

Now, here is what has already happened: ICE has reported a 1,000-percent increase—that is a tenfold increase—in assaults on officers. That is even more than tenfold, isn't it? Yeah, tenfold. And an 8,000-percent increase in death threats against officers and their families.

A Dallas gunman fired multiple rounds at an ICE field office from a nearby rooftop and used apps specifically to track the locations of ICE agents before the attack. In San Francisco and LA, a mob surrounded ICE agents in the street and at their offices. These agents were assaulted and threatened.

Now, ICE agents are just like you and me. They are normal Americans. They have got families, and they love their kids. If they have grandkids, they love their grandkids. They have great neighbors, great friends, and they are simply doing the job that they were hired to do to keep every American safe.

They are doing what police do, what sheriffs do: They are working every day to enforce the laws of this country that we pass, but many of my Democratic colleagues want to see them as monsters.

Now, here is the difference: The TSA workers, they are going to work every day enforcing the laws, trying to keep us safe, and they are under a lot of stress because they are not getting paid. The ICE agents might be getting paid right now, but they are being attacked by—Democrats act like they are monsters. Their families are worried about them. They are worried about getting a threatening midnight phone call because an activist website posted their loved one's photograph and home address, so their families are worried.

That is what the mask ban would enable—not accountability; exposure. And for people who are already doing their jobs under impossible conditions, that additional threat is not a policy debate; it is a danger to their life.

Now, let's be clear: I don't think any of us want ICE to wear masks. I wish they didn't have to. But if wearing a mask keeps a law enforcement officer and their family safe from being attacked by radical anti-ICE activists, I am all for it.

Now, I support measures that keep our police accountable to the people they serve and protect. I believed that when I was Governor. We started bringing body cameras in when I was Governor of Florida. The White House has proposed body cameras, and I completely agree with that proposal. Cameras create accountability.

When I just flew through the Denver airport, I saw a couple of the law enforcement officers. They had cameras, and they thought it was the greatest thing in the world—complete accountability for everybody, them and for the public. Cameras create accountability through recorded evidence and supervisor review without turning every of-

ficer into a target for harassment and violence.

Democrats still impress that they want to "have a conversation." They want to "discuss." Meanwhile, most of the more than 260,000 workers at the Department of Homeland Security are going without paychecks, and your gate security lines stretch around the block.

Now, Democrats can disagree with us on immigration enforcement, and that is their right. But shutting down an entire Federal Agency, refusing to pay the hundreds of thousands of people who simply want to show up and serve the Federal Government by protecting the American people all to force a so-called negotiation on immigration policy that we have never seen written down, that is not governance; that is hostage-taking.

And let me remind you: The average salary of a TSA agent—Mr. President, what do you think the average salary is? \$50,000. Now, these are the folks Democrats are withholding paychecks from, Americans making about \$50,000 a year.

What do we make? U.S. Senators, we make 174,000 bucks a year. And I have tried—I have had a bill—No Budget, No Pay. My Democratic colleagues have always blocked it because they refuse to go without being paid, but they are OK with other people not being paid. So while the folks at TSA are working-class Americans fighting every day to live their dreams, guess what the average net worth for a Democrat in the Senate is? About \$3 million.

Now, I am not here to shame anybody. I am glad they worked hard, they got rich, they have been successful in life. I worked my butt off, 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 the more than 260,000 hard-working Americans at DHS.

Now, I think my Democratic colleagues ought to have skin in the game. The last time Democrats shut down the government and hurt our Federal workers, one of my Democratic colleagues said that he couldn't go without his Senate paycheck because he has a mortgage to pay. Well, guess what? So does every Federal employee at DHS. They are either probably paying the rent or they have a mortgage. The people Democrats aren't paying right now, they have bills to pay.

It frustrates me, it makes me sick that a Member of the U.S. Senate that voted to say somebody else can't get paid, they said they have to get paid. I think that is insulting. Imagine how it makes someone at TSA feel to hear that: A U.S. Senator needs to get his paycheck when he is making 174,000 bucks, but you at DHS, good luck. I think that is pretty disgusting. I don't think, if Congress shuts down the government, Members should get paid.

Now, I have a bill to make that happen. I had a colleague that had a simi-

lar bill earlier today. 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.

Look, I think there needs to be personal consequences for politicians that want to play games with other people's lives and cut off their paychecks, so I think we need to pass my No Budget, No Pay Act. Again, this is a simple proposal that says if Members of Congress can't complete our basic constitutional job of funding the government—the whole government, not part, not some but all of it—we shouldn't get paid.

