

our TSA agents are overwhelmed and are not being paid. They have now missed two paychecks. This was a basic security measure put in place after 9/11, after the terrorist attacks of 9/11.

We know one component of ICE is the Homeland Security Investigations, which works hand in hand with the FBI to investigate domestic terrorism attacks. So, literally, by not funding Homeland Security Investigations, Democrats are making it more likely, not less likely, that we will have a successful terrorist attack on our home soil.

We also know that the TSA agents had nothing to do with the differences that separate Democrats and Republicans here. In fact, their complaint is with ICE because, again, they are for the open borders policy, and they don't want immigration laws enforced. They are going to do everything they can to block funding for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, but that also includes Homeland Security Investigations.

Then they come out here, and they offer unanimous consent requests, saying: Oh, we will pay for the salaries of the Transportation Security Administration, but we won't pay to support the rest of the functions of the Department of Homeland Security, including support for FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency; for the Coast Guard; and for ICE.

The irony is that we already passed funding for ICE in the One Big Beautiful Bill. So their blockade of the funding for the Department of Homeland Security is not going to have an immediate impact on ICE, but it does demonstrate how out of touch and how extreme the Democrats have become in their opposition to commonsense measures that protect public safety.

It is inexcusable to have the Department of Homeland Security—the very Agency whose duty it is to protect and defend the homeland—shut down amidst all of this chaos. At a time when global tensions are rising and the threat landscape is even more perilous, we can't afford to play politics with the safety and security of the American people. It is time for this to end. It is past time for this to end. This is not how the Senate is supposed to work, and this certainly isn't what my constituents in Texas or any American deserves.

My hope is that the negotiations that are ongoing right now will be fruitful immediately and that we will reopen the Department of Homeland Security not for the good of any political party but for the good of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF MARKWAYNE MULLIN

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, in just a little over a year since taking office, the Trump administration and the Department of Homeland Security have completely broken trust with the American people. In the last year, President Trump has made sweeping cuts to programs and personnel at the Department, undermining key missions from counterterrorism and cyber security protections to assistance following national disasters.

These actions are putting the safety and the security of Americans at risk at a time when many of the threats the Department was created to address—like terrorism and cyber attacks—are on the rise because of the President's war in Iran. These cuts to critical national security missions have all been at the expense of the Trump administration's singular focus on indiscriminate immigration enforcement that has led to serious disruptions in communities all across our country.

It was only 2 months ago when the country watched in horror as two U.S. citizens, Alex Pretti and Renee Good, were killed by Homeland Security law enforcement officers. We saw with our own eyes how officers have routinely deployed tear gas and pepper spray against Americans who were simply exercising their First Amendment rights.

Secretary Noem's leadership as the Department head has been a disaster, and Americans want to see a course correction, but I am not convinced that one change in leadership is enough to right the ship.

President Trump and advisers like Stephen Miller are continuing to drive so much of the chaos at the Department of Homeland Security.

When the President nominated Senator MULLIN to lead the Department, I came into the process with an open mind. However, I do not believe that he is the right person for the job. We need a Secretary who has a clear understanding of the Department's many different missions and a keen awareness of the challenges that the Department faces. We need a Secretary who is a steady leader, who won't rush to judgment without having all the facts, and who won't add fuel to the fire when there is a crisis. At a time when political violence is rising, we need a Secretary who will condemn violence, not encourage it. And we need a Secretary who can be trusted to be transparent and open with information to both Congress and the American people, especially—especially—when an emergency strikes.

Unfortunately, I have not seen the nominee exhibit these desperately needed characteristics in his confirmation process, and I urge President Trump to reassess his administration's prior record and nominate someone

who will help return the Department's focus to all of its critical national security missions. We need someone who will be more than just another rubberstamp. We need someone who will be thoughtful, deliberate, and work to restore the trust in the Department.

Therefore, I will be voting no, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mrs. HYDE-SMITH assumed the Chair.)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, as we enter spring and schools across the Nation approach their spring breaks, millions of families will soon be traveling. They will be relying on our airports to travel to visit family, to go on vacation, but unfortunately, they will be met with longer lines because Washington Republicans refuse to pay our TSA agents.

That is right—the Department of Homeland Security is currently without funding because Washington Republicans would rather see it shut down than pass commonsense—just commonsense—guardrails on ICE. In fact, every Senate Republican present voted just this past weekend against paying our TSA agents.

As a result, the American people are paying the price. When TSA staffing levels drop because officers aren't getting paid, wait times at airport security checkpoints—well, they stretch longer and longer. This doesn't just inconvenience travelers; it undermines security and directly threatens jobs and businesses and livelihoods.

The situation is so dire at our airports that the Trump administration is going to send untrained ICE agents to our airports—untrained ICE agents—to try to do the job of our highly trained TSA agents.

That is why I rise yet again with a simple, practical proposal to pay hard-working TSA agents, pay them right now. They deserve it. If we cannot move forward with funding for the entire Department of Homeland Security, we should at least be able to come together on this. The Trump administration and Senate leadership are having ongoing negotiations on the guardrails on ICE, and TSA officers should not be caught in the middle of that fight.

So today, I am asking my colleagues to take just a simple step: Pass my legislation right now to pay TSA workers so that commercial air travel remains safe and functional.

