

NAYS—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	

NOT VOTING—10

Coons	Fetterman	Shaheen
Curtis	Kaine	Sheehy
Daines	Kelly	
Durbin	Paul	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LUMMIS). On this vote, the yeas are 41, and the nays are 49.

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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 697.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Colin McDonald, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

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 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 the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 697, Colin McDonald, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

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

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I am here to talk about the SAVE America Act.

I have had two people already tell me my sign is upside down. The Presiding Officer is probably thinking it. I can tell the pages are too. It is a lot easier to show your photo ID when you go to vote than it is to read the poster. How do I know that? Because I go to vote and I show them my photo ID in Louisiana, which has a long history of, shall we say, people voting who are already buried. We no longer have that history since we have begun to put photo IDs out.

Think about that. It is no imposition upon our people, and now we don't have a problem with voter integrity despite our having had a long history of it, so I am told.

We keep on hearing that it is too difficult, so we have a commonsense, widely supported bill which is being objected to. The same people objecting to this bill don't object to having to show an ID to buy a gun, which is a constitutional right, but when it comes to this constitutional right and protecting its integrity, it doesn't work. The SAVE America Act is supported by 71 percent of Democrat voters and 95 percent of Republicans. If only it were supported by 71 percent of Democrat Senators. That is why I am a proud cosponsor.

You might scratch your head when you hear that some refuse to support it. I think that there is a small left-wing base who opposes this who is very vocal; therefore, that is the genesis of the opposition, but this does not keep an eligible American from casting a ballot. It doesn't take away someone's constitutional right.

I will say MIKE LEE, who is sitting next to me, has been working with those who object to its passage in order to meet their concerns.

For example, one of the concerns is that, if someone marries and changes her name and her driver's license is different than her birth certificate, she won't be able to vote. I just confirmed with MIKE—and he can tell me the page number and the line number, of course—that now all you have to do is sign an affidavit. My wife was born a Layden. When we married, she became a Cassidy. If she went and they said, "Well, your birth certificate says Layden and now you are a Cassidy," she would sign an affidavit. "I am married, and my name is now Cassidy," and—boom—she is there. So, as to the concern that it is discriminatory against women who marry and take their husbands' last names, just sign an affidavit.

Similarly—and, again, I don't always find Mr. LEE the most reasonable person. On this, he has been very reasonable, which is that, when you go originally to vote and you have to prove you are a citizen, MIKE—I am sorry. I should not be addressing him—you can

sign an affidavit establishing that I don't have my birth certificate but that I was born on this date, in this community, and you get to register to vote. The State shall come up with a mechanism by which that is allowed. It is really an attempt to meet the objections of those who oppose this bill. The lack of documentation is not an issue.

By the way, I will also point out, I have lost my birth certificate in the past. I called the place where I was born, and within a week, I had it in the mail, but now I am sure you can do it online. So even should you need a birth certificate—people lose birth certificates all the time. Then they get them back.

We have to show a photo ID or our citizenship sometimes, like, at least on a weekly basis. You fly. You open a bank account. You cash a check. All of those are routine activities of our lives, and you show your driver's license, which is a Real ID.

Those who are opposing this say that they are concerned regarding the woman who marries and takes her husband's name. That has been addressed; that you have to prove citizenship, but you don't have the documents when you go over to vote. That has been addressed; that the very fact of showing an ID is discriminatory. Yet over and over again in life, we show IDs to do things that are part of daily life.

I will note that, when New York City Mayor Mamdani offered New Yorkers a chance to make a little extra money snow shoveling during the blizzard last month, he required not one but two forms of valid ID.

So it is a weak argument when leading Democratic figures are having their citizens show ID. It is a weak argument that you have to endure some incredible hardship to show an ID to vote.

By the way, I have been asked about the talking filibuster. I have supported returning to the talking filibuster since I joined the Senate in 2015. I still remember Jimmy Stewart's "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington." It was rough on the Senators, but being rough on the Senators, frankly, kind of pushed people together to get something done. I am from Louisiana. For the longest time, Huey Long had the record for the longest filibuster, but that filibuster eventually either broke him or it broke the Senate in the sense that they were willing to compromise to get something done.

So, to my Democratic colleagues, I ask you to listen to the people. Pass the SAVE America Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the SAVE America Act, legislation that I have cosponsored to make certain that only U.S. citizens are voting in our elections.

This legislation would require proof of citizenship in our elections, and it would require that this citizenship be

identified when registering to vote and by presenting a valid photo ID when casting your vote at the ballot box.

