

MOTION TO PROCEED TO THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the cloture vote from February 24 on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147.

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

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147.

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

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 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 motion to proceed to Cal. No. 311, H.R. 7147, a bill making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Mike Crapo, Marsha Blackburn, Bill Hagerty, Tim Sheehy, Roger F. Wicker, Susan M. Collins, Todd Young, Jim Banks, Bernie Moreno, Jon Husted, Eric Schmitt, John Hoeven, John Barrasso, Pete Ricketts, Roger Marshall, Katie Boyd Britt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 7147, a bill making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

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 Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the Sen-

ator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 59 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—37

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kim	Schatz
Blumenthal	King	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	Lujan	Slotkin
Booker	Markey	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Reed	

NOT VOTING—16

Britt	Kelly	Smith
Coons	Klobuchar	Tuberville
Daines	Paul	Whitehouse
Fischer	Schiff	Wicker
Gallego	Shaheen	
Kaine	Sheehy	

The motion was rejected.

(Mr. RICKETTS assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCORMICK). On this vote, the yeas are 47, and the nays are 37.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, upon reconsideration, the motion is not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 696.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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. 696, MARKWAYNE MULLIN, of Oklahoma, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

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

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, today marks the fifth time that Republicans have asked to end debate and allow us to discuss funding the Department of Homeland Security.

So for the people at home that don't keep up with Senate procedures, what the Democrats have actually done again, for the fifth time, is not even let us get on the bill and actually debate it. They have refused to allow us to consider the bill, which is a pretty remarkable scenario when you think of the effects.

For those who aren't as familiar, the Department of Homeland Security was created right after 9/11, the attacks of 9/11. I don't know about you, Mr. President, but I know exactly where I was when that second plane hit the tower, because that is when we knew we were under attack.

We took a bunch of the Agencies that are charged with protecting this country and put them into this very, very large Agency that today employs 260,000 Americans. If this was a private company, it would be absolutely a Fortune 50, maybe even a Fortune 25 enterprise—huge, huge organization.

The one part of the Constitution that is crystal clear is that our responsibility is to fund the government. Yet, for the third time, we now are in either a full or partial government shutdown that the Democrats have initiated because they refuse to do the basic work—funding the government.

Now, you will see a lot of noise from the Democrats when they say: Well, we have—they acknowledge that they have not funded the entire Department, so they will say: But we want to fund this Agency or this Agency within the Department of Homeland Security.

What they won't tell you—because obviously then they would have to admit what it is they really want—is they don't want to fund Customs and Border Patrol and they don't want to

fund Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

So you think, well, what do those two Agencies do that would make the Democrats not want to fund them? So let's talk about the first one—Customs and Border Patrol.

All of us who have ever flown in from a foreign country, you see the person that greets you—that is somebody from Border Patrol, Customs.

Why would you not want to fund that Agency? I think what is interesting is the way the Senate is set up, the appropriations process is meant to allocate money, and then we have committees whose job it is to set the policies for those. But they don't want to do that. They are tying both together. We just don't want to fund—typically, when you don't want to fund an Agency, it is a way of saying we don't want that function any longer.

So they don't want to have Customs? They don't want to have people inspecting packages? We are in the middle of deep hostilities with a very savvy adversary, and you don't want to have somebody guarding our border, checking our ports, making sure these containers don't have hazardous materials?

We have all seen the movies. Those are people from Customs and Border Patrol. I haven't heard one rational explanation from my Democratic colleagues why on earth they would not want to fund Customs and Border Patrol.

Now, of course, it is no secret to anybody that the Democrats have been held hostage by the extremists in their base who want to both either abolish ICE or defund ICE.

So what is ICE? Immigration and Customs Enforcement. It is basically broken down into two organizations. You have something called Enforcement and Removal Operations. Now, what do they do? A pretty straightforward mission. If somebody enters the country illegally, a judge gives them a hearing and says: You have a final order of deportation. It is the job of that Agency to remove that person from the country. Is that what they are looking not to have happen any longer?

