



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, SATURDAY, MARCH 21, 2026

No. 52

## 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

SATURDAY, MARCH 21, 2026

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Honorable BERNIE MORENO, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Mighty God, our shelter from life's storms, give to the Members of this body a faith strong enough to face the tempest of our time.

Lord, strengthen them to confront with courage the challenges that come, knowing that Your purposes, providence, and power will prevail. Give Your Senators a constancy of purpose that will motivate them to do Your will.

Rule as sovereign Lord in this Chamber, guiding the deliberations, debates, and decisions.

And, Lord, let there be peace on Earth. We pray in Your sublime Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication

to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, March 21, 2026.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BERNIE MORENO, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. MORENO thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message with respect to S. 1383, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany S. 1383, a bill to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Thune motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill.

Thune motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with Thune (for Schmitt) amendment No. 4420 (to the House amendment to the bill), in the nature of a substitute.

Thune (for Tuberville-Blackburn) amendment No. 4421 (to amendment No. 4420), to protect women and girls in athletics.

Thune motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Rules and Administration, with instructions, Thune amendment No. 4422, to change the enactment date.

Thune amendment No. 4423 (to the instructions (amendment No. 4422), of a perfecting nature.

Thune amendment No. 4424 (to amendment No. 4423), of a perfecting nature.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2026—Motion to Proceed—Resumed

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

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

#### SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the truth eventually will get out. Democrats

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1461

have spent the last week or two attempting to hedge on photo ID, to suggest that, in fact, Democrats actually support photo ID, it is just the rest of the SAVE America Act they are concerned about.

So, on Thursday, the junior Republican Senator from Ohio decided to give them an opportunity to do something about it. Not interested in the rest of the SAVE America Act's commonsense proposals? OK, he said, and he offered a clean photo ID bill—no other provisions, just a measure to require showing photo ID at the polls, which could be a driver's license or State ID card, a passport, a military ID, a Tribal ID.

And Democrats—Democrats, the party that the Democrat leader said does not object to photo ID—well, Democrats blocked it.

So, as it turns out, Democrats support photo ID for voters, just as long as you don't actually ask them to support a photo ID bill. They want to have their cake and eat it, too; shield themselves from criticism, since polls show Americans overwhelmingly support photo ID for voters, but also save themselves from having to back up their words with actions.

I am still waiting for Democrats to come down to the floor and to call out requirements to show photo ID to board a plane. I am still waiting for them to attack doctor's offices and hotels and movie theaters and banks for requiring photo ID.

I am still waiting for Democrats to explain why it is perfectly logical for them to demand photo ID for their own rallies and yet oppose photo ID at the polls.

Is voting the one thing the Democrats don't think should be taken seriously? Do they think voting is so trivial that it really doesn't matter if those coming to vote are who they say they are? Well, I would like to know.

Democrats may have rejected a commonsense photo ID measure on Thursday, but they will have another chance to support common sense today when the Senate votes on an amendment to protect women's sports from being hijacked by men.

Over the past few years around the country we have seen men—biological men who identify as women—take up spaces and medals in athletics meant for actual women, and this is happening across a range of sports: swimming, softball, volleyball, basketball, tennis, and the list goes on.

Needless to say, men have inherent biological advantages when it comes to sports, things like greater muscle mass, greater aerobic power. That is just a simple scientific fact.

And those biological advantages mean that men are likely to dominate in women's sports, taking medals and opportunities that should belong to women.

One female runner had this to say:

Twenty-seven times during my high school career, all four years, I had to return to the

line and settle into blocks next to first one, then two biologically male athletes to run a race that everyone knew wasn't fair. I lost podium spots, awards, recognition, and four state championship titles during my junior year—the time when it was most crucial for college recruitment. . . . My teammates and I watched those two athletes dominate the girls' events. They won 15 women's state championship titles—titles that were held by nine different girls in 2016—set new . . . individual meet records, and eliminated girls from advancement opportunities more than 85 times.

They won 15 women's state championship titles . . . and eliminated girls from advancement opportunities more than 85 times.

And that was the effect of just two male athletes in women's track in just one State, and this is happening across the country and in a wide range of women's sports.

I want to know: Are my Democrat colleagues OK with this? Are they OK with two biological males eliminating girls from advancement opportunities more than 85 times?

Are they OK with the fact that, as the U.N. reported in 2024, "The replacement of the female sports category with a mixed-sex category has resulted in an increasing number of female athletes losing opportunities, including medals, when competing against males. According to information received by 30 March 2024, over 600 female athletes in more than 400 competitions have lost more than 890 medals in 29 different sports"?