As of last fall, 36 States were requiring voters to present IDs in order to vote. This includes my home State of South Dakota, where you can present your driver's license, passport, or Tribal ID. All we ask to cast your vote is that you can prove you are an American citizen and that you are who you say you are. That shouldn't be controversial. In fact, it should just be common sense.

Our neighboring State of Minnesota says that most voters will not have to show identification at all. In fact, if you want to vote, you can simply ask someone else who is registered in your precinct to vouch for your identity. One person can vouch for up to eight people. This loose requirement does not appropriately address voter integrity.

We require identification for many parts of everyday life in America. You need your photo ID to open a bank account, to rent a car, to start a job, or to board a plane. In New York City, you need two forms of ID just to shovel snow. Requiring identification to vote should be the standard.

The American people understand that. In a recent poll, over 80 percent of Americans favor requiring all voters to show government-issued photo IDs to vote; that includes 95 percent of Republicans, 85 percent of Independents, and, yes, even 71 percent of Democrats. Let me say that again: 71 percent of Democrats support voter ID laws. Our Democrat colleagues are on the wrong side of their own constituents.

This legislation implements a reasonable policy with broad support from all sides of the political spectrum. I simply do not understand why our colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to hold up this legislation.

Voting in elections is a constitutional right, but it is also a privilege. We live in the greatest country in the world, partially because of our free and fair elections to choose our leaders. We compromise these values when we allow noncitizens to vote in our elections.

The right to vote in our country belongs to the American people, not foreign nationals. American elections should be for the American citizen only. American leaders should be decided by Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support the SAVE America Act to uphold the law and protect voter integrity.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of 80 percent of Americans, including millions of North Carolinians who are asking Congress to ensure that only Americans can vote in American elections.

The charge here, it is really that simple, but I find it ironic that we are once again debating an 80-20 issue because my Democrat colleagues refuse to ac-

cept the stance held by an overwhelming majority of their own constituents.

Staging political theater on such commonsense issues, it has really become routine for Democrats. Let's take, for example, a few things: keeping our borders wide open, opposing the deportation of dangerous criminals, defunding the police, backing radical gender ideology for children, and allowing biological men to compete in women's sports.

And, like clockwork, here we are again, but this time my colleagues across the aisle are refusing to keep our elections fair, transparent, and secure by requiring proof of citizenship to register and have voter ID at the polls. Over 70 percent of Democrats across our country—Democrats—believe that voter ID should be required, but it seems that Senate Democrats couldn't care less.

And why is that? Because instead of accepting the will of the people that they represent, Senate Democrats have chosen to dig their heels in on their failed campaign as the party of open borders and illegal immigration.

By opposing the SAVE America Act, Senate Democrats are telling the American people, loud and clear, that they don't care about preserving the right to vote for American citizens because of their political agenda, which props up illegal immigrants over working-class Americans.

My Democrat colleagues should understand that it is a Federal offense for any noncitizen to vote in a Federal election. Providing proof of identification is a basic security measure, and everyone knows that.

When you board an airplane, you go to the doctor, you start a new job, or even if you get a library card, you are required to show proof of government identification.

In North Carolina, we require every voter to show a government ID before voting. Twenty-three other States already have this same voting law on their books, and nearly every European country has voter ID laws in place. And why? Because power in a democratic society is vested in the will of the people, and that fundamental right to self-determination must be protected at all cost.

I want to address a misleading claim that my Senate colleagues across the aisle continue over and over and over to repeat. Senate Democrats claim that the SAVE America Act would somehow disenfranchise millions of Americans, and that is just false.

This legislation does not target any American citizen eligible to vote; instead, it protects them. The SAVE America Act ensures that only U.S. citizens participate in Federal elections by requiring States to maintain accurate voter rolls and stopping noncitizens from voting. That is not disenfranchisement.

But, at its core, this bill is about restoring trust. The American people de-

serve to have confidence in our Federal elections, and they deserve peace of mind to know that their right as American citizens to determine the future of our country is not diluted by noncitizens meddling in our democratic process. The SAVE America Act puts the integrity of our Republic first again.

President Trump—he has been a steadfast champion of voter ID, and he has encouraged Congress to move this legislation forward because the state of our Nation depends upon protecting the power of the people, and I agree with the President. Ensuring that certainty in our Federal elections, it really shouldn't be controversial at all.

