

does not pass. I have been an election judge in weld county for many elections so I know personally how safe and secure our elections are. As a woman who changed my last name when I got married it is terrifying the rights that trump is insistent on removing from me. Please at least ensure I have the right to easily cast a vote as it is my constitutional right.

CONSTITUENT FROM BRECKENRIDGE

Hello! Wanted to write and convey my deep objection to both the SAVE voter suppression act (as a woman with a daughter, it's unacceptable to put greater burden on women to vote than men . . . not to mention it's easier for a man to acquire a gun than a woman to cast a vote) as well as my objection to Markwayne Mullin, not please no!!!!

CONSTITUENT FROM DURANGO

Please vote no the Save Act. This is truly voter suppression and nothing more. We are going backwards in women's rights. Please vote no on this bill not just for my rights but for the rights of all women now and in the future.

Please vote no!!!!

CONSTITUENT FROM BOULDER

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility (SAVE) Act currently being considered by congress. Since voter fraud is a very rare occurrence in this country, this bill seems entirely unnecessary. Although many people seem to support the bill in order to keep non-citizens from voting, that is already covered by other laws and rarely occurs.

I am deeply concerned that this bill could interfere with mail-in voting, which I value as a civic right and believe greatly improves voter participation. I am also concerned that the additional "paperwork" for voter verification could disqualify valid voters, including myself. Please commit everything in your power to defeat this unnecessary, unconstitutional infringement on my voting rights.

CONSTITUENT FROM THORNTON

Good day Michael Bennet, I am a constituent from Thornton, Colorado. I urge you to vote no on the SAVE Act. This bill is a voter suppression tactic that would make it harder for eligible Coloradans to vote by requiring in-person documentation. When the government requires you to have a specific document to vote, and that document isn't free, that is essentially a poll tax which is unconstitutional and illegal per the 24th amendment and is an unnecessary burden on voters. I personally will not look kindly at any senator who votes yes on this and will be looking to vote for alternative candidates who align better with my values in the next election.

CONSTITUENT FROM WELLINGTON

I urge you to vote "No" on the SAVE Act. Voting rights would be severely abrogated if this bill passes, and many legally eligible voters would have difficulty voting. The proponents of this bill point to voter fraud caused by immigrants, but the facts are that such violations, according to the data, are extremely low.

Please do all you can to stop the SAVE Act.

CONSTITUENT FROM LOVELAND

Hello, my name is Melissa Kelley. I have lived in Loveland for the last 16 years. I'm writing to you today, because I want you to vote no, on the Save Act. It is a badly hidden attempt at infringement of my voting rights. I had to show my birth certificate to get my marriage certificate, and my driver's license. I appreciate your attention on this matter. Thank you, and I hope you have a good day.

CONSTITUENT FROM DENVER

SENATOR BENNET: As a Colorado resident and taxpayer I am asking you to please not

vote for the SAVE act, as it will disenfranchise legal voters across the state, if not the nation.

CONSTITUENT FROM COLORADO SPRINGS

The public goal of the SAVE Act is to solve a problem that is miniscule.

It impact of the SAVE Act is to disenfranchise millions of legitimate voters: some have no passport, some have changed name (marriage/divorce) since last registration, some have moved in the year preceding an election. Most Americans do not vote in person due to transportation limits, work schedules, child care or illness.

Please do not support this legislation.

Mr. BENNET. The Founders understood the gravity of the debate before them about who could and who could not claim the franchise. The authors of Federalist No. 52 explain that "the definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government."

They wrestled with this question. They wrestled with this question. They debated it. And, ultimately, they excluded the great number of subjects who were newly made Americans, but, nevertheless, were denied, as those at Seneca Falls wrote, "the first right of citizen."

This was the founding generation's great mistake—this and the enslavement of Americans. And we have spent centuries working to rectify it—centuries working to rectify it.

Should the SAVE America Act pass, we will fall further away from realizing this country's promise and retreat the familiar errors of the past. We should reject that vision of our democracy. We should reject that return to a history that we have fought so hard to free ourselves from. Coloradans and all Americans deserve better than this.