Are Democrats OK with that? They think that is fair? They think women's opportunities to excel should be taken from them by biological males? I want to know.

Are Democrats willing to abandon decades of progress in women's sports the minute the transgender lobby comes calling? Well, I guess we will see today. Do Democrats stand with women or will they continue to sacrifice fairness and equality at the altar of radical transgender ideology?

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. President, the situation at U.S. airports continues to worsen thanks to Democrat's refusal to fund the Department of Homeland Security. Thousands of Homeland Security employees have been working without pay for more than a month.

The problems of having an unfunded Homeland Security Department continue to multiply. And Democrats, well, they just seem to shrug. I guess the Democrats' 43-day full government shutdown from earlier this fiscal year ought to have made it clear that Democrats are happy to deprive government workers of their salaries if it serves their political ends.

But I still marvel at the fact that Democrats have been willing to deprive some government employees of pay for almost—almost—80 days now over the course of less than 6 months, to say nothing of their willingness to defund law enforcement and jeopardize national security.

Thirty-six days, the Department of Homeland Security has been shut down

now. The White House has offered a substantial number of reforms to Democrats, but Democrats have yet to move a step off their original list of demands, and I hope that will change. So far, the concept of negotiation—which involves compromise and give-and-take—seems utterly lost to them.

Or perhaps it is simply that Democrats don't want a solution here. After all, if they get reforms, like many of the reforms the White House has offered, Democrats might not be able to use this as a campaign issue, and I strongly suspect that Democrats are less interested in fixing problems than they are at having issues that they can use in the November election.

Of course, I would caution them that their renewed commitment to defunding law enforcement may not play as well as they think it will. Democrats had to dial back on their hostility to law enforcement once before for political reasons. It turns out that defunding the police and defunding law enforcement isn't such a popular issue after all. So, perhaps, they ought to think twice before making defunding law enforcement and Homeland Security their signature issue this November.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

S. 1383

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, Mr. President, today, every Senator must answer a very simple question: Senator, do you want chaos at our airports to come down—yes or no, Senator?

Let me repeat the question: Republican Senator, do you want the chaos at our airports to come down—yes or no? If you have had enough of long lines, if you want TSA workers to get paid, then vote yes on the motion I am bringing before the Senate today.

It is unacceptable for workers and travelers and entire airports to get taken hostage in political games, but that is what the Republicans are doing. It is unacceptable to say we will only pay TSA workers if it is attached to a bill that funds ICE with no reforms, but that is what the Republicans have been doing.

Democrats want to pay TSA workers ASAP, with no strings attached. A "yes" vote will do that. That is the first time in this Chamber that we will have an opportunity to vote yes or no on whether you want to pay TSA workers ASAP, with no strings attached.

Every bill they have brought before the Senate says: Oh, yes, we want to

pay the TSA workers, we want to reduce the lines at airports, but only if you pass ICE funding with no reform.

And the American people want reform. They know that, but you have got Stephen Miller up there in the White House and so many others who don't want any reform of ICE, and our Republican Senate friends are willingly going along with that and holding airports, travelers, and TSA workers hostage.

We Democrats want to bring down the long lines at the airport, and a "yes" vote—plain and simple—would do just that. I urge Republicans to support my motion.

The chaos at airports has reached a boiling point. People have been waiting for 2 hours, 3 hours—sometimes more—just to get through security. One couple in Austin said the lines stretched right out the door and into the grass outside the airport.

Meanwhile, TSA workers are about to go a full month without pay. That is unacceptable. It means they cannot pay the rent or the mortgage, they cannot buy groceries, and they are digging into their savings just to get by—these hard-working, good people. And at the same time, they are being asked to work brutal hours.

It is no surprise many of them have been calling in sick. It is not even a surprise that many are looking for other jobs. They have to support their families and themselves. We need to bring this to an end today—today—and that is what we can start doing with a "yes vote" on our motion.

As I have said, we have seen a lot of rollcall votes over the past few weeks on the floor related to DHS funding, and they say they want to get up and fund TSA. But they want to fund all of DHS—even ICE, even Border Patrol—with no reform.

This vote today is different from what our colleagues on the other side have offered. It is a breakthrough because it says: Fund TSA only. Vote "fund TSA with no strings attached."

Republicans, in essence, say they want to reopen all of DHS but only if there are no changes to ICE and Border Patrol when they vote. That is not acceptable, not just to us, not just to Democrats but to the American people.

