

Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The 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. 673, Anna St. John, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

John Thune, Bill Hagerty, Tim Sheehy, Jim Banks, Ted Budd, Katie Boyd Britt, Bernie Moreno, Tommy Tuberville, John R. Curtis, Mike Rounds, Pete Ricketts, John Barrasso, Kevin Cramer, James Lankford, Ted Cruz, Rick Scott of Florida, Mike Crapo.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Anna St. John, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "Yea" and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) would have voted "Yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 55 Ex.]

YEAS—48

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

NAYS—45

Alsobrooks	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Hassan	Ossoff
Bennet	Heinrich	Padilla
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Peters
Blunt Rochester	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Rosen
Cantwell	Kelly	Sanders
Coons	Kim	Schatz
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Schiff
Duckworth	Lujan	Schumer
Durbin	Markey	Shaheen
Fetterman	Merkley	Slotkin
Gallego	Murphy	Van Hollen

Warner	Warren	Whitehouse
Warnock	Welch	Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Graham	Scott (SC)	
King	Smith	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 45. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BANKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes prior to the scheduled recess.

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

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. BANKS. Mr. President, there are some things in the world that are so obvious that there is really no use in debating them. There are things in this world that really "go without saying," and voter ID laws are one of those things.

Voter ID laws are so obvious, they are so commonsense, that it is shocking that we are even having a debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate this week about it. It is hard to see that there are even two sides to this issue, unless, of course, you believe that it really is OK for illegal immigrants to vote in our elections.

But how is that even a debate? The Constitution is very clear that only citizens of the United States of America are eligible to vote in our elections. So that debate is already settled.

Indiana already has voter ID laws. Hoosiers have to show an ID when they show up to vote on election day, and they have to prove that they are who they say they are when they register to vote in the first place.

But it is not fair to Hoosiers when other States don't require voter ID. It is not fair to law-abiding Americans throughout the country because, when we allow noncitizens to vote in our Federal elections, we dilute the power of the American voter, and that should never be allowed to happen in the United States of America. American elections are for Americans, period.

Even with voter ID laws, there are still illegals who show up and try to vote. In fact, our Secretary of State in Indiana Diego Morales just audited our voter rolls in our State to find every noncitizen that voted in our elections to clean up the process and he actually found some, and the Secretary of State and our Attorney General Todd Rokita are prosecuting those voters who voted illegally.

So it is obvious that even in the State of Indiana, where we take election integrity very seriously, that we need to do more to protect our elections, and the SAVE America Act goes a long way to doing that.

It is also obvious that we need to pass the SAVE America Act for very practical reasons, to have voter ID nationwide in Federal elections.

Under Joe Biden, illegal immigrants invaded and flooded into our country,

tens of millions of them. Joe Biden and the Democrats allowed this invasion to happen. Democrats defended the flood of illegal immigrants into this country on this floor, and that is why they are so bothered today by the SAVE America Act, a simple bill that is common sense to protect the integrity of our elections.

Voter ID laws are the only way that we can prevent tens of millions of illegals from voting in our elections.

America is about to turn 250 years old. There is so much that we have to celebrate in this great country, the greatest country in the history of the world. But it is crazy to think that we are gearing up for this epic birthday by debating voter ID laws.

The SAVE America Act is common sense. Voter ID is common sense. We have an opportunity this week to pass maybe the most commonsense bill ever passed by the U.S. Senate to protect our elections. I hope we do that. I hope we pass the SAVE America Act now. It is fundamental. I beg my colleagues to join me in supporting it this week.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF ANNA ST. JOHN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Anna St. John to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Ms. St. John's record reflects her partisan ideology and raises serious questions about her ability to impartially administer justice if she is confirmed. Her practice largely consists of challenging class-action settlements, and she has also made time to file amicus briefs in politically charged cases, in which she demeaned LGBTQ Americans and opposed diversity initiatives.