I yield the floor and look forward to hearing my colleague from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

END SPECIAL TREATMENT FOR CONGRESS AT AIRPORTS ACT OF 2026

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, it has been 34 days since Democrats chose to shut down funding at the Department of Homeland Security, jeopardizing America's safety and well-being.

No less than 120,000 DHS employees have missed paychecks, including the hard-working TSA agents and screeners that work at our Nation's airports, who have been working around the clock, without pay, to keep spring break travelers and others safe.

For example, in my home State of Texas, Houston Hobby Airport has been recommending that travelers arrive at least 3 hours before their flights, and if it is an international flight, they recommend 4 hours in advance.

Well, they are not alone. Staffing constraints have not only led to longer wait times around the country but also significant delays, disruptions, and missed flights.

The only reason I can fathom, other than being completely out of touch,

that our Democratic colleagues would do this is because not all Members of Congress are being forced to experience the same mess of their own making right now.

As many Americans probably don't know, but most of us in Washington do know, airports around the country allow Members of Congress to bypass the usual TSA security screening process at airports nationwide. In other words, they get to skip the line.

This should end today. Instead of enduring the same travel tribulations and security requirements that everyone else has to meet, Members of Congress are getting an unfair perk, while TSA officers have to work without pay.

That is why I come to the floor today to pass my legislation, called the End Special Treatment for Congress at Airports Act, to stop the practice of expediting TSA screening processes for Members of Congress at our Nation's airports.

This legislation would ensure that no Federal funds or resources will be used by TSA moving forward to provide Members of Congress with these special privileges. In other words, Congress is going to have to live with the laws that everybody else has to live with.

Ending these courtesy escorts for Members of Congress in our Nation's airports during a DHS funding shutdown is the right thing to do.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 4123 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4123) to prohibit preferential screening for Members of Congress at airports, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Cornyn 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 4707) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the definition of Trusted Traveler Program)

On page 2, strike lines 8 through 13, and insert the following:

(4) TRUSTED TRAVELER PROGRAM.—The term "Trusted Traveler Program" means any of the following:

- (A) Global Entry.
- (B) The PreCheck Program.
- (C) SENTRI.
- (D) NEXUS.

(E) Any other United States Government program that issues a unique identifier, such as a known traveler number, that the Transportation Security Administration accepts

as validating that the individual holding such identifier is a member of a known low-risk population.

(F) Any other program implemented by the Transportation Security Administration under section 109(a)(3) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (49 U.S.C. 114 note; Public Law 107-71).

On page 2, line 24, strike "may" and insert "shall".

On page 3, line 1, strike "bypass standard" and insert "be exempt from Federal passenger and baggage".

The bill (S. 4123), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 4123

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "End Special Treatment for Congress at Airports Act of 2026".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration.

(2) MEMBER OF CONGRESS.—The term "Member of Congress" has the meaning given that term in section 13101 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) SCREENING LOCATION.—The term "screening location" has the meaning given that term in section 1540.5 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

(4) TRUSTED TRAVELER PROGRAM.—The term "Trusted Traveler Program" means any of the following:

- (A) Global Entry.
- (B) The PreCheck Program.
- (C) SENTRI.
- (D) NEXUS.

(E) Any other United States Government program that issues a unique identifier, such as a known traveler number, that the Transportation Security Administration accepts as validating that the individual holding such identifier is a member of a known low-risk population.

(F) Any other program implemented by the Transportation Security Administration under section 109(a)(3) of the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (49 U.S.C. 114 note; Public Law 107-71).

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT FOR STANDARD SECURITY SCREENING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Transportation Security Administration shall be used to provide or facilitate the provision of a Member of Congress with expedited or preferential access to or through security screenings required pursuant to section 44901 of title 49, United States Code.

(b) NO EXPEDITED ACCESS.—A Member of Congress shall not—

(1) be exempt from Federal passenger and baggage screening procedures of the Transportation Security Administration; or

(2) receive priority or expedited access to a screening location on the basis of the official position of such Member of Congress.

