

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.

Again, these issues don't happen in silos, right? We have this war in Iran. We don't have DHS funded. I am as worried and concerned about American citizens here at home, about their safety, as I am our soldiers in harm's way overseas.

So there are two issues, at least that is what the Democrats have told us—the two main issues that we haven't figured out here. One is demasking ICE officers, and two is the issue of warrants for those who entered our country illegally.

Let's quickly touch the demasking issue. That is a nonstarter. I am not going to put the families of my ICE agents in harm's way either. That is because, when the names are revealed of these ICE officers, their family back home, their children, their spouses, their lives are being threatened. So we are not going to do that.

I am all for them being more recognizable. I think that is straightforward. But maybe what is not quite as straightforward is this warrant issue. And, again, I have to admit that I needed to try to understand this a little bit better myself—the difference between a judicial warrant versus an administrative warrant.

Now, why is this important? Because I continue to hear arguments in this Chamber that don't square with the facts, and I think the American people deserve to hear the truth about how the immigration enforcement system actually works.

Now, as you know, my Democrat colleagues want to overhaul—really, they want to destroy—the warrant system that ICE uses to arrest or remove people in this country illegally. Now, on the surface, maybe that sounds like a good idea, and it is certainly worth discussing. But when you really take a close look at the law—and, remember, I am just a country doctor, and I am the last one that needs to be up here pontificating about our legal system when it comes to immigration. But I think it is important that even I, as a country doctor, understand that their case evaporates when you look at the truth.

Now, here is what the current court system requires. Before ICE makes an interior arrest, officers must have probable cause. That is an important fact to remember—the term “probable cause.” It is a legal standard as old as our Republic that the person in front of them is removable under the Federal law, that they have probable cause to remove this person.

Now, they have to document that. It is reviewable. It is not a rubberstamp. These ICE officers would lose their jobs if they didn't follow this protocol. It is no different than when a highway patrolman pulls you over for speeding. He or she has to have probable cause. They can't just pull you over because you have a hat on or because you have sunglasses on. They need to have some type of probable cause. Maybe you didn't use your blinkers when you

changed lanes. But they have to have probable cause.

Now, some of my colleagues are blurring a very important distinction, and it is worth clearing up: the difference between a judicial warrant and an administrative warrant. A judicial warrant is issued by a Federal judge in a criminal proceeding. An administrative warrant is issued by a trained Federal officer in a civil process.

Immigration enforcement has always been civil, not criminal. There are different tools for different systems, and conflating them, as my colleagues are across the aisle, once again—again, they are all lawyers. They all should know this better than I do. So they are purposely deceiving the public—or, at least, a deliberate attempt to confuse the public.

Let me be direct about what an administrative warrant does not authorize. It does not allow ICE to enter a private home. It does not allow them to walk in the back of a business or workplace.

Let me emphasize this: Without either the owner's consent or a judicial warrant signed by a Federal judge, the door stays closed. These limits are very real. They are enforceable, and they are already built into the system.

Now, I think there are two situations that exist, for the most part, when ICE officers work inside the country.

Now, one, the first bucket is for someone who has already been through the immigration court. They have had a full hearing before an immigration judge. They have made their arguments. They could appeal if they chose to. And a final removal order was entered. Then ICE executes that order. This is one way the administrative order is used. The due process has already happened in an immigration court with an immigration judge presiding.

Demanding a second judicial signoff at that point isn't protecting anyone's rights. It is running out the clock, and we all know it.

So that is the first bucket. Someone has been through this entire process. They have had an immigration judge make the decision, but instead of leaving the country like they were supposed to, they are still inside the country, and our ICE officers are charged with removing that person.

Now, here is the second bucket. For those immigrants who haven't yet been through the proceedings—and, again, they are in the country illegally to start with, right. For those who haven't been through the proceedings, ICE makes an administrative arrest, but they have probable cause to start with. They have probable cause. They make an administrative arrest, and then they make a notice to appear before an immigration judge, typically months or years down the line, unfortunately.

The person gets their day in court. They get a lawyer. They present evidence. They could appeal all the way to a Federal circuit court.

Now, that is due process, right? It is quite an expense for the American people to pay for, and it is also a risk to the American public by allowing these people to stay in our Nation, many times with social services paid for by Americans. But it certainly is due process.

Guess what. This system has been in place for decades. It has been upheld by Federal courts. It was used by administrative courts of both parties, including the ones my colleagues across the aisle seem to remember so fondly.

The Supreme Court has affirmed the broad authority Congress delegated to immigration enforcement officers. It is not a gray area. This is settled law being relitigated for their own political purposes.

Now, I will grant this: There are real problems out there, and they are worth fixing. Immigration courts are backlogged. Detention facilities are strained.

If my colleagues want to fund the courts, clear the backlog, and strengthen the legal representation for those in proceedings, now that we have our border secure and we have stopped the hemorrhaging, then count me in. Let's make this broken system better.

But it is not the issue at hand. It is not the warrant issue. There is a significant difference between saying the system needs more resources and saying the system is unconstitutional.

Let me say that again, there is a big difference between saying the system needs more resources versus saying the system is unconstitutional. One is a policy debate. The other is not supported by facts, the law, or decades of court decisions.

Now, back home in Kansas, we have a simple standard: If the fence is doing its job, you don't tear it down. If a gate is broken, you fix it. If the fence posts are leaning, you straighten them out. You don't have to come bulldoze the whole fence and call it progress.

The warrant system is doing its job. It is grounded in probable cause. It provides due process. It has been tested in court, and it has upheld, and it keeps us safe. So let's stop pretending otherwise.

It all makes you wonder. It really does make you wonder: What do the Democrats really want? Their arguments disappear when it comes to the two things they are talking about, when it comes to the warrant issue or demasking. What is it that they really want?

We have to be concerned. Is it that they want these 30 million illegal aliens in this country to be given amnesty? Is that really their goal here? Is that really their goal? Why don't they just say it? Why don't they just come out and say it?

The Democrats, what they really want, is for 30 million illegal aliens to be given amnesty so they can vote.

It is time we demask the Democrats who are telling false misrepresentations of immigration law, and fund DHS.

It is time to get the SAVE Act across the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, first let me commend my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE for his excellent remarks that show all the dangers of the SAVE Act. And like my colleague, I rise today to speak out against the deceptively named SAVE America Act, a bill that would create new barriers for American citizens to exercise their most important right: the right to vote.

The success of our Nation, both as a source of opportunity for all Americans and as an inspiration for freedom-loving people everywhere, has depended upon strong civic engagement from all Americans. When more Americans vote, our government is more representative of the people. It is more responsive to their needs. It has more legitimacy, and it is a better steward of their tax dollars and public resources.

I am here to support laws that make it easier for American citizens to vote. The SAVE America Act will not do that. In fact, it will suppress the right to vote.

The SAVE Act is being portrayed as a simple voter ID bill that is supported by a vast majority of Americans. If the bill simply required every American to show an ID at the polls, then I would not be ringing such a loud alarm.

I represent a State that has a sensible voter ID law and that regularly reviews its voter rolls. This approach has been extremely effective.

The SAVE Act does not simply require everyone to prove their identity when they vote; instead, it requires them to prove their citizenship at the time of registration.

Now, that sounds very simple and very appealing, and people might ask: What is the difference if you have to prove citizenship to register versus showing your ID at the polling place? But as I will explain, proving citizenship at the time of registration requires a total and complete overhaul of our election system and will force millions of American citizens to scramble to gather the right documentation—if they can ever do so at all—while imposing very costly and burdensome unfunded mandates on the States.

That is a charitable version, which assumes that this bill is a good-faith effort to improve election integrity and security. But make no mistake, this bill is a bad-faith effort to help Donald Trump and his potential successors stay in power no matter what the voters say in 2026 and 2028. It is loaded up with additional measures that allow the Federal Government, under his control, to deter people from voting and then to challenge people's votes after they are cast.

It is designed to make people fearful that our elections are not safe and secure. That includes every single election that my current colleagues won. Now, if our elections are so rife with

cheating and fraud, as my Republican colleagues would lead you to believe, then do they also think their own election victories are tainted or illegitimate? I think this is a question that the sponsors of the SAVE Act need to answer before we vote.

Here is how the SAVE Act bolsters the tremendous power and resources of the Federal Government and places them at Donald Trump's disposal.

The bill compels the States to share their most sensitive information—their full voter rolls—with the Department of Homeland Security, a Department that has flagrantly violated the American people's civil liberties under the Trump administration.

The bill requires the States to review their voter rolls and purge them of people who have not shown "documentary proof of citizenship," which, based on current law, could encompass millions of law-abiding American citizens. That is right. Technically, millions of Americans could be wiped off the rolls as soon as this bill is passed and signed.

The bill establishes a private right of action allowing anyone to challenge a State official for registering voters that the litigant believes are illegitimate, which means every American's registration is now at risk of being questioned or invalidated. This will open the floodgates to thousands, perhaps millions, of frivolous cases and tangle every election up in knots with never-ending litigation. Indeed, given the record of filing outlandish lawsuits after the 2020 election, it is not hard to imagine that Donald Trump will use this law to contest the registration of everyone he believes is opposed or at least in areas the election is expected to be close.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED. No, I will not yield.

