counted to send them overseas. It counted to put their lives in danger. But it doesn't count to be able to vote.

Well, this is, without question, all part of a pattern which has been created by the Republicans. And we had a

hearing today in the Supreme Court just as a continuation of that plan to reduce participation in elections in our country because without, for example, that military official who is now standing there, trying to explain why they should be able to vote, they have to provide a military record of service, showing the United States as the place of their birth.

Without that document, a servicemember who has been risking their life on behalf of our country may find themselves shut out of the voting process.

So under this bill, a servicemember can deploy overseas, carry classified credentials, the top secrets of the United States, defend our democracy, but come home and be told their military ID is not sufficient for that serviceperson to engage in our democracy after they spent their entire life protecting us, and they have a military ID to prove it.

Or take a young person who just went off to college and is eager to become a first-time voter. The student hasn't yet left the country and has never had a passport. And under the SAVE America Act, they are also not allowed to use their student ID.

But by the time they apply and receive their passport, the voter registration deadline has passed, and they won't be able to cast that first ballot they were so excited about. So just think about that.

The student at one of our great universities across the country, they think that they are going to be able to register and vote where they are going to school. And they have a student ID, and now they are told: You cannot vote. You have to get a passport, which that student has never had.

Let's take a single working mom who just moved home. This new law might force her to reregister to vote in person due to her address change. Although she has the required documents, she is unable to find the time between her shifts and taking care of her children to visit an election office in person.

On the day she does show up to the polls to cast her vote, after losing a day of work, she is told she cannot vote.

This bill is unconscionable. It is un-American. It is actually unworkable, but that is not deterring the Republicans. They have a goal. They want to save their seats. They want to lower the participation in the elections this year and in the 2028 election cycle. That is what it is all about—steal elections. That is all it is about.

And this bill itself doesn't test whether you are eligible to vote; it tests whether you can outmaneuver unnecessary redtape, whether you have the time and the resources and the documentation to satisfy a system designed just to say no.

We cannot become a country that cares about representation for some instead of representation for everyone. The future and the strength of our democracy depend on every single American being heard at the ballot box, not just those who Donald Trump and his MAGA supporters deem as worthy to be able to vote.

The SAVE America Act would also force States to hand over super-sensitive voter data to the Department of Homeland Security. So just think about this. Kristi Noem—by the way, we are still celebrating ''Kristi Noem Got Fired Day.'' Kristi Noem and whoever her successor might be, they would have access to all of this voter data.

This would give Trump unprecedented power to interfere in local elections, conveniently just before the 2026 elections as Trump is down at 40 percent favorability and looking at a landslide heading his way, a tsunami of voters ready to change the control of the House and Senate.

So are any of these provisions an accident? No, this is designed. You know, there is such a thing that Daniel Patrick Moynihan, a great Senator who served here—he used to call something, when he didn't want to help something or hurt something, he said that people should just act in ''benign neglect''—''benign neglect''—of the problem.

That is not what we are talking about here. We are talking about designed neglect. It is a plan. It is a plan that they are putting together. The SAVE America Act—''the Steal the Election Act''—is a calculated effort by Trump and MAGA Republicans to erect barriers between American citizens and their fundamental democratic rights.

Republicans can claim that this bill is meant to combat voter fraud or to prevent noncitizens from voting, but the truth is that noncitizens already cannot vote in State and Federal elections. They run the risk of criminal prosecution if they vote in our country.

In this climate, with the way the immigrant community is being terrorized and targeted, the last thing noncitizens want to do is to register with the Federal Government to vote or to open themselves up to criminal penalties because they are not qualified to vote.

It is absolutely absurd to think otherwise. States already implement many checks to ensure that only citizens are allowed to vote. And despite numerous studies and audits and investigations over the years, it has been determined that noncitizens voting is very, very, very, very, very, very, very rare. It is not a problem.

I will tell you what is a problem: High oil prices, that is a problem; high healthcare prices, that is a problem; high tariff taxes on small businesses by the millions across our country, that is a big problem; inflation going up, that is a big problem; unemployment going up, that is a big problem.

Are we debating that on the floor? Are the Republicans having hearings on the Iran war? Are they having hearings on skyrocketing oil prices?

No, they are not. They are having the Senate, now, for over a week, debate something that is very, very, very, very, very, very, very rare, and they are trying to make a big crisis out of it.

Why is that? Because they want to distract everyone's attention away from the real crises of oil and healthcare and Iran and tariffs and all the other messes which they have created this year. It is strictly a distraction. It is a ''Wag the Dog.'' It is the take everyone's attention away from the actual issues that are harming families in our country right now on which we have no hearings, none—none—because there is absolutely no evidence that supports Trump and the MAGA Republican conspiracies that noncitizens are voting at a large scale.

It is simply false. It is a ghost story told for political purposes, used to justify laws whose real function has nothing to do with election security and everything to do with election outcomes so that the Republicans are not punished for their economic policies, for their foreign policy mistakes which they are making for which they do not want to be held accountable.

The SAVE America Act is a solution in search of a problem, but it is worse than that. It is a distraction from American efforts to strip millions of eligible Americans from their right to vote. Why do they want to do that? I have got five reasons—five reasons—why the Republicans want to establish this goal of disenfranchising millions of Americans:

No. 1, so that they can continue to give handouts and tax cuts to billionaire CEOs while making it harder for millions of Americans to get access to Medicaid and Medicare and affordable healthcare and looting by the trillions the money from healthcare for ordinary families to give over to the billionaires who do not need it; reason No. 1.

Reason No. 2, so they can continue their vendetta against the wind and solar energy industry, the all-electric vehicle industry, so that Big Oil and Big Gas can make bigger profits off of the hard-earned cash of American citizens because they will be forced to buy all gasoline-powered cars, and the oil companies can tip them upside down and shake money out of their pockets at the pump.

But they don't want that reversed. They don't want solar and wind and all-electric vehicles to be the future. No. That is reason No. 2.

Reason No. 3, so they can continue to give billions of dollars to ICE to terrorize immigrants while trampling on the constitutional rights of our communities. Right now, we have masked agents across our country not wearing cameras and violating constitutional rights that were built into the Constitution during the American Revolution and its aftermath. And they just hate the idea that they would have to comply with those constitutional safeguards that have matured and been codified over the centuries.

No. 4, they can continue to operate a pay-to-play pardon system, where fraudsters and friends and supporters of the President can essentially buy their way out of convictions and jailtime.

No. 5, so they can keep raising prices at home while razing countries abroad—but to do so without a peep coming out of the majority in the House and the Senate because that is where we are right now. We have a Senate; we have a Republican leadership which has been supine for the first 15 months of this second Trump administration. They have shown no courage. It is almost as though they had a vertebrae bypass operation that has made it impossible for them to be able to stand up to the illegal, to the corrupt, to the absolute disgraceful foreign policy, from Venezuela to Greenland to Iran and on and on and on, that Trump has been engaging in without a peep out of the Republican Party.

There are only three things you need in politics: backbone, backbone, and backbone. And what do they want on their side? They don't want to be held accountable for their lack of backbone. And the only way they can do that is reduce the number of people who vote this year. Don't allow for there to be a change of government by suppressing the votes of those who are most likely to be angry over what they have been doing to our country over the last 15 months.

Trump has thrown us into an illegal, reckless war, which is costing lives abroad, costing hundreds of billions of dollars of taxpayer dollars, costing American families at the pump, in-home heating oil, airline tickets, grocery prices, and in every other monthly bill. It is just going to ripple through our entire economy because he has created a global energy apocalypse. And every time Americans go to the pump, they are in for a crude awakening, courtesy of Donald Trump's illegal war in Iran.

The average price at the pump right now is $1 higher than it was just 4 weeks ago. Cumulatively, Americans spent $2.6 billion more last week than they did on gasoline before the war started. And $2.6 billion, it could pay for a lot of solar on more than 850,000 homes without any incentives. Mr. President, $2.6 billion could pay for about 350,000 drivers to use the electric vehicle tax rebate, which would insulate drivers from these crazy oil spikes.

Home heating oil prices are up by $1.20 a gallon in Massachusetts, which many families rely on to heat their homes. That means $350 more to fill up their tank, and it is still cold in Massachusetts in the winter.

So 500 bucks more for gasoline over the course of the year, 350 bucks more just to fill up their tank, and all as they watch television at night and watch a war going on in Iran that, so far, has had no public rationale that makes any sense whatsoever, and the Republicans are refusing to even have hearings so that we can cross-examine the rationale, if it existed at all, that Trump is using in order to perpetrate this insane war and its consequences not only on the Middle East but on the entire planet.

Oil prices go up like a rocket, but they come down like a feather. So we are going to see this price of oil in our economy that is going to go on for months and months and months, and when the President says he needs $200 billion more, well, it is costing $2 billion a day to run the war. So that means at least a 100 days more—2 billion times 100 days. That takes us into the summer. He is asking us—he is asking the Republican Senators to give him enough money to fight the war into the middle of the summer, which means the price of oil is just going to continue to go up and up and up like a rocket, and people are going to be standing there with the pump in their hands, with the nozzle in their car, and they are going to be looking up at that price as it goes up and up and up and up as this war goes on.

So experts say that Donald Trump's illegal war has now caused the largest oil supply disruption in the history of the world.

Can I say that again? Donald Trump has caused the largest oil supply disruption in the history of the world, and he has yet to explain successfully what the rationale for that war is.

So, to me, Trump's entire reign has caused the largest corruption in modern American history because his entire Presidency has been a disaster for American families. Even before the war, electricity prices were up by as much as 13 percent.

Can I say that again? People are paying their bills across the country—a 13-percent increase in electricity bills last year under Trump. And now those attacks on natural gas facilities in the Middle East are spiking prices worldwide, spikes that will likely hit American utility bills soon as U.S. natural gas exports surge to chase the highest price on the international market, which has been the goal of the natural gas industry right from the beginning.

And by the way, Trump is just wholly owned subsidiary of the natural gas industry. He said to them in April of 2024: If you raise me $1 billion, I will make sure that I kill all of the environmental laws in the country, all of the incentives for wind and solar and all-electric vehicles.

So that is cash and carry. They raise the money, and now we are living with the consequences of just having a total dependence upon those industries that Donald Trump said were going to make America great. No.

We are, right now, hostage to the oil industry, hostage to the natural gas industry. They can charge whatever they want.

This whole idea that he created energy independence for us? No. The price of oil and gas is set on a global market, not in Tulsa, OK. And I think every American now understands that, because these Big Oil vultures are already circulating, looking to scavenge their profits at the expense of every consumer, every family in our country.

Major oil and gas companies are poised to reap record profits this year from higher prices, as Americans reap devastating losses.

So Americans are going to be paying $2 billion a day in taxes for the war and $2 billion more each week for high gasoline prices.

And I am not even talking about home heating oil prices. I am not talking about jet fuel prices. I am not talking about natural gas prices for people's homes.

So the rich are going to get richer, and the rest are going to pay taxes and their skyrocketing energy bills. That is what he has left us with.

Do the Republicans want to debate that? They do not want to debate that.

Is that all the American people want us to debate? Yes, please put that front and center. Please, let me know when this ends. When does this chaos and corruption end and its impact upon the lives of every family in our country?

So let's just be clear: Big Oil only serves as a destabilizing force in global politics—not a stabilizing but destabilizing force. This entire conflict is a reminder that our continued dependence on fossil fuels pulls the world toward instability and pulls it towards conflict.

And the lesson is clear: We must transition rapidly to clean energy sources that cannot be blocked or bombed or weaponized.

In reality, wind and solar are the fastest growing electricity sources in history because they just make sense. In 2025, renewables made up over 88 percent of all new electricity generation in the United States. In 2025, the United States added more than 50,000 megawatts of new solar and wind capacity, compared to just under 5,000 megawatts of new natural gas capacity—10 times more.

Do you know who hates that? The natural gas industry.

Do you know who gave half a billion dollars to Donald Trump? The natural gas industry.

And what was the promise that they wanted back from him? We will kill the solar industry. We will kill the wind industry. We will kill all of those industries that are an existential threat to our business model.

And we are now living with the consequences of that.

So just let me repeat that for the fossil fuel apologists: New solar is cheaper than simply operating an existing coal-burning plant in our country. Onshore wind is half the cost of building new gas plants.

This isn't about ideology. This is just about arithmetic. It is not complicated. It is cheaper to do onshore wind.

And yet Trump and Republicans are failing basic arithmetic. Now, this is

not trigonometry. This is not calculus. This is not algebra. This is just arithmetic. It is very simple.

We were in an energy crisis already before the war because of AI data centers, which are demanding record electricity, while Trump and Republicans have done everything possible to destroy American-made cheap, clean energy, leaving Americans dependent on the expensive fossil fuels, whose prices are now skyrocketing.

And now we are in an even bigger crisis. Trump may be crushing American manufacturing, but he sure is good at manufacturing an energy price hike for every American, every small business in our country.

We have to invest in true independence: electric and fuel-efficient vehicles; cheap, clean, energy and battery storage made in the United States; and energy efficient technologies that do more with less.

And do you know what Trump says? Oh, that is all socialism. That is socialism for wind and solar, tax breaks for all-electric vehicles. That is socialist.

Well, what do you call 100 years of tax breaks for the oil, gas, and coal industry? I call that socialism. And all we are asking for is some of that socialism for the competitive technologies that have been attacked and stopped for 100 years by the fossil fuel industry. That is all we are asking for, and that is what we have been denied.

And that is why they don't want to have any hearings. That is why they don't want to discuss what is going on in the Persian Gulf. That is why they don't want to discuss the Strait of Hormuz. That is why they don't want to discuss how we are hostage to the price of energy that comes out of the Middle East.

And the only way to break that dependence is with solar and wind and all-electric vehicles that don't need any fossil fuels whatsoever.

But because of Trump, because of the Republicans—they voted on this floor, last July, to kill all of those industries—kill them. They don't want to have that discussion right now. They know that they would be on the defensive. They know they would be backing away from the microphones while they try to explain why they would kill something that would actually break our dependence upon imported oil, break our dependence upon natural gas, break our dependence upon coal.

And, by the way, we do import oil into the United States. The Presiding Officer may not know that, but it is coming in from Canada. It is coming in from Mexico. It is coming in from Venezuela.

Just so you know, Mr. President—sometimes, it is a bulletin to you that we are part of a global oil marketplace that you are part and parcel of.

Foreign dictators and authoritarian regimes cannot stop the Sun from shining or the wind from blowing, but they can disrupt oil and gas supplies. Electricity generated by the solar panels can't get stuck in the Strait of Hormuz. Electricity generated by our offshore wind plants can't be bombed by drones in Kuwait.

The SAVE America Act—the ''Steal the Election of 2026 Act''—is a classic ''shock and awe.'' Trump is trying to distract us from the cost he has created by bombing Iran—costing lives, costing hundreds of billions to fund his war, and costing us at the pump, at the airport, and at the grocery store.

And he has just become so desperate—so fearful that he is going to lose—that he is absolutely willing to suppress the vote of especially minority voters in our country because he knows that, otherwise, he will probably lose in Georgia, he will probably lose in Ohio this fall, and that we will have a revolution that is heading his way.

So that is what this is all about here today. It is millionaires and billionaires, greedy corporate executives, corrupt cronies against the voters.

And that is why the Democrats are not going to go away. We are going to stand up. We are going to fight. We are going to make sure that the American people understand what is at stake right now and why we cannot allow the Republicans, the MAGA base, and President Trump to pass this legislation because it would fundamentally be the end of democracy in our country.

And how do I know that? Trump says it himself that he would suppress the votes to an extent where they would never lose an election again.

So that is where we are. It is a moment in history. There is a nostalgia that some people have for a past that never existed, instead of the ideals which we need—to fight for the poor and the sick and the elderly and the immigrant communities, because for them the past is just a memory, and the future is their hard reality.

And that is what we are standing here today to fight to protect—the protections for their hard reality—and that can only be protected if we stop the SAVE Act, if we stop the ''Steal This Election Act,'' if we stop the ''Save Our Asses Act,'' which the Republicans are seeking to pass on the Senate floor today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues to oppose the attempt by the President and his allies in Congress to effectively disenfranchise millions of Americans through their so-called SAVE America Act. But more than that, I rise to join my fellow Granite Staters and the majority of freedom-loving Americans to ask a question more fundamental.

I have strong issues with this legislation, which I will discuss, but more than any provision, what I object to today is what this move to make it harder for more citizens of all ages to vote reveals about the President, the President's undemocratic impulse—an impulse that dominates and motivates this President in a way that distinguishes him from all of his predecessors.

In short, I rise today because I believe that it is worth asking: Why is it that the leader of the free world, the President of the world's greatest democracy, is so invested in spending his truly precious time making it harder for Americans to vote?

In the ''Live Free or Die'' State, we know that elections serve as the best means to hold elected leaders to account. In other words, elections are the very basis of self-government of, by, and for the people. That is the basic compact in a democracy. If a leader fails to deliver on his promises, fails to govern well, or fails in conduct or character, then citizens use their votes to hold him to account and vote him out.

That is what makes a democracy different. We have the means to self-correct and to improve, unlike any other form of government.

Democracy is the best form of government, not because we have always been perfect but because we always have the capacity to be more perfect.

With each generation, we have worked to more fully realize our Declaration of Independence's promise. The right to vote has steadily expanded until it was finally bestowed upon all Americans.

We have had setbacks along the way. Progress has often been slower than we would like. But the majority of Americans have understood, as President Kennedy said, that democracy is not ''a final achievement'' but ''an untiring effort.'' And it has always been an effort that required nothing less than what our Founders pledged: the lives, fortunes, and sacred honors of each generation of Americans.

But it appears that this President thinks that America's great democratic experiment has gone too far, that far too many Americans are making their voices heard for his liking.

Over the course of our history, we have had Presidents disagree on just about every issue. But in our modern history, ever since we passed critical civil rights and voting rights legislation, Presidents in both parties have agreed that our country's operation as a democracy is nonnegotiable, and that we are all better off when more and more Americans vote.

Now, though, we have the first President in these modern times who is trying to make it harder for eligible voters to vote.

President Trump's anti-voting crusade raises a fundamental question: Why is the President of the world's greatest democracy so invested in making it harder for Americans to vote?

Well, the answer is simple. The President wants fewer Americans to vote because he is the first President in American history who does not believe that he is accountable to them, the American people—''we the people''—because only a President who believes that he

is not accountable to the people would try to restrict the people's ability to hold him to account.