But every single time President Trump supports a policy, no matter how logical it is, Democrats draw a hard line in the sand and they oppose it. Common sense and deciding policy based on the merit of its principles seems right now to mean nothing to Senate Democrats because they refuse to come to the negotiating table to responsibly lay out their concerns and negotiate in good faith.

And when I travel to all 100 counties in North Carolina, I hear the same frustration. Americans see Congress stuck in gridlock with negotiation replaced by partisan stonewalling. I think the American people deserve better.

I am all for having passionate disagreements, you know, but a friendly debate, it is just as American as it gets. But discord should never be an excuse for obstruction, and partisan games are no substitute for responsible governance.

That is not what Americans sent us here to do. We must listen to the 80 percent of Americans calling on us to restore trust in our Federal elections by ensuring that only citizens can vote.

The American people, they didn't send us here to posture. They sent us here to legislate, and legislating requires setting aside partisanship, returning to common sense, and doing what is best for the country and not what is politically self-serving.

So I hope my colleagues across the aisle—that they will listen to the overwhelming majority of Americans, Republicans and Democrats, calling for action and vote to pass the SAVE America Act now.

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

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here to speak about the so-called SAVE America Act, which I think probably would be better described as the "Steal the Next Election Act" because of the purpose that this bill has to throw the election and to throw political influence in America to the Republicans.

You can imagine why they would want to engage in special weapons and tactics to try to win the 2026 election when you see the political disaster that they are enmeshed in: the mess that the Trump administration has made of the economy, the stench of corruption pervading the administration, a war that is running up gasoline prices and has no end in sight and no evident plan. Wherever you look, you see a party in complete disarray with Americans angry, frustrated, and befuddled by the nonsense, and an election coming.

So, of course, they want to change things at the ballot box.

Now, where would you go to test that proposition, that the purpose of this bill is to throw elections to the Republicans? Who might have a view on this that we should listen to?

Oh, right. The President of the United States, the one who has caused the Republicans the political catastrophe that they have looming from the disastrous second term that he has inflicted on this country.

"Republicans have to win this one," he said. Get this bill passed is what he is talking about. "Republicans have to win this one. We'll never lose a race for 50 years." That is how much the President thinks this bill will tank American elections in favor of him and his billionaire donors who already have way too much influence in our politics.

He is talking about us here, Democrats, "we know." "They know if we get this"—if Republicans get this bill—"they probably won't win an election for 50 years, maybe longer."

This is the President of the United States, the head of the Republican Party, the person most responsible for the mess that Americans are rejecting, and he is being pretty candid about what the purpose of this bill is; it is to throw the election. It is to politically interfere with the coming election so that the Republican Party, and, more importantly, the billionaire backers who are pulling the strings and giving it its direction don't lose, don't see split government, don't see compromise, don't see Congress in the people's hands again.

"Republicans have to win this one," he said. "We'll never lose a race for 50 years." And this isn't about political influence with comments like that, from the head of the Republican Party?

You may think he is thinking about some dim and distant future perhaps, that this effort on the floor of the Senate right now to throw the election to the Republican Party isn't immediate.

Whoops. There he goes. "It will guarantee the midterms." The guy says the quiet part out loud. I will give him that.

He tells Republicans: You are going to win the midterms at levels that you can't even believe. How would you win the midterms at levels that you can't even believe? Well, you probably can't believe that you would win the midterms based on current polling as

Americans reject the wars, the spending, the waste, the corruption, the cost increases. You can't even believe it, unless you get this bill—unless you are going to get this bill—and then you are going to win every election for a long time.

It is a conceded point by the head of the Republican Party—Donald Trump—the one who has caused this year of disaster, this year of change and disaster—that the whole purpose of the exercise we are going through is to lock in Republican control—more wars, higher costs, worse corruption—by making elections unwinnable for Democrats for 50 years by guaranteeing Republicans the midterms.

So let's not pretend there is some high-and-mighty, civic-minded motivation for this. That is just a screen. Behind the screen, Trump can't help himself. He admitted what this is all about: It will guarantee the midterms. You are going to win the midterms at levels that you can't even believe, and you are going to win every election for a long time.

We'll never lose a race [for] 50 years.

We will "never lose a race [for] 50 years."

We will have so fixed voting in this country—not enough with the gerrymandering, not enough with the dark money—we now have to fix elections so that Republicans will never lose a race for 50 years. He has admitted it. He has admitted it.