By the way, these mandates and requirements would be effective immediately, meaning they must be implemented for the 2026 election, which, I should point out, is already underway. There are primaries that have been completed in several States, and one could raise issues, if this bill passes, on the outcome of those primaries simply by invoking what the SAVE Act does, which is to question the validity of one's citizenship.

Of course, there is no one better suited to exploit this confusion and chaos than Donald Trump. That is how he has operated as a businessman, as a candidate, and as an elected official. When the bogus suits on the 2020 election results that he and his surrogates filed failed in court after court—62 times—he fomented an insurrection on January 6, 2021, in an effort to cling to power illegitimately.

On that day, 46 of my Republican colleagues had the fortitude to say no to Trump and voted to certify the election, which means they acknowledge the fact that Trump won in 2020. Today, many of these colleagues are prepared to hand Trump powerful new

tools to subvert free and fair elections. They know what Trump will do with this power, but they are willing to hand it to him anyway.

President Trump said that he wants the Federal Government, under his command, to "take over" elections and "nationalize the voting." The SAVE Act is the vehicle for him to do that.

Does anyone really believe that Donald Trump—the man who stoked that insurrection in which we all fled for safety off this floor, a man who has never accepted an electoral defeat even when the other candidate got more votes—all of a sudden genuinely cares about election integrity? Nobody should be fooled into thinking that.

Since the Civil War until now, our history has been all about securing the right to vote for all Americans—women, African Americans, and young people who could be called upon to fight and die for their country.

Now the Party of Lincoln has shed its proud legacy by advancing policies that would disqualify tens of millions of Americans from voting.

If the SAVE Act is enacted, it will be the latest assault on voting rights that we have seen under the Trump administration through partisan gerrymandering, which he insisted upon and which was unique—perhaps unprecedented historically—of a President asking to redistrict before the 10-year census window, the deadly insurrection of January 6, as I mentioned, and the subsequent mass pardons of those individuals who tried to overturn an election. Also looming in the background is the Supreme Court, which has gutted campaign finance laws, nullified key parts of the Voting Rights Act, and declined to prevent gerrymandering that has interfered with the bedrock principle of "one person, one vote."

Let me now discuss the specific reasons that the SAVE Act is so dangerous and why I will oppose it.

Simply put, the SAVE Act could disenfranchise tens of millions of Americans, and I cannot support any bill that makes it harder for law-abiding American citizens to vote.

Now, I can see people saying: What is the big deal about making someone show ID?

Well, like many slick sales pitches, this policy is really a bunch of "gotchas" that will stand between millions of voters and the ballot box.

Under current law, a vast majority of Americans vote by attesting to their citizenship and by showing a government-issued photo identification card—usually a driver's license—showing that person listed on the voter rolls is the person who is actually casting the vote. The penalties for violating these requirements are severe. This has made the system simple and secure. Indeed, instances of voter fraud are so rare that calling them minuscule would be a gross overestimate.

But under the SAVE Act, a person will need to demonstrate their citizenship in order to register to vote. That

can be accomplished only through either a U.S. passport or through a government-issued photo identification card plus a birth certificate with a name that matches what is on the photo ID.

According to the Brennan Center, more than 9 percent of voting-age Americans—those are 21 million people—don't have documents sufficient to prove their citizenship at this time, either a passport or a birth certificate that is readily available. Maybe they are at the home of another family member or are stored in a safety deposit box. And 4 million Americans don't have these documents available at all for many different reasons. Maybe they were lost, destroyed, or stolen. These millions of Americans are most at risk of being prevented from voting.

Americans can, of course, use a passport as documentary proof of citizenship, but more than half of Americans—an estimated 150 million to 200 million citizens—do not have a passport, and to get one, you need to find your birth certificate and a government-issued photo ID, submit the paperwork, pay \$165, and then wait a month for it to arrive, which would really bother someone who suddenly, in October, decides that they must vote, and they are legally entitled to do so but can't get a passport.

Proponents of the bill say that Americans can just use a REAL ID to satisfy the requirement. This is a State-issued driver's license which complies with Federal security standards established after 9/11 to limit counterfeiting; and the SAVE Act does say that a REAL ID is acceptable. It says we will accept the REAL ID so long as it "indicates the applicant is a citizen of the United States," but that is a false premise.

Fifteen secretaries of state, including Gregg Amore of Rhode Island, wrote:

REAL IDs do not indicate citizenship status. Even if the federal laws for REAL ID were amended, the nearly 140 million REAL IDs that have been issued over the last decade could not be used as proof of citizenship.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the secretary of state of Rhode Island be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,

February 12, 2025.

SENATORS REED AND WHITEHOUSE AND CONGRESSMEN AMO AND MAGAZINER: I write to urge you to vote against the federal legislation known as the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility (SAVE) Act should it come to a floor vote. Passage of this Act would threaten one of the most core principles of our democracy—our right to make our voices heard—by making access to the ballot box more difficult for millions of Americans. The SAVE Act is creating mistrust in our elections and solving a problem that simply doesn't exist. The Act's main objective is to require election officials to verify proof of American citizenship at the time of voter

registration, positioned as a solution to the false notion that non-citizens are voting in American elections in great numbers.

This Act deviates from pro-voter and pro-democracy policies that make it easier for people to cast a ballot by placing an undue burden on voters. The law is already clear. The United States Constitution, Rhode Island Constitution, and Rhode Island General Laws all explicitly state that only eligible United States citizens are permitted to vote in federal elections. It is a felony for a non-US citizen to cast a ballot in an American election.

Should the Act pass, the two most common ways an individual would be able to prove their citizenship would be by supplying a US passport or birth certificate. *USA Today* reports that only 51% of Americans have a US passport, and the Brennan Center indicates that nine percent of adults (21.3 million people) don't have proof of citizenship readily available. Additionally, millions of Americans, mainly spouses who have changed their name after marriage, currently have a different name than what is reflected on their birth certificate.

Individuals who do not have the required documentation would need to pay the associated fees to obtain those documents. Currently, the cost is \$165 for a Passport Book/\$65 for a Passport card. In the city of Providence, a birth certificate costs \$22. This is a clear violation of the 24th Amendment to the United States Constitution, effectively creating a poll tax in order for eligible citizens to participate in an election. In addition to placing a monetary burden on voters, this Act creates an unfunded mandate on election officials. The Act provides no funding for changes to voter registration systems and voter registration forms, or resources for a robust education campaign to ensure voters understand the dangerous changes this Act makes.

As a government by and for the people, it is imperative that we work together to resist legislation that disenfranchises our constituents and creates barriers for voters and election officials. As Rhode Island's chief elections official, I am available to provide any assistance you may need in that effort. If you have any questions, please contact Deputy Secretary of State Rob Rock.

Sincerely,

GREGG M. AMORE.

Mr. REED. Now, in Texas, for example, to get a REAL ID, an applicant "must provide proof of lawful presence in the United States." That is according to the instructions to form DL-53, which is the document the Texas Department of Public Safety uses to inform noncitizens of the documentation that they can use to get a REAL ID. Yes, that is correct. You don't need to be a citizen to get a REAL ID in Texas. For example, individuals seeking asylum are eligible for a Texas REAL ID if they provide "immigration documentation with an alien number." So non-citizens who are ineligible to vote can still get REAL IDs. By the way, a REAL ID issued by Texas does not indicate the holder's country of citizenship. So, in Texas, having a REAL ID won't allow you to register to vote under the SAVE Act.

Now, some people may still think that it is easier to get acceptable documents and register to vote in person, but that hasn't been the experience of my constituent who wrote me:

My wife is a native Rhode Islander. We just secured a certified copy of her [Rhode Island]

birth certificate from the State Archives a few weeks ago—primarily to ensure that she's able to vote in 2026 and beyond. The fact that we're forced to think about obtaining certified birth certificates as a precondition of voting is completely antithetical to our actual right to vote.

Now, if you don't have money to spare to get the proper documents, if you can't easily get to your town hall to fill in the gaps in your paperwork, if you are just too busy living your life, what are you to do? Faced with these barriers, you may just give up and not vote at all.

Let me tick through the Americans who will be the most directly affected if this legislation passes.

First, there are 69 million women who have changed their names after getting married. Their birth certificates do not reflect that change. While many of them have access to their original birth certificates, that alone would not be enough to register under the SAVE Act. They will also need to produce official documentation that their name has changed and matches what is on their current government-issued photo ID.

Now, if you have been divorced and remarried, good luck getting all that together. This isn't just a barrier for recently married women who haven't gotten around to updating their papers. Women of all ages will be affected.

Another one of my constituents reported an enormous headache with just proving her identity in order to get a REAL ID. And, mind you, a REAL ID is just a modern driver's license that doesn't even indicate citizenship status.

As a divorced woman it took me 3 visits to get my Real ID. The first time I did not realize I needed my marriage certificate. The second time, I brought the divorce decree and it was not accepted. The third time, I had to go to the town hall and have my marriage certificate made. This bill is so damaging to the women of this country.

Can you imagine the hardship that many other women will have to go through not only to get a REAL ID but also to document their citizenship under the system established by the SAVE Act?

Another one of my constituents has similar fears about her elderly mother being turned away from the polls:

If the SAVE Act gets passed, my husband and I still have the ability to vote. But my 85-year-old mother will not. She does not have a passport and changed her name when she married my father in 1964. Please do not let Trump do this to our female voters.