Then the other one is Homeland Security Investigations. What do they do? I am going to read you the mission statement. It says: Criminal investigations targeting transnational criminal organizations and terrorist networks that exploit U.S. customs and immigration laws.

It seems like a decently important function. You can see it here on this chart. It is 7,000 special agents.

So I wish we would just have a more honest debate here and that my Democratic colleagues would stand up and say: Look, we just want to abolish Immigration and Customs Enforcement. We want to abolish the Enforcement and Removal Operations. We do not want—they do not want to take people out of the country that are here illegally; it is that simple. Instead, what they are

doing is they are keeping 260,000 people without a paycheck.

I said, and I will say it again today: I find it deeply ironic and, quite frankly, I will use the word "disgusting" that we here in the U.S. Senate are getting paid while 260,000 people aren't getting paid because of political shenanigans from the other side.

It is just morally reprehensible. We need to do our job. We need to get the Department of Homeland Security funded. I am going to end with one difference between what we are seeing now and what we saw during the Biden era.

I think by any metric, by any standard during Mayor's term as the Secretary of Homeland Security, it was a total abject disaster. We allowed tens of millions of unvetted migrants to enter this country. We had no idea who they were, where they came from, what their intent was, or, quite frankly, where they were going.

Border Patrol was a total disaster during the Biden years, total and complete failure. But you know what we understood as Republicans? It wasn't the fault of the Border Patrol agents; it was a fault of policy. And yet Republicans still funded the Agency.

Because when we are not happy with the executive, we have a few other tools that we should be using. We could have impeached Mayor's; Democrats unanimously fought against that. By the way, we passed no new laws, and yet our border went from the most open in American history to a border that is now completely zero. Zero illegals entered this country in the last 10 months—zero, not 1. During the Biden years, there was 10,000 a day. Yet Republicans funded Customs and Border Patrol because we knew it was not the fault of the agents; it was the fault of a Commander in Chief and a Cabinet Secretary with Democrat enablers here in Congress that allowed that to happen. Just keep that in mind as these arguments get made.

It is Friday. People should be thinking about March Madness and which their favorite team is, what they are going to do for the weekend, and millions and millions of Americans are doing that. But 260,000 American families are wondering how they are going to pay for that barbecue, how they are going to make the rent, how they are going to pay for the car payment, how are they going to pay for that vacation that they had planned because they have now missed three paychecks.

I hope to get to a point in time where our Democrat colleagues find their humanity because this is what it is about, their humanity, to do the right thing, fund the Department of Homeland Security, and then let's have a robust argument around oversight and how we do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with me today is Mr. John Lowery, one of my colleagues from my office.

As the Presiding Officer knows, Democrats and Republicans in the U.S. Congress have a dispute over funding the Department of Homeland Security. And it is such a serious dispute that that Department is shut down.

Now, every now and then, there is a dispute in Washington, DC, that says something prophetic—something prophetic about the future of western civilization. This is not it. This dispute is silly.

Every single Member of this body knows how important the Department of Homeland Security is. Most people recently think that Homeland Security is border security, and ICE, interior security of our immigration system.

But Homeland Security is responsible for so much more. FEMA is part of Homeland Security. It is shut down. The Coast Guard is part of our Department of Homeland Security. It is shut down.

The CISA dealing with cyber security is part of Department of Homeland Security. It is shut down. The TSA is part of Homeland Security. They are working without pay, and not all of our colleagues in the TSA are working. This is the result, and it is going to get worse.

Now, for reasons that I don't—well, let me put this a different way. Some would argue and the party line is that we are making progress in terms of resolving this dispute. That is not true.

I mean, I know that is the party line and conventional wisdom, and every now and then you will see a reporter report that, but it is not true. For reasons I don't completely understand, for a while my Democratic friends said: We are only going to negotiate with the White House. And they have been negotiating with the White House for some time, but they are nowhere near agreement.