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(1) to limit the authority of the Transportation Security Administration to implement risk-based security programs available to the general public; or

(2) to prohibit Members of Congress from participating in a publicly available Trusted Traveler Program, provided such participation is not based on the official positions of such Members of Congress.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) POLICY IMPLEMENTATION.—The Administrator shall update policies and procedures as necessary to ensure compliance with this Act.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of, and compliance with, this Act.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I am glad the Senate has agreed with this commonsense bill to prevent those of us who pass laws—or, in this case, refuse to pass the laws funding DHS appropriations—to prevent us from receiving special privileges. Maybe, just maybe, if Congress has to live under the same laws that everybody else does, it will motivate us to get our work done—in other words, to fund the Department of Homeland Security—so no American, so no air traveler will have to suffer the disruption and the tribulations that many, many travelers are having to experience now.

It is not too much to expect that Congress will be subject to the same rules as everyone else. We know trust in Congress is at an alltime low, but today, thank goodness, the Senate has taken an important step toward restoring the trust of the people we are here to represent.

I yield the floor.

SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

IRAN

Mr. WELCH. Madam President, it is time to end the war that the President started with Iran on February 28—3 weeks ago.

The war must stop now, not a week from now after U.S. taxpayers spend another \$14 billion, another 1,000 innocent civilians are lost, another 500,000 are displaced from their homes, and more economic punishment here at home; not a month from now after U.S. taxpayers spend another \$60 billion, another 4,000 innocent civilians are lost, another 2 million are displaced from their homes, and even more dire economic consequences here at home; and certainly not 3 months from now after U.S. taxpayers spend another \$200 billion, another 12,000 innocent civilians are lost and the creation of a global refugee crisis affecting millions, and the possibility of a global economic recession. The time to end the war is now—right now.

Today, we are heading in the opposite direction. The war is escalating. Netanyahu bombed the South Pars gasfield. Iran retaliated by bombing Qatar's natural gas hub, the Ras Laffan Industrial City. Oil prices are surging to nearly \$120 a barrel.

The President must act and act now. End this war. The President can end the war that he started, and if he won't, Congress must.

President Trump's stated goal was to destroy Iran's nuclear capability, and

in his own words, that program was "totally obliterated." President Trump's stated goal was to degrade Iran's missile programs. In his own words, we have "already destroyed 100 percent of Iran's military capability." By President Trump's own account, his objectives have largely been realized.

We are now at a very dangerous inflection point: Do we end the war now or do we escalate? Do we escalate to achieve Netanyahu's goal—not ours—of regime change? Do we escalate with no end in sight—an escalation that will put American boots on the ground? An escalation American taxpayers will fund with a \$200 billion downpayment on yet another forever war in the Middle East? We must decide. And make no mistake, indecision, not to decide, is escalation, and escalation will lead to failure.

President Trump is dragging us toward escalation, and Congress must not allow it.

America has been down this road before. In Iraq, Saddam presided over an evil regime. He was deposed quickly. In Afghanistan, the Taliban were an evil regime. They were deposed quickly, but what came after was devastating—trillions of dollars of taxpayer money wasted and thousands of American soldiers killed and injured. The Iraq war cost nearly \$2 trillion. In the Iraq war, we lost more than 4,500 American servicemembers. The Afghanistan war cost over \$2 trillion, and in Afghanistan, we lost nearly 2,500 American servicemembers.

Unless this escalation is stopped, President Trump's Iran war could cost even more. And for what? A regime change war in Iran could be worse—worse than Iraq or even Afghanistan. Regime change is impossible without boots on the ground. Those boots are the boots of brave American men and women who will follow the President's order to deploy should he give it. And regime change is impossible to sustain without a permanent occupying force.

Iran—make no mistake—is a proud country with proud people, and they may welcome the riddance of the ayatollahs but will fiercely reject American and Israeli occupiers. Iran is also huge. It stretches as far as the distance from Houston, TX, to New York, and it has as many people as California, Texas, and Florida combined.

Iraq and Afghanistan taught us something that we must not forget, and that is the limits of military power. In the early phases of both of those wars, as in Iran now, the extraordinary skills and capabilities of our military won impressive victories, but what followed those early victories in Iraq and Afghanistan is already upon us in Iran, and that is the asymmetric response—the one where the United States, with all its military might, is at a disadvantage.

Iran's drone attacks have closed the Strait of Hormuz—something that the Secretary of Energy dismissed as being something that couldn't happen. Nearly one-third of the global oil, fertilizer,