These barriers aren't being faced just by women in blue States. They are being felt in red States too. Take Brandi Halladay from Utah—Senator LEE's home State. She wrote a letter to the editor of the Salt Lake Tribune on March 15:

When my 80-year-old mother moved to Utah, she needed to get a new ID and register to vote. She had to show a birth certificate, her marriage license to my father, her divorce papers from my father (in which she kept his last name to match that of her children) and then her marriage license to her second husband.

This was the only way to trace the name on her birth certificate to her current last name.

This took two trips to the DMV, which was not an easy task for someone of her age who uses a walker, and she was fortunate to have my help in tracking down the relevant documents.

Now imagine trying to do this for a person who may have moved frequently over the course of their lives and has lost documents along the way. They will need to contact various offices, possibly across many states and request the appropriate documentation which may also require fees that they may not be able to afford. And imagine someone working two jobs while trying to raise a family needing to do this.

Now, my colleague from Utah has sought to minimize these burdens. He has pointed to text in the bill, specifically page 14, line 15, purporting to say that “if you don’t have documentation, you don’t have a problem” and that you can register “without a single additional document other than what you provide to the government in the form of a sworn affidavit under penalty of perjury.”

So if this is true, then what is the purpose of this bill? What the Senator from Utah described is basically the current system, at least in Rhode Island.

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

Mr. REED. I will not.

But this is not the way the bill works. If you review the specific page and line that Senator LEE has referenced, page 14, line 15, and just look a few lines further in that same direction—specifically page 15, line 6—the bill says that anyone submitting a sworn affidavit must also “submit such other evidence to the appropriate State or local official demonstrating that the applicant is a citizen of the United States and such official will make a determination as to whether the applicant has sufficiently established United States citizenship.”

This section further requires the State or local official to then file their own affidavit that “the applicant has sufficiently established United States’ citizenship.” And if that official makes an improper determination, then he or she could be put in jail for 5 years. All I am doing is reading the words on the page that we are being asked to enact into law. I am trying to take a textualist approach and derive the original meaning.

So this purported exception to alleviate the gross injustice that this bill would inflict upon the 69 million women who have changed their names and the 21 million Americans without ready access to the papers, well, this exception wouldn’t deliver them any relief at all. They still must show their papers—which exact ones, no one can say. It will be subject to the decision of the clerk who is attesting to it. Asking the clerk to risk 5 years in jail simply for permission to register to vote doesn’t sound like much relief at all. It is another “gotcha.”

Second, young Americans in college will face issues at the polls. The 26th

Amendment lowered the voting age from 21 to 18. This was a critical reform in the Vietnam war era that embodied a simple principle: If you are old enough to fight, you are old enough to vote. It is the height of hypocrisy to place barriers to vote in front of any American citizen who puts his life on the line to keep us safe.

Well, in Rhode Island, which has a voter ID law, a college ID is sufficient to show at the polls when voting. But through the SAVE Act, that Rhode Island law would be invalidated; a college ID is not on the list of “valid photo identification” in the SAVE Act. And I will bet there are very few college-age students bringing their birth certificates with them to school. At their parents’ rightful insistence, these documents are probably kept locked away at home. And very few college students go through the trouble of getting a local driver’s license because they only are temporarily living where they attend school. So young Americans may disproportionately get turned away, maybe be denied the right to participate in civic life, even though they have so much riding on it.

Concerns that many Americans will be stripped of their voting rights are not theoretical or hypothetical. We have seen this play out very recently. In 2013, Kansas implemented a State version of the SAVE Act. According to the Associated Press, it was “one of the biggest political fiascos in the state in recent memory.” In other words, it was a total failure, and we are on the verge of replicating that failure nationwide. It was such a failure because over 30,000 Kansans—that is 12 percent of everyone seeking to register—saw their registration suspended or invalidated. Fortunately, in 2018, the court stepped in and invalidated the Kansas law before it could do more damage.

As Trump and the Republicans are purportedly trying to do now, Kansas was trying to prevent noncitizens from voting. It turns out that this is a completely illusory problem. In Kansas, only three noncitizens registered to vote each year from 1999 through 2012. That is a total of 39—or 0.002 percent—of all registered voters. The court found that these were nominal cases, explained by administrative error and confusion. And of the 39, only 11 actually voted.

When invalidating the Kansas law, the court found the following fundamental and fatal flaws:

The law had acted as a deterrent to registration and voting for substantially more eligible Kansans than it has prevented ineligible voters from registering to vote. At least one applicant testified that he opted not to apply to register to vote again, despite possessing documentary proof of citizenship, because of the burdensome experience of being held in suspense and prevented from voting in 2014 due to the law.

Based on this record, the magnitude of the burden on unregistered eligible Kansas voters cannot be justified. The evidence at trial demonstrated that the documentary proof of

citizenship law disproportionately impacts duly qualified registration applicants, while only nominally preventing noncitizen voter registration. It also may have the inadvertent effect of eroding, instead of maintaining, confidence in the electoral system.

Imagine disqualifying 30,000 legitimate Kansas voters because, over a 13-year period, a total of 39 noncitizens were mistakenly added to the voting rolls. This unfortunate episode in Kansas is a cautionary tale for us here in Congress. We should learn from their mistake. We should be humbled by their mistake. And, more importantly, we should not repeat their mistake. In Kansas, it made no sense to punish 30,000 law-abiding American citizens who wanted to vote, just to prevent 11 noncitizens from voting.

The way to solve this election problem of noncitizen voting is simply to enforce existing Federal and State law, that only U.S. citizens are allowed to vote, with strong penalties for non-compliance. Under Federal law, it is a felony for noncitizens to vote. Section 1015 of title XVIII of the U.S. Code states that:

Whoever knowingly makes any false statement or claim that he is a citizen of the United States in order to register to vote or to vote in any Federal, State, or local election (including an initiative, recall, or referendum) shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

The Rhode Island Constitution states, “Every citizen of the United States of the age of eighteen (18) years or over who has had residence and home in this state for thirty (30) days next preceding the time of voting, who has resided thirty (30) days in the town or city from which such citizen desires to vote” is eligible to vote.

Under current law, to register in Rhode Island, all voters must attest to their U.S. citizenship. They must “swear or affirm that I am a U.S. citizen.” Then check a “yes” or “no” box for whether they are a citizen of the United States. They are warned on the registration form—a simple, one-page document—that “if you sign this form and know it to be false, you can be convicted and fined up to \$5,000 or jailed for up to 10 years.” And then to vote in Rhode Island, all voters must show a valid photo ID.

These laws are enforced. They are an effective deterrent. They have made our elections safe and secure, and that is why noncitizen voting is so rare. According to Christine Stenning, the President of the League of Women Voters in Rhode Island, “There is no evidence that noncitizen voting has ever been significant enough to impact an election’s outcome.”

Research from the Heritage Foundation, perhaps a preeminent Trump-aligned conservative think tank, found only 77 instances of noncitizen voting from 1999 until 2023, each of which was investigated by the authority. That is 77 out of hundreds of millions, maybe even more than a billion, votes cast during this time period. During the

2016 election, an exhaustive study by the Brennan Center found that at least 30 cases of noncitizen voting were referred for investigation.

And in Trump's first term, 2017 through 2021, only 19 people were indicted for voting without U.S. citizenship. In 2024, the numbers looked very similar. The top election official in Utah reviewed all 2.1 million registered voters and found just one "confirmed noncitizen" registered to vote, and that person never voted. In Idaho, officials found 36 "very likely" registered noncitizens, and not all of them voted. The secretary of state of Idaho said that "out of the million-plus registered voters we started with, we're down to 10 thousandths of a percent" of the overall count—"10 thousandths of a percent."

In Louisiana, investigators found 390 noncitizen registrants out of 2.9 million. Only 79 had voted in an election over the last several decades; in Montana, only 23 possible noncitizen registrants out of approximately 785,000; in Georgia, only 20 out of 8.2 million; in Maricopa County, AZ, only 2 out of 2.5 million.

Now, none of these people should have registered or voted, and they should be punished for breaking the law, but we are talking about a handful of votes. We do not need a complete overhaul of our election system and to potentially strip millions of American citizens' voting rights when the evidence demonstrates that this purported issue is already addressed by current law.

According to an op-ed by Stephen Richer of the Cato Institute, a famously conservative and Republican-leaning think tank, the results of these State investigations, in his words, "affirm what is simply common sense. People largely aren't willing to risk their status in the United States—the land of economic opportunity—for the ability to cast one more vote out of hundreds of thousands or millions in a state and hundreds of millions in the country."

The Wall Street Journal editorial page, a loudspeaker for conservative views, similarly said about the SAVE Act:

Although Mr. Trump insists that voter fraud is endemic, his big claims aren't backed by hard evidence. The President recently said illegal aliens are voting in such huge numbers that he won Minnesota three times.

Audits in a variety of places—Georgia, Michigan, Texas, Utah, Idaho—have found noncitizen voting and registration to be rare. Other states might be worse, but consider incentives: Illegal immigrants who want to stay are trying to be avoid being noticed by the authorities. Green card holders have much to lose if they commit a crime. Prosecuting violations is good for deterrence, and vigilance is important.