Leaders who believe that they answer to ''we the people'' do not try to overrule the people's voice and the people's vote by seeking to overturn a free and fair election.

Leaders who believe that they answer to the people do not try to silence free speech. They don't use the heavy hand of government to drive critics off the airwaves because they made jokes that the President doesn't like.

Leaders who believe that they answer to the people don't use the Justice Department and the FBI to exact revenge on their political foes. They don't seek to extend the long arm of the law into an iron fist of injustice.

Leaders who believe that they answer to the people don't defy court orders. They don't disregard the Constitution; nor do they ignore laws passed by the people's representatives and snatch from their hands the powers of the purse, taking away the people's money.

They don't send our heroes in uniform into harm's way without the people's consent nor do they launch trade wars against our own allies on the basis of nothing but their own ego and whim. They don't revel in power and self-aggrandizement nor do their references to dictators drip with admiration.

And let us be very clear. Leaders who believe that they answer to ''we the people,'' leaders who believe that they are accountable to the people and who understand that it is freedom and democracy that make America great—they don't incite a mob to storm the Capitol—to storm this very Chamber to stop the peaceful transfer of power; to stop the count and silence the votes of the American people, and they certainly don't spend their first day on the job pardoning the mob of convicted criminals who stormed the Capitol and assaulted brave police officers.

Take these actions each as one or take them all together. Everyone in this body knows that not only has no other President behaved this way but that no one can describe these acts as resembling anything close to patriotism, not in a country that loves freedom as much as ours does.

The President of the United States of America is supposed to embody our love of freedom, of American democracy, but, today, it is an open question as to whether this President actually believes in democracy and the consent of the governed. This shouldn't be a question that any American even has to consider, but we are compelled to consider it today.

So, look. We can pretend that this is politics as usual, but all of my colleagues know that no President in our modern history—if ever, up until now—has possessed such a stark anti-democratic impulse or has been so disdainful of the people's voices or of our laws and liberties when they run counter to his own will.

For those who disagree, I direct you to the walls and windows around this great building that are scarred by bullet holes from just 5 years ago that remind us otherwise.

It is worth noting that the only reason the SAVE America Act—this legislation to purge voters that the President doesn't like from the rolls—that the only reason it is even on the floor is that the President won't give up on the lie that the 2020 election was stolen, and he is continuing this same singularly dishonorable brand of lies as we head into this year's midterm. What the majority in this body is doing, therefore, is nothing short of a large, elaborate, expensive bit of legislative play-acting—all because there appear to be no people in the President's orbit to find the courage to summon the words: I am sorry, Mr. President, but you are wrong. That unwillingness to speak truth to power is how lies become truths and how bills that are nothing less than solutions in search of a problem get written.

Now, the President can delude himself. That doesn't mean that the rest of us have to do so as well. There are legitimate debates to be had about election reforms, including voter ID laws, but not when the laws are seemingly designed by legislators to discourage or bar people from voting, not when the law is passed upon the orders of a President, as he himself has said, as the means to win a midterm election.

My colleagues have spoken at length about the details of this bill, so I won't spend too long relitigating them here.

In short, this bill would require all voters to register using either their birth certificates or their passports. Now, only half of Americans even have a passport. It has been estimated that 3.8 million American citizens do not currently have either of these documents in their possession. To put that number in perspective, a bit more than 826,000 Granite Staters voted in the last Presidential election. So this bill says that a great swath of American citizens—close to five times the number of total votes cast in New Hampshire in the last election—shouldn't be allowed to vote next time. What is more, this bill would virtually end absentee voting as we know it, which is how one in three American citizens votes. That is tens of millions of Americans.

Who are these Americans whose liberties the President would effectively dispense with?

Well, they are both Democrats and Republicans. Many are older Americans. Some have long since lost their birth certificates and don't do the kind of traveling that requires passports. Some have chronic conditions with disabilities that require them to vote by mail. Some are people who work 12-hour shifts or who have long commutes to their jobs. Others are veterans who are as patriotic as any American alive but who spend most of their time at home these days, living in the country, far from the nearest polling place, and they have been voting by mail longer than some in this body have even been alive.

In the end, all of them are Americans, and their right to vote is sacred. It was won through sacrifice and wars abroad and given renewed meaning at places like Seneca Falls and Selma here at home.

Should the so-called SAVE America Act pass and be signed into law, fewer Americans—people who have worked hard and paid their taxes their whole lives—will be able to vote than before. It will be harder for a substantial number of Americans to vote.

If this bill is enacted, there will be more Americans who, in practice, will have less of a voice in our democracy. They will be less free. The number of Americans who will lose their ability to vote may well be in the millions. Perhaps some will eventually find a way to jump through all the new legal hoops and cut through all the redtape and get their ballots in. Even if it becomes a relatively few number who remain unable to navigate these new barriers, we are still talking about law-abiding, tax-paying Americans who will lose their ability to vote—even as citizens of the world's greatest democracy.

If this bill passes, it will also represent an enormous deviation in our history. Our country's progress has been marked by a history in which more and more Americans—Americans in each ensuing generation—have gained the right to vote; but if this legislation passes, President Trump will be the first President to turn that progress back—to work to restrict the right to vote—and to take it away, in practice, from a great swath of Americans. Among those impacted, in particular, will be women. This bill makes it harder for women to register to vote should they have changed their names when they married—names that will be different from what appears on their birth certificates.

Now, perhaps this is a simple hurdle that the administration would move with great speed to help women resolve, but I cannot see myself extending the benefit of the doubt on the rights and freedoms of American women to an administration that has worked hard to take away a woman's most fundamental freedom—the freedom to make her own healthcare decisions.

This bill would also require all States to hand over their voter rolls, including names, addresses, and Social Security numbers, to the President. To do this under any administration would be a move that raises concern, but particularly with this administration, it would be an act of supreme recklessness.

Why should any American trust their Social Security number to an administration whose internet privacy standards involve leaking war plans over an insecure Signal chat?

To have one's personal information handled by the chaotic band of untrained, unchecked, and unprofessional political appointees who ran enterprises like DOGE would be as wise as to staff the local fire department with a brigade of arsonists.

So this bill is, on substance, exceedingly harmful and unjust. It should be rejected.

However, I return to my original question: With all of the challenges in the world, why this bill? Why now? Why is the President so determined to make it harder for Americans to vote?

I understand in a way why the President does not wish to be held accountable by the American people. It is that he has failed to deliver to the American people because, of course, in a democracy, at some point, a leader has to deliver. Autocrats don't.

Do you think, in Putin's Russia, that in the depths of the Kremlin somewhere, they are drawing up plans for measures similar to the Americans with Disabilities Act or the PACT Act?

Of course not. A dictator doesn't need to make people's lives better. There is no one to hold them to account. There is no one to push them to deliver.

But a democracy? A democracy is different. In a democracy, talk can win an election, but without results, a leader can lose a nation; and 1 year in, this President has lost the majority of Americans.

The President came into office with big promises—boasts, really—about how he would singlehandedly bring down high costs. Now, of course, I disagree with the President strongly on many issues, and I didn't vote for him, but I was willing to and continue to be willing on a bipartisan basis to find ways to work with my colleagues in the Senate to help bring relief to American families, but President Trump has chosen a very different course.

The President is trying to silence the votes and voices of the American people because he doesn't want to be held to account, because he thinks he is above the people, and he does not want to hear what they have to say. He does not want to hear that this is not a nation entering a golden age; that instead, to paraphrase Thomas Paine some 250 years after he first coined the phrase: Our Nation is entering a time that tries citizens' souls.

We are entering a new American crisis. It is a crisis of costs. The American people have been clamoring for relief—relief from high grocery bills and energy costs, relief from high rent and steep mortgages, relief from a healthcare system that forces families to choose between being sick and dying or being healthy and in debt.

Our country was already in an affordability crisis, but the President, rather than solving problems, has made it worse. He chose—he chose—to take away healthcare from millions of Americans. He chose to make premiums surge for tens of millions more. He did all of this while giving billionaires a tax break. Some people call this tax break unpaid for, but in some ways, it is worse. The tax breaks for billionaires will be paid for. They will be paid for by our children, who will be burdened with trillions in debt, and they will be paid for by every person who gets sick who might have been healthy had the President not taken away their healthcare—a toll summarized less on budget sheets and more on the faces of loved ones in hospital waiting rooms.

Americans want to go to the grocery store without grimacing at the cash register, but the President has launched senseless trade wars against our allies and imposed illegal and costly tariffs that have made everything more expensive. Virtually every entrepreneur I talk to in New Hampshire has felt the burden of tariffs one way or another. Some businesses have closed their doors altogether.

These trade wars should be a reminder to my Republican colleagues that a politics that exists simply to flatter the President's ego does not come without a cost, and it is a cost borne by the people to whom he has sworn an oath to serve. Now the costs of this Presidency have become even higher as gas prices surge. It is as if the President is searching for new ways to make life less affordable.

The truth is simple: It costs more to be an American under President Trump. The American people asked for lower costs. The President, instead, gave them a steeper bill.

It is no surprise that a man who has only made the crisis of high costs even worse under his watch does not wish to answer to the people. He can lie about stolen elections. It is harder to lie about the numbers Americans see printed on the very receipts that they hold in their hands.

Under this President, we are also awash in the crisis of corruption. While Americans lose more of their paychecks to high costs and tariffs, the President rakes in billions in exchange for political favors because, in Donald Trump's America, it is easier for someone rich to buy a pardon than it is for millions of Americans to afford to buy their prescriptions.

Perhaps the cause of most alarm is that we face a crisis as a country because the President has realized that he is at his strongest when America is most divided. There are great and challenging things that we need to do as a country—a new 21st century economy to build, costs to bring down, diseases to cure, veterans to care for—but we can do none of these things because we have to fight to keep our heads above water in floods of the President's own making and because the President tries to get us to spend our days fighting each other.

I am not surprised that the President doesn't want to be held accountable by the people. I am not surprised that the President wants fewer Americans to vote because, on his watch, our country has become less affordable, our people less healthy, our world more chaotic, our government more corrupt, and our people more angry. Of course he doesn't want to hear what the American people have to say.

So, yes, it is deeply telling that in this moment of American crisis—both self-inflicted by this administration and otherwise—President Trump has decided that above all else, the most important priority is not to bring down people's costs or make their lives better; it is to try to restrict their right to vote.

What, ultimately, does the President's obsessive focus on trying to pass this bill above all others truly reveal? Sometimes it is as simple as it appears: The President wants to pass into law a bill that will allow fewer Americans to vote because he actually wants fewer Americans to vote.

It was President Reagan who said that ''the right to vote is the crown jewel of American liberties, and we will not see its luster diminished.'' We shall find out soon if his words remain true.

The American people—they have always known how precious the right to vote is. The American people—they will wait in long lines even on a cold November morning to vote. But they will do more than just that. They will join the suffragists and rally and petition and do whatever it takes until the ballot belongs to America's daughters and not just her sons. Americans will fill out their ballots while stationed at a foreign post—in trenches in France or the jungles of the Pacific—and ship them back home as soon as they can just so they make sure their vote gets counted, casting their ballots halfway across the world as they fight to ensure that others can have the freedom to vote at all.

Americans won't just stand in line at a polling station to vote; they will march to vote, even if it means going down to Selma, just as Granite Staters from Saint Anselm College did when they joined Dr. King's marchers, even if it means trying to cross a bridge three times, even if it means enduring Bloody Sunday.

Voting is not just an American right; it is an American habit; it is an American prayer.

We do all this because most Americans understand what the President does not—that voting is the most American thing anyone can do.

I oppose the SAVE America Act because of its provisions, yes, but what I object to the most about this bill to restrict the right to vote is what it says about the current state of the American Presidency and our democracy. That an American President would try to pass this bill is an outrage.

Rather than work to pass this bill, the President would instead be wise to remember the words of his great predecessor Abraham Lincoln, who said:

In leaving the people's business in their own hands, we cannot be wrong.

This law has been called the SAVE America Act. It is a striking name to me because when I think of when America has needed to be saved, I think of our determination to be saved from British tyranny in our fight for independence; our need to be saved from the Depression or economic hardship; from disunion or division. But apparently this President thinks that America needs to be saved from her own voters, that America needs to be saved from ''we the People.''

I also think it is worth noting what the SAVE America Act will not save. It will not save American families from paying more for their groceries or at the pump. It will not save the small business that has had to close its doors because the President decided to launch senseless trade wars against our friends. It will not save a young couple money on their downpayment when they are trying to buy their first home—not as long as we have a President who would rather build monuments to honor his name than help our country build more homes that people can afford to live in. It will not save a single American from pricey healthcare premiums, nor will it save the future lives lost to diseases that could have been treated had the President not fired America's best doctors and researchers. It will not save our children from burdensome debt tomorrow to pay for tax giveaways to billionaires today. It will not save America from the dangers of dictators like Vladimir Putin, whom the President still vainly tries to appease.

But more than that, this law won't save America from the flames of division that the President so often fans, from the meanness and coarseness that he revels in. It will not save America from the march of extremism or the grip of conspiracy. It will not save us from more discouraging broadcasts of the nightly news, of watching our supposed leaders with disbelief, of wondering just how much higher prices will soar. It won't save a young girl who wanted to get involved in public service, wanted to help her country, from becoming disillusioned when she sees what happens in Washington these days, from wondering if our country's politics can offer anything of promise or if only cynicism reigns. It will not save an old veteran from shaking his head and asking what yet might happen to his country he loves, in whose service he risked so much.

This law, in short, won't save our fellow Americans—certainly not from high costs. It will not save America. This law seeks to save nothing but the President's political fortunes. Because, in the end, one does not save America by ensuring that fewer Americans vote. One cannot save America by making America less free.

Does this body wish to save America? to learn to become a country once more? to do great things together once more? The answer remains what it has always been: Don't restrict the right to vote. Don't turn to answers from the would-be strongman. Instead, leave the saving to the ''we the people'' and put it in their hands. When we do that, truly, as Lincoln said, we cannot be wrong, and we cannot go wrong.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF MARKWAYNE MULLIN

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, in just a few moments, this body will vote for the next Secretary of Homeland Security. It happens to be a friend of mine. His name is MARKWAYNE MULLIN.

MARKWAYNE MULLIN is the pride of Westville, OK, which—ironically enough—is the easternmost town in our State. On a normal day, there are more people inside the U.S. Capitol than there are in all of Westville, OK. But it is a bunch of really nice folks that work really hard, and MARKWAYNE MULLIN has risen from being a country boy in a cow-calf operation with his dad, running a very small plumbing company, to now being nominated, and tonight being confirmed as our next Secretary of Homeland Security.

He graduated from Stilwell High School, but the most important thing wasn't his graduation from Stilwell High School. It is the girl that he met in the third grade.

In the third grade, he fell in love with Christie, and they waited all the way until she was 18 and he was 19 before they got married. And now, decades later and six children later, that proud family will now be the lead family to be able to serve to keep every family safe in the country.

Responsibility at Homeland Security is dramatic. There are a quarter million Federal employees that work for the Department of Homeland Security. It is a massive operation, and it is incredibly important to our country.

And I think he will be a terrific leader for it. He not only loves our country, but he is passionate about security.

He served in the House of Representatives for a decade and has now served in this body for 3 years. He has spent a lot of time on the issues of national security. He has done a lot of research in that area.

He has worked to be able to pass the bills that actually fund Homeland Security, and now he will be the one to actually implement those same bills.

So he is keenly aware of the law and the issues that he will actually be carrying out.

Interestingly enough, MARKWAYNE MULLIN is a member of the Cherokee Nation. He is actually the second Senator ever to serve in this body that is a member of the Cherokee Nation, but there has not been a Cherokee that has actually been in the Senate for more than two decades.

The Cherokee Nation leadership sent in a letter with their overwhelming support for him and for what he has done and his awareness of the Tribal issues, as well as just national issues and family issues.

He has been my friend, and we have worked side by side on a lot of issues.

I will never forget, multiple years ago, with my wife and MARKWAYNE and his wife Christie—the four of us—sitting down for a dinner in a quiet place in a booth in the middle of a restaurant, just to talk, because MARKWAYNE was thinking about saying, ''I am done with all of this chaos that is in Congress,'' and he was actually praying through what to do next.

And it was over that dinner that the four of us just talked and visited, prayed together, and he determined: I am going to stay at it because there is more work to be done.

And I am glad he did.

In the days ahead, the Nation will be glad that he did because I think he will make a fantastic Secretary of Homeland Security.

As we approach this moment, I can't help but also note a challenge that he is going to walk into on day one, because when he walks in tomorrow morning into a new office, into a new role, and being sworn in, there will not be funding for the people around him. The staff that will be there, working alongside him, won't have been paid for more than a month.

And this is not an anomaly for them. As of this week, half of the fiscal year, Homeland Security employees have not been paid—half of the fiscal year. They faced 43 days without any paycheck, and they are at 37 days now. Half of the year, they have not been paid. As of this week, it will be six paychecks that they have either lost entirely or partially.

This body has the responsibility to solve this problem. And as MARKWAYNE steps in to be able to lead so capably in Homeland Security, it is the responsibility of this body to be able to make sure that Homeland Security actually has the funding that it needs to be able to protect the Nation.

So my expectation is twofold tonight: One is that we will confirm my friend MARKWAYNE MULLIN, and he will be the next Secretary. And the other one is that soon we will finish this argument, and we will resolve our differences. And so the fine folks that work at Homeland Security, in all areas, whether it be Coast Guard, Secret Service, whether it be FEMA, whether it be TSA—yes, even ICE and Customs and Border Protection—wherever they may be, that their families can also reap the benefit of their service by actually getting a paycheck—what a novel idea.

Let's finish the task tonight.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the confirmation vote for Senator MARKWAYNE MULLIN to be the Secretary of Homeland Security right now.

VOTE ON MULLIN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Mullin nomination?

Mr. LANKFORD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 63 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Banks	Fischer	Moody
Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Blackburn	Grassley	Moreno
Boozman	Hagerty	Mullin
Britt	Hawley	Murkowski
Budd	Heinrich	Ricketts
Capito	Hoeven	Risch
Cassidy	Husted	Rounds
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Justice	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Kennedy	Sheehy
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Curtis	Lummis	Tillis
Daines	Marshall	Tuberville
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fetterman	McCormick	Young

NAYS—45

Alsobrooks	Kaine	Rosen
Baldwin	Kelly	Sanders
Bennet	Kim	Schatz
Blumenthal	King	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Klobuchar	Schumer
Booker	Luján	Shaheen
Cantwell	Markey	Slotkin
Coons	Merkley	Smith
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murray	Warner
Durbin	Ossoff	Warnock
Gillibrand	Padilla	Warren
Hassan	Paul	Welch
Hickenlooper	Peters	Whitehouse
Hirono	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Gallego

The nomination was confirmed.