So I urge my colleagues to consider this: What about the mortgages of DHS workers? What about their grocery bills? What about their kids' camp? What about their daughter's dance recital? I think we ought to care about them.

So I don't get it. I can't see how a Democratic colleague can get on a plane, fly home, probably go to the front of the line, look at these unpaid TSA agents in the eye, walk to the gate in front of all of them, pass Americans who just waited in line for 4 hours, and not feel some shame.

More than 260,000 American families are going without a paycheck, but my Democratic colleagues are still cashing theirs. Democrats shouldn't be shutting down the government and risking others' paychecks without being willing to put their paychecks on the line too.

So I am not going to ask for a UC, but I wish at some point we would pass my No Budget, No Pay Act so we all have skin in the game. If Republicans, Democrats—whoever—are going to shut down the government, then they ought to do the same thing that they are doing to other people to themselves.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, I rose in this Chamber in support of the SAVE America Act. I implored my colleagues to listen to the people who put us here, to restore their trust in our elections, to defend the integrity of what John Adams called "the primary right by which [all] other rights are protected."

Today, the rubber meets the road. We must continue our debate in front of

the American people, and we need to pass this bill. That is why I rise today to dispel the myths peddled by the bill's opponents and to remind us and to remind the American people what it is we are really debating here.

Now, I understand the importance of election integrity more than most. In 2022, I lost my first statewide election by 950 votes—that is about 14 per county—and I won my second statewide election by 15,000 votes out of about 7 million votes cast. These incredibly narrow races show just how important it is that our elections run smoothly, fairly, and that only—only—legitimate votes are counted.

And right now, we cannot pretend that all elections in America meet this standard. In my home State of Pennsylvania, an illegal immigrant named Mahady Sacko was recently indicted for having illegally voted in seven different Federal elections, including the 2024 election. He was not the only one. We have seen similar cases of noncitizens voting across the country. Also in 2024, a Chinese national was caught and charged in Michigan after his ballot had already been processed. And just days ago, a British national was charged in Texas for illegally casting a ballot in the 2024 election.

Now, critics of the SAVE America Act say such cases are rare, but in 2024, two—two—of the five swing State Senate races were decided by less than 0.3 of a percentage point, and the other three races were decided by 2 percentage points or less. The key point here is it doesn't take that many illegal votes to swing an election and, by doing so, to change the course of history.

And—and this is a big “and”—because an additional 10 million illegal immigrants entered the country during the Biden administration—that is undisputed—that risk has risen dramatically. Therefore, it is no surprise—it is no surprise at all—that more than half of Americans say they are deeply concerned about the integrity and the fairness of our elections. And it is also no surprise that the American people are demanding we do something about it. They are demanding a change.

And so, to my colleagues: As stewards of our constitutional order, we have a duty. We have a duty to root out the source of this distrust and restore the integrity and the confidence in our democratic process, and that is why I support the SAVE America Act, and it is why I hope that we can gain support from across the aisle with our Democratic colleagues as well to support this incredibly important piece of legislation.

This bill does one thing—one thing. It ensures that only American citizens cast ballots in American elections, and it does so through a number of measures. First, it requires documentary proof of citizenship to register to vote. It requires standardizing the list of acceptable documents that prove such citizenship. It creates an alternative

process for applicants who lack such documentation. It requires photo ID when casting a ballot, and it mandates ongoing roll maintenance to remove noncitizens, allowing States to use Federal databases for verification. And it strengthens enforcement and penalties against officials who knowingly register noncitizens.

These are commonsense measures. So basic, so reasonable, and most importantly, most importantly, the American people support them. Voter ID is an 80–20 issue. There are not that many 80–20 issues. This is an 80–20 issue. The Pew Research Center found that 95 percent of Republicans and 71 percent of Democrats support it. Meanwhile—meanwhile—only 22 percent of Americans oppose requiring proof of citizenship to register for Federal elections. And that conclusion was from a recent Washington Post-ABC News-IPSOS poll, just last month—just last month. The American people have spoken. Bottom line: The American people understand the problem, and they support the solution of the SAVE America Act.

Now, since I last rose in support of the SAVE America Act, President Trump has proposed three additional measures. These include the limiting of mail-in ballots to those who are sick, disabled, serving in the military, traveling, or otherwise experiencing hardship, keeping men out of women's sports, and protecting children from transgender mutilation surgeries. I support each of these efforts, and I support Senator SCHMITT's amendment incorporating them.