Now, you might be thinking that you are a law-abiding citizen or have lived in the same neighborhood for decades and, therefore, you have nothing to worry about if the SAVE Act were en-

acted—not so. Even if you have been registered for decades and voted without issue, you still should be worried about what the SAVE Act means for you. States would be required to report their full voter rolls to the Department of Homeland Security and certify that there are no noncitizens on their list. And the Federal Government can require then States to purge their voter rolls of any suspected noncitizens.

Think about it this way: The Department that maintains the "no fly" list, which often misidentifies people, will be now maintaining a no vote list. What could go wrong?

There is not a single State that commonly requires documentary proof of citizenship on par with the SAVE Act. So how will the States be able to meet this new mandate and avoid voter purges? The short answer is: They can't—at least not easily. So there is a real risk that States will take a conservative approach to compliance and require all their voters to reregister with documentary proof of citizenship.

In addition, the SAVE Act does not contain any express language protecting voters who have already registered under the current system, so there is also a risk that Trump's DOJ could use authority under the SAVE Act to find a State's entire voter roll-out of compliance with the "documentary proof" of citizenship requirement.

If that happens, someone who has voted for decades, and lived in the same home, could be forced to reregister.

Consider those 30,000 U.S. citizens in Kansas who were in the exact same boat and were denied the ability to register to vote. If you can't furnish the required documentation or you are busy and miss the window to reregister, well, you simply won't be able to vote in the 2026 election and maybe beyond that.

The SAVE Act will centralize all States' voter rolls in a Federal Government database. According to the Campaign Legal Center, "this is a plain attempt to bully states into sharing voters' sensitive personal information with the Federal Government. Making matters worse, the SAVE America Act places no restrictions on what the Federal government can do with the sensitive data once DHS receives it."

That is sensitive personal information for around 75 percent of the Nation's adults. The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights has said that "DHS's desire to turn the SAVE program into a de facto national citizen registry raises significant civil liberties concerns."

My Republican colleagues should tell the American people whether this invasion of privacy is worth it. I do not personally believe that it is.

Such a database is an irresistible one-stop shop for hackers and foreign governments to steal America's most sensitive personal information.

Again, this is not a theoretical concern. A whistleblower report from last

week alleged that a former DOGE representative with "God-level access" to Social Security Administration servers copied data onto a thumb drive and planned to share it with a private employer.

The data allegedly included the "Numident" and the "Master Death File" containing more than 500 million living and dead Americans, including Social Security numbers, places and dates of birth, citizenship, race and ethnicity, and parents' names.

We have seen the current administration be incredibly sloppy and careless with classified information, from then-former President Trump taking documents with security classification markings to Mar-a-Lago and storing them in his bathroom to the current Secretary of Defense sharing military strike plans via Signal with a journalist.

In 2015, the Office of Personnel Management announced that it had been a target of a data breach targeting over 22 million records involving security clearances in which Social Security numbers, names, dates and places of birth, and addresses were exfiltrated by hackers working on behalf of the Chinese Government.

Now, ask yourself if you would trust Secretary Noem and Attorney General Bondi to keep the personal information of the 200 million registered voters safe. Would you trust them with your name, address, date of birth, driver's license number, and biometric information like height, weight, hair color, and eye color? The SAVE Act asks you to place that trust in them. I personally would not.

So the SAVE Act centralizes election administration with the Federal Government. It reveals another fatal flaw in the bill which, again, replicates mistakes and the problems with the Kansas law. It is this centralization that makes the SAVE Act, in my view, unconstitutional.

Article I, section 4 of the Constitution reads:

The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators.

So the Constitution says that the States play a role in election administration. It says the Congress place a role in election administration. It does not say anything about the Executive branch playing a role in election administration. And yet that is exactly what the SAVE Act would do. It gives DOJ and DHS, which are part of the Executive branch, immense power to determine the sufficiency of State voter registration laws and then to mess around with State procedures to actually conduct elections.

The Wall Street Journal editorial page said March 18 that:

The decentralized nature of American elections is a source of resilience, and Republicans rightly opposed President Biden's attempt to federalize voting rules on the lax

California model. Have they given up federalist principles?

Well, it appears they have.

Now, one could argue that if the Congress intervenes, then the constitutional requirement is met, but we have seen daily this administration ignore Congress, ignore the law, and ignore the Constitution. This will be a pass for President Trump to exploit the elections that are before us.

And you can bet that there will be lawsuits initiated as soon as the ink is dry with President Trump's signature. And before the Supreme Court ultimately weighs in, there will be litigation in district courts and the appellate courts across the country.

There will be conflicting rulings, and the constitutionality of the SAVE Act will almost certainly not be resolved before the 2026 election—possibly not even until the 2028 election. In the meantime, there will be mass confusion about the rules that govern those elections.

And the 2026 elections, as I said, are already underway. At least six States have already had their primary elections. If the rules suddenly change or there are mass purges of the voter rolls between the primary elections and the general elections, then that will undermine the integrity of the election far more than the illusory problem of non-citizen voting.

In addition to these constitutional infirmities, there are tremendous unfunded mandates and burdens that will be placed on the States if this law is enacted.

According to Rhode Island secretary of state Gregg Amore, the State government would need to change its voter systems and forms. It may need to purchase new voting machines and equipment, and it would need to pursue a significant public outreach campaign to educate voters about changes in the law. But the SAVE Act provides zero dollars to cover these costs. States and localities will need to cover this unfunded mandate, and that means higher taxes or more debt.

With regard to Rhode Island, first, Rhode Island would be required under the SAVE Act to essentially eliminate registration by mail and online. Under current law, any Rhode Islander can print and then fill out a voter registration form, get their signature notarized, and mail it to their town hall or they can complete the process entirely online—they can do it entirely online. The SAVE Act requires anyone who registers by mail to also present documentary proof of citizenship in person at the election office by the registration deadline. While the election is silent about online registration, I am assuming the same rule applies.

So Rhode Islanders will need to spend precious time and inconvenience to go in person to show their proof of citizenship, which means that this process of mail-in registration will be practically eliminated.

As I said at the beginning of these remarks, what I would like to see is to

make voting easier for American citizens, not to give my constituents yet another headache, place additional demands on their time, and impose, frankly, ridiculous government mandates—especially when it comes to exercising their fundamental rights to vote.

Second, Rhode Island would need to narrow its list of acceptable photo ID to present at the polls when voting. Rhode Island law permits voters at the polls to verify their registration and identity through ID cards that are issued by educational institutions and government-issued medical cards. The SAVE Act would not permit these cards.

Rhode Island currently permits voting without photo identification if accompanied by a birth certificate, Social Security card, or government-issued medical card. The SAVE Act does not permit nonphoto IDs to vote under any circumstances.

This example alone should shred any notion that the SAVE Act is a simple voter ID law. If it were, then the very sensible procedures currently used in Rhode Island would be acceptable. They have been in operation since 2012 without any issues. And yet, my Republican colleagues would meddle in them for no discernible and compelling reason.

Third, Rhode Island would need to submit its own voter rolls to DHS and purge anyone suspected of being a non-citizen within 30 days of enactment and then on an ongoing basis. The State must submit its voter rolls to the DHS "SAVE" system to identify noncitizens and then purge them from its rolls. Anyone identified as a noncitizen who believes that is a mistake must meet the new documentary proof of citizenship requirement and reregister.

Rhode Island and many other States—red States and blue States alike—are actively litigating with DOJ to rebuff the Federal Government's attempts to obtain its voter rolls. DOJ hasn't even said why it wants this information. Nobody should believe it is for any legitimate purpose.

DOJ has been losing in court, and this legislation would essentially end this litigation against the States' interests. DOJ should be defending what it is doing in court, not coming to Congress for a bailout, nor should we give them a bailout.

This meddling by the Federal Government is completely unnecessary. Rhode Island already undergoes regular voter maintenance efforts. A statewide voter mailing in 2020 ultimately resulted in 60,619 inactive voter registrations being removed from the State's voter list. Since 2023, election officials in Rhode Island have removed 107,738 voters from the voter lists through maintenance and processes.

In November 2025, the Rhode Island secretary of state launched the latest effort to ensure the State's rolls are accurate. The government mailed every single registered voter in the State

asking them to review the information in their voter record and update any inaccurate or outdated information.

Rhode Island is already a participant in information-sharing agreements to identify potential instances of election fraud through the Electronic Registration Information Center or ERIC, which 25 States use for voter list maintenance and identification of potential instances of election fraud. Our States are constantly and actively determining that their rolls do not contain people ineligible to vote.

Fourth, Rhode Islanders will need to pay to comply with the new Federal mandates. The State, as I indicated, must conduct a marketing campaign to ensure that Rhode Islanders are aware of the requirement to provide documentary proof of citizenship to register. The State must notify every person who registers by mail of the requirement to provide documentary proof of citizenship prior to voting. The State must change its registration forms and its signage at the polls. As noted above, the State must review its entire voter rolls for citizen status.

So the SAVE Act says that Rhode Island—a State where noncitizen voting is punishable by 10 years in prison and where everyone must show ID at the polls—would need to radically overhaul its voting system and pass those costs on to the taxpayers in order to meet new Federal mandates.

The proposal on the table is to throw out State rules about voter ID and require what is effectively a national ID, while ignoring current law that already makes it a serious crime for non-citizens to vote. That is a raw deal to fix a nonexistent problem.