(Mr. SCHMITT assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 697, Colin McDonald, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

John Thune, Chuck Grassley, Roger Marshall, John Barrasso, Bill Hagerty, Pete Ricketts, Bernie Moreno, John Cornyn, Lindsey Graham, Thom Tillis, Rick Scott of Florida, Shelley Moore Capito, Jim Banks, Jon Husted, Joni Ernst, Marsha Blackburn, Ted Budd.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Colin McDonald, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 64 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Banks	Fischer	Moody
Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Blackburn	Grassley	Moreno
Boozman	Hagerty	Murkowski
Britt	Hawley	Paul
Budd	Hoeven	Ricketts
Capito	Husted	Risch
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Collins	Johnson	Schmitt
Cornyn	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lankford	Sheehy
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Curtis	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	McCormick	Young

NAYS—45

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Reed
Baldwin	Hirono	Rosen
Bennet	Kaine	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schatz
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schiff
Booker	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Coons	Luján	Slotkin
Cortez Masto	Markey	Smith
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Welch
Hassan	Padilla	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Gallego	Tuberville
Mullin	Van Hollen

(Mr. SCHMITT assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 45, and the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Colin McDonald, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, on Friday, March 20, 2026, I attended the funeral service of MSG Nicole Amor, of White Bear Lake, MN, who was killed in action while serving in Kuwait. I would have voted against the DHS appropriations bill that was before the Senate, (rollcall vote No. 59), as I had on rollcall vote Nos. 38, 39, 47, and 54.

As I have stated in the past, I support proposals that will immediately fund the Department of Homeland Security's critical national security functions such as cyber defense, airport safety, and the Coast Guard. But, following DHS's actions in Minnesota which resulted in the deaths of two American citizens, as well as repeated violations of the Constitution and defiance of court orders, I will not vote to support continued funding for ICE, which already has $75 billion in guaranteed funding from the bill that was passed last summer, until critical reforms to rein in unlawful behavior and restore accountability are secured.

REMEMBERING REV. DR. BERNARD LAFAYETTE, JR.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life and service of a great advocate for justice and nonviolence, Rev. Dr. Bernard Lafayette, Jr.

Dr. Lafayette was a Freedom Rider who risked his life challenging segregation across the South. He helped organize the Selma voting rights movement, laying the groundwork for the march from Selma to Montgomery and the eventual passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

As a young activist in Nashville, Dr. Lafayette worked closely with John Lewis, who later became my mentor and a moral compass for so many of us who serve today. Together, they believed deeply in the power of nonviolence and the courage it takes to stand up for justice, even in the face of violence and hatred.

The late Rev. Dr. Bernard Lafayette helped shape a generation of leaders

who carried forward the spirit of the movement. Today, I rise to honor his life and legacy. May we continue the work he devoted his life to building a nation that lives up to its highest ideals of justice, equality, and dignity for all.

Dr. Lafayette and his family are in my prayers.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING MIKE CLAMPITT

● Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, today I rise to honor the life and legacy of North Carolina State Representative Mike Clampitt, a dedicated public servant, firefighter, and strong advocate for the people of western North Carolina, who passed away on March 18, 2026, after a courageous battle with cancer.

Representative Clampitt devoted his life to serving others. Long before his time in elected office, he spent nearly three decades with the Charlotte Fire Department, rising to the rank of captain and responding to emergencies across the community. His career in public safety reflected a deep commitment to protecting lives and to putting others first, a calling he carried into public office.

In the North Carolina House of Representatives, where he served multiple terms representing Jackson, Swain, and Transylvania Counties, Representative Clampitt was known as a tireless advocate for his constituents and for western North Carolina. He brought a practical, service-oriented approach to legislating, grounded in the real needs of the communities he represented.

That approach was especially evident in the aftermath of Hurricane Helene, one of the most devastating natural disasters to impact our State. As communities in western North Carolina faced significant flooding and damage, Representative Clampitt was actively engaged in recovery efforts, working to support families and ensure western North Carolina received the resources it needed.

Even while battling a serious illness, Representative Clampitt continued to serve. He remained engaged in legislative work and continued advocating for his constituents. Those who knew Mike Clampitt remember a man of humility, kindness, and steady determination. Whether as a firefighter, legislator, or simply a neighbor, he lived a life defined by service and a commitment to his community.

On behalf of Susan, myself, and the people of North Carolina, I extend our deepest condolences to his family, friends, and all who had the privilege of knowing him. His legacy will endure in the lives he touched and the communities he served.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–3041. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Council Resolution 26–250, ''Transfer of Jurisdiction of Portions of U.S. Reservations 343-C and 343-D, S.O. 23–03016, Approval Resolution of 2025'' received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3042. A communication from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Office's audit of the United States government's fiscal years 2025 and 2024 consolidated financial statements; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3043. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Standards for Traffic Control Devices; the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways; Revision'' (RIN2125–AG15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3044. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route Q–151 and Revocation of Jet Route J–517 in the Northern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2025–2023)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3045. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range Federal Airways V–14, V–192, V–210, and V–221 in the Vicinity of Muncie, Indiana'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2025–2415)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3046. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–23267'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–5036)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3047. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–23268'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–5034)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3048. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–23275'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2026–2284)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3049. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4208'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31653)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3050. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4207'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31652)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3051. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–23264'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–2545)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3052. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–23259'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–3437)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3053. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; BRP–Rotax GmbH & Co KG (Formerly BRP–POWERTRAIN GMBH & CO KG and Bombardier-Rotax GmbH) Engines; Amendment 39–23261'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2026–1321)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3054. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Lycoming Engines; Amendment 39–23271'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–1365)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3055. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation, Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Cessna Aircraft Company) Airplanes; Amendment 39–23255'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–5037)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3056. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Schempp-Hirth Flugzeugbau GmbH Gliders; Amendment 39–23253'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–1362)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3057. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class E Airspace; Ketchikan International Airport, Ketchikan, Alaska'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2025–5579)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3058. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–23281'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2026–2288)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3059. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; MHI RJ Aviation ULC (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–23278'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2026–2285)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3060. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Engines; Amendment 39–23273'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–1730)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3061. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–23270'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0741)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3062. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–23282'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2026–2290)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3063. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–23287'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2026–2296)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3064. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D Airspace; Farmingdale, New York'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2026–2421)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3065. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–23274'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0924)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3066. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–23276'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–1719)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3067. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range Federal Airways V–14, V–192, V–210, and V–221 in the Vicinity of Muncie, Indiana'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2025–2415)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3068. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–23285'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2026–2291)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–3069. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–23280'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0618)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CASSIDY, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3315. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to coordinate to improve cybersecurity in the health care and public health sectors, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 4160. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prohibit certain event contracts involving sports and casino-style games; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SHEEHY (for himself and Mr. KELLY):

S. 4161. A bill to authorize the transfer by the Secretary of the Navy to the U.S. Space and Rocket Center Commission in Huntsville, Alabama, of certain F–14 Tomcat aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. RICKETTS):

S. 4162. A bill to improve the provision of services from the Department of Veterans Affairs to incarcerated veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 4163. A bill to amend the National Quantum Initiative Act to require support for regional innovation initiatives in quantum information science and technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 4164. A bill to make technical corrections to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026; considered and passed.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. FETTERMAN):

S. Res. 657. A resolution commending Taiwan on the 30th anniversary of its first direct presidential election in 1996, and expressing support for Taiwan in the preservation of its democratic institutions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. Res. 658. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of April 6 through April 10, 2026, as ''National Assistant Principals Week''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. Res. 659. A resolution celebrating the 100th anniversary of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BRITT (for herself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. BANKS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MORENO, Mr. HUSTED, and Mr. SHEEHY):

S. Res. 660. A resolution honoring the service and sacrifice of Air Force Major John A. Klinner, Air Force Major Ariana G. Savino, Air Force Technical Sergeant Ashley B. Pruitt, Air Force Captain Seth R. Koval, Air Force Captain Curtis J. Angst, and Air Force Master Sergeant Tyler H. Simmons; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. Con. Res. 29. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 28

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 28, a bill to require the disclosure of a camera or recording capability in certain internet-connected devices.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCCORMICK), the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 567, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War.

S. 1088

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCCORMICK) were added as cosponsors of S. 1088, a bill to provide that the memorial to commemorate the sacrifice and service of the women who worked on the home front to support the efforts of the United States military during World War II may be located on the National Mall, and for other purposes.

S. 1395

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1395, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out activities to reduce food loss and waste, and for other purposes.

S. 1454

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCCORMICK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1454, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide for greater protection of roosters, and for other purposes.

S. 1532

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. MORENO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1532, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 1555

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1555, a bill to increase loan limits for loans made to small manufacturers, and for other purposes.

S. 1651

At the request of Mr. MULLIN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1651, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to ensure equitable and nondiscriminatory contributions to the mechanisms that preserve and advance universal service, to reduce the financial burden on consumers, and for other purposes.

S. 3208

At the request of Mr. CURTIS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3208, a bill to codify the Six Assurances to Taiwan, provide congressional review of the Six Assurances, protect Taiwan from coercion, and for other purposes.

S. 3257

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3257, a bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to revise regulations for certain individuals carrying out aviation activities who disclose a mental health diagnosis or condition, and for other purposes.

S. 3304

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3304, a bill to provide for the coverage of medical food and vitamins and individual amino acids for digestive and inherited metabolic disorders under Federal health programs, to ensure State and Federal protection for existing coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 3556

At the request of Ms. ALSOBROOKS, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCCORMICK) and the Senator from California (Mr. SCHIFF) were added as cosponsors of S. 3556, a bill to reauthorize and improve the wildlife crossings program, and for other purposes.

S. 3654

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 3654, a bill to improve housing and environmental health and safety protections for members of the Armed Forces and their families residing in military family housing, and for other purposes.

S. 3788

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3788, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require drug labeling to include original manufacturer and supply chain information.

S. 3958

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3958, a bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to transition Puerto Rico to the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 4001

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4001, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes.

S. 4023

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4023, a bill to establish the America's Living Library Project, and for other purposes.

S. 4063

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCCORMICK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4063, a bill to impose sanctions on the Polisario Front if it cooperates with an Iranian-affiliated terrorist organization.

S. 4064

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. HUSTED) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. MORENO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4064, a bill to provide for a system of regulation of the offer and sale of digital commodities by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 4066

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4066, a bill to provide that the approved application under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the drug mifepristone for the purpose of the termination of intrauterine pregnancy is deemed to have been withdrawn, to establish a Federal tort for harm to women caused by chemical abortion drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 4146

At the request of Ms. LUMMIS, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) were added as cosponsors of S. 4146, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 with respect to the listing of threatened and endangered species, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 657—COMMENDING TAIWAN ON THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS FIRST DIRECT PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION IN 1996, AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR TAIWAN IN THE PRESERVATION OF ITS DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. FETTERMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S RES. 657

Whereas Taiwan, the government of which officially calls itself the Republic of China, began transitioning to a liberal democracy in the late 1980s, lifted martial law in 1987, and held its first direct legislative election in 1992;

Whereas, on March 23, 1996, the people of Taiwan held their first direct presidential election, marking a historic milestone in Taiwan's democratic development;

Whereas Taiwan has now held 8 presidential and multiple legislative and local elections since its democratic transition, all of which were free, fair, and representative of the will of the people of Taiwan;

Whereas Taiwan has demonstrated the strength of its democratic system through multiple peaceful transfers of political power, which is a bedrock of a free, stable, and representative political system;

Whereas the democratic institutions of Taiwan codify the freedoms of speech, press, assembly, and religion into law, and the citizens of Taiwan have exercised these freedoms in practice to build a vibrant civil society, a strong journalistic and media sector, and an advanced business community;

Whereas Taiwan has continued to strengthen and safeguard its democratic system in the face of growing military, economic, and political pressure from the People's Republic of China;

Whereas the people of Taiwan have shown resilience and steadfast commitment to democratic values despite ongoing coercion and intimidation;

Whereas Taiwan's democracy and respect for the rule of law contribute to peace, stability, and prosperity in the Indo-Pacific region;

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) and the Six Assurances, which were originally conveyed by President Ronald Reagan to Taiwan in 1982, remain fundamental elements of United States policy toward Taiwan; and

Whereas the people of the United States and the people of Taiwan continue to stand as partners against coercion, and threats to regional peace and stability: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMEMORATION STATEMENT.

The Senate of the United States—

(1) commemorates the historic significance of Taiwan's first direct presidential election, which was held on March 23, 1996;

(2) commends Taiwan for building and sustaining a robust democratic system, and the example it has set for self-governance, not just for the Pacific region, but for the world;

(3) regards the democracy of Taiwan as a great strategic strength for the free world and a key component of strong and enduring United States-Taiwan relations;

(4) is committed to supporting Taiwan's self-defense and the liberty of its people; and

(5) remains committed to the United States policy toward Taiwan that has been established by the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96–8; 22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.), the Three Communiqués, and the Six Assurances towards Taiwan.

SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this resolution may be construed as authorizing the use of military force.

SENATE RESOLUTION 658—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF APRIL 6 THROUGH APRIL 10, 2026, AS ''NATIONAL ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS WEEK''

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. LUJÁN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 658

Whereas the National Association of Secondary School Principals (referred to in this preamble as ''NASSP''), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (referred to in this preamble as ''NAESP''), and the American Federation of School Administrators have designated the week of April 6 through April 10, 2026, as ''National Assistant Principals Week'';

Whereas an assistant principal, as a member of the school administration, interacts with many sectors of the school community, including support staff, instructional staff, students, and parents;

Whereas assistant principals are responsible for establishing a positive learning environment and building strong relationships between their school and community;

Whereas assistant principals play a pivotal role in the instructional leadership of their schools by supervising student instruction, mentoring teachers, recognizing the achievements of staff, encouraging collaboration among staff, ensuring the implementation of best practices, monitoring student achievement and progress, facilitating and modeling data-driven decision making to inform instruction, and guiding the direction of targeted intervention and school improvement;

Whereas the day-to-day logistical operations of schools require assistant principals to monitor and address facility needs, attendance, transportation issues, and scheduling challenges, as well as to supervise extra- and co-curricular events;

Whereas assistant principals are entrusted with maintaining an inviting, safe, and orderly school environment that supports the growth and achievement of each and every student by nurturing positive peer relationships, recognizing student achievement, mediating conflicts, analyzing behavior patterns, providing interventions, and, when necessary, taking disciplinary actions;

Whereas, since its establishment in 2004, the NASSP National Assistant Principal of the Year Program has recognized outstanding middle and high school assistant principals who demonstrate success in leadership, curriculum, and personalization;

Whereas the NAESP National Outstanding Assistant Principal Program promotes the fundamental importance of the assistant principal and honors exceptional elementary and middle-level assistant principals who demonstrate excellence in educational leadership and set high standards for students, colleagues, parents, and the community; and

Whereas the week of April 6 through April 10, 2026, is an appropriate week to designate as ''National Assistant Principals Week'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of ''National Assistant Principals Week'';

(2) honors the contributions of assistant principals to the success of students in the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Assistant Principals Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the role played by assistant principals in school leadership and ensuring that every child has access to a high-quality education.

SENATE RESOLUTION 659—CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN SHORE AND BEACH PRESERVATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 659

Whereas the year 2026 marks the centennial of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association (in this preamble referred to as the ''Association''), which has for a century advanced a science-guided commitment to coastal restoration and protection;

Whereas, in 1926, the Association's visionary leaders sought to establish a forum ''where the novice and he who has long wrestled with these problems can seek more light; where the man of science and the statesman can exchange ideas and collaborate together; where idealist and lover of Nature and the economist can arrive at a mutual understanding; where landscape artist and philanthropist can find an outlet for their activities,'' thereby fostering collaboration and innovation for coastal stewardship;

Whereas the critical issues of shore and beach preservation, which promote community protection, a strong economy, ecological health, and recreation, remain as vital in 2026 as they were at the time of the Association's founding;

Whereas United States coastal communities and natural resources have benefitted from the Association's work in translating coastal science and engineering, guiding policy, and advocating for resilient shores and beaches over the past century; and

Whereas, in 2026, the Association is celebrating its 100th anniversary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and celebrates the 100th anniversary of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association (in this resolution referred to as the ''Association'');

(2) commemorates the centennial of the Association, honoring a century of shore and beach preservation and progress; and

(3) congratulates the leaders and members of the Association on a century of dedication to the shores and beaches of the United States and recognizes the enduring importance of its mission.

SENATE RESOLUTION 660—HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF AIR FORCE MAJOR JOHN A. KLINNER, AIR FORCE MAJOR ARIANA G. SAVINO, AIR FORCE TECHNICAL SERGEANT ASHLEY B. PRUITT, AIR FORCE CAPTAIN SETH R. KOVAL, AIR FORCE CAPTAIN CURTIS J. ANGST, AND AIR FORCE MASTER SERGEANT TYLER H. SIMMONS

Mrs. BRITT (for herself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. BANKS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MORENO, Mr. HUSTED, and Mr. SHEEHY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 660

Whereas the men and women who perished during an accident involving a KC–135 Stratotanker refueling aircraft operating over western Iraq while in support of Operation Epic Fury on March 12, 2026, represent the best of the United States of America;

Whereas Major John A. Klinner of Auburn, Alabama, Major Ariana G. Savino of Covington, Washington, and Technical Sergeant Ashley B. Pruitt of Bardstown, Kentucky, served in the 99th Air Refueling Squadron located at Sumpter Smith Joint Air National Guard Base in Birmingham, Alabama;

Whereas Captain Seth R. Koval of Mooresville, Indiana, Captain Curtis J. Angst of Wilmington, Ohio, and Master Sergeant Tyler H. Simmons of Columbus, Ohio were assigned to the 121st Air Refueling Wing at Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base in Columbus, Ohio;

Whereas the people of the United States will remember the bravery of these fallen service members who made the ultimate sacrifice while supporting operations overseas;

Whereas their service secures the blessings of liberty and freedom for the United States of America; and

Whereas their sacrifice on March 12, 2026, was not made in vain, and so long as their grateful Nation lives, their faithful service shall not be forgotten: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the memory, service, and sacrifice of Air Force Major John A. Klinner, Air Force Major Ariana G. Savino, Air Force Technical Sergeant Ashley B. Pruitt, Air Force Captain Seth R. Koval, Air Force Captain Curtis J. Angst, and Air Force Master Sergeant Tyler H. Simmons;

(2) expresses its deepest condolences and gratitude to the Gold Star Families and loved ones of the fallen; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the 99th Air Refueling Squadron located at Sumpter Smith Joint Air National Guard Base in Birmingham, Alabama; and

(B) the 121st Air Refueling Wing at Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base in Columbus, Ohio.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 29—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR AN EVENT TO CELEBRATE THE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I

Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 29

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR EVENT TO CELEBRATE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on June 7, 2026, for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the event described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4745. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4746. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4420 proposed by Mr. THUNE (for Mr. SCHMITT) to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4747. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4748. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4749. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4750. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4751. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4752. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4753. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. WARNOCK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4754. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4755. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4756. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4757. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4758. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4759. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4760. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4761. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4762. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4763. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4764. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4765. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4766. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4767. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4768. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4769. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4770. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4771. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4745. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. LIMITATIONS ON THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION, OR EXPANSION OF AN IMMIGRANT DETENTION CENTER IN GEORGIA.