And how do they do that? Well, until recently, Director of Homeland Security former Secretary Noem said: We just want to make sure that the "right people" are voting. The "right people." Gee, who might that be?

And so this whole scheme gets cooked up, marketed falsely as some civic safe voting proposition, when what it really is, is a scheme to influence elections so that the creepy billionaires behind the Republican Party can continue to control the decisions that get made in this town. That is what this is about, plain and simple.

My friends will say: Oh, this is just a voter ID bill. Everybody loves voter ID. You will hear 80–20 more than you can imagine.

Oh, voter ID. Just voter ID. People should have to bring their ID when they vote.

Well, we did that in Rhode Island. It was a bit of a pain. You can imagine an individual person—let's say an 80-year-old woman—widow—living alone, living in, say, a senior high rise in Providence or in Pawtucket. She is not traveling. If she had a passport, it has lapsed. She is not driving. She hasn't had a car in 5 years. Her community is largely in that high rise and people who come to help and help bring her groceries. She has a Social Security card because she is on Social Security, but the Social Security card isn't a photo ID.

So when you bring in voter ID, you have now dumped on that lady a new hassle. She has been voting her whole

life. She has been voting for 60-plus years, and now suddenly they have a problem with her voting—even when she comes downstairs to the voting machines that get set up in the senior center lobby to make it easier for seniors to vote, and everybody in the building knows her; but no ID, no vote.

So, in Rhode Island, we went through the hassle of helping people who needed an ID—who for perfectly legitimate reasons didn't have one—get an ID. It was unnecessary. We had essentially zero voter fraud, but we did it and we put in the work and it worked out fine.

So let's not pretend this is just a voter ID law. This points its attack at voter registration. If you move, you have to reregister to vote. If you are young and are registering to vote for the first time, that is where you run into the obstacles designed to prevent certain people—people who aren't the "right people"—from being able to vote. That is where you run into the problem.

And worse than that, they are trying to take the voter information that we entrust to our secretary of state and to our elections board. They are trying to get the private information of voters in our voter rolls and put it into a national website controlled by, oh, the Department of Homeland Security, the ones who are running ICE around in neighborhoods, the one who ran their agents through the Rhode Island courthouse and threatened a judge with smashing his car windows when he tried to vouch for his high school intern whom the ICE agents wrongly thought was a 30-year-old person they were looking for. We are going to trust the entire country's worth of voter information to that operation?

Look at what just happened in Fulton County. In Fulton County, a Trump U.S. attorney from Missouri sent the FBI in Georgia into the election headquarters to seize all of the voter data that they had. I have separately explained what a completely fouled-up operation that was and how the way in which they did that search warrant left enormous holes for any defendant, who was later charged based on evidence obtained in that search warrant, to run a truck through that prosecution.

They violated really basic rules that prosecutors follow—prosecution 101—rookie, dumb errors. And that leads to only one of two conclusions: One is they are idiots. They are incompetent. They have no idea what they are doing. And there is some sense around that because the local U.S. attorney in Georgia wanted no part of this mess. It was being directed by Washington through Missouri into Georgia. The FBI special agent in charge in Georgia didn't seem to like it much. He got run out of his job—presumably for objecting to this nonsense.

But there is a worse theory than that this was a completely incompetent screw up of a search warrant execution, and that is: They didn't mind leaving

all these holes for a future defendant—somebody charged on the basis of that evidence—to exploit. They didn't mind opening these unnecessary vulnerabilities in a case for a defendant who might later be charged to exploit because they never thought there would be a defendant.

The point wasn't to do a criminal prosecution or even a criminal investigation; the point was to use the search warrant process falsely in order to get their hands on a massive amount of voter data in a swing State. That is being litigated right now, and we will find out.

But that is the kind of effort by this administration to use the Federal Government to seize private voter data. That would be exactly consistent with why we need to worry about DHS, which only wants the "right people" to vote, getting a massive amount of personal voter data.

In Rhode Island, our Secretary of State is fighting that right now because he understands that Rhode Islanders want their voter data to be private, to be safe, and not to be part of some massive political election interference operation run using ICE, using the FBI, using DHS, and using this voter information to hand out to political operatives, to make sure that a weaponized Federal Government is not used to try to throw the election.

It is no small thing to have the Department of Homeland Security want data on every voting American. In recent years, Republican heads would have exploded about that idea. It used to be a party that cared about voter privacy; that in the contest between an individual and the government, tried to take the side of the individual. But now that their billionaires control the government—flip. Now they are on the side of the government, and they want your data.