This is so dangerous because it will break a system that successfully prevents fraud and replace it with one that makes it harder for American citizens to exercise their constitutional right to vote.

So why are they doing this? The real reason, in my view, is to support Trump's Big Lie that the 2020 election was stolen, even though he lost by 7 million votes and even though 46 of my Republican colleagues voted to certify the election.

They are doing this in service of President Trump's ego and his insatiable desire for power—power that he is using to take revenge on his political enemies and reward his political allies; power that he is using to personally enrich himself and his cronies through corrupt business deals, while he leaves the American people holding the bag through his tariffs; power that he is using to no longer provide Medicaid to children and seniors, while funding yet another "forever war" in the Middle East; and power that he is using to remain above the law, immune from prosecution, based on a sweeping Supreme Court ruling that he is protected so long as he is President.

Let's examine the record of how Trump is executing this power grab. It is systemic. It began on day one, and this is a component of that effort.

He has gutted the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, or CISA, which is part of the Department of Homeland Security that defends our Nation's infrastructure from cyber attacks. This includes all kinds of election components, including voter registration databases, voting machines, and related IT systems.

Congress created CISA during Trump's first term to avoid a repeat of the 2016 election, in which the Russian Government sowed misinformation to aid the Trump campaign. CISA provides election offices nationwide with intelligence briefings and cyber security systems. In 2023 and 2024, it conducted 700 cyber security assessments for local election jurisdictions across the country.

But upon returning to office, Trump immediately froze all CISA election security work. DOGE cut 130 employees from CISA, including its election security advisers. Trump dismissed the head of the National Security Agency and the U.S. Cyber Command, which provide crucial intelligence to CISA regarding foreign cyber threats to election infrastructure. Trump terminated or cut funding for the public-private and State-Federal partnerships that CISA uses as conduits for the Federal Government to help the States.

At CISA, Trump installed one of his cronies to be his eyes and ears: the 2020 election denier Marci McCarthy, who was the chair of the DeKalb County, GA, Republican Party and has amplified false claims of voter fraud in Georgia and spread disinformation about voting machines. She obviously has zero cyber security expertise.

(Mr. LEE assumed the Chair.)

Democrats want free and fair elections that have integrity. The biggest threat to achieving that is not the illusory problem of noncitizen voting but, rather, outside threats from foreign actors, like the Russian Government, who have actually tried to manipulate election outcomes and who have sophisticated capabilities in cyber space.

According to the 2025 "Annual Threat Assessment" prepared by the Director of National Intelligence—that is, Tulsi Gabbard, by the way, who is not exactly known as a Russia hawk—"Moscow probably believes information operations efforts to influence U.S. elections are advantageous, regardless of whether they affect election outcomes, because reinforcing doubt in the integrity of the U.S. electoral system achieves one of its core objectives."

Defunding and gutting CISA is entirely consistent with the core Russian objective to sow doubt in our democratic process. The "Annual Threat Assessment" goes on to forecast that "Moscow's malign influence activities will continue for the foreseeable future and will almost certainly increase in sophistication and volume."

If Trump were actually committed to election integrity, he would not have gutted the Federal Agency responsible for securing our election infrastructure

against this threat. But that is exactly what he has done.

As if to remove any doubt that Trump's primary objective is perpetrating his Big Lie that the 2020 election was stolen and create the circumstances to perhaps do the same thing in 2026 and 2028, he issued an Executive order directing the Department of Justice to investigate the former leader of CISA, Chris Krebs, after he had the temerity to say that "the 2020 election was the most secure in American history. There is no evidence that any voting system deleted or lost votes, changed votes, or was in any way compromised." By the way, at the same time, Trump canceled Mr. Krebs' security clearance.

Over 40 cyber security experts have condemned the "political persecution" of Krebs. They wrote in an open letter that "by placing Krebs in the crosshairs, the President is signaling that cybersecurity professionals whose findings do not align with his narrative risk having their businesses and livelihoods subjected to spurious and retaliatory targeting."

Here we have a prime example of Donald Trump using the machinery of the Federal Government to intimidate into silence those who refute his Big Lie that the 2020 election was stolen and plagued by widespread fraud, and he is gearing up to do the same thing in 2026 and 2028. Trump has stacked DOJ, Department of Justice, Department of Homeland Security, and other parts of his administration with cronies, sycophants, and loyalists who perpetrated the Big Lie in 2020 and organized the Stop the Steal movement that culminated in the deadly insurrection on January 6.

Notable examples include the following individuals: Harmeet Dhillon, the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division, who represented President Trump and his campaign in the past and continues to amplify Trump's debunked claims of widespread voter fraud in the 2020 election; Maureen Riordan, the recently departed Acting Chief of the Voting Section at DOJ, who is another election skeptic and defender of voter suppression tactics, who has reiterated unfounded claims of widespread voting by noncitizens; Eric Neff, the current Chief of the Voting Section at DOJ, who has been leading this dangerous effort to compel the States—including Rhode Island—to turn over their voter rolls.

Mr. Neff has been reprimanded for his past work in the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office, where he pursued a case against an election software company based on evidence provided by a conspiracy-driven election denier group called True the Vote. The charges were ultimately dropped, Neff was put on leave, and the L.A. taxpayers were stuck paying a \$5 million settlement.

Ed Martin, the Pardon Attorney at DOJ, represented January 6 rioters in

court and has defended Trump's claims of voter fraud in the 2020 election.

Kurt Olsen, the White House Director of Election Security; Mr. Olsen was a Trump campaign lawyer who worked on the efforts to overturn the 2020 election results, including being part of the Texas attorney general's attempt to get the Supreme Court to stop four swing States from certifying Biden's 2020 victory over Trump.

Heather Honey, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Election Integrity at DHS; Ms. Honey worked closely with Cleta Mitchell, who participated in Trump's infamous call with the Georgia secretary of state, pressuring him to "find" sufficient votes for Trump to win the State, which I think most casual observers would cite as one of the most egregious attempts to influence votes illegally that we have seen—certainly, from a President.

Honey was on the ground in Maricopa County, AZ, for a Republican-backed audit seeking proof of fraud in the 2020 election. Honey pushed a conspiracy that there were more votes counted than were cast in Pennsylvania.

And Gregg Phillips, the Director of the Office of Response and Recovery at FEMA; Mr. Phillips was a board member of True the Vote, the organization that traffics in conspiracy theories that Mr. Neff used to pursue a faulty case against an election software company. Phillips made the outrageous claim that he reviewed voter rolls with over 3 million noncitizens on the rolls in 2016—absolutely preposterous.

The machinery of the Federal Government has already been deployed, through these individuals and others, to relitigate the 2020 election and intimidate election officials into doing Trump's bidding in 2026 and 2028.

On January 28, the FBI raided the election office in Fulton County, GA, and actually seized ballots. Fulton County contains the State's biggest metropolitan area—Atlanta—where half a million votes were cast in 2020. According to court documents, the reasons for this raid were the same claims and conspiracy theories that underpinned Trump's Big Lie about the 2020 election. It was based on a referral from Kurt Olsen, whom I discussed above. He was a key person who tried to steal the 2020 election and is currently working in the White House, which historically and for good reason, has not directed law enforcement, which is supposed to be nonpartisan and based on facts and evidence and the law, not the whim of the President.

The FBI's affidavit claimed a discrepancy in votes cast and votes counted of 3 percent, but, in reality, those numbers were off by less than 0.2 percent. That the FBI would mislead the court to justify this raid about 2020 should give everyone tremendous concern about what kinds of falsehoods will underpin efforts to subvert results in 2026 and 2028.

A similar "investigation" about the 2020 election is underway by the FBI in

Maricopa County, AZ, which is the State's largest metropolitan area.

So why is the FBI investigating an election that occurred 6 years ago, and why is the FBI focusing on the biggest cities in the two States that swung the election against Trump? Again, it is to perpetrate the Big Lie and to lay the groundwork for interference in the 2026 and 2028 elections.

It is not just the Federal Government that has been stacked with election deniers who are dedicated to making sure Trump remains in power. Trump has also installed allies at every level of State and local election offices. These allies stand ready to do his bidding and disenfranchise large numbers of voters who oppose him. These efforts by Trump's enablers have already disenfranchised American citizens. In North Carolina, Republicans sought to cancel 65,000 votes in a judicial election last year. An estimated 2,000 to 8,000 of the votes were military and overseas voters.

Speaking of the military, Trump may be preparing to use the National Guard in order to deter Americans from exercising their constitutional right to vote. He signed an Executive order requiring each State to be ready to deploy a "National Guard Response Force" with a total of 23,750 members nationwide that can be ordered into States without the consent of local Governors. And under existing law, the President has command of a "Quick Reaction Force" of 2,000 National Guard members. He can deploy them nationwide to any State within 8 hours of notice.

Trump may try to abuse his authority as Commander in Chief to place these forces in polling places—perhaps in Fulton County or Maricopa County—under the guise of "protecting" them. They could be used to quell protests if Trump tries to steal another election.

Trump famously did not deploy the Guard to defend the Capitol on January 6. But now the pendulum may well swing in the other direction. He could preemptively deploy the Guard to deter people from voting.