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Homeland Security under Public Law 119–21, or under any other Act, may be used for the acquisition, construction, renovation, or expansion of any U.S. Immigration and Enforcement detention center located in Social Circle, Georgia or Oakwood, Georgia unless such action in either such location is explicitly authorized by Mayor of the City of Social Circle or the Mayor of the City of Oakwood, as applicable.

SA 4746. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4420 proposed by Mr. THUNE (for Mr. SCHMITT) to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, insert the following:

Subtitle D—Application Only to Certain States

SEC. 131. APPLICATION ONLY TO CERTAIN STATES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the provisions of and amendments made by this title shall only apply to a State with respect to an election for Federal office if more than 100 noncitizens were convicted of, or entered a plea of guilty or no contest to, an offense under section 611 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the preceding election for Federal office held in the State.

SA 4747. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. LIMITATIONS ON THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, RENOVATION, OR EXPANSION OF AN IMMIGRANT DETENTION CENTER IN GEORGIA.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION REQUIRED.—No Federal funds may be expended by the Department of Homeland Security for the acquisition, construction, renovation, or expansion of any U.S. Immigration and Enforcement detention center located in Social Circle, Georgia or Oakwood, Georgia unless such action in either such location is explicitly authorized by an Act of Congress.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS AND INSPECTION REQUIREMENTS.—Any acquisition, construction, or expansion by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement of a facility intended to be used for the detention of noncitizens in Social Circle, Georgia or Oakwood, Georgia shall be subject to all applicable environmental laws and inspection requirements, including—

(1) the completion of an environmental impact statement required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(2) site assessments required under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.).

SA 4748. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REQUIREMENTS FOR HANDLING VOTER DATA.

The Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the head of any other Federal agency that obtains material relating to a Federal election, including voter rolls and data, from a State or local government shall maintain and publish written procedures for, with respect to that material—

(1) the chain of custody;

(2) physical storage and environmental protections;

(3) digital access controls;

(4) the logging of every access, transfer, duplication, or testing event;

(5) the return or certified destruction timelines; and

(6) a notice of the obtainment to the State or local government.

SA 4749. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Preventing Election Subversion Act of 2026''.

SEC. 2. RESTRICTIONS ON REMOVAL OF LOCAL ELECTION ADMINISTRATORS IN ADMINISTRATION OF ELECTIONS FOR FEDERAL OFFICE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress has explicit and broad authority to regulate the time, place, and manner of Federal elections under the Elections Clause under article I, section 4, clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States, including by establishing standards for the fair, impartial, and uniform administration of Federal elections by State and local officials.

(2) The Elections Clause was understood from the framing of the Constitution of the United States to contain ''words of great latitude,'' granting Congress broad power over Federal elections and a plenary right to preempt State regulation in this area. As made clear at the Constitutional Convention and the State ratification debates that followed, this grant of congressional authority was meant to ''insure free and fair elections,'' promote the uniform administration of Federal elections, and ''preserve and restore to the people their equal and sacred rights of election.''.

(3) In the founding debates on the Elections Clause, many delegates also argued that a broad grant of authority to Congress over Federal elections was necessary to check any ''abuses that might be made of the discretionary power'' to regulate the time, place, and manner of elections granted the States, including attempts at partisan entrenchment, malapportionment, and the exclusion of political minorities. As the Supreme Court has recognized, the Elections Clause empowers Congress to ''protect the elections on which its existence depends,'' Ex parte Yarbrough, 110 U.S. 651, 658 (1884), and ''protect the citizen in the exercise of rights conferred by the Constitution of the United States essential to the healthy organization of the government itself,'' id. at 666.

(4) The Elections Clause grants Congress ''plenary and paramount jurisdiction over the whole subject'' of Federal elections, Ex parte Siebold, 100 U.S. 371, 388 (1879), allowing Congress to implement ''a complete code for congressional elections.'' Smiley v. Holm, 285 U.S. 355, 366 (1932). The Elections Clause, unlike, for example, the Commerce Clause, has been found to grant Congress the authority to compel States to alter their regulations as to Federal elections, id. at 366–67, even if these alterations would impose additional costs on the States to execute or enforce. Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now v. Miller, 129 F.3d 833 (6th Cir. 1997).

(5) The phrase ''manner of holding elections'' in the Elections Clause has been interpreted by the Supreme Court to authorize Congress to regulate all aspects of the Federal election process, including ''notices, registration, supervision of voting, protection of voters, prevention of fraud and corrupt practices, counting of votes, duties of inspectors and canvassers, and the making and publication of election returns.'' Smiley v. Holm, 285 U.S. 355, 366 (1932).

(6) The Supreme Court has recognized the broad ''substantive scope'' of the Elections Clause and upheld Federal laws promulgated thereunder regulating redistricting, voter registration, campaign finance, primary elections, recounts, party affiliation rules, and balloting.

(7) The authority of Congress under the Elections Clause also entails the power to ensure enforcement of its laws regulating Federal elections. ''[I]f Congress has the power to make regulations, it must have the power to enforce them.'' Ex parte Siebold, 100 U.S. 371, 387 (1879). The Supreme Court has noted that there can be no question that Congress may impose additional penalties for offenses committed by State officers in connection with Federal elections even if they differ from the penalties prescribed by State law for the same acts. id. at 387–88.

(8) The fair and impartial administration of Federal elections by State and local officials is central to ''the successful working of this government,'' Ex parte Yarbrough, 110 U.S. 651, 666 (1884), and to ''protect the act of voting . . . and the election itself from corruption or fraud,'' id. at 661–62.

(9) The Elections Clause thus grants Congress the authority to ensure that the administration of Federal elections is free of political bias or discrimination and that election officials are insulated from political influence or other forms of coercion in discharging their duties in connection with Federal elections.

(10) In some States, oversight of local election administrators has been allocated to State Election Boards, or special commissions formed by those boards, that are appointed by the prevailing political party in a State, as opposed to nonpartisan or elected office holders.

(11) In certain newly enacted State policies, these appointed statewide election administrators have been granted wide latitude to suspend or remove local election administrators in cases where the statewide election administrators identify whatever the State deems to be a violation. There is no requirement that there be a finding of intent by the local election administrator to commit the violation.

(12) Local election administrators across the country can be suspended or removed according to different standards, potentially exposing them to different political pressures or biases that could result in uneven administration of Federal elections.

(13) The Elections Clause grants Congress the ultimate authority to ensure that oversight of State and local election administrators is fair and impartial in order to ensure equitable and uniform administration of Federal elections.

(b) RESTRICTION.—

(1) STANDARD FOR REMOVAL OF A LOCAL ELECTION ADMINISTRATOR.—A statewide election administrator may only suspend, remove, or relieve the duties of a local election administrator in the State with respect to the administration of an election for Federal office for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

(2) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any local election administrator suspended, removed, or otherwise relieved of duties in violation of paragraph (1) with respect to the administration of an election for Federal office or against whom any proceeding for suspension, removal, or relief from duty in violation of paragraph (1) with respect to the administration of an election for Federal office may be pending, may bring an action in an appropriate district court of the United States for declaratory or injunctive relief with respect to the violation. Any such action shall name as the defendant the statewide election administrator responsible for the adverse action. The district court shall, to the extent practicable, expedite any such proceeding.

(B) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Any action brought under this subsection must be commenced not later than 1 year after the date of the suspension, removal, relief from duties, or commencement of the proceeding to remove, suspend, or relieve the duties of a local election administrator with respect to the administration of an election for Federal office.

(3) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—In any action or proceeding under this subsection, the court may allow a prevailing plaintiff, other than the United States, reasonable attorney's fees as part of the costs, and may include expert fees as part of the attorney's fee. The term ''prevailing plaintiff'' means a plaintiff that substantially prevails pursuant to a judicial or administrative judgment or order, or an enforceable written agreement.

(4) REMOVAL OF STATE PROCEEDINGS TO FEDERAL COURT.—A local election administrator who is subject to an administrative or judicial proceeding for suspension, removal, or

relief from duty by a statewide election administrator with respect to the administration of an election for Federal office may remove the proceeding to an appropriate district court of the United States. Any order remanding a case to the State court or agency from which it was removed under this subsection shall be reviewable by appeal or otherwise.

(5) RIGHT OF UNITED STATES TO INTERVENE.—

(A) NOTICE TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Whenever any administrative or judicial proceeding is brought to suspend, remove, or relieve the duties of any local election administrator by a statewide election administrator with respect to the administration of an election for Federal office, the statewide election administrator who initiated such proceeding shall deliver a copy of the pleadings instituting the proceeding to the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. The local election administrator against whom such proceeding is brought may also deliver such pleadings to the Assistant Attorney General.

(B) RIGHT TO INTERVENE.—The United States may intervene in any administrative or judicial proceeding brought to suspend, remove, or relieve the duties of any local election administrator by a statewide election administrator with respect to the administration of an election for Federal office and in any action initiated pursuant to paragraph (2) or in any removal pursuant to paragraph (4).

(6) REVIEW.—In reviewing any action brought under this section, a court of the United States shall not afford any deference to any State official, administrator, or tribunal that initiated, approved, adjudicated, or reviewed any administrative or judicial proceeding to suspend, remove, or otherwise relieve the duties of a local election administrator.

(c) REPORTS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the suspension, removal, or relief of the duties of a local election administrator by a statewide election administrator, the Statewide election administrator shall submit to the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Divisions of the Department of Justice a report that includes the following information:

(A) A statement that a local election administrator was suspended, removed, or relieved of their duties.

(B) Information on whether the local election administrator was determined to be inefficient or to have engaged in neglect of duty or malfeasance in office.

(C) A description of the effect that the suspension, removal, or relief of the duties of the local election administrator will have on—

(i) the administration of elections and voters in the election jurisdictions for which the local election official provided such duties; and

(ii) the administration of elections and voters in the State at large.

(D) Demographic information about the local election official suspended, removed, or relieved and the jurisdictions for which such election official was providing the duties suspended, removed, or relieved.

(E) Such other information as requested by the Assistant Attorney General for the purposes of determining—

(i) whether such suspension, removal, or relief of duties was based on unlawful discrimination; and

(ii) whether such suspension, removal, or relief of duties was due to inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

(2) EXPEDITED REPORTING FOR ACTIONS WITHIN 30 DAYS OF AN ELECTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If a suspension, removal, or relief of duties of a local administrator described in paragraph (1) occurs during the period described in subparagraph (B), the report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted not later than 48 hours after such suspension, removal, or relief of duties.

(B) PERIOD DESCRIBED.—The period described in this subparagraph is any period which begins 60 days before the date of an election for Federal office and which ends 60 days after such election.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) ELECTION.—The term ''election'' has the meaning given the term in section 301(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(1)).

(2) FEDERAL OFFICE.—The term ''Federal office'' has the meaning given the term in section 301(3) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(3)).

(3) LOCAL ELECTION ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''local election administrator'' means, with respect to a local jurisdiction in a State, the individual or entity responsible for the administration of elections for Federal office in the local jurisdiction.

(4) STATEWIDE ELECTION ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''statewide election administrator'' means, with respect to a State—

(A) the individual or entity, including a State elections board, responsible for the administration of elections for Federal office in the State on a statewide basis; or

(B) a statewide legislative or executive entity with the authority to suspend, remove, or relieve a local election administrator.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to grant any additional authority to remove a local elections administrator beyond any authority provided under the law of the State.

SEC. 3. PROTECTIONS FOR VOTERS ON ELECTION DAY.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Subtitle A of title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

''SEC. 303A. VOTER PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS.

''(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR CHALLENGES BY PERSONS OTHER THAN ELECTION OFFICIALS.—

''(1) REQUIREMENTS FOR CHALLENGES.—No person, other than a State or local election official, shall submit a formal challenge to an individual's eligibility to register to vote in an election for Federal office or to vote in an election for Federal office unless that challenge is supported by personal knowledge with respect to each individual challenged regarding the grounds for ineligibility which is—

''(A) documented in writing; and

''(B) subject to an oath or attestation under penalty of perjury that the challenger has a good faith factual basis to believe that the individual who is the subject of the challenge is ineligible to register to vote or vote in that election, except a challenge that is based on the race, color, ethnicity, national origin, or membership in a language minority group (as defined in section 14 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10310)) of the individual who is the subject of the challenge may not be considered to have a good faith factual basis for purposes of this paragraph.

''(2) PROHIBITION ON CHALLENGES ON OR NEAR DATE OF ELECTION.—No person, other than a State or local election official, shall be permitted—

''(A) to challenge an individual's eligibility to vote in an election for Federal office on the date of the election on grounds that could have been made in advance of such date; or

''(B) to challenge an individual's eligibility to register to vote in an election for Federal office or to vote in an election for Federal office less than 10 days before the election unless the individual registered to vote less than 20 days before the election.

''(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office occurring on and after January 1, 2026.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO ENFORCEMENT.—Section 401 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21111) is amended by striking ''and 303'' and inserting ''303, and 303A''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following:

''Sec. 303A. Voter protection requirements.''.

SA 4750. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF THE SENATE RECOGNIZING THAT JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR. WON THE 2020 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

It is the sense of the Senate that Joseph R. Biden, Jr. won and Donald J. Trump lost the 2020 presidential election.

SA 4751. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON POLL TAX.

Notwithstanding section 2, or any other provision of this Act, and as required by the 24th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the Federal Government shall not impose any precondition to register to vote or to vote that requires payment of a fee for documentation to prove identity or citizenship, and nothing in this Act shall be construed to require such a precondition.

SA 4752. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON FEDERAL ACCESSING OF PERSONAL PRIVATE INFORMATION.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''personal private information'' means any number, symbol, or other identifying particular, including a Social Security number, a driver's license number, or a State identification number that can be used to trace or determine the identity of a specific individual.

(b) PROHIBITION.—The Federal Government shall not access the personal private information of any individual as contained in the voter registration records, databases, or other similar information of any State.

SA 4753. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. WARNOCK) submitted an

amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2026''.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

SEC. 101. VOTE DILUTION, DENIAL, AND ABRIDGMENT CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(a) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after ''applied by any State or political subdivision'' the following: ''for the purpose of, or''; and

(2) by striking ''as provided in subsection (b)'' and inserting ''as provided in subsection (b), (c), (d), or (e)''.

(b) VOTE DILUTION.—Section 2 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10301), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) A violation of subsection (a) for vote dilution is established if, based on the totality of circumstances, it is shown that the political processes leading to nomination or election in the State or political subdivision are not equally open to participation by members of a class of citizens protected by subsection (a) in that its members have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice. The extent to which members of a protected class have been elected to office in the State or political subdivision is one circumstance which may be considered: *Provided*, That nothing in this section establishes a right to have members of a protected class elected in numbers equal to their proportion in the population. The legal standard articulated in Thornburg v. Gingles, 478 U.S. 30 (1986), governs claims under this subsection. For purposes of this subsection a class of citizens protected by subsection (a) may include a cohesive coalition of members of different racial or language minority groups.''.

(c) VOTE DENIAL OR ABRIDGEMENT.—Section 2 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10301), as amended by subsections (a) and (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c)(1) A violation of subsection (a) for vote denial or abridgment is established if the challenged standard, practice, or procedure imposes a discriminatory burden on members of a class of citizens protected by subsection (a), meaning that—

''(A) members of the protected class face greater difficulty in complying with the standard, practice, or procedure, considering the totality of the circumstances; and

''(B) such greater difficulty is, at least in part, caused by or linked to social and historical conditions that have produced or currently produce discrimination against members of the protected class.

''(2) The challenged standard, practice, or procedure need only be a but-for cause of the discriminatory burden or perpetuate a preexisting discriminatory burden.

''(3)(A) The totality of the circumstances for consideration relative to a violation of subsection (a) for vote denial or abridgment shall include the following factors, which, individually and collectively, show how a voting standard, practice, or procedure can function to amplify the effects of past or present racial discrimination:

''(i) The history of official voting-related discrimination in the State or political subdivision.

''(ii) The extent to which voting in the elections of the State or political subdivision is racially polarized.

''(iii) The extent to which the State or political subdivision has used unduly burdensome photographic voter identification requirements, documentary proof of citizenship requirements, documentary proof of residence requirements, or other voting standards, practices, or procedures beyond those required by Federal law that may impair the ability of members of the protected class to participate fully in the political process.

''(iv) The extent to which members of the protected class bear the effects of discrimination in areas such as education, employment, and health, which hinder the ability of those members to participate effectively in the political process.

''(v) The use of overt or subtle racial appeals either in political campaigns or surrounding the adoption or maintenance of the challenged standard, practice, or procedure.

''(vi) The extent to which members of the protected class have been elected to public office in the jurisdiction, except that the fact that the protected class is too small to elect candidates of its choice shall not defeat a claim of vote denial or abridgment under this section.

''(vii) Whether there is a lack of responsiveness on the part of elected officials to the particularized needs of members of the protected class.

''(viii) Whether the policy underlying the State or political subdivision's use of the challenged qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure has a tenuous connection to that qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure.

''(B) A particular combination or number of factors under subparagraph (A) shall not be required to establish a violation of subsection (a) for vote denial or abridgment.