Let me say this: Claiming that you will not agree to pay TSA agents because this bill doesn't fund the entire

Department—well, it is, frankly, just an excuse because if Washington Republicans truly believe that, then why did they agree to literally fund everything else in our government except for DHS?

If it has to be all or nothing, like they are now claiming, then why agree to fund parts of our government where we have an agreement and leave DHS unfunded?

I can tell you why. It is that they know it is the right thing to do. They know that other government employees should not be penalized for the President's mass deportation agenda.

That is exactly why we are asking for this today. Don't penalize TSA and the traveling public for the fact that you refuse to rein in ICE. Have them be held accountable. Have them be trained, transparent, and accountable like every other law enforcement agency in this country.

So, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 362, S. 4127; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, my colleague from Nevada asks this floor to fund the TSA. She and her colleagues have voted against TSA funding at least five—if not six—times over the past several weeks. Republicans have voted to fund the TSA and to fund all of DHS. So this just seems a bit hypocritical, I guess.

As I think about the situation here, I would ask my colleague: Why did it take Democrats 30 days to come to the table and discuss this issue with Republicans—30 days?

Then we started negotiations. There were some talks on Thursday and Friday between the leaders of both parties. Then, over the weekend, Democrats refused to continue those discussions. Why? Was it because they wanted to go home?

Well, look, we all wanted to go home. TSA officers would like to have a paycheck as well. So it is not lost on me.

How in the world can we sit here and have you ask us to fund the TSA when Republicans have consistently voted to fund the DHS?

This is now the 37th day of the shutdown.

Remember, the DHS was formed out of the ashes of September 11, when we took 22 Agencies and brought them together—maybe there was some information missed that wasn't shared on September 11—so that maybe that day never happens again. So why would we start breaking up these Agencies now and break up their funding, since we are a stronger, more secure country when we fund all of DHS, not just a part of it?

Again, Republicans have voted to fund the TSA at least 6 times in the past 2 weeks, and Democrats have voted at least 6 times not to fund the TSA.

Therefore, I ask that the Senator modify her request so that the Senate may proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 156, H.R. 4553. I further ask that the substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify the request?

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

I think we would all agree that it would be better to fund the DHS as a whole rather than piecemeal, but you won't agree to commonsense reforms. In fact, the President himself said, this weekend, that he will not agree to any reform or funding of the DHS, and he is holding other bills hostage. So it is on the President's desk. The President has clearly interjected himself in this by putting ICE in our airports when we can fund the entire Department of Homeland Security and continue the discussions on ICE, which are going back and forth with the President and his team and leadership, and be done with it.

In the meantime, if we pass my piece for right now, we can at least pass the TSA, but the President has interjected himself again. He doesn't want guardrails. So I want to just, at least, prevent those TSA agents from missing another paycheck.

In the meantime, get ICE out of our airports.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. MARSHALL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, you know, I find this really disappointing. Paying our hard-working TSA officers shouldn't be controversial. It is not partisan. The funding isn't controversial. People in my State and in every State are waiting 3 hours, maybe more than that. They are missing their flights.

Everyone here has the power to do something about it. My Republican colleagues have the power to do something about it. They don't have to wait for the President. So, if Washington Republicans—my Senate colleagues—really wanted to do what was right by their constituents regarding the TSA workers, you would have passed my bill to pay the TSA officers, instead of punishing them and the American people because of your inaction.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the McDonald nomination.

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

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, we are talking again about the SAVE Act.

This is a simple piece of legislation that focuses on two key ideas: that if you are an American citizen, which is required by law, you just show it. I call that the "trust and verify" portion of the bill.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act begins with the statement "all citizens." It is already required under Federal law that you have to be a citizen of the United States to vote. We have all agreed on that. There is no one disputing that—Republican, Democrat, Independent. We all agree American citizens are the ones who should decide the future of America.

What we disagree on is, Should we check or should we just trust that it actually is true?

I have shared in this body before, that, in Oklahoma, we passed a statute, several years ago, saying: If you go to jury duty and you tell a judge, "I am not eligible to be able to serve on a jury because I am not a citizen of the United States," in Oklahoma, we then check to see if you are registered to vote. We have found quite a few folks who have told a judge, "I am not a citizen," but have told the election board, "I want to vote anyway." Well, that is not legal.

In Oklahoma, we purge the voter rolls when that happens in order to make sure those individuals who have already given sworn testimony that they are not citizens are not also registered to vote. That is not true everywhere across the country. Lots of folks just say: We just trust, but we never verify. We actually don't clean up the voter rolls at all.

There are some States—and it is really fascinating to me—like Arizona—Arizona has a State law in place right now that says: Every person who registers to vote must also prove their citizenship.

This already exists right now.

New Hampshire has a law that says: Every person who registers to vote has to show they are a citizen.

This is not crazy policy. This is already happening in some of our States right now, that they have to be able to show they are a citizen.

In Arizona, though, it is a very interesting thing. In Arizona, you can register to vote for a State election or a county election, and you have got to be a citizen. But if you want to vote in a Federal election, you don't have to show that you are a citizen.

If you want to talk backward, this was a case that broke out there, in a court case for them, where they established: Oh, no, you have got to show