Steve Bannon last month on a podcast stated:

[W]e're going to have ICE surround the polls come November. President Trump has to nationalize the election. You've got to put—not just, I think, ICE—you've got to call up the 82nd and 101st Airborne on the Insurrection Act. You've got to get around every poll and make sure only people with IDs, people . . . actually registered to vote and people that are United States citizens vote in this election.

So here you have Steve Bannon—someone who is very close to Trump and who essentially served as his consigliere in the first administration—openly saying that the military and ICE should be enforcing the SAVE Act.

Steve Bannon said he wants the 82nd Airborne to do voter intimidation. I served in the 82nd Airborne. I was a platoon leader and a company com-

mander. It is so offensive to our values and so denigrating for the men and women in uniform for Steve Bannon to suggest that they should be turned against their own neighbors, to be conscripted to help President Trump cling to power. This is not what happens in functioning democracies; this is what happens under authoritarian regimes and in dictatorships.

Let anyone believe Mr. Bannon's attempt to cultivate himself as a deeply read intellectual, I would note that it is a criminal offense for military officers to do what he has proposed. Section 592 of title 18 of the U.S. Code says that if a commander sends troops under his command into a polling place, he can go to jail for up to 5 years:

Whoever, being an officer of the Army or Navy, or other person in the civil military, or naval service of the United States, orders, brings, keeps, or has under his authority or control any troops or armed men at any place where a general or special election is held, unless such force shall be necessary to repel armed enemies of the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years or both; and be disqualified from holding any office of honor, profit, or trust under the United States.

That is the military forces.

This notion of ICE being at the polls is just as concerning. Agents have detained law-abiding American citizens who have gotten caught up in Trump's mass deportation campaign. So there are some citizens who would be justified in thinking that it is still risky to go to the polls, lest you inadvertently get picked up.

What is the criteria for ICE to stop, detain, and harass people? It seems to be how they look, not what is in their hearts, not that they are dedicated Americans, not that they may be police officers in civilian uniforms, not that they may be former veterans.

If ICE will be asking people to "show their papers" before they even enter the polling place, then that adds more time, more process, and more complexity to something that should be quick, easy, and simple.

Finally, even if you do not cast a vote, the bill contains a dangerous private right of action allowing anyone to challenge another voter's registration status. That provision can be used with great effect to challenge large numbers of votes in States and localities that elect non-Trumpers.

Even if those claims are meritless and ultimately dismissed, they will tangle the courts with so much litigation that we will not know the actual election results for months on end. That sows additional mistrust in the process and, depending on the judges who hear these cases, could result in mass disenfranchisement of U.S. citizens who vote.

Given the data I have recited about the paltry numbers of noncitizen voters, reviews of the voter rolls after the fact and strong enforcement of existing criminal penalties are more than sufficient to achieve the purpose of allow-

ing American citizens to vote and encouraging them to do so.

So this is not about election integrity or protecting the will of voters. This is about voter suppression and voter intimidation. This is about keeping Trump and his gang in power. This is about Trump knowing that he is deeply unpopular, that he could be on a path to lose fair and square and trying to bend the rules and create the machinery for the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security and even the military to do his personal bidding to cling to power. If that happens, if he is successful, then we will no longer be a democracy.

Let anyone still think that this bill is about "election integrity" and not 100 percent about Donald Trump's power grab, my Republican colleagues have added two provisions covering "culture war" provisions that denigrate trans rights—Donald Trump's favorite boogeyman and his personal pet issuing having precisely nothing to do with the alleged scourge of noncitizen voting.

I am proud tonight to join my Democratic colleagues in sounding the alarm. We want to help our fellow citizens participate in our elections because only their participation will ensure that the government is truly accountable to the people it represents.

My secretary of state Gregg Amore has said:

The SAVE Act deviates from pro-voter and pro-democracy policies that make it easier for people to cast a ballot by placing an undue burden on American citizens. It is already illegal for non-citizens to vote, and requiring documentation proving citizenship effectively creates a poll tax for voters. President Trump is disregarding our country's separation of powers as the SAVE Act makes its way through Congress.

This isn't or should not be a partisan endeavor. Democrats and Republicans shouldn't be afraid to face the voters—all the voters—and compete on the basis of our ideas and aspirations. The SAVE Act shows that Trump has a different agenda—consolidating power for himself while subjugating the American people.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will understand that and oppose these efforts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today for the hard-working American families who are struggling to make ends meet. These are hard-working American families who are struggling to make ends meet because they are victims of Democrats' political theater.

I grew up in public housing and watched my parents struggle to make ends meet. I saw my adopted dad lose his job. I remember when my dad had his car repossessed.

When these things happened, I felt the panic my parents dealt with in trying to keep food on the table for me and my siblings when the next paycheck wasn't guaranteed. I don't wish

what my family went through on anyone. I actually ran for Governor of Florida and the U.S. Senate because I wanted to change this country so fewer families grow up with the struggle that mine did.

So it makes me furious to see what Democrats are doing right now with this political stunt of shutting down the Department of Homeland Security. It has been more than a month since this shutdown began. This is the third time in the last 6 months that the hard-working Americans who work to keep us safe each and every day had to worry about how they are going to pay mortgages, pay the rent, buy gas, bring home groceries to feed their kids.

It is unfair, and it is un-American.

I think every American has probably felt the squeeze from this shutdown when they go to the airport. TSA's staffing shortages have gone through the roof, and that has meant longer screening times at airports across the country.

Lines are stretching out the door and wait times are skyrocketing into hours. People in Atlanta are missing 6 a.m. flights when they showed up to the airport at 3 a.m. in the morning.

But the Federal employees—the ones who show up to work every day to keep the rest of us safe—are the ones going through the worst of all this shutdown.

A union official who represents workers at TSA said:

A lot of employees that I've talked to don't have any money in their bank account. They've already missed half a check, so they don't know what bill to pay.

This week in my State of Florida, the good folks over at Feeding South Florida distributed food to Federal workers who aren't being paid because of this reckless shutdown.

Think about the situation that Democrats in the Senate have put DHS workers in. What if your boss called you tonight and said: Listen, I need you to come in tomorrow. Your job is absolutely essential to the security of our Nation. We need you to help us keep people safe. Millions of people around America rely on you to show up so they can be safe.

But management decided not to pay you, and we don't know when management will decide to pay you.

What would you do? Who would you call? What would you do when your rent was due? How would you feed your family? What would you do about that car payment coming up? What would you tell your child when you couldn't afford their upcoming field trip or sports lessons or were forced to cancel the thing that your little boy or girl was really looking forward to?

These aren't hypothetical questions for the more than 50,000 TSA agents Democrats are forcing to work without pay right now. But don't just think of them as a number. These are Americans, and here are some of their stories.

Alondra Galvan is a single mom and a TSA officer currently working with-

out pay because of the partial government shutdown. She has been working for TSA for 2 years. Here is what she said:

It's very frustrating for everything, from financial restraints to mental instability. There's times at night I'm like what am I going to do, how am I going to do it.

She says:

I'm a single mom right now. My son usually goes to spring break camps, and I can't afford that right now because there's no money coming in, and I just don't know what to do anymore. There's no babysitter. I don't have money to pay a babysitter, so it's all around bad.

She is not alone.

There are food banks for DHS employees springing up all over the country—in San Diego, Pittsburgh, Chattanooga. Demands have been so great in Las Vegas that supplies are now limited, and they are looking for more donations according to one report.

"Most people have drained through their emergency funds" said TSA agent Johnny Jones.

"The majority of TSA agents live paycheck to paycheck" he said.

"A lot of them still have loans or debts from the previous shutdown" he said.

In Omaha, NE, one man started a GoFundMe page to raise donations so he can buy meals to deliver to TSA employees at Eppley Airfield.

Airports across the country are asking for gift card donations so the people who keep our economy going, the people who make it safe and possible for other Americans to visit their families, do business, or go on vacation can keep scraping by while Democrat politicians in this Chamber can put on a show for the news cameras and fight for illegal aliens.

In Nashville, one TSA supervisor noted people are "starting to get eviction notices."

She summed the entire situation up when she told the same newspaper "We are forgotten."

I want to tell you another story I read about in the Christian Science Monitor. In an article published 2 days ago, they wrote about a woman named Susan. That is not her real name. She asked to remain anonymous for fear of retribution at work. Her story is real, and it is fully verifiable.

Susan is a single mother. She has a teenage son. Next month, she will mark her 10th anniversary as a TSA employee. That is 10 years of showing up, 10 years of being the one who checks the bags, scans the boarding passes, and stands between the traveling public and whatever threats might be lurking.

Before the longest government shutdown in American history last fall, the 43-day shutdown—Susan had finally paid off all of her debts—all of them.

For a single working mother, that is pretty amazing.

Susan went through years of sacrifice, years of careful budgeting, years of telling her son "no" or "not yet." And she got there. She was debt-free.

Then the fall shutdown came and the one after that and now this one. Today, two of Susan's credit cards are maxed out. She has three-quarters of a tank of gas left and enough food in the house to make it until yesterday.

She has \$1.15 in her bank account. Still, when talking to a reporter for the Christian Science Monitor, she said she was one of the more fortunate ones.

She said "We just dig in and hope that we get paid before we get evicted and our cars get repossessed."