Recently, some of my Democratic colleagues have met with two of my Republican colleagues and Mr. Tom Homan—it happened yesterday—to see if we could make progress. Again, the conventional wisdom, the party line that we are supposed to tell everybody is that we are making progress, but I have spoken directly with the people who were at that meeting yesterday here among just Senators and Mr. Homan. On a scale of 1 to 10—I will describe it as they described it to me—about a minus 17. We made no progress, and I regret that, but I understand it.

Let me see if I can state—I don't say this disrespectfully. I try to—what I am about to say, I want people to know I am serene in saying this, and I don't mean to offend anyone, but we all know what is going on.

Our Democratic friends will agree to open up TSA, thank you. To open up FEMA, to open up the Coast Guard, to open up the CISA, thank you, thank you, thank you. But they haven't agreed, despite concessions on our side, to open up ICE. And they are not going to. It is not going to happen in your or my natural lifetime.

And if you have been following this debate and you understand the politics,

you don't need to be able to explain the theory of special relativity to know what is going on. It is not complicated.

Parties have wings, factions within their parties. I am a Republican; we have factions. Democrats also have factions. And a specific faction of the Democratic Party right now is in control. That is just a fact.

You could call it the progressive wing; some call it that. The more cynical call it the loon wing of the Democratic Party. I on occasion have referred to it as the Karen wing of the Democratic Party. The Karen wing wants to defund ICE, and they will accept nothing less.

Now, this is the same wing of their party that also wanted to defund the police. How did that work out for us? This is the same wing of their party that has a very novel way to reduce the crime rate in America: Just don't prosecute anyone, and our crime rate goes to zero.

Now, I don't mean to paint with too broad a brush. Not all my Democratic friends agree with the loon, the Karen wing of their party—they don't—just like not all Republicans are part of the factions in my party. But it is a fact that the Karen wing of the Democratic Party is in ascendancy, and it is firmly in control.

And any Democrat—we all know this—that agrees to any kind of compromise with respect to ICE is going to be punished to the rest of their natural lives. They can't do it, and they are not going to.

Now, we can keep having meetings and discussing it; we have been doing it for weeks. Most of these meetings could easily be accomplished with an email. I have been part of the discussions in our conference. I am convinced that listening to the same thing over and over and over again is lowering my IQ, when we know that nothing is going to resolve this because my Democratic friends politically can't agree to a compromise about ICE.

So here is what I think we ought to do: I think that we should accept the Democrats' offer to open up TSA and to open up FEMA and to open up Coast Guard and to open up and fund CISA. Let's get that done. Let's shorten these lines, and then the day after we do that, Republicans need to file a reconciliation bill, which is the same way we passed the One Big Beautiful Bill, and on our own, we need to come up with a budget for ICE. It is the only way to solve this problem.

Now, as the Presiding Officer knows, under the Budget Control Act, we can pass legislation. There are parameters on us, but that only requires 51 votes. That is how we passed the One Big Beautiful Bill. Under the rules, we are allowed to do two more reconciliations, so we have two bullets left. For reasons that I don't completely understand—well, strike that. I think I do understand. I just don't agree with them—some on my side are reluctant to do any more reconciliations. And they are

hard, OK? I know they are hard. They are hard for my Democratic friends when they do it, and they are hard for us when we do it. You know, that is what we were sent here for, is to do hard things. I mean, med school was hard, but we still have a lot of great doctors. We ought to do our job. That is the only way I can see that we are going to be able to break the stalemate.

So let me say again what I would do if I were King for a day. I am not, and I don't aspire to be. I would accept my Democratic friends' offer to immediately open up the TSA, FEMA, the Coast Guard, the CISA—every part of the Department of Homeland Security except ICE. I would stop looking reality in the eye and denying it and accept the fact that my Democratic colleagues, because of their internal politics, will never be able to reach an agreement with respect to ICE. It is not going to happen. In the meantime, these lines get longer.

