

NURSE AIDE TRAINING AND COMPETENCY PROGRAMS AND NURSE AIDE COMPETENCY EVALUATION PROGRAMS.—A State may not use any civil money penalty amounts to—

“(I) reimburse costs incurred in completing a nurse aid training and competency evaluation program or a nurse aide competency evaluation program under subsection (f)(2)(A); or

“(II) supplant the payment of such costs under such subsection.

“(C) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) QUALIFIED NURSING FACILITY PROVIDER.—The term ‘qualified nursing facility provider’ means—

“(I) a geriatrician or other physician, nurse practitioner, physician assistant, or other practitioner who provides services in a skilled nursing facility or nursing facility; or

“(II) a registered professional nurse, licensed practical nurse (or a licensed vocational nurse), or certified nursing assistant who provides direct care services to residents in a skilled nursing facility or nursing facility, as determined by the Secretary.

“(ii) RELATED PARTY.—The term ‘related party’ means an entity that, to a significant extent is associated or affiliated with, or has control of, or is controlled by, a nursing facility or skilled nursing facility.

“(D) ANNUAL REPORTING.—

“(i) REPORT FROM STATES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and annually thereafter, each State that receives any civil money penalty amounts shall submit to the Secretary a report describing—

“(I) how amounts received in the previous fiscal year were allocated;

“(II) the mechanisms to ensure such amounts benefit the development of the nursing facility workforce;

“(III) how such amounts will impact measurable outcomes for residents of skilled nursing facilities and nursing facilities, such as staff vacancy rates, turnover rates, median hourly wages, staffing hours per resident, and resident quality outcomes; and

“(IV) how such State is ensuring compliance with subparagraph (B).

“(ii) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the Secretary receives the annual reports from States under clause (i), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the information contained in such report.”.

SEC. 5. CODIFICATION OF REGULATIONS REGARDING REQUIREMENTS FOR LONG-TERM SERVICES AND SUPPORTS AND PAYMENT TRANSPARENCY REPORTING.

Sections 438.72 and 442.43 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on May 10, 2024), shall have the force and effect of law.

SA 4707. Mr. CORNYN proposed an amendment to the bill S. 4123, to prohibit preferential screening for Members of Congress at airports, and for other purposes; as follows:

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”.

SA 4708. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. GALLEG0, and Mr. KELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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 the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. RESPECT FOR LOCAL COMMUNITIES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Respect for Local Communities Act”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.—The term “appropriate local government officials” means—

(A) the mayor, county executive, or equivalent elected official of the town, city, county or other local jurisdiction in which a new processing site or detention center will be located; and

(B) a majority of the town council, city council, county council, county commission, or equivalent legislative authority in which a new processing site or detention center will be located.

(2) NEW PROCESSING SITE OR DETENTION CENTER.—The term “new processing site or detention center” means any facility operated by, or pursuant to a contract with, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, including any facility designed under the Detention Reengineering Initiative, that, beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, will be used to temporarily hold persons pending the resolution or completion of immigration removal operations or processes.

(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR NEW ICE PROCESSING SITES AND DETENTION CENTERS.—The Department of Homeland Security or any other Federal agency may not initiate the construction, acquisition, renovation, or operation of, or otherwise acquire an interest in real property to be used as, a new processing site or detention center for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement until—

(1) the relevant Federal agency issues a public notice in the Federal Register that—

(A) is open for public comments for a period lasting at least 30 days;

(B) describes the scope of the construction, acquisition, renovation, or operation;

(C) includes information regarding such agency’s due diligence process, which shall explain how such agency will comply with—

(i) Federal guidance and standards related to immigration detention;

(ii) applicable environmental regulations;

(D) includes any other information or documentation relevant to such new processing site or detention center; and

(E) includes an economic impact analysis and an engineering review that addresses the site or center’s waste exportation, water usage, and electrical demand;

(2) after the conclusion of the public comment period, the head of the relevant Federal agency—

(A) considers and responds to significant comments received in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) enters into a signed, written agreement with appropriate local government officials

and the Governor of the State in which such processing site or detention center will be located that authorizes such construction, acquisition, renovation, or operation, as applicable; and

(3) at least 30 days has elapsed since the head of the relevant Federal agency submitted a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives regarding such planned construction, acquisition, renovation, or operation that includes a fully executed copy of the agreement described in paragraph (2).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have five requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in open and closed session during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 19, 2026, at 9:30 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 19, 2026, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 19, 2026, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 19, 2026, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 19, 2026, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct an executive business meeting.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to my defense fellow and my intern for the remainder of the Congress. They are Alexis Todaro-Wiegner and Caroline Moffett.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we have begun what will be our third day of debating the SAVE America Act, just over 48 hours ago. We voted to proceed to this bill, and we have been debating it for a couple of days, now entering our third 24-hour period of debates.

I want to make a few observations to some of the arguments that I have made and respond to some of them; in particular, respond to some of the arguments that I have heard made just in the last couple of hours.

We have heard a number of arguments. Nearly all of them that come from the other side of the aisle deal with something that is either easily addressed in ways that would not require any change to the legislation before us, or, more commonly—in fact, almost entirely—what we are hearing are arguments that overlook or even blatantly mischaracterize key features of the legislation.

The distinguished Senator from Colorado who spoke just a little while ago, made a number of accusations against the legislation. Now, they are not materially different from some of the other arguments that have been made this evening, but they were a little bit more strident coming from the Senator from Colorado than they have been from some others.