Susan is still going to work every day. She is still showing up to protect the traveling public. She is doing it on empty pockets, maxed-out cards, and on borrowed time. She considers herself one of the lucky ones. Think about what that says about the people who are less fortunate than Susan.

Democrat Members of the U.S. Senate: These are our fellow citizens. These are patriotic people who made the decision to serve our Federal Government, and you are torturing them.

Meanwhile, every Democrat Senator who voted to start this shutdown is getting paid. The average salary of a TSA agent is around \$50,000. U.S. Senators make \$174,000. While the folks at TSA are working-class Americans fighting every day to live their dreams, the average net worth for a Democrat in the Senate is nearly \$3 million.

I am not here to shame those who worked hard and have been successful in life. I worked my butt off during my life, and I have been very successful, and I don't apologize for it for a second. But in addition to donating my entire Senate salary every year, I am also not the one sitting here today denying a paycheck to more than 260,000 hard-working Americans at DHS.

The last time the Democrats shut down the government and hurt our Federal workers, one of my colleagues on the left said that he couldn't go without his Senate paycheck because he has a mortgage to pay. What the hell do you think the hard-working people at DHS have to do? They have bills to pay. They have mortgages. They have to pay the rent. They have to buy groceries.

It makes you sick. It makes you sick to hear a Member of the U.S. Senate who voted to not pay people say something so insulting. Imagine how it makes someone at TSA feel to hear that. A U.S. Senator needs to get his paycheck to pay his mortgage, but if you are at DHS, good luck. I think that is disgusting.

If Congress shuts down the government, Members shouldn't get paid. I have a bill to make sure that is how it works. My No Budget, No Pay Act would keep everyone in this Chamber from getting a paycheck if we can't provide them to the hard-working men and women who work in our Federal Government. There needs to be serious personal consequences for politicians that want to play games with people's lives and cut off their paychecks. We need to pass my No Budget, No Pay Act.

After hearing about the suffering Democrats have caused for the TSA agents that I talked about earlier, how can anyone here oppose this? Sadly, the answer to that question is the same as the answer to the question of how we got here in the first place.

I don't get it, but Democrats want to defund the police and shut down ICE and CBP. Why? Because the brave officers in these Agencies were simply doing their jobs and enforcing existing U.S. law.

Here is what happened: During the Biden administration, Democrats allowed the office and power of a mentally incapacitated President to be hijacked by unelected radical staffers. Once these staffers seized the levers of power without President Biden even realizing it, they opened our southern border and actually allowed or encouraged millions upon millions of illegal aliens to flood into the United States. They let criminals in, rapists, murderers, child abusers, drug dealers. They all flooded in. They let drugs pour over the border and poison the American people. And my Democrat colleagues did nothing to stop it.

It was a national disaster, and the American people saw that it was intentional and would ruin our Nation, so they elected President Trump. They elected President Trump to take the White House and Republicans to take control of Congress because the American people knew we would clean up Biden's mess and secure the border.

The agenda wasn't a surprise. President Trump ran on securing the border and getting criminal illegal aliens out of our country. It was probably the biggest reason they elected President Trump.

Now that he is executing on that agenda, I don't get it, but Democrats can't stand it. He is undoing all of their work to let illegal aliens flood across the border, and he is doing it without passing any new laws. He is simply allowing ICE and CBP to do their jobs and enforce the laws that are already on the books. It is incredible what simply letting people do their jobs can accomplish.

Now, because radical Democrat mayors and Governors won't work with ICE and in some cases are actively encouraging resistance against our Federal law enforcement, there has been conflict.

Two Americans, Alex Pretti and Renee Good, lost their lives in incidents with Federal agents. It is horrible. I wish it never happened in this country. My heart goes out to their families.

If we didn't have illegal sanctuary cities in the States, ICE would be able to peacefully detain individuals at jails. That is how we do it in Florida. We don't have issues with ICE. But there are liberal mayors and Governors who want to put the concerns of illegal aliens over American citizens and American law enforcement. It doesn't make any sense to me.

President Trump has made offer after offer to Democrats to address the concerns they have with ICE actions that they have forced to happen. President Trump is trying to meet this moment with reasonable reforms to how ICE operates. He has even said he will bring ICE agents to help our TSA agents. But Democrats aren't engaging.

There are violent illegal aliens in our country. We have to remove them. If you don't believe me, here are three names: Rachel Morin, Jocelyn Nungaray, Laken Riley. Rachel Morin, Jocelyn Nungaray, Laken Riley—a mother and a child and a college student—all murdered. Three lives that were shattered. Three families that were devastated. Why? Because of the horrific violence caused by an illegal alien.

These are the people that ICE is targeting, and in my mind, it is worth it. If ICE can save one person, if ICE can prevent another woman from facing the same fate as Rachel Morin, Jocelyn Nungaray, and Laken Riley, it is worth it.

I don't get it, but Democrats insist on protecting illegal aliens with sanctuary policies while they spit in the faces of American law enforcement officers who risk their lives every day, every single day, to keep us safe.

It is happening here just outside Washington. Last month, a 40-year-old mother from Fredericksburg, VA, was stabbed to death. She was stabbed to death while standing at a bus stop in Fairfax County, VA. Her name was Stephanie Minter.

On a Monday morning, a mother was ripped from her children by an illegal alien that officials in Virginia refused—they refused—to let ICE deport.

Stephanie's alleged killer had a long criminal record. He was a known violent criminal who Fairfax County described as being "a danger to the community." But not only was he never handed over to ICE, he was let off the hook again and again. He had more than 30 arrests to his name—charges of malicious wounding, assault, drug possession, identity theft, firing a weapon, contributing to delinquency of a minor. Over and over, the charges were dropped, and he was released.

But this injustice in Fairfax County wasn't limited to the alleged killer who murdered Stephanie Minter. The Center for Immigration Studies found that from October 2022 through February 2025, the Fairfax County Adult Detention Center freed more than 1,000 deportable individuals in direct defiance of over 1,150 ICE detainers.

Fairfax County ranked third in the entire Nation for refusing to honor ICE detainer requests, and soon, all of Virginia could follow suit, because the same week that Stephanie Minter was murdered at that bus stop, new Governor Spanberger ordered the termination of all 287(g) agreements between State agencies and ICE.

Think about that for a second and ask yourself, how could this happen in America?

Sadly, this is the reality facing Americans in Democrat cities, counties, and States. According to DHS, sanctuary jurisdictions across the country declined to honor 17,864 ICE detainer requests in 2025 alone—nearly 18,000 in 1 year.

In California alone, over 4,500 criminal individuals have been released since January 2025 despite active ICE detainers. The crimes those individuals were associated with include homicides, assaults, burglaries, and sexual offenses.

In New York, ICE has documented cases where individuals with records including rape, strangulation, and burglary were repeatedly released by sanctuary policies.

First, Democrats pass sanctuary laws to protect violent illegals that they know their Soros-funded prosecutors won't go after. Now Democrats are trying to destroy ICE completely so that the very system of brave law enforcement officers, which was established to save the lives of individuals like Stephanie, Laken, Rachel, and Jocelyn, could no longer protect our families.

I don't know why the Democrats want to defund our law enforcement. I don't understand why they want to watch as TSA agents suffer without pay. I don't know why Democrats are fine seeing Americans wait hours in line for a flight. The thing I struggle with most is, I don't know why the left is so hell-bent on protecting illegal aliens while letting a mother like Stephanie Minter be stabbed to death at a bus stop. It doesn't make sense to me.

I think it is time for Democrats to come to their senses and fund DHS.

To the hard-working individuals at DHS: I am sorry this is happening to you. You absolutely deserve to be paid and respected. You deserve a shot at the American dream. My heart goes out to you and your family.

These individuals chose to take a job where every second of their professional lives is spent protecting their fellow Americans and keeping their homeland safe. They didn't sign up to not get paid. When they agreed to take these jobs, the Federal Government made a deal with them that they would be provided for, and we are failing on our end of that agreement.

Now these people who are working full time, dealing with long lines, very frustrated travelers, and long brutal days, dead on their feet, many probably working overtime to protect us, are going home to empty refrigerators, overdue bills, and eviction notices because of my Democrat colleagues' political theater for illegal aliens.

If you look at some of the half-measures Democrats have put forward to get themselves out of this situation, it is obvious: They do not care about whether TSA, FEMA, and the Coast Guard are paid, and they want to absolutely shut down ICE and CBP.

That is just another way of saying they want to defund the police so they

can hamstring our ability to enforce immigration laws—again, not for the benefit of American citizens but for the benefit of illegal aliens.

I think we have had enough of this political theater. We have had enough of the hypocrisy. We need to make sure these individuals get paid. It is unfair to deny paychecks to our TSA agents and more than 200,000 other DHS workers. And we can't allow more heart-breaking stories like Alondra, Susan, Rachel, Jocelyn, Laken, and Stephanie.

America is better than this, and I am not going to stop fighting until these radical attempts end to put illegal aliens before American citizens.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am somewhat perplexed by the comments of my colleague because six times in the last week and a half, measures have been put forth on this floor that would have paid TSA, would have paid the Coast Guard, would have paid FEMA, would pay CISA, and his party blocked every one of them. There was a vote just today that would have led to the funding of TSA, and I don't know how the gentleman voted, but I suspect he voted no. So this idea that somehow this side of the aisle is defunding and not voting for these other Agencies—it is just not true. There have been six—at least in the last week and a half—motions to move forward with the funding of the non-ICE Agencies, and each time, a representative of the party across the aisle has risen to object.