''(C) The totality of the circumstances for consideration relative to a violation of subsection (a) for vote denial or abridgment shall not include the following factors:

''(i) The total number or share of members of a protected class on whom a challenged standard, practice, or procedure does not impose a material burden.

''(ii) The degree to which the challenged standard, practice, or procedure has a long pedigree or was in widespread use at some earlier date.

''(iii) The use of an identical or similar standard, practice, or procedure in other States or political subdivisions.

''(iv) The availability of other forms of voting unimpacted by the challenged standard, practice, or procedure to all members of the electorate, including members of the protected class, unless the State or political subdivision is simultaneously expanding those other standards, practices, or procedures to eliminate any disproportionate burden imposed by the challenged standard, practice, or procedure.

''(v) A prophylactic impact on potential criminal activity by individual voters, if such crimes have not occurred in the State or political subdivision in substantial numbers.

''(vi) Mere invocation of interests in voter confidence or prevention of fraud.''.

(d) INTENDED VOTE DILUTION OR VOTE DENIAL OR ABRIDGMENT.—Section 2 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10301), as amended by subsections (a), (b), and (c) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d)(1) A violation of subsection (a) is also established if a challenged qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure is intended, at least in part, to dilute the voting strength of a protected class or to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth in section 4(f)(2).

''(2) Discrimination on account of race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth in section 4(f)(2), need only be one purpose of a qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure in order to establish a violation of subsection (a), as described in this subsection. A qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure intended to dilute the voting strength of a protected class or to make it more difficult for members of a protected class to cast a ballot that will be counted constitutes a violation of subsection (a), as described in this subsection, even if an additional purpose of the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure is to benefit a particular political party or group.

''(3) Recent context, including actions by official decisionmakers in prior years or in other contexts preceding the decision responsible for the challenged qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure, and including actions by predecessor government actors or individual members of a decisionmaking body, may be relevant to making a determination about a violation of subsection (a), as described under this subsection.

''(4) A claim that a violation of subsection (a) has occurred, as described under this subsection, shall require proof of a discriminatory impact but shall not require proof of violation of subsection (b) or (c).''.

SEC. 102. RETROGRESSION.

Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), as amended by section 101 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) A violation of subsection (a) is established when a State or political subdivision enacts or seeks to administer any qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting in any election that has the purpose of or will have the effect of diminishing the ability of any citizens of the United States on account of race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth in section 4(f)(2), to participate in the electoral process or elect their preferred candidates of choice. This subsection applies to any action taken on or after January 1, 2021, by a State or political subdivision to enact or seek to administer any such qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice or procedure.

''(f) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (e), final decisions of the United States District Court of the District of Columbia on applications or petitions by States or political subdivisions for preclearance under section 5 of any changes in voting prerequisites, standards, practices, or procedures, supersede the provisions of subsection (e).''.

SEC. 103. VIOLATIONS TRIGGERING AUTHORITY OF COURT TO RETAIN JURISDICTION.

(a) TYPES OF VIOLATIONS.—Section 3(c) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10302(c)) is amended by striking ''violations of the fourteenth or fifteenth amendment'' and inserting ''violations of the 14th or 15th Amendment, violations of this Act, or violations of any Federal law that prohibits discrimination in voting on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group,''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10302(a)) is amended by striking ''violations of the fourteenth or fifteenth amendment'' and inserting ''violations of the 14th or 15th Amendment, violations of this Act, or violations of any Federal law that prohibits discrimination in voting on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group,''.

SEC. 104. CRITERIA FOR COVERAGE OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.

(a) DETERMINATION OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO SECTION 4(a).—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10303(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) DETERMINATION OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) EXISTENCE OF VOTING RIGHTS VIOLATIONS DURING PREVIOUS 25 YEARS.—

''(A) STATEWIDE APPLICATION.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a State and all political subdivisions within the State during a calendar year if—

''(i) fifteen or more voting rights violations occurred in the State during the previous 25 calendar years; or

''(ii) ten or more voting rights violations occurred in the State during the previous 25 calendar years, at least one of which was committed by the State itself (as opposed to a political subdivision within the State).

''(B) APPLICATION TO SPECIFIC POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a political subdivision as a separate unit during a calendar year if three or more voting rights violations occurred in the subdivision during the previous 25 calendar years.

''(2) PERIOD OF APPLICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if, pursuant to paragraph (1), subsection (a) applies with respect to a State or political subdivision during a calendar year, subsection (a) shall apply with respect to such State or political subdivision for the period—

''(i) that begins on January 1 of the year in which subsection (a) applies; and

''(ii) that ends on the date which is 10 years after the date described in clause (i).

''(B) NO FURTHER APPLICATION AFTER DECLARATORY JUDGMENT.—

''(i) STATES.—If a State obtains a declaratory judgment under subsection (a), and the judgment remains in effect, subsection (a) shall no longer apply to such State and all political subdivisions in the State pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) unless, after the issuance of the declaratory judgment, paragraph (1)(A) applies to the State solely on the basis of voting rights violations occurring after the issuance of the declaratory judgment.

''(ii) POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—If a political subdivision obtains a declaratory judgment under subsection (a), and the judgment remains in effect, subsection (a) shall no longer apply to such political subdivision pursuant to paragraph (1), including pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) (relating to the statewide application of subsection (a)), unless, after the issuance of the declaratory judgment, paragraph (1)(B) applies to the political subdivision solely on the basis of voting rights violations occurring after the issuance of the declaratory judgment.

''(3) DETERMINATION OF VOTING RIGHTS VIOLATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a voting rights violation occurred in a State or political subdivision if any of the following applies:

''(A) JUDICIAL RELIEF; VIOLATION OF THE 14TH OR 15TH AMENDMENT.—Any final judgment (that was not reversed on appeal) occurred, in which the plaintiff prevailed and in which any court of the United States determined that a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group occurred, or that a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting created an undue burden on the right to vote in connection with a claim that the law unduly burdened voters of a particular race, color, or language minority group, in violation of the 14th or 15th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, anywhere within the State or subdivision.

''(B) JUDICIAL RELIEF; VIOLATIONS OF THIS ACT.—Any final judgment (that was not reversed on appeal) occurred in which the plaintiff prevailed and in which any court of the United States determined that a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting was imposed or applied or would have been imposed or applied anywhere within the State or subdivision in a manner that resulted or would have resulted in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, in violation of subsection (e) or (f) or section 2, 201, or 203.

''(C) FINAL JUDGMENT; DENIAL OF DECLARATORY JUDGMENT.—In a final judgment (that was not been reversed on appeal), any court of the United States has denied the request of the State or subdivision for a declaratory judgment under section 3(c) or section 5, and thereby prevented a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting from being enforced anywhere within the State or subdivision.

''(D) OBJECTION BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General has interposed an objection under section 3(c) or section 5, and thereby prevented a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting from being enforced anywhere within the State or subdivision. A violation under this subparagraph has not occurred where an objection has been withdrawn by the Attorney General, unless the withdrawal was in response to a change in the law or practice that served as the basis of the objection. A violation under this subparagraph has not occurred where the objection is based solely on a State or political subdivision's failure to comply with a procedural process that would not otherwise count as an independent violation of this Act.

''(E) CONSENT DECREE, SETTLEMENT, OR OTHER AGREEMENT.—

''(i) AGREEMENT.—A consent decree, settlement, or other agreement was adopted or entered by a court of the United States that contains an admission of liability by the defendants, which resulted in the alteration or abandonment of a voting practice anywhere in the territory of such State or subdivision that was challenged on the ground that the practice denied or abridged the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group in violation of subsection (e) or (f) or section 2, 201, or 203, or the 14th or 15th Amendment.

''(ii) INDEPENDENT VIOLATIONS.—A voluntary extension or continuation of a consent decree, settlement, or agreement described in clause (i) shall not count as an independent violation under this subparagraph. Any other extension or modification of such a consent decree, settlement, or agreement, if the consent decree, settlement, or agreement has been in place for ten years or longer, shall count as an independent violation under this subparagraph. If a court of the United States finds that a consent decree, settlement, or agreement described in clause (i) itself denied or abridged the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, violated subsection (e) or (f) or section 2, 201, or 203, or created an undue burden on the right to vote in connection with a claim that the consent decree, settlement, or other agreement unduly burdened voters of a particular race, color, or language minority group, that finding shall count as an independent violation under this subparagraph.

''(F) MULTIPLE VIOLATIONS.—Each instance in which a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, including each redistricting plan, is found to be a violation by a court of the United States pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B), or prevented from being enforced pursuant to subparagraph (C) or (D), or altered or abandoned pursuant to subparagraph (E) shall count as an independent violation under this paragraph. Within a redistricting plan, each violation under this paragraph found to discriminate against any group of voters based on race, color, or language minority group shall count as an independent violation under this paragraph.

''(4) TIMING OF DETERMINATIONS.—

''(A) DETERMINATIONS OF VOTING RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.—As early as practicable during each calendar year, the Attorney General shall make the determinations required by this subsection, including updating the list of voting rights violations occurring in each State and political subdivision for the previous calendar year.

''(B) EFFECTIVE UPON PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—A determination or certification of the Attorney General under this section or under section 8 or 13 shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 4(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10303(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the first sentence of the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''any State with respect to which'' and all that follows through ''unless'' and inserting ''any State to which this subsection applies during a calendar year pursuant to determinations made under subsection (b), or in any political subdivision of such State (as such subdivision existed on the date such determinations were made with respect to such State), though such determinations were not made with respect to such subdivision as a separate unit, or in any political subdivision with respect to which this subsection applies during a calendar year pursuant to determinations made with respect to such subdivision as a separate unit under subsection (b), unless'';

(B) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking the second sentence;

(C) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''(in the case of a State or subdivision seeking a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection)'';

(D) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''(in the case of a State or subdivision seeking a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection)'';

(E) in paragraph (3), by striking ''(in the case of a State or subdivision seeking a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection)'';

(F) in paragraph (5), by striking ''(in the case of a State or subdivision which sought a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection)'';

(G) by striking paragraphs (7) and (8); and

(H) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (7).

(b) CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF LANGUAGE MINORITY GROUPS.—Section 4(a)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10303(a)(1)), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended, in the first sentence, by striking ''race or color,'' and inserting ''race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees of subsection (f)(2),''.

(c) FACILITATING BAILOUT.—Section 4(a) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C.

10303(a)), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1)(C) and redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (F) as subparagraphs (C) through (E), respectively;

(2) by inserting at the beginning of paragraph (7), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)(H), the following: ''Any plaintiff seeking a declaratory judgment under this subsection on the grounds that the plaintiff meets the requirements of paragraph (1) may request that the Attorney General consent to entry of judgment.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) If a political subdivision is subject to the application of this subsection, due to the applicability of subsection (b)(1)(A), the political subdivision may seek a declaratory judgment under this section if the subdivision demonstrates that the subdivision meets the criteria established by the subparagraphs of paragraph (1), for the 10 years preceding the date on which subsection (a) applied to the political subdivision under subsection (b)(1)(A).

''(9) If a political subdivision was not subject to the application of this subsection by reason of a declaratory judgment entered prior to the date of enactment of the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2026, and is not, subsequent to that date of enactment, subject to the application of this subsection under subsection (b)(1)(B), then that political subdivision shall not be subject to the requirements of this subsection.''.

SEC. 105. DETERMINATION OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO PRECLEARANCE FOR COVERED PRACTICES.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) is further amended by inserting after section 4 the following:

''SEC. 4A. DETERMINATION OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO PRECLEARANCE FOR COVERED PRACTICES.

''(a) PRACTICE-BASED PRECLEARANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State and each political subdivision shall—

''(A) identify any newly enacted or adopted law, regulation, or policy that includes a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or a standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, that is a covered practice described in subsection (b); and

''(B) ensure that no such covered practice is implemented unless or until the State or political subdivision, as the case may be, complies with subsection (c).

''(2) DETERMINATIONS OF CHARACTERISTICS OF VOTING-AGE POPULATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—As early as practicable during each calendar year, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Bureau of the Census and the heads of other relevant offices of the government, shall make the determinations required by this section regarding voting-age populations and the characteristics of such populations, and shall publish a list of the States and political subdivisions to which a voting-age population characteristic described in subsection (b) applies.

''(B) PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER.—A determination (including a certification) of the Attorney General under this paragraph shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

''(b) COVERED PRACTICES.—To assure that the right of citizens of the United States to vote is not denied or abridged on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group as a result of the implementation of certain qualifications or prerequisites to voting, or standards, practices, or procedures with respect to voting, newly adopted in a State or political subdivision, the following shall be covered practices subject to the requirements described in subsection (a):

''(1) CHANGES TO METHOD OF ELECTION.—Any change to the method of election—

''(A) to add seats elected at-large in a State or political subdivision where—

''(i) two or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent or more of the voting-age population in the State or political subdivision, respectively; or

''(ii) a single language minority group represents 20 percent or more of the voting-age population on Indian lands located in whole or in part in the State or political subdivision; or

''(B) to convert one or more seats elected from a single-member district to one or more at-large seats or seats from a multi-member district in a State or political subdivision where—

''(i) two or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent or more of the voting-age population in the State or political subdivision, respectively; or

''(ii) a single language minority group represents 20 percent or more of the voting-age population on Indian lands located in whole or in part in the State or political subdivision.

''(2) CHANGES TO POLITICAL SUBDIVISION BOUNDARIES.—Any change or series of changes within a year to the boundaries of a political subdivision that reduces by 3 or more percentage points the percentage of the political subdivision's voting-age population that is comprised of members of a single racial group or language minority group in the political subdivision where—

''(A) two or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent or more of the political subdivision's voting-age population; or

''(B) a single language minority group represents 20 percent or more of the voting-age population on Indian lands located in whole or in part in the political subdivision.

''(3) CHANGES THROUGH REDISTRICTING.—Any change to the boundaries of districts for Federal, State, or local elections in a State or political subdivision where any racial group or language minority group that is not the largest racial group or language minority group in the jurisdiction and that represents 15 percent or more of the State or political subdivision's voting-age population experiences a population increase of at least 20 percent of its voting-age population, over the preceding decade (as calculated by the Bureau of the Census under the most recent decennial census), in the jurisdiction.

''(4) CHANGES IN DOCUMENTATION OR QUALIFICATIONS TO VOTE.—Any change to requirements for documentation or proof of identity to vote or register to vote in elections for Federal, State, or local offices that will exceed or be more stringent than such requirements under State law on the day before the date of enactment of the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2026.

''(5) CHANGES TO MULTILINGUAL VOTING MATERIALS.—Any change that reduces multilingual voting materials or alters the manner in which such materials are provided or distributed, where no similar reduction or alteration occurs in materials provided in English for such election.

''(6) CHANGES THAT REDUCE, CONSOLIDATE, OR RELOCATE VOTING LOCATIONS, OR REDUCE VOTING OPPORTUNITIES.—Any change that reduces, consolidates, or relocates voting locations in elections for Federal, State, or local office, including early, absentee, and election-day voting locations, or reduces days or hours of in-person voting on any Sunday during a period occurring prior to the date of an election for Federal, State, or local office during which voters may cast ballots in such election, or prohibits the provision of food or non-alcoholic drink to persons waiting to vote in an election for Federal, State, or local office, except where the provision would violate prohibitions on expenditures to influence voting, if the location change, reduction in days or hours, or prohibition applies—

''(A) in one or more census tracts in which two or more language minority groups or racial groups each represent 20 percent or more of the voting-age population; or

''(B) on Indian lands in which at least 20 percent of the voting-age population belongs to a single language minority group.

''(7) NEW LIST MAINTENANCE PROCESS.—Any change to the maintenance process for voter registration lists that adds a new basis for removal from the list of active voters registered to vote in elections for Federal, State, or local office, or that incorporates new sources of information in determining a voter's eligibility to vote in elections for Federal, State, or local office, if such a change would have a statistically significant disparate impact, concerning the removal from voter rolls, on members of racial groups or language minority groups that constitute greater than 5 percent of the voting-age population—

''(A) in the case of a political subdivision imposing such change if—

''(i) two or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent or more of the voting-age population of the political subdivision; or

''(ii) a single language minority group represents 20 percent or more of the voting-age population on Indian lands located in whole or in part in the political subdivision; or

''(B) in the case of a State imposing such change, if two or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent or more of the voting-age population of—

''(i) the State; or

''(ii) a political subdivision in the State, except that the requirements under subsections (a) and (c) shall apply only with respect to each such political subdivision individually.

''(c) PRECLEARANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) ACTION.—Whenever a State or political subdivision with respect to which the requirements set forth in subsection (a) are in effect shall enact, adopt, or seek to implement any covered practice described under subsection (b), such State or subdivision may institute an action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for a declaratory judgment that such covered practice neither has the purpose nor will have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, and unless and until the court enters such judgment such covered practice shall not be implemented.

''(B) SUBMISSION TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), such covered practice may be implemented without such proceeding if the covered practice has been submitted by the chief legal officer or other appropriate official of such State or subdivision to the Attorney General and the Attorney General has not interposed an objection within 60 days after such submission, or upon good cause shown, to facilitate an expedited approval within 60 days after such submission, the Attorney General has affirmatively indicated that such objection will not be made. For purposes of determining whether expedited consideration of approval is required under this subparagraph or section 5(a), an exigency such as a natural disaster, that requires a change in a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice,

or procedure with respect to voting during the period of 30 days before a Federal election, shall be considered to be good cause requiring that expedited consideration.

''(ii) EFFECT OF INDICATION.—Neither an affirmative indication by the Attorney General that no objection will be made, nor the Attorney General's failure to object, nor a declaratory judgment entered under this subsection shall bar a subsequent action to enjoin implementation of such covered practice. In the event the Attorney General affirmatively indicates that no objection will be made within the 60-day period following receipt of a submission, the Attorney General may reserve the right to reexamine the submission if additional information comes to the Attorney General's attention during the remainder of the 60-day period which would otherwise require objection in accordance with this subsection.

''(C) COURT.—Any action under this subsection shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28, United States Code, and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court.

''(2) DENYING OR ABRIDGING THE RIGHT TO VOTE.—Any covered practice described in subsection (b) that has the purpose of or will have the effect of diminishing the ability of any citizens of the United States on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, to elect their preferred candidates of choice denies or abridges the right to vote within the meaning of paragraph (1).