It is so bad that it seems they have even had one of their little "Musk rats"—the "doggy boys"—running around in government. Remember that operation when Musk was the President's close adviser, and there were DOGE people? Turns out, there may even have been your Social Security data taken. We will find out more about that.

So this is no small thing. And if you want to know what the motive is, just ask the people who are running this. We just want to make sure the "right people" vote. "We'll never lose a race [for] 50 years" if you pass this bill. "It will guarantee the midterms." You are going to win the midterms at levels you can't even believe and you are going to "win every election for a long time."

That is putting the fix in. That is using the power of government to put the fix in to fix the elections, to choose who runs the government. That is about as un-American as it gets.

So why is it that they are so afraid about the midterms? What is it that makes them have to put in place mech-

anisms—from voter ID to registration restrictions to data control—that will give them the tools to guarantee the midterms? Why not run on the record? Because the record stinks—that is why—and voters know it.

This is where President Trump's approval rating has gone. He is down 15 percent. He is down more than 25 percent since when he came in. That is a crash in confidence. And I believe this ended before this Iran—what did he call it?—"excursion" that has driven up gas prices by about a dollar a gallon already, with no end in sight.

So they are looking at an election disaster, and for a really good reason. Here are Trump's job approval ratings. His disapprovals have been going up and up and up to nearly 60. His approval has been going down and down and down to below 40. There is a more than 20-point swing between his disapproval and his approval. That is a politically lethal place to be. That is a signal that you have made such a mess of your unified control of government that voters want something different, want something new, want a change, are sick of the nonsense. And when you are looking at that and you are looking just a few months down at November—man, time to make sure you change the law so that we can make sure the right people—the right people—are voting.

Let's take a look at a few examples of why it is that Trump's disapproval is more than 20 points above his approval. Why is it that they are in such trouble politically? Why is it that these approval ratings have dropped 15 points and 25 from before net zero? This is a real problem.

And we are not the only ones looking at this data. The billionaires who run the Republican Party these days—the billionaires who tell Trump what to do and boss him around and give him big gifts and super deals for his family and his cronies and his friends—they are watching it too. They have never had it so good right now. They can basically secretly, quietly run the U.S. Government through the Republican Party. What a deal. Poor men wannabe rich. Rich men wanna be King. And they get to be King from the shadows, with dark money and influence and a Republican Party that hops to their tune. So they are not happy either.

That is why they need emergency measures that will guarantee the midterms. That is what we are involved in today—trying to make sure elections are fair, trying to make sure everybody has a shot to vote, trying to make sure—for real—this is an election that reflects what the American people get to choose.

Why are these numbers so terrible for Trump and Republicans? Because things aren't so great for the American people right now. The annual cost of residential electricity is up in almost every State in the last year. In some cases, it is up a lot—\$278, \$210, \$123, \$159, \$171 up in Maine. People under-

stand that their electric bills are going up, and if they are paying attention—if they are paying attention—they understand that their electricity bills are going up because Trump and his administration are deliberately pushing clean energy away from the grid. They are deliberately keeping cheap, clean energy off the grid so that, for any given level of demand, the grid has to go where if it doesn't have the cheap, clean energy? It has to go to the polluting fossil fuel plants.

Those plants set the grid price when they are called up, and when they set the grid price, they are more expensive than clean energy, so everybody's costs go up. All that excess money—the billions of dollars that get sucked out of consumers' pockets, out of ratepayers' pockets when they have to pay the higher prices of fossil fuel compared to the lower prices of clean energy—that whole delta of billions of dollars flows where? Right to Trump's billionaire fossil fuel donors, to the ones that he went to in Mar-a-Lago and said: Give me a billion dollars, and I will give you everything you want. I need your money to win this race.

And what did they do? They coughed up hundreds of millions of dollars. Did they get to the billion? We don't know because so much of the money is so dark. But we know they got hundreds of millions to Trump. Now he is paying them back by stopping and slowing down clean energy, which would lower costs for people, and instead he drives the cost up. That is why so much of this is happening.

I will give you an example. The Trump administration has messed around twice with the offshore wind farm off of Rhode Island called Revolution Wind. Out of the clear, blue sky, for no cause, they dropped a stop work order on the project, stopping it dead when it was about 80-plus percent complete. Well, that caused them a little problem because the Trump administration had been in court defending that very project against fossil fuel front groups who were suing it to slow down its arrival on the grid.