So, once we can get that agreement with our Democratic colleagues, the very next day, we start a resolution in the Budget Committee, and we do a second reconciliation bill. We fund ICE and border security—what is still shut down in Homeland Security—like we want to. I would welcome my Democrats to work with us on a bill, but they will not. We only need 51 votes to do it. Then the government—all of government—is back open.

Now, there are other things that we could do in that reconciliation bill. I have talked about them, and I am not going to repeat what I said yesterday. My side feels very strongly about the SAVE Act. We believe that only Americans—citizens of our country—should be able to vote, and we believe that you shouldn't be able to vote unless you can prove you are who you say you are.

My Democratic colleagues, in my trying to be as serene and objective as I can, come back and say: Yes, but there is another side of this argument. It is already against the law to not be a citizen and try to register.

And I understand that.

Then they come back and make the point: Well, you cannot show me where we have had a lot of instances of illegal immigrants actually voting.

And I understand that—those are fair points—but that is not what we are fighting about.

What we are fighting about is that President Biden, for whatever reason, admitted between—I don't know how many—8 million, 12 million, 15 million, 20 million people illegally into our country. He did—we all watched him do it—and we don't even know where these people are. We don't. Some of them were children. We don't know where all the children are. We don't.

I am not saying all of those folks were bad people. I am not saying that. A lot of them were economic migrants. They just wanted better lives, and so they wanted to come to America. They chose not to do it through legal immi-

gration. If they would do it legally, we could consider admitting them—we admit a million people a year of our world's neighbors to become American citizens—but they came illegally because, frankly, President Biden said to do it, and they did it.

Not everybody was Cinderella who came in. Some people who came in were criminals. They were murderers. They were rapists. They were drug dealers. They were sex traffickers. We all know that. That is what our ICE, right now, is trying to do. It is trying to find these people who shouldn't be in any country—their own, ours, anywhere. They ought to be jailed and fined.

But here is my point: As a result—and we all saw it happen, and the American people saw it happen. They get it. The American people may not read Aristotle every day—they are too busy earning a living—but they get it. And a whole bunch of Americans believe, whether it is true or not—and I am not saying it is true. I am not saying it isn't true because I think some of my Democratic colleagues believe this—but many Americans—millions of Americans—have concluded that this was all by design; that these 8, 10, 15, 20 million people who were admitted illegally into America was a way to try to bolster the Democratic Party. So these folks will be beholden to the Democratic Party and will try to vote and/or, once they become citizens, if they become citizens, will vote for Democrats.

Again, some of the commentators who go catatonic and foam at the mouth when I talk about this—but we all know it is true—call this the replacement theory. I am not saying all Democrats believe that, and I am not here to say it is true or not, though I think there are some of my Democratic friends who believe that. But that is not the point. The point is the American people believe it, so they no longer trust our electoral system, and our elections are not worth a damn if people don't accept the result. If they don't trust the system, they are not going to accept the result.

That is why we are moving the SAVE Act. I support it unconditionally. We are going to have difficulty passing it. That much is clear. So, as part of a reconciliation bill for us to get ICE back up and running, I would include the SAVE Act as part of that reconciliation bill as well. We wouldn't need 60 votes. We wouldn't need 55 votes. We would only need 51 votes. We passed the One Big Beautiful Bill with 50 votes, with the Vice President breaking the tie.

Again, I feel like I am repeating some of what I said yesterday.

Some of my colleagues are going to say: Kennedy, you know, you need to back away from the crank. You can't do this through reconciliation. You can't do the SAVE Act through reconciliation.

And I tell them: I have been here 10 years, and we can do what the Parliamentarian says we can do. I have seen measures get approved under the Budget Control Act—we call it a Byrd bath—that I thought didn't have a chance, and I have seen others not get approved that were slam dunks.

As I said, I am in the minority on this even among my Republican colleagues. I don't mean this to sound bad, but sometimes the majority just means all the fools are on the same side. I am not calling my colleagues fools, but I am saying this is worth a try. I would go get a really smart lawyer and ask him to help us craft a SAVE Act that can survive a Byrd bath. I would do those two things in reconciliation or at least open up ICE through reconciliation. We don't need to do it with Democratic support.