The American people feel very strongly that ICE's conduct needs to be reined in. Trump himself, the originator of these horrible ICE goon squads, has said they have gone too far.

We can't just give ICE a blank check to keep operating without guardrails, as Republicans have proposed in their previous votes. So, today, Democrats offer to pay TSA without the anchor of demanding funding of ICE and CBP without any guardrails, which is what the Republicans are doing.

We want to open TSA with no strings attached.

Let me repeat: no strings attached.

There is not one bill the Republicans have brought forward that doesn't have strings attached—strings that don't let it have a majority vote.

Now, we are having productive conversations on reforming ICE and CBP, and Democrats remain committed to securing reforms. But that is an ongoing process. We are meeting today again, but we must fund TSA now.

Let us keep negotiating the outstanding issues with ICE, but let us start sending paychecks to TSA workers now. Let us bring the long lines at the airports—let us end the long lines at the airport now. This is the logical, expedient, correct thing to do.

So in conclusion, I urge my Republican colleagues: Vote yes if you want to pay TSA. Vote yes if you want to bring down the long lines at airports. Vote yes today.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, we are having quite a debate, and I do believe that the American people are learning quite a bit about the Democratic Members of the Senate and the Republican Members of the Senate as we go through this debate on the SAVE America Act.

Now, what we have heard from some of our Democratic colleagues is showing a voter ID is common sense. I am glad that they have come to that recognition and that they realize it does make sense that you would show an ID when you go to vote, that they show an ID many times a day, whether it is to pick up a prescription at the pharmacy or to register for Federal benefits or to go to a child's school. Voter ID is something that makes sense because the American people are accustomed to verifying to individuals that they are indeed who they claim to be. But our friends across the aisle, only here in this Chamber, are saying: Oh, we can't vote for that. Now, 71 percent of all Democrats, 85 percent of all Independents, and over 90 percent of all Republicans agree voter ID is a good idea.

We also see the same type of numbers when it comes to the other common-sense provision that if you are going to vote in a U.S. election, you really ought to be a U.S. citizen. That makes sense to people. They know that when they travel to other countries they don't vote in those elections, even if they are there on an election day. But because our friends across the aisle want to make it easy to cheat, they want to allow individuals that are illegally in the country or people that are here on a visa or people that are here as permanent residents or people that are touring our country to show up at a poll, grab a ballot, give an address, and cast that ballot because in 12

States in this country you can vote without showing anything when you go to the polls—just give them your name and cast that ballot.

Well, quite frankly, the American people think that the right to vote is precious and that we should defend "one person, one vote." They look at casting that vote as their duty and their honor. And they are fully aware that if someone illegally in the country, someone not entitled to vote, casts a ballot, then it negates their ballot.

So the American people are watching and observing and learning, and we see that not only are they blaming the Democrats for this latest shutdown of Homeland Security; they think they have lost their ever-loving minds that they will not support voter ID and being a citizen of the Nation in order to cast a vote.

Now, there is another provision that I want to call attention to, and we are going to vote on this amendment in a few minutes. This is protecting girls in sports. We know that title IX has opened the doors for young women and girls to compete in sports.

Now, 50 years ago, when title IX came to be, we only had about 300,000 college and high school female athletes that were competing. Today, that number is over 3 million. And I know many of us are watching March Madness and the talented young women that are playing in this tournament. We love cheering for them. We love watching them excel and succeed. We love it when we are watching college sports and we see young women who have come together, who have formed a team, who have built that camaraderie and know how to compete as a team.

They like that, but obviously our friends across the aisle, who once upon a time liked to say that they were leading the pack supporting women, decided they no longer support women; they can't even define the word "woman." So therefore they are not able to support women, and therefore they want to tear down title IX, which has opened doors of opportunity for young women.

Now, thank goodness President Donald Trump has tried to chase away some of the adverse actions against title IX that were carried out during the Biden administration, when opportunities for young women and girls were lost, when women would be forced to share a locker room with guys because the guy decided he was going to claim to be a female so he could compete, whether it is track or swimming or volleyball, softball. The guy couldn't win in the guys' category, so they claimed to be female so they could take away that opportunity, so they could take away that trophy, so they could take away the scholarship from young women.

Actually, I think that is disgusting—absolutely disgusting—but our friends across the aisle support that. They want to diminish these opportunities for women. But President Trump said:

I have had enough of that. He did an Executive order banning men from competing in women's sports.

Secretary McMahon, who is doing a fabulous job as our Education Secretary, is investigating educational institutions all across the country that are violating title IX and are allowing men to compete in women's sports and thereby take away the opportunities from women. Thank goodness she is doing that, and thank goodness these institutions are being held to account for discriminating against these women who want to compete, who want to be able to do it safely and without being injured.