So the lawyers—the regular, normal Federal lawyers who were in there defending this, defending their permit—suddenly had to pull a 180 about the same project, in the same courtroom, and suddenly say "Oh, no. That project we have been defending until this minute is suddenly now all bad" because of this ridiculous stop work order.

Well, the judge didn't take long to throw out that stop work order because it was illegal and even preposterous, and the Trump administration then let the appeal period expire. So there is no longer a time to appeal it. So it is like: OK, that is done. Back to work, everybody.

Sure enough, they went back to work. What happened 30 days later, 2 days before Christmas, without notice? Men and women going out to work on these projects were told: Nope. New

stop work order. Sorry about your Christmas. Not sure when you will ever come back to work. Too bad you were relying on all those nice wages. You are done now.

Well, fortunately for the project, that second stop work order crashed and burned in court just as badly as the first illegal stop work order had.

My point is they went to enormous, illegal effort to slow down that project. Why? Because, by contract, Revolution Wind is going to bring 9-cent kilowatt hours to our Rhode Island grid. Nine-cent kilowatt hours is what they sell for by contract. And how much does it cost on our grid, on average? Eighteen cents. Revolution Wind was going to bring 350,000 homes' worth of low-cost, 9-cent clean power onto our grid, so they wanted to stop it because then, without that clean, inexpensive power, the grid would have to go up, up, up what they call the generation stack, calling up more and more different units to burn gas and oil and make electricity. And all that extra money gets moved from customers' pockets to Trump's big donors, his big fossil fuel donors. It is a scheme. It is on purpose.

These people may not know it yet, but by November, I hope they will learn that the reason their electric rates went up was on purpose—on purpose—so that Trump and his cronies could pay off his big fossil fuel donors with all that extra revenue from their delay and their blocking of cheaper, cleaner energy—in the billions. In the billions.

Of course, it is not just electricity where people know that they have an administration that is not looking out for them but is looking out for the big corporations, the big polluters, the big donors. You probably can't read this, so I will read it.

"My cost of living has increased": 80 to 16.

"My grocery costs have gone up": 79 to 17.

"My utility costs like electricity have gone up": 69 to 22.

These are huge numbers that match the dissatisfaction I showed already with where Trump is—more than 20 points in the hole with voters and going the wrong way, approval rating collapsing before the whole Iran mess has kicked into voters' budgets. It is a real mess.

Our electricity prices, look where they are going—up, up, up, up, up, for the exact reason I said: because the Trump administration is blocking clean, cheap energy to force the grid to have to spend more and more money on Trump's big fossil fuel donors.

When a really big clean energy plant comes onto the grid, the grid moves to it because it is the cheapest. They pull the cheapest power first to meet demand. So when a big wind farm comes on, when a big solar array comes on, that means there is a fossil fuel plant somewhere at the top of that generation stack that doesn't get to run anymore, and the owners of that fossil fuel

plant don't get paid for running it, and the fossil fuel dealers who fuel that plant don't get paid. So they have a vested interest in blocking clean energy, and they are doing it because basically they have infiltrated and occupy the Trump administration.

Just look at the appointees and look at the behavior, and all of it drives costs up. Electricity prices are surging in the United States, and what people are going to understand by November is that those electric prices are surging on purpose. Ratepayers are being dragooned into a scheme to pay back Trump's big donors with their money.

Costs of housing: up, 69 to 21.

Healthcare costs: up, 61 to 26.

Medicaid has been cut. People already know that. Half of the Americans already understand that Medicaid has been cut even though the cuts were postponed until after the election. Wait until they actually land in people's pocketbooks.

Social Security and Medicare have been cut: 42 to 40.

That is where all that is.

But check all of these: cost of living, grocery, utility, housing, healthcare—60 to 80 versus 26 to 16.

The American people know what is going on, they know what is being done to them, and they know who has done it.

So that is why they have just got to make sure only the right people are voting.

We did some work on another big cost area for Americans when I was the chairman of the Budget Committee.

One of the biggest expenditures that a family has is home insurance on their home. It is very expensive, and it is going dramatically up. In some cases, not only are the premiums going dramatically up, but the insurance companies are finding that they can't insure the property any longer; it is too risky.

So the poor owner gets a notice of nonrenewal—that is what it is called. You have been a loyal customer for 15, 20 years, you have made your premium payments on time every time, and the company sends a letter to you in the mail, comes through your mailslot: Sorry. Sorry. We can't insure you any longer. You are going have to find a new insurance company.