Her public commentary is also troubling. She has criticized what she calls "woke ideology." She has challenged First Amendment protections guaranteed by the Supreme Court more than 60 years ago in *New York Times v. Sullivan*.

In November 2021, Ms. St. John testified against bipartisan legislation ending forced arbitration in cases of workplace sexual assault and harassment. The legislation—the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act—enjoyed broad support among lawmakers from both parties.

Former Fox News host Gretchen Carlson was one of the leading advocates for the legislation. She is speaking out about Ms. St. John's nomination, including in an article in which she wrote: "While women around the country bravely shared the urgency of eradicating forced arbitration, St. John used her power and influence to gaslight these women and the public. She downplayed their stories and minimized their pain."

I oppose Ms. St. John's nomination. I ask my colleagues to join me.

## RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:40 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. BRITT).

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

## VOTE ON ST. JOHN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the St. John nomination?

Ms. ERNST. 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 senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

## [Rollcall Vote No. 56 Ex.]

## YEAS—51

Banks	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Moreno
Blackburn	Grassley	Mullin
Boozman	Hagerty	Murkowski
Britt	Hawley	Paul
Budd	Hoeben	Ricketts
Capito	Husted	Risch
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Collins	Johnson	Schmitt
Cornyn	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lee	Sheehy
Crapo	Lummis	Sullivan
Cruz	Marshall	Thune
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	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	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Hassan	Padilla	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	Wyden

## NOT VOTING—4

Gillibrand	Smith	Tillis
Lankford		

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). 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.

The majority leader.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

## SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if MAGA Republicans want to bog down the Senate over a debate on voter suppression, Democrats are ready. We are ready to be here all day, all night—as long as it takes—to ensure the powers of voter suppression do not win the day.

Let me be very clear: The SAVE Act is not a voter ID bill. It is, in every sense, a voter suppression bill. It could purge millions of American citizens from the voter rolls through a screening algorithm designed by Elon Musk's DOGE squad. It could disenfranchise over 20 million American citizens. It would kill online voter registration. It would kill vote-by-mail. It would kill voter motor registration.

What does any of that have to do with election security? It doesn't. It is a naked attempt to rig our elections.

The SAVE Act also rejects the most common forms of ID for anyone trying to register.

The way this works is that you don't have to be notified if you are kicked off the rolls. You show up on election day. They say: We are sorry, Mr. Smith or Ms. Jones. You are not on the rolls anymore.

Then they make it impossible to re-register. Certainly, on that day, you would lose your right to vote.

Driver's licenses are no longer enough. The most common ID forms for anyone to register are rejected in the SAVE Act for the first time in just about every State. Not even military IDs would be enough.

Can you believe that? That would be radical. It would force Americans to register only in person—something only 5 percent of Americans do today.

It punishes married women who change their last names.

The SAVE Act is not about protecting the vote. It is about making it harder to vote and easier to steal an election.

We know what the deal is here. Donald Trump said, if Republicans pass the SAVE Act, it will guarantee his midterm. The senior Senator from Utah said Republicans will lose power, likely for a long time, if they don't get the SAVE Act passed.

That is the whole game. It is cynical. It is beneath the Senate. It is beneath democracy.

Senate Democrats will never let this rotten bill move through this body.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT—Motion to Proceed

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senate has received a message from the House to accompany S. 1383.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the House message to accompany S. 1383.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

## [Rollcall Vote No. 57 Leg.]

## YEAS—51

Banks	Fischer	Moody
Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Blackburn	Grassley	Moreno
Boozman	Hagerty	Mullin
Britt	Hawley	Paul
Budd	Hoeben	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	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	McCormick	Young

## NAYS—48

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	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Fetterman	Murphy	Warnock
Gallego	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Welch
Hassan	Padilla	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	Wyden

## NOT VOTING—1

Tillis

The motion was agreed to.

## SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 1383) entitled "An Act to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes.", do pass with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.