He repeatedly referred to this legislation, in ways described it using adjectives like “shameful,” a lot of characterizations of the legislation as being somehow evil or malign. But as important as anything, he continued to repeat characterizations of the bill that are just lies. And I wish I didn't have to use that term. It is a very blunt term, but these are lies. It is as though he is staring straight into the noonday Sun and, while looking at the Sun with a cloudless sky, saying: It is midnight. There is no Sun visible.

A lot of this—not all of it, but a lot of it—traces back, in one way or another, to this refrain about how this law is alternatively either Jim Crow 2.0; that it disenfranchises women; that it disenfranchises racial minorities, persons of color; that it disenfranchises 20, 21 million people; that it disenfranchises anyone who lacks any documentation, anyone who, after getting married, goes through a name change if the marriage certificate can't be found along with the other documents.

Arguments that you would have to get a passport in order to vote, having to shell out a couple hundred dollars, which is about what a passport costs. I think it is \$185 without any expedited fees, more than that otherwise.

On that basis, these arguments often culminated in the point that this is somehow a poll tax because if you have to spend a couple hundred bucks getting a passport or otherwise procuring documents, without which you couldn't

register to vote, according to them, then you are disenfranchised; therefore, this is a poll tax. Poll taxes were outlawed by constitutional amendment over 60 years ago, and therefore this is bad.

There are a lot of other arguments, but let's just stop right there and let me address—I think I can address nearly all, if not all, of those arguments by referring to one section of the bill that I have oft repeated, oft cited, oft quoted. And yet no matter how many times I cite it, paraphrase it, quote it, or refer my colleagues across the aisle to its provisions, they seem to ignore it.

Many of the same people have continued to repeat this lie, even after they have been in the room here in the Senate Chamber when I have made the argument, and here is the argument that overcomes most, if not all, of the immediately aforementioned arguments.

This legislation doesn't require you to have any of the documents that they reference. Ideally, you should have them. And, in fact, most Americans do have them, and most Americans are required to use them, from time to time, in other contexts.

Perhaps the most common of those contexts is in the employment context. When you start a new job—whenever any American citizen starts a new job with a new employer in the United States—you have to fill out a form called the I-9. The I-9 requires you to establish your U.S. citizenship.

Now, if you are not a U.S. citizen, then you don't have to produce that because you have to produce something else. You have got to produce a visa and establish the link between the visa that you have, your authorization to work, and your authorization to work in that particular job. So that is par for the course if you are not a U.S. citizen because you have got to establish a very specific type of work permit or an authorization based on your visa. But if you are an American citizen, you still have to pony up with documents every time you begin new employment as a new employee with a new employer in the United States.

You have to prove you are a citizen, and you have to do it in fairly precise ways. It prescribes a couple of methods that you can use to establish your U.S. citizenship.

Method one, which is the simpler one: You show up with a U.S. passport that establishes your citizenship, and that one document can satisfy the entire obligation—if you have one.

A lot of Americans have them, but a lot of them don't. Not everyone travels outside the United States. If you don't travel outside the United States, you are not necessarily going to need a passport. Why go through the expense and hassle of getting one if you don't travel? That is why a lot of people don't have them. And that is one of the reasons why I find it so reckless when people are making the claim that you would have to have one, or even the in-

direct suggestion that anyone without a passport who is not willing to shell out a couple hundred bucks to get a passport and go through the hassle and the waiting period to get one might be disenfranchised, because that is not the only means by which you can establish your U.S. citizenship—not under the SAVE America Act, certainly, and also not under the I-9.

But under the I-9, you can also prove your citizenship by coming up with an original copy of your birth certificate—the original certified copy of your U.S. birth certificate—and then a government-issued photo ID. And in some contexts, the original Social Security card can also be acceptable along with the original certified copy of your birth certificate. And that is about it. So anybody who has ever had a job in this country who is a U.S. citizen has had to do that.

Like most Americans, I have had a number of jobs in my career, and so I have had to fill out the I-9 many times. I don't always have those documents right with me. I can usually track them down. I am pretty sure my wife knows where they are. They are not things that we utilize every day, but I know that, from time to time, I will need access to them. And I have needed access to them every time I have applied for a new job.

There have been other times when I have needed them, including when I have applied for a passport. I have needed them most recently when I renewed my driver's license in Utah. And Utah is moving toward a system of having a driver's license that can establish citizenship. The last time I renewed, they asked me to bring in those documents. I established my citizenship with that.

If you don't have those, you can't start a new job. So most Americans, if they don't have those documents at the moment they start a new job, they have to find them.

We wanted the SAVE America Act to provide other methods of documenting one's citizenship, recognizing that not everybody has those documents. A lot of people are not going to have a U.S. passport; and those who don't have a U.S. passport might also not have the combination of other documents, including the birth certificate with the State-certified seal on it—not just a photocopy—along with a government-issued photo ID and/or a Social Security card.

And so we added a bunch of other things to it. There is a subset of the REAL ID driver's license. Not all REAL ID driver's licenses prove citizenship. Some of them do. It is typically evident on the face of a REAL ID driver's license whether or not that particular driver's license establishes citizenship. That would suffice under this legislation.

It would also suffice—in some circumstances, certain forms of Tribal ID could be used, insofar as they establish citizenship.