This creates a huge hassle in the life of that family, which almost always ends up with a more expensive policy or one with a lot less coverage.

This is happening all over the country, and it is happening because of climate risk. It is happening because along our coasts, the rising sea levels, the warmer oceans, the worse storms, the bigger hurricanes that come ashore are making it impossible for insurers to provide insurance to homeowners.

It is also happening out West, although out West, it is not coastal storms and flooding that are making people's homes uninsurable; it is wildfire.

Whether it is wildfire or whether it is coastal flooding, the cascade is the

same; the dominoes that fall are the same.

First is you have the climate risk. And why do we have the climate risk? We have the climate risk because the fossil industry, which is now running the Trump administration, has spent billions of dollars and decades in Congress making sure we let them pollute for free. And they have won. They have succeeded. It is still free to pollute carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. We have never put a price on carbon emissions.

Nothing else is free to pollute. Nothing should be free to pollute. You don't get to dump chemicals in a river and get away with it just because the river carries it away.

So this homeowners insurance problem is a massive, massive cost problem for homeowners across the country.

Here in Florida—you can see how acute the problem is down in Florida. In Florida, I think we are at \$14,000 average homeowners insurance for a standard \$400,000 policy, and it is predicted, depending on the county you are in, to double, triple, or quadruple.

What does it do to the value of your home when a \$14,000 home insurance cost doubles or triples? What if you now have a \$40,000 instead of a \$14,000 annual carrying cost to own your home? Its value crashes.

That is the cascade. You go from climate risk; to uninsurability; to, oops, now I can't get a mortgage on this property because if you can't insure a property, no one will issue a mortgage on it, to its value crashing, to a recession.

Those warnings are all over the place—and not from Save The Whales, not from the League of Conservation Voters, not from the Sierra Club, but from the former risk manager of Goldman Sachs, from the former head of the Bank of England, from the international Financial Stability Board, from the former Chief Economist of Freddie Mac. The warnings are legion.

Here is another cost that families are more and more dealing with. This is the rate of nonrenewal increase, where the insurance company says: Sorry, your property is now uninsurable—at least by our standards.

Here are nonrenewal rates by State. Again, you see the coastal States hit pretty hard, but there is also wildfire coming in.

This was the work of my Budget Committee. Then some other groups followed up and did some more detailed work.

This is where home insurance premiums are changing. They are already up. What this did was to look forward, not to say "OK, they are up; they have doubled in the last few years" but "Where are they going to go? Where do we predict they will go?" The prediction here is that insurance premiums are going to climb as much as 300 percent in the 30-year period of a mortgage holder buying right now.

What does he have to look forward to? Well, if you are down here and you

are already paying 14,000 bucks a year—it is even more in Miami—and it is going to go up 300 percent, it is going to quadruple, these are people who have a real cost problem now, and they have a real cost problem coming, and behind that comes a real home values problem.

If you are a Palm Beach billionaire and you want to swap mansions, that is fine. You can do that. You don't even need a mortgage; you just pay with cash. But if you are living north of Tampa in a development and you bought your house with a mortgage and you want to sell it, the person you want to sell it to is going to need a mortgage. If your property is now un-mortgageable because it is un-insurable, there goes your market of buyers.

We talked to people in Florida when we did this investigation who literally cannot sell their home at any price. It is not fancy enough for a billionaire, and it is not mortgageable and insurable for a normal person. They are just stuck. They are just stuck.

Here, what the map shows is where they expect to see changes in home value, again, in the next 30 years, in the period of a mortgage entered into at the time, and they are looking at changes in value, dropped 20, 40, 60, 80, and even 100 percent—a total wipeout of home value—based on that home insurance, mortgage, property values cascade because we won't take care of the climate danger that everybody in their right mind knows exists.

The fossil fuel industry has a big reckoning coming from that mess, and they do not want to be responsive to voters. They want the White House and the House and the Senate controlled by a party that they control. They want this election to keep Republicans in power so that they are not held to account for the fraudulent climate denial, for the dark money corruption, and for the looming catastrophe in home insurance rates. And the way they do that is making sure with this bill that “we just make sure only the right people are voting.” So the stakes are very high right now.

I will close, because I think I have the floor only for another few minutes, by talking just briefly about Kansas. Why would a Rhode Islander want to talk about Kansas? I will tell you why. Because they tried this in Kansas. They had a similar law in Kansas, and it went to court, and the court threw it out as unconstitutional. The SAVE America Act resembles a law in Kansas that was decided to be unconstitutional.