''(3) PURPOSE DEFINED.—The term 'purpose' in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall include any discriminatory purpose.

''(4) PURPOSE OF PARAGRAPH (2).—The purpose of paragraph (2) is to protect the ability of such citizens to elect their preferred candidates of choice.

''(d) ENFORCEMENT.—The Attorney General or any aggrieved citizen may file an action in a district court of the United States to compel any State or political subdivision to satisfy the obligations set forth in this section. Such an action shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges under section 2284 of title 28, United States Code. In any such action, the court shall provide as a remedy that implementation of any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, that is the subject of the action under this subsection be enjoined unless the court determines that—

''(1) the voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, is not a covered practice described in subsection (b); or

''(2) the State or political subdivision has complied with subsection (c) with respect to the covered practice at issue.

''(e) COUNTING OF RACIAL GROUPS AND LANGUAGE MINORITY GROUPS.—For purposes of this section, the calculation of the population of a racial group or a language minority group shall be carried out using the methodology in the guidance of the Department of Justice entitled 'Guidance Concerning Redistricting Under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act; Notice' (76 Fed. Reg. 7470 (February 9, 2011)).

''(f) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of determinations under this section, any data provided by the Bureau of the Census, whether based on estimation from a sample or actual enumeration, shall not be subject to challenge or review in any court.

''(g) MULTILINGUAL VOTING MATERIALS.—In this section, the term 'multilingual voting materials' means registration or voting notices, forms, instructions, assistance, or other materials or information relating to the electoral process, including ballots, provided in the language or languages of one or more language minority groups.''.

SEC. 106. PROMOTING TRANSPARENCY TO ENFORCE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT.

(a) TRANSPARENCY.—The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 5 the following:

''SEC. 6. TRANSPARENCY REGARDING CHANGES TO PROTECT VOTING RIGHTS.

''(a) NOTICE OF ENACTED CHANGES.—

''(1) NOTICE OF CHANGES.—If a State or political subdivision makes any change in any qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting in any election for Federal office that will result in the qualification or prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure being different from that which was in effect as of 180 days before the date of the election for Federal office, the State or political subdivision shall provide reasonable public notice in such State or political subdivision and on the website of the State or political subdivision, of a concise description of the change, including the difference between the changed qualification or prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure and the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure which was previously in effect. The public notice described in this paragraph, in such State or political subdivision and on the website of a State or political subdivision, shall be in a format that is reasonably convenient and accessible to persons with disabilities who are eligible to vote, including persons who have low vision or are blind.

''(2) DEADLINE FOR NOTICE.—A State or political subdivision shall provide the public notice required under paragraph (1) not later than 48 hours after making the change involved.

''(b) TRANSPARENCY REGARDING POLLING PLACE RESOURCES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to identify any changes that may impact the right to vote of any person, prior to the 30th day before the date of an election for Federal office, each State or political subdivision with responsibility for allocating registered voters, voting machines, and official poll workers to particular precincts and polling places shall provide reasonable public notice in such State or political subdivision and on the website of a State or political subdivision, of the information described in paragraph (2) for precincts and polling places within such State or political subdivision. The public notice described in this paragraph, in such State or political subdivision and on the website of a State or political subdivision, shall be in a format that is reasonably convenient and accessible to persons with disabilities who are eligible to vote, including persons who have low vision or are blind.

''(2) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this paragraph with respect to a precinct or polling place is each of the following:

''(A) The name or number.

''(B) In the case of a polling place, the location, including the street address, and whether such polling place is accessible to persons with disabilities.

''(C) The voting-age population of the area served by the precinct or polling place, broken down by demographic group if such breakdown is reasonably available to such State or political subdivision.

''(D) The number of registered voters assigned to the precinct or polling place, broken down by demographic group if such breakdown is reasonably available to such State or political subdivision.

''(E) The number of voting machines assigned, including the number of voting machines accessible to persons with disabilities who are eligible to vote, including persons who have low vision or are blind.

''(F) The number of official paid poll workers assigned.

''(G) The number of official volunteer poll workers assigned.

''(H) In the case of a polling place, the dates and hours of operation.

''(3) UPDATES IN INFORMATION REPORTED.—If a State or political subdivision makes any change in any of the information described in paragraph (2), the State or political subdivision shall provide reasonable public notice in such State or political subdivision and on the website of a State or political subdivision, of the change in the information not later than 48 hours after the change occurs or, if the change occurs fewer than 48 hours before the date of the election for Federal office, as soon as practicable after the change occurs. The public notice described in this paragraph and published on the website of a State or political subdivision shall be in a format that is reasonably convenient and accessible to persons with disabilities who are eligible to vote, including persons who have low vision or are blind.

''(c) TRANSPARENCY OF CHANGES RELATING TO DEMOGRAPHICS AND ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.—

''(1) REQUIRING PUBLIC NOTICE OF CHANGES.—Not later than 10 days after making any change in the constituency that will participate in an election for Federal, State, or local office or the boundaries of a voting unit or electoral district in an election for Federal, State, or local office (including through redistricting, reapportionment, changing from at-large elections to district-based elections, or changing from district-based elections to at-large elections), a State or political subdivision shall provide reasonable public notice in such State or political subdivision and on the website of a State or political subdivision, of the demographic and electoral data described in paragraph (3) for each of the geographic areas described in paragraph (2).

''(2) GEOGRAPHIC AREAS DESCRIBED.—The geographic areas described in this paragraph are as follows:

''(A) The State as a whole, if the change applies statewide, or the political subdivision as a whole, if the change applies across the entire political subdivision.

''(B) If the change includes a plan to replace or eliminate voting units or electoral districts, each voting unit or electoral district that will be replaced or eliminated.

''(C) If the change includes a plan to establish new voting units or electoral districts, each such new voting unit or electoral district.

''(3) DEMOGRAPHIC AND ELECTORAL DATA.—The demographic and electoral data described in this paragraph with respect to a geographic area described in paragraph (2) are each of the following:

''(A) The voting-age population, broken down by demographic group.

''(B) The number of registered voters, broken down by demographic group if such breakdown is reasonably available to the State or political subdivision involved.

''(C)(i) If the change applies to a State, the actual number of votes, or (if it is not reasonably practicable for the State to ascertain the actual number of votes) the estimated number of votes received by each candidate in each statewide election held during the 5-year period which ends on the date the change involved is made; and

''(ii) if the change applies to only one political subdivision, the actual number of votes, or (if it is not reasonably practicable for the political subdivision to ascertain the actual number of votes) the estimated number of votes in each subdivision-wide election held during the 5-year period which ends on the date the change involved is made.

''(4) VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE BY SMALLER JURISDICTIONS.—Compliance with this subsection shall be voluntary for a political subdivision of a State unless the subdivision is one of the following:

''(A) A county or parish.

''(B) A municipality with a population greater than 10,000, as determined by the Bureau of the Census under the most recent decennial census.

''(C) A school district with a population greater than 10,000, as determined by the Bureau of the Census under the most recent decennial census. For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'school district' means the geographic area under the jurisdiction of a local educational agency (as defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

''(d) RULES REGARDING FORMAT OF INFORMATION.—The Attorney General may issue rules specifying a reasonably convenient and accessible format that States and political subdivisions shall use to provide public notice of information under this section.

''(e) NO DENIAL OF RIGHT TO VOTE.—The right to vote of any person shall not be denied or abridged because the person failed to comply with any change made by a State or political subdivision to a voting qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure if the State or political subdivision involved did not meet the applicable requirements of this section with respect to the change.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'demographic group' means each group which section 2 protects from the denial or abridgement of the right to vote on account of race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth in section 4(f)(2);

''(2) the term 'election for Federal office' means any general, special, primary, or runoff election held solely or in part for the purpose of electing any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Senator, Member of the House of Representatives, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress; and

''(3) the term 'persons with disabilities', means individuals with a disability, as defined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) shall apply with respect to changes which are made on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 107. AUTHORITY TO ASSIGN OBSERVERS.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY IN POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO PRECLEARANCE.—Section 8(a)(2)(B) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10305(a)(2)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

''(B) in the Attorney General's judgment, the assignment of observers is otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 14th or 15th Amendment or any provision of this Act or any other Federal law protecting the right of citizens of the United States to vote; or''.

(b) ASSIGNMENT OF OBSERVERS TO ENFORCE BILINGUAL ELECTION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 8(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10305(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) the Attorney General certifies with respect to a political subdivision that—

''(A) the Attorney General has received written meritorious complaints from residents, elected officials, or civic participation organizations that efforts to violate section 203 are likely to occur; or

''(B) in the Attorney General's judgment, the assignment of observers is necessary to enforce the guarantees of section 203;''; and

(3) by moving the margin for the continuation text following paragraph (3), as added by paragraph (2) of this subsection, 2 ems to the left.

(c) TRANSFERRAL OF AUTHORITY OVER OBSERVERS TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(1) ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS.—Section 3(a) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10302(a)) is amended by striking ''United States Civil Service Commission in accordance with section 6'' and inserting ''Attorney General in accordance with section 8''.

(2) OBSERVERS; APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.—Section 8 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10305) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), in the flush matter at the end, by striking ''Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall assign as many observers for such subdivision as the Director'' and inserting ''Attorney General shall assign as many observers for such subdivision as the Attorney General'';

(B) in subsection (c), by striking ''Director of the Office of Personnel Management'' and inserting ''Attorney General''; and

(C) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following: ''The Director of the Office of Personnel Management may, with the consent of the Attorney General, assist in the selection, recruitment, hiring, training, or deployment of these or other individuals authorized by the Attorney General for the purpose of observing whether persons who are entitled to vote are being permitted to vote and whether those votes are being properly tabulated.''.

(3) TERMINATION OF CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS OF OBSERVERS.—Section 13(a)(1) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10309(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''notifies the Director of the Office of Personnel Management,'' and inserting ''determines,''.

SEC. 108. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO SEEK RELIEF.

(a) POLL TAX.—Section 10(b) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10306(b)) is amended by striking ''the Attorney General is authorized and directed to institute forthwith in the name of the United States such actions,'' and inserting ''an aggrieved person or (in the name of the United States) the Attorney General may institute such actions''.

(b) CAUSE OF ACTION.—Section 12(d) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10308(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(d)(1) Whenever there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person has engaged in, or is about to engage in, any act or practice that would (1) deny any citizen the right to register, to cast a ballot, or to have that ballot counted properly and included in the appropriate totals of votes cast in violation of the 14th, 15th, 19th, 24th, or 26th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, (2) violate subsection (a) or (b) of section 11, or (3) violate any other provision of this Act or any other Federal voting rights law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, an aggrieved person or (in the name of the United States) the Attorney General may institute an action for preventive relief, including an application for a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order, or other appropriate order. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to create a cause of action for civil enforcement of criminal provisions of this or any other Act.''.

(c) JUDICIAL RELIEF.—Section 204 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10504) is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: ''Whenever there are reasonable grounds to believe that a State or political subdivision has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by a provision of this title, an aggrieved person or (in the name of the United States) the Attorney General may institute an action in a district court of the United States, for a restraining order, a preliminary or permanent injunction, or such other order as may be appropriate.''.

(d) ENFORCEMENT OF TWENTY-SIXTH AMENDMENT.—Section 301(a)(1) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10701(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a)(1) An aggrieved person or (in the name of the United States) the Attorney General may institute an action in a district court of the United States, for a restraining order, a preliminary or permanent injunction, or such other order as may be appropriate to implement the 26th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.''.

SEC. 109. PREVENTIVE RELIEF.

Section 12(d) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10308(d)), as amended by section 108, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(2)(A) In considering any motion for preliminary relief in any action for preventive relief described in this subsection, the court shall grant the relief if the court determines that the complainant has raised a serious question as to whether the challenged voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure violates any of the provisions listed in section 111(a)(1) of the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2026 and, on balance, the hardship imposed on the defendant by the grant of the relief will be less than the hardship which would be imposed on the plaintiff if the relief were not granted.

''(B) In making its determination under this paragraph with respect to a change in any voting qualification, prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, the court shall consider all relevant factors and give due weight to the following factors, if they are present:

''(i) Whether the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure in effect prior to the change was adopted as a remedy for a Federal court judgment, consent decree, or admission regarding—

''(I) discrimination on the basis of race or color in violation of the 14th or 15th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

''(II) a violation of the 19th, 24th, or 26th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States;

''(III) a violation of this Act; or

''(IV) voting discrimination on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group in violation of any other Federal or State law.

''(ii) Whether the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure in effect prior to the change served as a ground for the dismissal or settlement of a claim alleging—

''(I) discrimination on the basis of race or color in violation of the 14th or 15th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

''(II) a violation of the 19th, 24th, or 26th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

''(III) a violation of this Act; or

''(IV) voting discrimination on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group in violation of any other Federal or State law.

''(iii) Whether the change was adopted fewer than 180 days before the date of the election with respect to which the change is to take or takes effect.

''(iv) Whether the defendant has failed to provide timely or complete notice of the

adoption of the change as required by applicable Federal or State law.

''(3) A jurisdiction's inability to enforce its voting or election laws, regulations, policies, or redistricting plans, standing alone, shall not be deemed to constitute irreparable harm to the public interest or to the interests of a defendant in an action arising under the Constitution or any Federal law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group in the voting process, for the purposes of determining whether a stay of a court's order or an interlocutory appeal under section 1253 of title 28, United States Code, is warranted.''.

SEC. 110. BILINGUAL ELECTION REQUIREMENTS.

Section 203(b)(1) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10503(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''2032'' and inserting ''2037''.

SEC. 111. RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS OF VOTING RIGHTS LAWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS OF VOTING RIGHTS LAWS.—In this section, the term ''prohibited act or practice'' means—

(A) any act or practice—

(i) that creates an undue burden on the fundamental right to vote in violation of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States or violates the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; or

(ii) that is prohibited by the 15th, 19th, 24th, or 26th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101), the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.), the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20301 et seq.), the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20901 et seq.), the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act (52 U.S.C. 20101 et seq.), or section 2003 of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10102); and

(B) any act or practice in violation of any Federal law that prohibits discrimination with respect to voting, including the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to diminish the authority or scope of authority of any person to bring an action under any Federal law.

(3) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—Section 722(b) of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988(b)) is amended by inserting ''a provision described in section 111(a)(1) of the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2026,'' after ''title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,''.

(b) GROUNDS FOR EQUITABLE RELIEF.—In any action for equitable relief pursuant to a law listed under subsection (a), proximity of the action to an election shall not be a valid reason to deny such relief, or stay the operation of or vacate the issuance of such relief, unless the party opposing the issuance or continued operation of relief meets the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that the issuance of the relief would be so close in time to the election as to cause irreparable harm to the public interest or that compliance with such relief would impose serious burdens on the party opposing relief.

(1) IN GENERAL.—In considering whether to grant, deny, stay, or vacate any order of equitable relief, the court shall give substantial weight to the public's interest in expanding access to the right to vote. A State's generalized interest in enforcing its enacted laws shall not be a relevant consideration in determining whether equitable relief is warranted.

(2) PRESUMPTIVE SAFE HARBOR.—Where equitable relief is sought either within 30 days of the adoption or reasonable public notice of the challenged policy or practice, or more than 45 days before the date of an election to which the relief being sought will apply, proximity to the election will be presumed not to constitute a harm to the public interest or a burden on the party opposing relief.

(c) GROUNDS FOR STAY OR VACATUR IN FEDERAL CLAIMS INVOLVING VOTING RIGHTS.—

(1) PROSPECTIVE EFFECT.—In reviewing an application for a stay or vacatur of equitable relief granted pursuant to a law listed in subsection (a), a court shall give substantial weight to the reliance interests of citizens who acted pursuant to such order under review. In fashioning a stay or vacatur, a reviewing court shall not order relief that has the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote of any citizen who has acted in reliance on the order.

(2) WRITTEN EXPLANATION.—No stay or vacatur under this subsection shall issue unless the reviewing court makes specific findings that the public interest, including the public's interest in expanding access to the ballot, will be harmed by the continuing operation of the equitable relief or that compliance with such relief will impose serious burdens on the party seeking such a stay or vacatur such that those burdens substantially outweigh the benefits to the public interest. In reviewing an application for a stay or vacatur of equitable relief, findings of fact made in issuing the order under review shall not be set aside unless clearly erroneous.

SEC. 112. PROTECTION OF TABULATED VOTES.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10307) is amended—

(1) in section 11—

(A) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) No person acting under color of law shall—

''(1) fail or refuse to permit any person to vote who is entitled to vote under Federal law or is otherwise qualified to vote;

''(2) willfully fail or refuse to tabulate, count, and report such person's vote; or

''(3) willfully fail or refuse to certify the aggregate tabulations of such persons' votes or certify the election of the candidates receiving sufficient such votes to be elected to office.''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting ''subsection (a) or'' after ''duties under''; and

(2) in section 12—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking ''a year following an election in a political subdivision in which an observer has been assigned'' and inserting ''22 months following an election for Federal office''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: ''Whenever the Attorney General has reasonable grounds to believe that any person has engaged in or is about to engage in an act in violation of this subsection, the Attorney General may institute (in the name of the United States) a civil action in Federal district court seeking appropriate relief.'';

(B) in subsection (c), by inserting ''or solicits a violation of'' after ''conspires to violate''; and

(C) in subsection (e), by striking the first and second sentences and inserting the following: ''If, after the closing of the polls in an election for Federal office, persons allege that notwithstanding (1) their registration by an appropriate election official and (2) their eligibility to vote in the political subdivision, their ballots have not been counted in such election, and if upon prompt receipt of notifications of these allegations, the Attorney General finds such allegations to be well founded, the Attorney General may forthwith file with the district court an application for an order providing for the counting and certification of the ballots of such persons and requiring the inclusion of their votes in the total vote for all applicable offices before the results of such election shall be deemed final and any force or effect given thereto.''.

SEC. 113. ENFORCEMENT OF VOTING RIGHTS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Section 12 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10308), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) VOTING RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to fulfill the Attorney General's responsibility to enforce this Act and other Federal laws that protect the right to vote, the Attorney General (or upon designation by the Attorney General, the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights) is authorized, before commencing a civil action, to issue a demand for inspection and information in writing to any State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, with respect to any relevant documentary material that the Attorney General has reason to believe is within their possession, custody, or control. A demand by the Attorney General under this subsection may require—

''(A) the production of such documentary material for inspection and copying;

''(B) answers in writing to written questions with respect to such documentary material; or

''(C) both the production described under subparagraph (A) and the answers described under subparagraph (B).