So let's be clear who is blocking funding for the TSA. It is not over here. We are ready to fund it tonight. We had a vote a few hours ago that would have funded it. So let's be clear about who is blocking funding for the TSA. It is right over here.

The second piece is, Why are we talking about ICE? If ICE, as the Senator suggested, were talking about criminal aliens, we wouldn't be here having this debate. The problem is that that is not what is happening.

In my State of Maine—in Portland—we had an ICE surge back in January and February that was similar to what happened in Minneapolis. It wasn't as large, and it wasn't as violent, but it was, nonetheless, a similar kind of surge, wherein a lot of agents came in, and a lot of arrests were made.

We have had a hard time in getting the actual data, but here is what we do know: Over 200 people were arrested or detained, many of whom were sent far away to Louisiana or to Texas or somewhere else.

But the website—I just looked it up. The DHS actually has a website called the Worst of the Worst, wherein they give you the picture and the name and the crime of the people whom they have arrested to demonstrate that, in fact, this is what they are doing.

Here is the problem: What we know is they arrested or detained over 200 peo-

ple, and the DHS' Worst of the Worst website lists 21. That is 10 percent. Who are the other 90 percent?

I can tell you, from knowing my constituents, a lot of them are people who were asylum seekers, who were paying taxes, who were working people, who were refugees. One guy was approved to be a prison guard in our local county jail.

So, if it were the worst of the worst—the Senator kept using terms like “criminal illegal aliens,” and he gave these horrible cases. If that is what ICE was doing, we wouldn't have had a problem. The problem is the untargeted mass searching and picking up of people because of their accents or their color. That is what we are talking about here, and that is what we should be focused on. Indeed, there are discussions going on right now to try to find some resolution.

By the way, nobody is talking about defunding ICE. Nobody I have heard of is talking about defunding DHS or defunding the police. We are talking about guardrails being applied to ICE that are similar to the guardrails and the codes of conduct that apply to every police force in America.

I would suspect the city of Miami has a code of conduct that talks about how you respond to use of force and when warrants are required. They may also have something about identification. Those are the kinds of things that we are talking about. We are talking about guardrails. We are not talking about defunding anybody.

So let's be honest with the American people about what this debate is about.

I believe deeply—listen, I understand about the TSA and the Coast Guard, which is very important to my State. They should be getting paid, and that is why, starting several weeks ago, this side of the aisle has been bringing forward unanimous consent agreements that would fund those Agencies—only for them to be objected to. If we could have one of those unanimous consent agreements tonight or tomorrow, we could get those Agencies funded right away and then focus on what the issue is that divides us. And there are discussions going on with your colleagues and with the White House to try to resolve some of those issues.

I am an Independent, although I caucus with these guys, but let's not talk about the Democrats shutting down the TSA. The Democrats are moving to fund the TSA and are being blocked by the other side. Let's be clear about what is going on here. If we could solve this and if we could fund those other Agencies, which we should—I agree—then we could talk about guardrails for ICE and putting them under the same kind of reasonable constraints as every other law enforcement agencies in the country.

In my whole life, I have never seen a law enforcement agency that wears masks. Why do they wear masks? Because it is intimidating. It puts people in fear—citizens in fear. It also gives a

license to the person with the mask on to act not in the public interest. It emboldens somebody to use the force that they have.

I understand about doxing, and we can have a law—we can pass a statute—making the doxing of these agents illegal and a crime—a serious crime. I understand that. I have got a draft of that here—of that law—and I think that should be part of that discussion.

But I think we really should be talking about what it is that we are trying to resolve here with regard to the guardrails on ICE. The original communication from the minority leader and the minority leader in the House said nothing about defunding. They talked about what the restrictions are that we need to talk about. Warrants—this is Constitution 101. You don't break down somebody's door without a warrant unless there are certain exigent circumstances. The Presiding Officer is a constitutional scholar; he understands the Fourth Amendment. But those are the kinds of things that we need to be talking about, not “Should we be paying TSA officers?” Of course, we should.

So let's vote on it. Let's do it. Let's put it on the floor and get that done tonight or tomorrow, and then we can focus on the issue that is before us. I just believe that this body ought to be coming together and talking about the real issues and trying to resolve them and not having the collateral damage of these other Agencies.

For myself, given what happened in Maine and what happened in Minnesota, I cannot vote for a budget that leaves ICE rampant and without the guardrails that apply to every other police force in the United States. I can't, in good conscience, do that. That is why I am voting to move forward with the funding of the other Agencies but then will focus on ICE to try to get some reasonable guardrails, and we are negotiating and working toward those.

In the meantime, let's pay the TSA people. Let's pay the Coast Guard. Let's pay CISA. Let's pay FEMA. I get that. But let's be clear about who is blocking that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, let's remember who shut down Homeland Security. The Democrats shut down Homeland Security. They voted to shut down Homeland Security. They wouldn't fund it, and they wouldn't fund it because they don't want ICE to be able to do their job. It is a problem the Democrats caused because the border was completely open for 4 years. So, if we do one part and don't do the rest, we know what is going to happen: ICE will never get funded.

With regard to masks, law enforcement does use masks because they have to protect their privacy sometimes. There is doxing going on. Think about it. All of us have security, probably. I have been swatted, and maybe

my colleagues have been swatted. Think about these agents. They don't have security at home when their families are at home. There are websites out there that, when they find a picture of an ICE agent, they are putting it up on these websites to try to intimidate their families and intimidate their kids.

Sure, I think we ought to always have reasonable restrictions on how law enforcement works. But ICE is busting their butt to solve a problem that was caused by having 4 years of completely open borders, and nobody on the Democrat side wanted to talk about it. Now ICE is trying to do this job and clean up the mess, and, all of a sudden, Democrats want to put all of these rules on them so that they can't even do their job. That doesn't make any sense.

I want to tell my colleague—I mean, the White House proposed things, and for so many weeks, Democrats didn't come back with any proposal. So I am glad there are conversations going on now, but, in the meantime, all of these TSA agents haven't gotten paid, and some ICE agents are not getting paid. This is completely unfair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, let the record show that a real debate broke out for a few minutes on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The majority whip.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

HONORING OUR FALLEN HEROES ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, last December, Congress passed into law the Honoring Our Fallen Heroes Act as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026. This important law was passed to expand access to Federal support for the families of firefighters and other first responders who pass away from service related cancers, through the Public Safety Officers' Benefits—PSOB—Program. Firefighters put their lives on the line everyday to keep us safe, and the law we passed honors the commitment we make to first responders who make the ultimate sacrifice.

Included in the law is a confidentiality of information provision, ensuring that when families of these heroes apply for the benefits they deserve, the sensitive medical information required

as part of their PSOB application remains confidential. Because some parts of the PSOB program, such as benefits arising from the September 11 terrorist attacks, were covered under different statutory frameworks, we drafted the confidentiality of information provision to ensure that a uniform set of rules apply to all PSOB claims.

I understand that the Justice Department has argued that the law passed to help firefighters and first responders somehow prohibits the disclosure of Deaths in Custody Reporting Act data made pursuant to a Freedom of Information Act request. That was not our intent.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 4073

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4073, a bill making continuing appropriations for essential Transportation Security Administration pay and operations during the lapse in appropriations beginning on February 14, 2026, and for other purposes.

S. 4127

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4127, a bill making continuing appropriations for essential Transportation Security Administration pay and operations during the lapse in appropriations beginning on February 14, 2026, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 117

At the request of Mr. SCHIFF, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 117, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4743. Mrs. BRITT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4743. Mrs. BRITT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS.

(a) PROHIBIT VOTING BY NONCITIZENS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS.—An individual who is not a citizen of the United States may not vote in an election for public office in the District of Columbia or in any

ballot initiative or referendum in the District of Columbia.

(b) REPEAL OF THE LOCAL RESIDENT VOTING RIGHTS AMENDMENT ACT OF 2022.—The Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022 (D.C. Law 24-242) is repealed, and any provision of law amended or repealed by such Act shall be restored or revived as if such Act had not been enacted into law.

ORDERS FOR SUNDAY, MARCH 22, 2026

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 noon on Sunday, March 22; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate resume the House message with respect to S. 1383.

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

Mr. BARRASSO. For the information of my colleagues, we expect a cloture vote on the Mullin nomination at 1 p.m. tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of Senators LEE, KING, KIM, and BLUMENTHAL.

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

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we have had more discussion today on a number of topics. One of the topics that has commanded a lot of today's discussion is the bill that is now pending before the U.S. Senate, the SAVE America Act.

There have been more assertions made on this bill today than there have been in the past. So I need to address each one of those points, particularly those that have not been refuted—or at least adequately refuted today—in connection with these debates. While it is difficult to know exactly where to begin, I am going to begin—before I refute these—just with a generalized statement up front that will facilitate my ability to refute.

These scurrilous and false arguments that have been made against this bill—now, although some of these arguments have been mingled with truth, they are almost entirely false. They are built on lies. They are built on a blatant mischaracterization of the legislative text now pending before the Senate. They are based on a mischaracterization of the legal status quo and the effects of existing laws.