In just a few moments, Senator TUBERVILLE and I are going to push to pass the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act. We are doing this as part of the SAVE America Act because it is another of these issues where you have 80 percent of the American people, 90 percent, 70 percent of the American people who are for this.

What the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act will do is to codify President Trump's Executive order.

I am asked regularly by Tennesseans: These Executive orders are great, but when are you going to codify this and put it into law so that it will have the force of law behind it?

So today, when it comes to protecting women in sports, to making certain men cannot compete in women's sports; when it comes to affirming biological reality, we are going to take that vote as the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act is offered as an amendment.

To my friends across the aisle, I would encourage them: Choose today to honor women. Choose today to stand with women. Choose today to support so many young women that absolutely want to be able to compete.

You know, today is a beautiful day in the great State of Tennessee, which I think is the best place on the face of the Earth to live. It is a gorgeous spring day. The forsythia is bright yellow and blooming. The red buds are purple, and they are magnificent. The Sun is shining.

In driveways all across our great State, you have young girls who are out bouncing that basketball. They are hoping for their shot to play for Vanderbilt or to be a UT Lady Vol and to make that college team. They want to be able to compete. They are watching what is happening with March Madness. They are following women that they have seen compete on these college teams.

I hope they find it as absolutely disgusting as I do that our colleagues across the aisle have chosen a course of action. They cannot define "woman," and they will not defend women. I would encourage them to change course and vote for the Protection of Girls in Sports Act.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. 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 Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, it seems like "Groundhog Day" in here to me. I have been here 6 years, and this is the fourth time that I have had this bill on the floor, and I am still trying. I am going to continue to try until I am gone. I can't believe this is even an issue, but nothing, basically, has surprised me since I have been here, the things we have either voted for or voted against here in this body.

I have come to the floor, as I said, four different times to try to get the Senate to pass the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act. It is not very complicated. For some reason, we are making it complicated. Every time we have voted on this, I have not gotten one single Democrat to vote for it.

I think you can look back at the election this past year in 2024. One of the main issues that put a majority in here, a majority in the House, and control over 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue is because for some reason, my Democrat colleagues do not want to protect girls and women in sports. It is ludicrous.

For the life of me, I cannot understand how biological males can be given the right to take away the rights of young girls—elementary school, junior high, high school, junior college, 4-year universities, and even in pro sports. I cannot understand it.

We have women's sports, and we have men's sports, and that is the way it should be. That is the way it has been up until just a few years ago.

President Trump has changed that since he took office. He Executive-ordered that no men participate in women's sports. Here is the deal: We all know that Executive orders only last a certain amount of time. If the Democrats take control of the White House, that will change overnight. Biological men will be allowed to participate in women's sports.

But surely to goodness, everybody in here has daughters or nieces or granddaughters that love sports—one of the best things this country has going for it. You are taught teamwork, dedication, work ethic, time control, organization. You get all those things out of sports.

I did it for 35 years. I have seen people change their lives because of what sports did to their lives. Sometimes they are not very focused through a school—whether it is high school, junior college, or a 4-year university—but if they participate in that and they go through the grueling practice and meetings and lifting and all the things they have to do, they learn. They learn how to control their lives. They learn how to take care of themselves. But for some reason, we don't want women and

girls to have that opportunity. In this body, the Democratic Party wants biological men to be able to participate.

So what would you say to the volleyball player at San Jose University who thought that on a road trip, you double up—whether it is men's sport or women's—you double up in a hotel room before you play the next day. She did not realize that she was sharing a room and possibly even a bed with a male. She didn't know he was transgender. She did not know it. She quit school and did not get her degree because she was petrified at what she had to go through because of this body right here. It is ridiculous—absolutely ridiculous.

Female athletes suffer long injuries because of competing against bigger men. Can we not figure that out? Can we not figure that out?

How about the trophies and awards that are stolen from young girls and ladies that work all their life to win a game or a sport or win some kind of award in the sport they are in, and they put all their dedicated life into that, and they lose to somebody that is much more physical—bigger, stronger, and faster—because of us in here? Not anybody else; because of us. Because we won't vote to say: No, they can't do it. It really makes no sense whatsoever.

But do you know what? The people of this country voted. They voted their tails out a majority in the House, in the Senate, and the White House, and one reason was because of no common sense—none. And they should, and it is going to get them again next year.