I have been thinking about this for a while. Senator CRUZ talked about this much more eloquently than I did at our luncheon yesterday. I hope TED will come down and share with you, at some point, his thoughts on it. I see Senator CORNYN here. They are two pretty smart lawyers who could help us craft something.

I just wanted to come spend a few minutes and offer my point of view on that.

I thank the Presiding Officer for hearing me out and for being serene and patient and all that other good stuff.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. President, I came down to the floor to talk about the SAVE Act, but before I do so, I am reminded that, over the last 10 days, my Republican colleagues have blocked paying TSA agents on at least five occasions. The number five was used earlier to talk about some other procedure, but on five different occasions, Republicans blocked paying TSA agents.

Now, I certainly hope that my Republican colleagues who are not in Washington, DC, today—because anyone watching C-SPAN or the proceedings earlier might be wondering why the proceedings were open so long. They were open because my Republican colleagues were worried that they didn't have quorum. They talk about 51 votes for one thing or another. They are not here today.

So what I would ask my Republican colleagues—wherever you are in America; I hope you are with family—is that, when you go to the airport and you walk by those TSA agents, you have the courage to tell them why you blocked paying them. This could have been done.

I very much appreciate the words of my colleague from Louisiana just a few moments ago. Any one of them could offer unanimous consent right now. I would agree to it, but I would bet my life that one of my Republican colleagues would object to paying the

TSA agents if it were offered right now. That is the truth.

One of my colleagues just talked about people voting who are not citizens. It is a crime. It is illegal. It is against the law. Enforce the law. If there is a concern about something that is happening, then stop it. I am surprised one of them has not offered a piece of legislation that says that American citizens should stop at a stop sign. Maybe that is not the law just yet. We should be clear about that if that is what we are trying to do here.

But come on, man. If there is disagreement, stop holding these other folks hostage. Pay the TSA agents. Get FEMA funded. Get CISA funded. Get the Coast Guard funded.

My Republican colleagues were very happy when the President was doing whatever he was doing around Venezuela. I asked the Admiral of the Coast Guard if he had been included by the Secretary of Defense in any of that work. His response was no. That is their job. If there is agreement, let's move forward and get that done.

I appreciated the debate yesterday with my colleague from Ohio and my colleague from Michigan. I thought there was some agreement to say: Let's move forward. Let's get this done.

I appreciate what my colleague from Michigan said: Let's get locked in a room and not leave until we figure it out.

That was an old adage from a former Governor from New Mexico, Bruce King.

Bruce, who was a cattle rancher, always said: Lock them up in a barn, and don't let them out until they can figure things out.

Maybe we should do that.

Well, I am here on the floor today to talk about a piece of legislation that many of my colleagues have been talking about, and it is the reason that we are here today. We are supposed to be in Washington, DC, today as U.S. Senators, having a debate about a piece of legislation.

But, again, I hope the journalists up there on the third floor or those who are in the room are writing about the number of Republicans who aren't here. If this is so important to Republicans, where the hell are they? Because they are not here, and someone needs to call this out.

Now, I asked the Parliamentarian if there were some words that I could use earlier because I have come to the practice of calling some things “manure” and “fertilizer” and things, but I found out today that I can say “bullshit” on the Senate floor, and maybe it is about the time someone were to do this—because come on, y'all, if this is important enough to be here, then get your colleagues back to Washington, DC, and let's get to work, because they are not here.

I will yield to you.

Mr. MORENO. Thank you. Thank you.

Are all of your Democrat colleagues here, because, by our count, there are nine missing.

Mr. LUJÁN. Senator MORENO, it takes 51 votes for y'all to move on any of your procedures. The Republicans aren't even here for something that is important.

Mr. MORENO. So we are willing to call our Members back. Are you willing to call your Members back from the California fundraiser that they are doing this weekend?

Mr. LUJÁN. I think everyone should be back here. I am here, sir.