Yesterday, I also voted for the Tuberville-Blackburn amendment which would have further protected women's sports, but again, the Democrats blocked this commonsense effort. These additions make a strong bill stronger, but the overall purpose—the overall purpose—and the reason I first rose in support of this legislation is restoring the people's faith in our elections. That is what the SAVE America Act does, that is what it is all about, and that is why I support it.

Now, I continue to hear a lot of misleading claims about this bill, and I would like to address a few of them directly right here and right now. Myth 1: that the bill disenfranchises women who change their names at marriage. False. If you are already registered, this bill requires nothing of you. For those registering for the first time or reregistering after a move, the bill explicitly directs States to accommodate name discrepancies. Applicants can sign a sworn statement, submit supporting evidence, and have an election official certify their citizenship. The bill anticipates the challenge and provides a solution.

Myth 2: that voters must bring proof of citizenship, like a birth certificate, to the polls. False. Proof of citizenship is required only at registration. On election day, a standard photo ID suffices. This includes a driver's license, a State ID, a military ID, or a passport.

We ask Americans—we ask all of us—to show an ID to board a plane or to buy a beer. Asking the same to protect the ballot is not a burden; it is a basic, fundamental civic responsibility.

Myth 3: Voter ID suppresses turnout. The argument is that this bill—as some have called it—is a Jim Crow 2.0. This is false. There is no evidence that voter ID suppresses turnout. In fact, a 2021 National Bureau of Economic Research study analyzed a full decade—an entire decade—of data and found voter ID laws have no negative effect on registration or turnout. Let me repeat that: no negative effect on registration or turnout. A 2006 study by the Crime Prevention Research Center went further. Fraud prevention measures actually increase participation. And when my good friend Governor Kemp of Georgia enacted a voter ID law in 2021, the State turnout records in 2022 and again in 2024 were alltime highs.

These facts are pesky things. But despite the facts and despite the support of the American people, many Democrats have stood against this act from the very beginning. The reason: They fundamentally oppose requiring proof of citizenship to register to vote and voter ID at the polls. It is just a fundamental disagreement. They fundamentally disagree with what 80 percent of the American people agree with. And because they know these principles are so simple, so intuitive, some have decided, sadly, that they cannot defeat this measure with honest debate; and so instead, as is so often the case in Washington, they try to bury it—this legislation and this very idea—in hysteria and misinformation.

Sadly, I have heard this bill smeared as “one of the most despicable pieces of legislation,” “an attack on our sacred right to vote,” “a voter suppression bill.” And the Democratic leadership, before even seeing the specifics of the bill, declared it dead on arrival.

I should be used to it. I am new to Washington, but I should be used to this kind of performative language, this kind of escalation I see on the left. It is simply petty—petty political theater. It is wrong, it is disgraceful, and it is unworthy. This kind of rhetoric is unworthy of the serious attention, the honest debate, and the thoughtful action that is required on such an important and such a fundamental issue.

The facts around this issue are clear. Fact 1: The American people are worried about the integrity of their elections and rightly so. Fact 2: The American people overwhelmingly—overwhelmingly—support voter ID and citizenship requirements to ensure that only American citizens cast ballots in American elections. Fact 3: These are the core features—these are the core features of the SAVE America Act. Fact 4: There are abundant, readily available ways to get the proper documents or meet the requirements to ease access for all those who are qualified to vote. The bill expects that. It protects that. Fact 5: This Chamber

can and must work together in a bipartisan manner to address this critical concern of the American people. It is possible. Don't believe this is not possible.

We just did it. We just did it with the ROAD to Housing Act last week.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have a problem. We have a problem with voter confidence. We have a problem with voter integrity. The American people want it fixed, and the SAVE America Act is a commonsense and effective solution for addressing this problem.

For all these many reasons, I implore my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting the SAVE America Act.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, this week, the Senate took an important step by beginning debate on the SAVE America Act—a commonsense piece of legislation that safeguards our elections by implementing voter ID requirements and ensuring that only U.S. citizens are eligible to vote in our elections.

This is not a controversial idea. In fact, recent polling shows that over 70 percent of Americans support the bill.

Let me try that one more time. Over 70 percent of Americans support this bill. That means Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—over 70 percent.

That means that the American people agree that only eligible citizens should vote in our elections. It means the American people support voter ID as a reasonable and responsible safeguard.

The Presiding Officer was secretary of state in the Buckeye State—huge State, millions of people. The Presiding Officer knows from his own experience that whether somebody is an Independent, whether they are Republican, whether they are Democrat, the law is that you have to be a citizen.

People want integrity—voter integrity—at the ballot box. This is a pretty fundamental concept, which is why Americans overwhelmingly support it.