If I was a leader over there, I would go: Hey, listen, we are getting our tails kicked on this. Let's go vote for this and get it over with because we are going to lose a lot of votes.

Eighty percent of the country believes that men should not play in women's sports, but, no—they are going stand up for the 20 percent—the 20 percent crazies that have no clue of what they are doing when they are voting for men to play in women's sports.

So I appreciate President Trump's Executive order to put life back into women's sports. And we are not talking about all 18-, 19-, 20-year-olds; I am talking about 4 or 5 years old—all of women's sports.

So this is an 82-20 issue—common sense. I mean, there is not a lot of common sense up here because my colleagues on the left a couple years ago tried to push on the United States that men can have babies. Are you kidding me? Are you kidding me? What country do we live in when we have leaders of this country trying to push an idea that men can have babies?

We have lost it, and we better get control of it. I think that my colleagues on the left have really lost touch with reality. Because why? You would ask yourself why. You go home and think, why would anybody vote for that?

And I will tell you why. There is a group of people they are trying to protect that would vote for their power. They are not voting for young women. They are not voting for older women. They are voting for power so they can push this nonsense on you all over this country. And enough is enough of it. Enough is enough.

So I hope today when we vote on this bill for the fourth time that men cannot play in women's sports, that when they walk up to vote and say: No, I am against that, look at the damn camera up there and let the people see you vote against women in this country to have the same rights as men when it comes to athletics.

Please do that so we can put your picture on television. Don't vote for this guy next November because there is no possible way that you can elect somebody that believes this nonsense.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Kansas.

HONORING THE LIFE OF KANSAS CITY, KANSAS POLICE OFFICER HUNTER SIMONCIC

HONORING THE LIFE OF HAYS, KANSAS POLICE SERGEANT SCOTT HEIMANN

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following resolutions, en bloc: S. Res. 372, for Officer Hunter Simoncic, who was killed in the line of duty on August 26, 2025, and S. Res. 425 for Officer Scott Heimann, who was killed in the line of duty on September 27, 2025.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged of the relevant resolutions, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolution (S. Res. 372), with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 3, 2025, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

(The resolution (S. Res. 425), with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 30, 2025, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

WAIVING QUORUM CALLS

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum calls in relationship to the Senate amendment No. 4421 and the Schumer motion to suspend rule 25.

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

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 amendment No. 4421 to the motion to concur in the House message to accompany S. 1383 with substitute amendment No. 4420, a bill to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Roger Marshall, John Barrasso, Bill Hagerty, Pete Ricketts, Bernie Moreno, John Cornyn, Rick Scott of Florida, Lindsey Graham, Shelley Moore Capito, Jim Banks, Jon A. Husted, Joni Ernst, Marsha Blackburn, Ted Budd, Steve Daines, Tommy Tuberville.

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 amendment No. 4421 to the motion to concur in the House message to accompany S. 1383 with substitute amendment No. 4420, a bill to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes, 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 Utah (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) would have voted "yea."

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 60 Leg.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—41

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

NOT VOTING—10

Coons	Fetterman	Shaheen
Curtis	Kaine	Sheehy
Daines	Kelly	
Durbin	Paul	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 49, and the nays are 41.

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

The motion was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader.

S. 1383

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have a motion today that asks every Senator a very simple question: Do you want TSA workers to get their pay—yes or no? Are you tired, like many Americans are, of seeing long lines at the airport—yes or no?

If Senators want to pay TSA workers and end the airport chaos, they should support my motion. Our TSA workers cannot be taken hostage for political games, but that is what Republicans have done.

It is unacceptable—unacceptable—to say we will only pay TSA workers if it is attached to a bill that funds ICE with no reforms, but that is what Republicans have done.

Democrats want to pay TSA workers ASAP, no strings attached. A "yes" vote on my motion would start doing just that. This is the only vote—the only vote, not the others—that the Senate has taken that will fund TSA—no ands, ifs, or buts.

This is the first time—the first time—the Senate holds a vote related to paying TSA workers that has zero strings attached to it. This is the only vote that says you are for supporting TSA families unconditionally. All the votes Republicans have pushed so far tie TSA paychecks to fully funding ICE without any reforms.

Republicans say: Sure, we will pay TSA, but only if you keep funding ICE agents without any guardrails whatsoever.

That is not acceptable to the American people.

So, today, my motion makes the matter very simple: Let's pay TSA workers ASAP. That is it—nothing else. We can keep negotiating ICE and CBP separately.

We are having some productive conversations on getting reforms to ICE, and Democrats are going to continue pushing for real, serious reforms