Mr. MORAN. So I look forward to you having your nine Democrat colleagues back from the posh California—

Mr. LUJÁN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. President.

I would ask all my Democratic colleagues and all of my Republican colleagues and all of the men, wherever they are, to come back to Washington, DC, and let's do the work.

Mr. MORENO. Will you yield for another question?

Mr. LUJÁN. I will yield in a little bit, sir. I have a lot to say right now. I will give you a few moments in a bit, Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. LUJÁN. I appreciate that, Mr. President. Thank you for that. Sometimes I forget the rules around this place.

Now, getting back to the SAVE Act, you know, yesterday, I was part of a press conference with some of my colleagues, and one of my constituents called me up and said: You know, the name of that piece of legislation should be called “Saving Republicans' Behinds Act.”

And the reason that I think that holds true is the only thing this is good for is for Republicans to throw a bunch of people off the voter rolls—namely, 67 million women across the country who may have changed their last name. Some of them may have gotten married. That is what happens in America. Sometimes we take our partner's name, our spouse's names, as well. Sixty-seven million women would be thrown off the voter rolls.

My Native American brothers and sisters' Tribal IDs would not be respected. Many of my Native American constituents were born at home. They didn't go to vital statistics. They were born in generational homes.

Some of my colleagues in this room also represent First Nations, and they know the truth about this.

So throw Native Americans off the rolls. Throw women off the rolls. Let's do what President Trump said. President Trump said out loud to a bunch of my Republican colleagues—I don't know if you were down at his resort, wherever they were—but he told them: If Republicans pass the SAVE Act, it will guarantee that Republicans win in November of 2026.

And then he went further. He said: and for the next 50 years.

Well, thank you for telling the truth. Thank you for telling the American

people what this is all about, because that is what this is.

Now, Donald Trump, when he made those intentions clear, he also said that Republicans should just try to rewrite the rules. President Trump said that Republicans should just take over these elections. President Trump has already threatened insurrection rule here and there. President Trump has also said he is going to send ICE agents across the country to ballot places.

There was a hearing this week where TULSI GABBARD, who is supposed to be in charge of intelligence in America—that is kind of an oxymoron. She was sent down to look for ballots in Georgia, something about a stolen election in 2020.

Now, I look around the room. At least two of my colleagues that are in the Chamber right now were here on January 6. I was here as well.

This notion of the President not buying the outcome of the election because he didn't win—bring it back to where we are today and the SAVE Act: another power grab. Take away the right to vote for American citizens.

Now, Republicans know something today that I know to be true as well: that the Republican agenda isn't working, and that is bad for the American people.

If you don't believe me, go to a grocery store with some of your constituents. Chat with them after church. Go to the ball game, but take a few extra bucks because that hotdog is not going to cost you a buck fifty anymore. It is going to cost you 5, 6, 10 bucks.

American people, when they are trying to get some groceries for the kids, they go to the checkout line, and they realize that maybe they put too many things in the grocery cart because everything got more and more expensive—Trump tariffs, this and that.

There is nothing happening to lower the costs for the American people, and what I hope my brothers and sisters across the country realize today is that if Republicans in the majority in the Senate want to do something and bring it to the floor, they do it. They are doing it right now, even though a bunch of Republicans are not in Washington, DC. We are on the floor talking about the SAVE Act.

I wish they had the same gumption to lower prices for the American people, to hold this President accountable. Bring that legislation to the floor.

And maybe one of my Republican colleagues will surprise me and offer a unanimous consent to pay the TSA agents. I am going to stick around for that one because I look forward to hearing that we are going to do that one here as well.

So just as a reminder, this legislation would also empower the Department of Homeland Security to get their hands not just on Social Security information and on IRS information, but now on voting information.

What my Republican colleagues want to do is give these out-of-control ICE

agents—the same ones that killed two of our American citizens, our brothers and sisters in Minnesota; the same out-of-control agents that are busting American people's car windows open, busting into people's houses without a judicial warrant—those same folks, that is what this legislation will do, hand that nonsense over to them.