''(2) CONTENTS OF AN ATTORNEY GENERAL DEMAND.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Any demand issued under paragraph (1), shall include a sworn certificate to identify the voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, or other voting related matter or issue, whose lawfulness the Attorney General is investigating and to identify the Federal law that protects the right to vote under which the investigation is being conducted. The demand shall be reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of documentary material and information relevant to such investigation. Documentary material includes any material upon which relevant information is recorded, and includes written or printed materials, photographs, tapes, or materials upon which information is electronically or magnetically recorded. Such demands shall be aimed at the Attorney General having the ability to inspect and obtain copies of relevant materials (as well as obtain information) related to voting and are not aimed at the Attorney General taking possession of original records, particularly those that are required to be retained by State and local election officials under Federal or State law.

''(B) NO REQUIREMENT FOR PRODUCTION.—Any demand issued under paragraph (1) may not require the production of any documentary material or the submission of any answers in writing to written questions if such material or answers would be protected from disclosure under the standards applicable to discovery requests under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in an action in which the Attorney General or the United States is a party.

''(C) DOCUMENTARY MATERIAL.—If the demand issued under paragraph (1) requires the production of documentary material, it shall—

''(i) identify the class of documentary material to be produced with such definiteness and certainty as to permit such material to be fairly identified; and

''(ii) prescribe a return date for production of the documentary material at least 20 days

after issuance of the demand to give the State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, a reasonable period of time for assembling the documentary material and making it available for inspection and copying.

''(D) ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS.—If the demand issued under paragraph (1) requires answers in writing to written questions, it shall—

''(i) set forth with specificity the written question to be answered; and

''(ii) prescribe a date at least 20 days after the issuance of the demand for submitting answers in writing to the written questions.

''(E) SERVICE.—A demand issued under paragraph (1) may be served by a United States marshal or a deputy marshal, or by certified mail, at any place within the territorial jurisdiction of any court of the United States.

''(3) RESPONSES TO AN ATTORNEY GENERAL DEMAND.—A State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, shall, with respect to any documentary material or any answer in writing produced under this subsection, provide a sworn certificate, in such form as the demand issued under paragraph (1) designates, by a person having knowledge of the facts and circumstances relating to such production or written answer, authorized to act on behalf of the State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, upon which the demand was served. The certificate—

''(A) shall state that—

''(i) all of the documentary material required by the demand and in the possession, custody, or control of the State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, has been produced;

''(ii) with respect to every answer in writing to a written question, all information required by the question and in the possession, custody, control, or knowledge of the State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, has been submitted; or

''(iii) the requirements described in both clause (i) and clause (ii) have been met; or

''(B) provide the basis for any objection to producing the documentary material or answering the written question.

To the extent that any information is not furnished, the information shall be identified and reasons set forth with particularity regarding the reasons why the information was not furnished.

''(4) JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS.—

''(A) PETITION FOR ENFORCEMENT.—Whenever any State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, fails to comply with demand issued by the Attorney General under paragraph (1), the Attorney General may file, in a district court of the United States in which the State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, is located, a petition for a judicial order enforcing the Attorney General demand issued under paragraph (1).

''(B) PETITION TO MODIFY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Any State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, that is served with a demand issued by the Attorney General under paragraph (1) may file in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia a petition for an order of the court to modify or set aside the demand of the Attorney General.

''(ii) PETITION TO MODIFY.—Any petition to modify or set aside a demand of the Attorney General issued under paragraph (1) must be filed within 20 days after the date of service of the Attorney General's demand or at any time before the return date specified in the Attorney General's demand, whichever date is earlier.

''(iii) CONTENTS OF PETITION.—The petition shall specify each ground upon which the petitioner relies in seeking relief under clause (i), and may be based upon any failure of the Attorney General's demand to comply with the provisions of this section or upon any constitutional or other legal right or privilege of the State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent. During the pendency of the petition in the court, the court may stay, as it deems proper, the running of the time allowed for compliance with the Attorney General's demand, in whole or in part, except that the State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, filing the petition shall comply with any portions of the Attorney General's demand not sought to be modified or set aside.''.

SEC. 114. DEFINITIONS.

Title I of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 21. DEFINITIONS.

''In this Act:

''(1) INDIAN.—The term 'Indian' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

''(2) INDIAN LANDS.—The term 'Indian lands' means—

''(A) any Indian country of an Indian tribe, as such term is defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code;

''(B) any land in Alaska that is owned, pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, by an Indian tribe that is a Native village (as such term is defined in section 3 of such Act), or by a Village Corporation that is associated with the Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 3 of such Act);

''(C) any land on which the seat of government of the Indian tribe is located; and

''(D) any land that is part or all of a tribal designated statistical area associated with the Indian tribe, or is part or all of an Alaska Native village statistical area associated with the tribe, as defined by the Bureau of the Census for the purposes of the most recent decennial census.

''(3) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' or 'tribe' has the meaning given the term 'Indian tribe' in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

''(4) TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.—The term 'Tribal Government' means the recognized governing body of an Indian Tribe.

''(5) VOTING-AGE POPULATION.—The term 'voting-age population' means the numerical size of the population within a State, within a political subdivision, or within a political subdivision that contains Indian lands, as the case may be, that consists of persons age 18 or older, as calculated by the Bureau of the Census under the most recent decennial census.''.

SEC. 115. ATTORNEYS' FEES.

Section 14(c) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10310(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) The term 'prevailing party' means a party to an action that receives at least some of the benefit sought by such action, states a colorable claim, and can establish that the action was a significant cause of a change to the status quo.''.

SEC. 116. OTHER TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) ACTIONS COVERED UNDER SECTION 3.—Section 3(c) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10302(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''any proceeding instituted by the Attorney General or an aggrieved person under any statute to enforce'' and inserting ''any action under any statute in which a party (including the Attorney General) seeks to enforce''; and

(2) by striking ''at the time the proceeding was commenced'' and inserting ''at the time the action was commenced''.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF LANGUAGE MINORITY GROUPS.—Section 4(f) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10303(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking the second sentence; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4).

(c) PERIOD DURING WHICH CHANGES IN VOTING PRACTICES ARE SUBJECT TO PRECLEARANCE UNDER SECTION 5.—Section 5 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10304) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''based upon determinations made under the first sentence of section 4(b) are in effect'' and inserting ''are in effect during a calendar year'';

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''November 1, 1964'' and all that follows through ''November 1, 1972'' and inserting ''the applicable date of coverage''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) The term 'applicable date of coverage' means, with respect to a State or political subdivision—

''(1) June 25, 2013, if the most recent determination for such State or subdivision under section 4(b) was made on or before December 31, 2021; or

''(2) the date on which the most recent determination for such State or subdivision under section 4(b) was made, if such determination was made after December 31, 2021.''.

(d) REVIEW OF PRECLEARANCE SUBMISSION UNDER SECTION 5 DUE TO EXIGENCY.—Section 5 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10304) is amended, in subsection (a), by inserting ''An exigency, including a natural disaster, inclement weather, or other unforeseeable event, requiring such different qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure within 30 days of a Federal, State, or local election shall constitute good cause requiring the Attorney General to expedite consideration of the submission.'' after ''will not be made.''.

SEC. 117. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2026 or any amendment made by this title, or the application of such a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional or is otherwise enjoined or unenforceable, the remainder of this title and amendments made by this title, and the application of the provisions and amendments to any other person or circumstance, and any remaining provision of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), shall not be affected by the holding. In addition, if any provision of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), or any amendment to the Voting Rights Act of 1965, or the application of such a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional or is otherwise enjoined or unenforceable, the application of the provision and amendment to any other person or circumstance, and any remaining provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, shall not be affected by the holding.

SEC. 118. GRANTS TO ASSIST WITH NOTICE REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall make grants each fiscal year to small jurisdictions who submit applications under subsection (b) for purposes of assisting such small jurisdictions with compliance with the requirements of the Voting Rights Act of

1965 to submit or publish notice of any change to a qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice or procedure affecting voting.

(b) APPLICATION.—To be eligible for a grant under this section, a small jurisdiction shall submit an application to the Attorney General in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may require regarding the compliance of such small jurisdiction with the provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

(c) SMALL JURISDICTION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ''small jurisdiction'' means any political subdivision of a State with a population of 10,000 or less.

TITLE II—ELECTION WORKER AND POLLING PLACE PROTECTION

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Election Worker and Polling Place Protection Act''.

SEC. 202. PROHIBITION ON INTERFERENCE AND INTIMIDATION.

Section 11 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10307) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f)(1)(A) Whoever, whether or not acting under color of law, by force or threat of force, or by violence or threat of violence to any person or property, willfully interferes with or attempts to interfere with, the ability of any person or any class of persons to vote or qualify to vote, or to qualify or act as a poll watcher or as any legally authorized election official, in any primary, special, or general election, or any person who is, or is employed by, an agent, contractor, or vendor of a legally authorized election official assisting in the administration of any primary, special, or general election to assist in that administration, shall be fined not more than $2,500, or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

''(B) Whoever, whether or not acting under color of law, by force or threat of force, or by violence or threat of violence to any person or property, willfully intimidates or attempts to intimidate, any person or any class of persons seeking to vote or qualify to vote, or to qualify or act as a poll watcher or as any legally authorized election official, in any primary, special, or general election, or any person who is, or is employed by, an agent, contractor, or vendor of a legally authorized election official assisting in the administration of any primary, special, or general election, shall be fined not more than $2,500, or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

''(C) If bodily injury results from an act committed in violation of this paragraph or if such act includes the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, an explosive, or fire, then, in lieu of the remedy described in subparagraph (A) or (B), the violator shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

''(2)(A) Whoever, whether or not acting under color of law, willfully physically damages or threatens to physically damage any physical property being used as a polling place or tabulation center or other election infrastructure, with the intent to interfere with the administration of a primary, general, or special election or the tabulation or certification of votes for such an election, shall be fined not more than $2,500, or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

''(B) If bodily injury results from an act committed in violation of this paragraph or if such act includes the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, an explosive, or fire, then, in lieu of the remedy described in subparagraph (A), the violator shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

''(3) For purposes of this subsection, de minimus damage or a threat of de minimus damage to physical property shall not be considered a violation of this subsection.

''(4) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'election infrastructure' means any office of a legally authorized election official, or a staffer, worker, or volunteer, assisting such an election official or any physical, mechanical, or electrical device, structure, or tangible item, used in the process of creating, distributing, voting, returning, counting, tabulating, auditing, storing, or other handling of voter registration or ballot information.

''(g) No prosecution of any offense described in subsection (f) may be undertaken by the United States, except under the certification in writing of the Attorney General, or a designee, that—

''(1) the State does not have jurisdiction;

''(2) the State has requested that the Federal Government assume jurisdiction; or

''(3) a prosecution by the United States is in the public interest and necessary to secure substantial justice.''.

SA 4754. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON INFANT BEDDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is any article of infant bedding.

SA 4755. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON INFANT THERMOMETERS AND NONPRESCRIPTION MEDICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is an infant thermometer or nonprescription medication.

SA 4756. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON INFANT AND TODDLER CARRIERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is an infant or toddler carrier.

SA 4757. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON BREASTFEEDING EQUIPMENT OR SUPPLIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is any breastfeeding equipment or supplies.

SA 4758. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON CAR SEATS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is a car seat.

SA 4759. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON INFANT AND EARLY CHILDHOOD GOODS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis,

including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is any of the following:

(1) Car seats.
(2) Breastfeeding equipment and supplies.
(3) Baby clothing.
(4) Educational toys.
(5) Infant formula.
(6) Infant feeding supplies.
(7) Strollers.
(8) Cribs.
(9) High chairs.
(10) Pre-packaged baby food.
(11) Baby monitors.
(12) Diapers and baby wipes.
(13) Infant bouncers and swings.
(14) Baby gates and other babyproofing supplies.
(15) Infant bedding.
(16) Infant thermometers and non-prescription medications.
(17) Infant and toddler carriers.

SA 4760. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON BABY CLOTHING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is any article of baby clothing.

SA 4761. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON EDUCATIONAL TOYS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is any educational toy.

SA 4762. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON INFANT FORMULA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is infant formula.

SA 4763. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON INFANT FEEDING SUPPLIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is any infant feeding supply.

SA 4764. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON STROLLERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is a stroller.

SA 4765. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON CRIBS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is a crib.

SA 4766. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON HIGH CHAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is a high chair.

SA 4767. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON PRE-PACKAGED BABY FOOD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is any article of pre-packaged baby food.

SA 4768. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON BABY MONITORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of

the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is a baby monitor.

SA 4769. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON DIAPERS AND BABY WIPES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is diapers or baby wipes.

SA 4770. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON INFANT BOUNCERS AND SWINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is an infant bouncer or swing.

SA 4771. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS DUTIES ON BABY GATES AND OTHER BABYPROOFING SUPPLIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation imposing duties on a country-by-country basis, including any authority with respect to the imposition of duties under emergency situations, no duty may be imposed in excess of the rate assessed as of January 19, 2025, with respect to any article described in subsection (b) that is imported to the United States from a country to which the United States has extended normal trade relations.

(b) ARTICLES DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is a baby gate or other babyproofing supplies.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I understand the Chair has an announcement to make.

LETTERS OF RESIGNATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication regarding the resignation of Senator MARKWAYNE MULLIN.

Without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD and spread upon the Journal.

The letters follow:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, March 23, 2026.

Hon. JD VANCE,
Vice President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, DC.

MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I have enclosed a letter of resignation, addressed to the Governor of Oklahoma, announcing my resignation from the office of U.S. Senator effective immediately in order to assume the responsibilities of the U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security. As the President of the U.S. Senate, I bring this letter to your attention.

Sincerely,

MARKWAYNE MULLIN,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, March 23, 2026.

Hon. KEVIN STITT,
Governor of the State of Oklahoma,
Oklahoma City, OK.

DEAR GOVERNOR STITT: This is to advise you that I hereby resign as U.S. Senator for the State of Oklahoma effective immediately in order to assume the responsibilities of U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security. It has been an honor and privilege to represent the State of Oklahoma in the U.S. Senate.

Sincerely,

MARKWAYNE MULLIN,
U.S. Senator.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding rule XXII, all postcloture time be expired and the Senate vote on confirmation of the McDonald nomination at 2:15 p.m. tomorrow, and if any nominations are confirmed during Tuesday's session of the Senate, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TYLER'S LAW

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 307, S. 921.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 921) to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue guidance on whether hospital emergency departments should implement fentanyl testing as a routine procedure for patients experiencing an overdose, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as ''Tyler's Law''.

SEC. 2. TESTING FOR FENTANYL IN HOSPITAL EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use and in coordination with other Federal departments, agencies, or stakeholders, as appropriate, shall complete a study to determine—

(1) how frequently hospital emergency departments test for fentanyl or fentanyl-related substances when a patient is experiencing an overdose, and test for other controlled substances related to such an overdose;

(2) scenarios in which hospital emergency departments do not administer tests for fentanyl or fentanyl-related substances when a patient is experiencing an overdose, or for other controlled substances related to such an overdose;

(3) the costs associated with such testing for fentanyl or fentanyl-related substances;

(4) the potential benefits and risks for patients receiving such testing for fentanyl or fentanyl-related substances;

(5) potential staff training needs to support testing for fentanyl or fentanyl-related substances;

(6) how testing for fentanyl or fentanyl-related substances in hospital emergency departments may impact the experience of the patient, including—

(A) protections for the privacy and security of the patient's protected health information (as defined in section 160.103 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations)) under part 160 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, and subparts C and E of part 164 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations); and

(B) the patient-health care professional relationship; and

(7) barriers that hospital emergency departments may encounter when trying to implement testing for fentanyl or fentanyl-related substances and recommendations on how best to address those barriers.

(b) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 9 months after completion of the study under subsection (a), based on the results of such study, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use and in coordination with other Federal departments, agencies, or stakeholders, as appropriate, shall issue guidance on the following:

(1) Whether hospital emergency departments should implement testing for fentanyl or fentanyl-related substances as a routine procedure for patients experiencing an overdose.

(2) How hospitals can ensure that health care professionals in their hospital emergency departments are aware of which substances are being tested for in their routinely-administered drug tests, regardless of whether those tests screen for fentanyl or fentanyl-related substances.

(3) How the administration of testing for fentanyl or fentanyl-related substances in hospital emergency departments may affect the future risk of overdose and health outcomes.

(4) Available Federal resources that can assist hospital emergency departments in implementing testing for fentanyl or fentanyl-related substances.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term ''hospital emergency department'' means an emergency department of a hospital or an independent freestanding emergency department (as such terms are defined in section 2799A–1(a)(3)

of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–111(a)(3))).

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 921), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4164, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4164) to make technical corrections to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 4164) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 4164

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026.