The fact that you should have voter ID—just take voter ID. That is over 80 percent. I mean, think about it. Let's see. ID to get into a government building, to get a fishing license, to rent a hotel room, to rent a car. I mean, come on.

It just doesn't get any more fundamental; it doesn't make any more common sense. So it really shouldn't be a partisan issue. As I said, it is a commonsense issue, it is that simple, and

this body should come together and vote and pass it.

So I urge our Democrat colleagues to join us and I guess just do what 70 to 80 percent of Americans want, what 70 percent of their own Democratic voters want. How about doing what their voters want—let alone ours—and the Independents?

So, somehow, the false choice they are bringing up there is that, gee whiz, if we do this, somehow you are denying voters access to the polls. Well, that is just not true. That is not true at all. In fact, when voters trust the process, they are more likely to participate. Think about it. If they trust the process, that makes them motivated to participate.

Again, it is not a burden to simply have a photo ID. They have to have it for everything else, so they certainly should have it when they vote.

For example, in my State of North Dakota, you know, elections are both secure and accessible. Our approach actually goes above and beyond. In North Dakota, my State, we already go beyond what is required in the legislation.

North Dakota officials across multiple State agencies conduct daily maintenance to ensure clean, updated, and accurate voter rolls. We also have a robust voter ID policy that requires an individual to provide a birth certificate, a passport, or a certificate of naturalization to get a driver's license. Now, this is to get a driver's license or a nondriver ID. But once you get that so you can drive your car, you are in great shape to vote.

Again, this is stuff that people have in their everyday lives, so to try to make it out that it is a problem—well, that just doesn't fly.

The American people expect us to protect the integrity of the election system.

Again, the Presiding Officer was secretary of state. That was his job every single day. But it is our job too. It is our job too. And the Voting Rights Act requires it, and that is exactly what this legislation does.

Americans support the SAVE America Act, and I urge our Democrat colleagues to join us in doing exactly what the American people are asking us to do, what they elected us to do.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. President, with that, I would also like to speak about another critical issue that we need to get resolved, and we need to get it resolved sooner, not later. We need to get it resolved. As a matter of fact, we are way past due for getting it resolved. And that is funding the Department of Homeland Security.

Want to go back to one of those fundamental things that you just have to do? Funding the Department of Homeland Security. Look at the risk right now, the global risk of terror. Look at all the things that are going on in the world and here at home. Pretty fundamental—pretty fundamental that we need to fund the Department of Homeland Security.

We have now been shut down since February 14. What is it—37 days? Paychecks have been stopped. The hard-working men and women of the Department of Homeland Security continue to work to secure the homeland, but they are not getting paid.

For more than a month, we have been working to find an agreement to fund the Department of Homeland Security, which is more important now than ever, as I said, given all the things that are going on.

Since the start of fiscal year 2026, Customs and Border Protection has had almost 4,000 encounters with individuals at U.S. ports of entry who are in some way tied to the Terror Watchlist.

Let me repeat that. Since the start of fiscal year 2026, this year, Customs and Border Protection has had encounters with almost 4,000 individuals at our ports of entry who are in some way tied to the Terror Watchlist.

Again, it goes to fundamental homeland security. That is what we are talking about, and that is what Republicans are standing here on the floor fighting to get funded. We need our Democrat colleagues to join us.

We have offered to make reforms to ICE, including body cams and more training. Guess what. It is right in the bill. It is right in the bill.

Also, the President has made changes at DHS. He sent Tom Homan to Minneapolis-St. Paul to defuse the situation there, and Border Czar Homan did an incredible job. He did a really good. Ask Democrats. Don't take my word. They will tell you he did a really good job of deescalating the situation in Minneapolis-St. Paul.

Also, right now, we are in the process of confirming new leadership at DHS, our colleague Senator MARKWAYNE MULLIN. I mean, we had the first vote, and we are in the process of confirming him to lead the Department of Homeland Security. We had the initial vote, bipartisan vote—bipartisan.

Earlier this week, the administration—and obviously, there are a lot of us working on getting this done, and we have been working with the administration on it. Earlier this week, the administration provided a list of the policy changes we have been working on—meaningful changes to respond in a commonsense way to concerns our colleagues across the aisle have brought up.

Let me mention some of those. First, limiting civil enforcement actions at sensitive locations like hospitals, schools, and churches; expanding use of body-worn cameras and requiring longer term retention of the video; conducting greater oversight of DHS detention facilities; and enforcing the use of visible officer identification for DHS law enforcement.

Now, we have offered a clean continuing resolution. If they want to keep negotiating, fine.

If you want to keep negotiating a bill that you have already agreed to, that