But, look, let's not forget that the Trump administration has shown that it is willing to lie and abuse its power. President Trump keeps joking over and over and over about a third term. And every time I bring it up, my Republican colleagues say: Oh, he is just joking. He doesn't really mean it.

Well, I wish that was true.

I am going to give some advice to my Republican colleagues, if they are willing to listen. Some of them are up for election this year.

I am reminded of stories that many of us maybe heard firsthand—I hope all of us have read—about a colleague that some of us served with as a Member of the House of Representatives. His name was John Lewis.

John, a civil rights giant, a civil rights hero, a man who stood arm in arm with strangers to stand for our rights, to make sure that—no matter who we were as American citizens, the way we spoke, the color of our skin, where we were from—we could vote; that no longer would the right to vote be taken away from us. He stood on that bridge in Selma, where thousands of Americans were bloodied and beaten and left for dead—that John Lewis.

The SAVE Act would undo the work of these civil rights activists and giants that fought for all of us.

Now, in our democracy, voting should be accessible for every eligible American, no matter who they support. But what congressional Republicans only want to happen is you can vote in America, but only if you vote for them.

So here is my advice: If Republicans want to win some more elections, they should stop taking food away from seniors, children, and veterans. That is something we should agree on. They should stop taking away tax credits that make healthcare more affordable for millions of Americans. I am not even going to remind you all of my fight 4 years ago when I survived a stroke, of how hard it is to get care and how expensive it is.

Maybe stop emboldening untrained ICE agents from smashing in Americans' car windows and illegally entering American citizens' homes to kidnap American citizens. That is probably good too.

And stop leaving behind our farmers and ranchers—enough with the bandaids. Let's work on some things together here. The farm bill is something that we could still do, and I hope we do it.

Stop allowing this President to keep raising prices on families with tariffs and illegal wars. That is something that a lot of my colleagues agree on. Some of them have voted to stop this stuff.

So to my Republican colleagues, if any of you are still wondering how I am going to vote on this bill, I will be voting no.

And to the American people, my Republican Senator colleagues should too.

Donald Trump doesn't get a third term. He does not get to choose who votes and who doesn't when they are American citizens. In America, people decide who is going to represent them.

BATAAN DEATH MARCH

Mr. President, what I want to chat briefly about is about the Bataan Death March. Now, the anniversary, the recognition, the commemoration will be in April. It is still a few weeks away.

Approximately 70,000 troops surrendered at the fall of Bataan in April of 1942. About 66,000 were Filipino soldiers, about 9,000 American troops. They were forced into the Bataan Death March, one of the largest surrenders of the United States and Allied forces in history.

I want to take a moment to remember one of the darkest chapters of World War II. After the fall of Bataan in 1942, tens of thousands of American and Filipino servicemembers were forced to march for miles under brutal condition—little food, water, medical care. Many did not survive. Those who did endured suffering as prisoners of war.

The reason I am raising this is, tomorrow, in New Mexico, there are thousands of people gathered from across America and across New Mexico for the Bataan Memorial March.

Some of our staff are actually down that way. I was hoping to be there with them in person. I will be putting some miles in tomorrow to stand in solidarity with all of my brothers and sisters who are there.

I just wanted to take a moment to send them prayers and send them strength, all the Bataan families that have sat to share the importance of why we need to stand strong for those who have served across the country and are still with us today. I just want to say thank you to each and every one of them for taking their time.

And the last thing I will say, Mr. President—if my colleague still wants me to yield, I would be happy to—but the last thing I want to say is to the two barbers I had a chance of meeting in Mesilla, a couple of weeks ago, from Pistoleros Barbershop: God's speed to you as you hit the sand tomorrow. God bless each and every one of you tomorrow.

My colleague is no longer on the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I don't think our friend from New Mexico will be shocked to hear me say that I am not going to be taking his advice. I know he is very concerned about Republicans in the next elections and our