There are some other interesting things the court found. Across 19 years, the proponents of that law could only show 67 noncitizens registering to vote or even attempting to register to vote. Over 19 years, 67 people.

If you look just at the Presidential elections in that period, Kansans voted in this number: 5.5 million votes cast. So those 67 people are 0.0012 percent of voters.

For the pretext of trying to deal with those 67 attempts, the effect was to keep 31,000 legitimate Kansas voters from voting—31,000 kept from voting to solve a problem of 67 that didn't even exist because most of them were only attempts.

So this is a solution to a nonproblem. The solution that it provides is to the problem of Trump and Republicans having made such a hash of things that they are now in a 20-plus point hole.

So the billionaires who run the Republican Party and, through the Republican Party, run this body, run the House, run the Oval Office, make all the decisions for their own benefit—this is their clawing hand coming out of what seems like election disaster ahead to try to just grab back the power they are losing because their Republican Party has made such a hash of things. That is what this bill is. It is the dead zombie hand of the billionaires who are seeing the exact same approval rating as Trump taking the Republicans into a crash of an election and trying to solve that problem by guaranteeing the midterms by making sure that just the right people vote.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEE. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

IRAN

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, it has been a long weekend up here. We have a lot of balls in the air. We have DHS funding. We have the SAVE Act and a war going on in the Middle East. All these are demanding our attention simultaneously.

I would like to shed a little light here. What makes this job generally challenging isn't the workload. I worked much harder as an obstetrician delivering a baby most every day, at least every other night if not every night of the every week. It is when you are trying to have serious policy conversations up here and you are up against misinformation, moving goalposts, and arguments that seem completely detached from the facts on the ground. The frustration can be exhausting. But today, I decided to start with the easy stuff.

Let's talk about Iran. First of all, I want to mourn the loss of the 13 soldiers who made the ultimate sacrifice and let their Gold Star families know that we are grateful for the price their loved ones paid and that we will be there for them as they go through their mourning.

I want to praise the military, let them know I stand beside them, that our family stands beside them. My dad served. My brother served. I served. My son is serving. We support our military, and we salute the incredible job they are doing.

Now, as we all know, President Trump had four basic goals when the war started. Don't let the legacy media confuse you. The four basic goals are

basically to end Iran's ability to have missiles and navy nukes and destroy Iran's ability to fund an armed terrorist.

I would say we are 90 percent there. I am not on the Intelligence Committee. I don't have the inside numbers. But it looks like to me we are 90 percent there. Now, I warn folks that the last 10 percent may be as hard as the first 90 percent. But they are doing an incredible job, and we want to do everything we can to make them successful so that we are safe for decades to come.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Next, I want to talk about the SAVE Act just for a minute. As you all know, the SAVE Act has three pillars. It wants to make sure that only citizens register to vote, it wants to make sure every voter has an ID, and we want some guardrails around mail-in ballots.

I think it is important to remember that 70 percent of Democrats and 80 percent of Americans believe in voter ID, and it was just this week that Democrats voted against a stand-alone voter ID law.

And I do want to get back to some of the comments—the erroneous comments—that my colleague from Rhode Island made. You would think he would know better. He is a lawyer. He is a former attorney general.

Kansas did have a law that required you to be a citizen to vote. It did go to the Supreme Court, but the Supreme Court didn't say that was unconstitutional. What they said is: Look, if Congress wants it that way, if your State legislature wants it that way, then you need to legislate it.

And that is what we are doing right here. We are trying to make our elections safer, to make them more secure, to make sure that just American citizens vote.

So be careful—be careful what you are listening to up here. There are absolutely some very erroneous statements and conflation made by people that are smarter than I am when it comes to the law.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. President, I want to sit down and talk a little bit more specifically about DHS funding though.

Again, it is important to remember that it took 18 days for Democrats to respond to the President's offer—18 days, crickets, nothing from the Democrats. That is because they are the party of “defund the police.” They don't want ICE to be working.

And then it took over a month for Democrats to be willing to sit down with Republicans. It has been over a month since DHS was defunded, and it wasn't until later, at the very end of this week, that Democrats were willing to sit down with Republicans to have any type of conversation.

Now, as near as I can tell, there are two issues left separating us from funding DHS—at least on the surface, that is what it looks like to me—that prevent us from funding TSA, from funding FEMA, the Coast Guard, or the cyber security defense team.