(a) QUALIFICATIONS FOR JUDGE ADVOCATES.—Subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 806 of title 10, United States Code (article 6 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as added by section 561(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026 (Public Law 119–60), is amended to read as follows:

''(B) maintains a license status in good standing that provides eligibility to practice law;''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR AWARD OF THE DISTINGUISHED-SERVICE CROSS TO ISAAC ''IKE'' CAMACHO FOR ACTS OF VALOR IN VIETNAM.—Section 592 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026 (Public Law 119–60) is amended by striking ''**POSTHUMOUS**'' in the section heading.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF AIR FORCE MAJOR JOHN A. KLINNER, AIR FORCE MAJOR ARIANA G. SAVINO, AIR FORCE TECHNICAL SERGEANT ASHLEY B. PRUITT, AIR FORCE CAPTAIN SETH R. KOVAL, AIR FORCE CAPTAIN CURTIS J. ANGST, AND AIR FORCE MASTER SERGEANT TYLER H. SIMMONS

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 660, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 660) honoring the service and sacrifice of Air Force Major John A. Klinner, Air Force Major Ariana G. Savino, Air Force Technical Sergeant Ashley B. Pruitt, Air Force Captain Seth R. Koval, Air Force Captain Curtis J. Angst, and Air Force Master Sergeant Tyler H. Simmons.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 660) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR AN EVENT TO CELEBRATE THE BIRTHDAY OF KING KAMEHAMEHA I

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 29.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 2026

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 noon on Tuesday, March 24, that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate resume the House message with respect to S. 1383; further, that the Senate recess from 1 to 2 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings; finally, at 2:15 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session and execute the order in relation to the McDonald nomination.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:21 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 24, 2026, at 12 noon.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 23, 2026:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

MARKWAYNE MULLIN, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, MARCH 24, 2026 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 25

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the state of the bulk power system.
SD–366

10 a.m.
Committee on the Budget
To hold hearings to examine Social Security, focusing on a discussion on the facts and the path forward.
SD–608

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to consider S. 1682, to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety standard for certain gates, S. 1885, to require the Federal Trade Commission, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Health and Human Services acting through the Surgeon General, to implement a mental health warning label on covered platforms, S. 1962, to amend the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from granting a license or United States market access for a geostationary orbit satellite system or a nongeostationary orbit satellite system, or an authorization to use an individually licensed earth station or a blanket-licensed earth station, if the license, grant of market access, or authorization would be held or controlled by an entity that produces or provides any covered communications equipment or service or an affiliate of such an entity, S. 2378, to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish funds for investments in aviation security checkpoint technology, S. 3257, to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to revise regulations for certain individuals carrying out aviation activities who disclose a mental health diagnosis or condition, S. 3404, to require a report on Federal support to the cybersecurity of commercial satellite systems, S. 3597, to reauthorize the National Quantum Initiative Act, S. 3618, to require the Federal Trade Commission to submit to Congress a report on the ability of minors to access fentanyl through social media platforms, S. 3791, to reauthorize Regional Ocean Partnerships, and a promotion list in the Coast Guard.
SR–253

Committee on Foreign Relations
To receive a closed briefing update on the Russia-Ukraine war.
SVC–217

10:15 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine pending nominations.
SD–106

1 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To receive a closed briefing on Operation Epic Fury.
SVC–217

1:30 p.m.
Joint Economic Committee
To hold hearings to examine the rising global scam economy, focusing on modernizing federal approaches to protect Americans from foreign fraudsters.
SD–G50

2 p.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on the Constitution
To hold hearings to examine protecting American citizenship, focusing on federalism, sanctuary cities, and the rule of law.
SD–226

3 p.m.
Select Committee on Intelligence
To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

3:30 p.m.
Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine seniors and the workforce.
SH–216

MARCH 26

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the posture of the United States Space Command and United States Strategic Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2027 and the future years defense program; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC–217.
SD–G50

10 a.m.
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine Export-Import Bank Reauthorization.
SD–538

Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine certain pending nominations.
SD–419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine positioning student-athletes for success in school and beyond.
SD–430

10:15 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
Business meeting to consider S. 545, to prohibit certain uses of xylazine, H.R. 2159, to direct the Attorney General of the United States to submit to the Congress a report on Federal criminal offenses, S. 2934, to limit the availability of civil actions affected by United States sanctions, and the nominations of Brian Gootkin, to be United States Marshal for the District of Montana, and James Stuart, to be United States Marshal for the District of Minnesota.
SH–216

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate confirmed the nomination of Markwayne Mullin, of Oklahoma, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1525–S1560

Measures Introduced: Five bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4160–4164, S. Res. 657–660, and S. Con. Res. 29. **Pages S1544–45**

Measures Reported:

S. 3315, to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to coordinate to improve cybersecurity in the health care and public health sectors, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1544**

Measures Passed:

Tyler's Law: Senate passed S. 921, to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue guidance on whether hospital emergency departments should implement fentanyl testing as a routine procedure for patients experiencing an overdose, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1559–60**

Technical Corrections to the National Defense Authorization Act: Senate passed S. 4164, to make technical corrections to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026. **Page S1560**

Honoring the Service and Sacrifice of the KC–135 Servicemembers: Senate agreed to S. Res. 660, honoring the service and sacrifice of Air Force Major John A. Klinner, Air Force Major Ariana G. Savino, Air Force Technical Sergeant Ashley B. Pruitt, Air Force Captain Seth R. Koval, Air Force Captain Curtis J. Angst, and Air Force Master Sergeant Tyler H. Simmons. **Page S1560**

Authorizing the Use of Emancipation Hall: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 29, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for an event to celebrate the birthday of King Kamehameha I. **Page S1560**

House Messages:

SAVE America Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 12 noon, on Tuesday, March 24, 2026, Senate resume consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access. **Page S1560**

Letter of Resignation—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the letter from Senator Mullin regarding his resignation from the Senate be printed in the Record. **Page S1559**

McDonald Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Colin McDonald, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General. **Page S1542**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX 64), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S1542**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, all post-cloture time be expired, and Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination at approximately 2:15 p.m., on Tuesday, March 24, 2026. **Page S1559**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 63), Markwayne Mullin, of Oklahoma, to be Secretary of Homeland Security. **Pages S1542, S1560**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1543–44**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S1545**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1545–47**

Additional Statements: **Page S1543**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1547–59**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—64) Page S1542

Adjournment: Senate convened at 3 p.m. and adjourned at 9:21 p.m., until 12 noon on Tuesday, March 24, 2026. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1560.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. The House will meet at 12 p.m. on Tuesday, March 24, 2026.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 2026

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold a closed hearing to examine low-cost munitions; to be immediately followed by an open hearing at 11:00 a.m. in SD–G50, 9:30 a.m., SVC–217.

Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, to hold hearings to examine enterprise security and information technology operations of Department of Defense networks and systems; to be immediately followed by a closed session at 3:45 p.m., in SVC–217, 2:30 p.m., SR–232A.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine arms control and transforming international security functions at the State Department, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Federal Courts, Oversight, Agency Action, and Federal Rights, to hold hearings to examine Arctic Frost, 10:15 a.m., SH–216.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 3 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 8029, the "Pay Our Homeland Defenders Act"; H. Res. 1128, expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the Department of Homeland Security; H.R. 7084, the "Defending American Property Abroad Act of 2026"; and H.R. 5103, the "Make the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Act of 2026", 4 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, business meeting on amending the Committee Rules and release of Committee transcripts, 5:15 p.m., HVC–304.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of March 24 through March 27, 2026

Senate Chamber

On *Tuesday*, Senate will resume consideration of the House Message to accompany S. 1383, SAVE America Act.

At 2:15 p.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Colin McDonald, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Armed Services: March 24, to hold a closed hearing to examine low-cost munitions; to be immediately followed by an open hearing at 11 a.m. in SD–G50, 9:30 a.m., SVC–217.

March 24, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, to hold hearings to examine enterprise security and information technology operations of Department of Defense networks and systems; to be immediately followed by a closed session at 3:45 p.m., in SVC–217, 2:30 p.m., SR–232A.

March 25, Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing on Operation Epic Fury, 1 p.m., SVC–217.

March 26, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the posture of the United States Space Command and United States Strategic Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2027 and the future years defense program; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC–217, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: March 26, to hold hearings to examine Export-Import Bank Reauthorization, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget: March 25, to hold hearings to examine Social Security, focusing on a discussion on the facts and the path forward, 10 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: March 25, business meeting to consider S. 1682, to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety standard for certain gates, S. 1885, to require the Federal Trade Commission, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Health and Human Services acting through the Surgeon General, to implement a mental health warning label on covered platforms, S. 1962, to amend the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from granting a license or United States market access for a geostationary orbit satellite system or a nongeostationary orbit satellite system, or an authorization to use an individually licensed earth station or a blanket-licensed earth station, if the license, grant of market access, or authorization would be held or controlled by an entity that produces or provides any covered communications equipment or service or an affiliate of such an entity, S. 2378, to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish funds for investments in aviation security checkpoint technology, S. 3257, to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to revise regulations for certain individuals carrying out aviation activities who disclose a mental health diagnosis or condition, S. 3404, to require a report on Federal support to the cybersecurity of commercial satellite systems, S. 3597, to reauthorize the National Quantum Initiative Act, S. 3618, to require the Federal Trade Commission to submit to Congress a report on the ability of minors to access fentanyl through social media platforms, S. 3791, to reauthorize Regional Ocean Partnerships, and a promotion list in the Coast Guard, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: March 25, to hold hearings to examine the state of the bulk power system, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: March 24, to hold hearings to examine arms control and transforming international security functions at the State Department, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

March 25, Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing update on the Russia-Ukraine war, 10 a.m., SVC–217.

March 26, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine certain pending nominations, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: March 26, to hold hearings to examine positioning student-athletes for success in school and beyond, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: March 24, Subcommittee on Federal Courts, Oversight, Agency Action, and Federal Rights, to hold hearings to examine Arctic Frost, 10:15 a.m., SH–216.

March 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine pending nominations, 10:15 a.m., SD–106.

March 25, Subcommittee on the Constitution, to hold hearings to examine protecting American citizenship, focusing on federalism, sanctuary cities, and the rule of law, 2 p.m., SD–226.

March 26, Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. 545, to prohibit certain uses of xylazine, H.R. 2159, to direct the Attorney General of the United States to submit to the Congress a report on Federal criminal offenses, S. 2934, to limit the availability of civil actions affected by United States sanctions, and the nominations of Brian Gootkin, to be United States Marshal for the District of Montana, and James Stuart, to be United States Marshal for the District of Minnesota, 10:15 a.m., SH–216.

Select Committee on Intelligence: March 24, to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 3 p.m., SH–219.

March 25, Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 3 p.m., SH–219.

Special Committee on Aging: March 25, to hold hearings to examine seniors and the workforce, 3:30 p.m., SH–216.

House Committees

Committee on Appropriations, March 25, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "Member Day", 10 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

March 25, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, oversight hearing on the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

March 25, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "Quality of Life in the Military", 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

March 25, Subcommittee on National Security, Department of State, and Related Programs, hearing entitled "Member Day", 10 a.m., H–140 The Capitol

March 25, Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "Member Day", 10 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

March 25, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, oversight hearing on the National Weather Service, 11 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

March 25, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "Member Day", 2:30 p.m., 2008 Rayburn.

March 26, Subcommittee: Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "Member Day", 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

March 26, Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, oversight hearing on the Government Accountability Office—Federal Buildings Fund, 10 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

March 26, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, hearing entitled "Member Day", 10 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

March 26, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "Advancing Permanency in Child Welfare: Leveraging Federal Funding for Adoption Programs", 10:30 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

March 26, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled "Member Day", 3 p.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, March 25, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing entitled "National Security Space Programs and Activities", 3 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 26, Subcommittee on Cyber, Information Technologies, and Innovation, hearing entitled "Information Technology Posture of the Department of Defense", 3:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Workforce, March 26, Full Committee, hearing entitled "U.S. Universities Under Siege: Foreign Espionage, Stolen Innovation, and the National Security Threat", 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, March 26, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled "The Telecommunications Act of 1996: 30 Years Later", 10:15 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

March 26, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "Policies to Protect Our Communities From Illicit Drug Threats", 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Ethics, March 26, Adjudicatory Subcommittee, hearing entitled "In the matter of Representative Sheila Cherfilus-McCormick", 2 p.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on Financial Services, March 26, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Tokenization and the Future of Securities: Modernizing Our Capital Markets", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

March 26, Subcommittee on Digital Assets, Financial Technology, and Artificial Intelligence, hearing entitled "Innovation at the Speed of Markets: How Regulators Keep Pace with Technology", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

March 26, Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance, hearing entitled "Mitigation and Multiple Loss Properties: Factors Influencing the High Cost of Flooding", 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 25, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Securing the Future: Arms Control and International Security for the Modern Age", 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 26, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 7654, to authorize the consolidation of reports required to be submitted by the Bureau of Global Health Security and Diplomacy of the Department of State, and for other purposes; H.R. 7642, to authorize the recruitment and retention of specialized disaster assistance professionals by the Department of State; H.R. 7641, to provide for a pilot program to require congressional notification of additional information for certain foreign assistance programs; H.R. 7633, to require the United States flag to be displayed on United States foreign assistance; H. Res. 971, condemning the coercive actions of the People's Republic of China against Japan in response to statements regarding Taiwan and reaffirming the United States commitment to its allies in the Indo-Pacific region; H.R. 1744, to extend and authorize annual appropriations for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom through fiscal year 2028; H.R. 3447, to require the Secretary of Commerce to issue standards with respect to chip security mechanisms for integrated circuit products, and for other purposes; H.R. 7669, to require a report that describes the current restrictions imposed by the Taliban on women and girls in Afghanistan since August 2021; H.R. 7616, to require the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to identify and mitigate relationships that pose a risk to United States foreign policy interests between certain European institutions and certain covered entities of concern, and for other purposes; H.R. 6428, to require the Secretary of State to submit a report on participation in educational and cultural exchange programs; H.R. 7058, to require the Secretary of State to conduct assessments of the risks posed to the United States by foreign adversaries who utilize generative artificial intelligence for malicious activities, and for other purposes; H.R. 7653, to enhance diplomatic engagement on international biotechnology and biosecurity matters; H.R. 6196, to authorize and encourage the United States to pursue a model of locally led development and humanitarian response and expand engagement with local actors and increase its local partner base; H.R. 7632, to designate a Coordinator for hybrid warfare accountability, require the Secretary of State to submit a report identifying Chinese entities materially supporting Russia's defense industrial base and recommending appropriate sanctions, and for other purposes; H.R. 2504, to require the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to strengthen United States-European nuclear energy cooperation and combat Russian malign influence in the nuclear energy sector in Europe; H.R. 7649, to ensure that persons found responsible for the unauthorized diversion or destruction of United States humanitarian assistance are liable to the United States, and for other purposes; H.R. 7605, to abolish the United States African Development Foundation; H.R. 7630, to prohibit United States recognition of the claims of sovereignty of South Ossetia or Abkhazia within the Republic of Georgia; H.R. 7675, to require the Secretary of State to establish the Initiative on Foreign Investment Screening, and for other purposes; and H.R. 7674, to require the Secretary of State to submit to Congress a strategy to support a democratic transition in Venezuela, and for other purposes, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 27, Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, hearing entitled "Latin America After the Fall of Maduro", 11 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, March 25, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Funding Lapse and Security Gaps: Assessing the Harmful Impacts of the DHS Shutdown on Americans", 10 a.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, March 25, Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, Artificial Intelligence, and the Internet, hearing entitled "Oversight of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office", 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, March 25, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on H.R. 1555, the "Bureau of Land Management Mineral Spacing Act"; H.R. 5639, the "Co-Location Energy Act"; H.R. 7831, the "License to Drill Act"; H.R. 7872, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to provide for the payment of bonus payments of certain coal leases issued under that Act; and H.R. 7882, to provide for the leasing of certain deposits of minerals located within the City of Carlsbad, New Mexico, 10:15 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

March 25, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Unleashing America's Mineral Potential: The Critical Mineral Commodity Supply Chain'', 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

March 26, Subcommittee on Water, Wildlife and Fisheries, hearing on H.R. 5694, the ''ARTIST Act''; H.R. 6893, the ''Chesapeake Bay Watershed Advancement for Training, Education, Restoration, and Science Act''; H.R. 7250, to reauthorize the Fort Peck Reservation Rural Water System Act of 2000; and H.R. 7889, the ''AWRC Act of 2025'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

March 26, Subcommittee on Federal Lands, hearing on H.R. 6778, the ''Parkway Safety and Reinvestment Act''; H.R. 7618, the ''American Battlefield Protection Program Amendments Act of 2026''; H.R. 7951, the ''Long-Term Good Neighbor Authority Act''; and H.R. 7979, the ''Public Lands Access Restoration Act'', 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, March 25, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing entitled ''The Future of Low Earth Orbit: From the ISS to Commercial Platforms'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

March 26, Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled ''Beneath the Waves: The Science and Technology of Deep-Sea Mining'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, March 25, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Defending Main Street: Combating CCP Threats to America's Small Businesses'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, March 26, Subcommittee on Transportation and Maritime Security; and Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence, joint hearing entitled ''Arctic Security in an Era of Global Competition: Safeguarding U.S. Interests in Frigid Waters'', 2 p.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, March 25, Subcommittee on Oversight Investigations, hearing on H.R. 6654, the ''Veterans Affairs Management and Oversight of Software Assets Act''; H.R. 1288, the ''Veteran DATA Act''; H.R. 7319, the ''VA Bonus and Relocation Incentive Act''; H.R. 7683, the ''VA Fiscal Management Modernization Act''; legislation on the Vets CLEAR Act; legislation on the Veterans Affairs Subcontractor Competition and Opportunity Network Act; legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to require that certain sterile processing technicians of the Department of Veterans Affairs maintain appropriate professional certifications, and for other purposes; legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish compensation at a supplemental period of unpaid parental leave for employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; legislation to deem certain individuals as parents for purposes of determining entitlement to certain family and medical leave for such employees; legislation to prohibit the downgrading of law enforcement positions in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; and legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Office of Congressional Legislative Affairs in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, 2:15 p.m., 360 Cannon.

March 26, Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, markup on H.R. 1004, the ''Love Lives on Act of 2025''; H.R. 2164, the ''Dayton National Cemetery Expansion Act of 2025''; H.R. 5339, the ''Susan E. Lukas 9/11 Servicemember Fairness Act''; H.R. 5723, the ''FRAUD in VA Disability Exam Act''; H.R. 6698, the ''Board of Veterans Appeals Annual Report Transparency Act of 2025''; H.R. 6943, the ''Veterans Burial Allowance and Reimbursement Act of 2026''; and H.R. 7260, the ''National Cemetery Administration Annual Report Act of 2026'', 1:15 p.m., 360 Cannon.

March 26, Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, hearing entitled ''Kitchen Table Issues: Lowering Costs for Veteran Families Through the VA Home Loan Program'', 3 p.m., 360 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, March 25, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2347, the ''Survivor Justice Tax Prevention Act''; H.R. 5366, the ''Federal Disaster Tax Relief Act of 2025''; H.R. 5334, the ''Supporting Early-childhood Educators' Deductions Act of 2025''; H.R. 7971, the ''Taxpayer Experience Improvement Act''; and H.R. 7959, the ''IRS Whistleblower Program Improvement Act'', 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Joint Meeting

Joint Economic Committee: March 25, to hold hearings to examine the rising global scam economy, focusing on modernizing federal approaches to protect Americans from foreign fraudsters, 1:30 p.m., SD–G50.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

12 noon, Tuesday, March 24

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will resume consideration of the House Message to accompany S. 1383, SAVE America Act.

At 2:15 p.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Colin McDonald, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

(Senate will recess from 1 p.m. until 2:10 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

12 noon, Tuesday, March 24

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of measures under suspension of the Rules.

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.