

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

that you are an American citizen to vote for the Governor of Arizona, but you don't have to show that you are an American citizen to vote for the President of the United States.

If we can figure out how to do registration to be able to protect the rights of the individuals in Arizona to be able to vote for their Governor if they are an American citizen, surely, we can do this all over the country.

The SAVE America Act is simple. It just says: It is already the law that you have to be an American citizen to vote. Let's just verify.

The State of New Hampshire is not trying to limit the number of people voting. They are just following Federal law.

Then there is the second part, which is pretty simple: You have to show ID to vote.

There are 36 States that already have this requirement. Let me just run through what this means. There are already 36 States that say you have to show an ID. Now, some of them are very narrow. They say you have got to have a specific type of photo ID on that. That is Arkansas, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Ohio, Tennessee, Wisconsin. They all have in their State laws that you have got to have a certain type of photo ID to actually qualify you to be able to show up and be able to vote.

Multiple other States have some other limitation where a photo ID is, maybe, preferred, but they can also bring other IDs. That is Arizona, North Dakota, Utah, Wyoming, Alabama, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Washington State, West Virginia, Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Oklahoma, Virginia, and Pennsylvania.

This doesn't seem very controversial to me. If you are keeping count on fingers and toes, you ran out a while ago. There are 36 States that already have some kind of requirement for ID to be able to vote. This has got to be the most noncontroversial proposal sitting out there to say: How can we disagree when 36 States already do this?

But, for some reason, in this body, it is controversial for us as a nation to do what 36 States already do. So we bring this to the body, yet again, as we have now for days and days and days.

The American people are just not offended with pulling out an ID at an airport to be able to get on a plane. They are just not offended by showing an ID when they walk into a Federal building. They are just not offended by pulling out an ID in some places where they are going to write a check—for those who still know how to write a check in America. It is just not that offensive to have to pull out some sort of identification.

State after State after State has shown that this doesn't limit the number of people who can show up to vote.

It just limits the amount of fraud that can happen in that State when people vote.

You just can't walk up to a polling place and say, "My name is," and pick a name. You have got to show something with your name on it to vote. It is pretty straightforward, and 36 States already agree and have already put this into practice.

So all we are trying to say is, Can we continue this as Federal law? I think we can—and not just saying it is Federal law but actually verifying that it is actually applied. I am a big fan of the phrase "trust and verify." That is all that this does.

I would hope, at some point, we would have a breakthrough here, but, in the meantime, I am going to continue coming back and saying: Why can't we all agree to what most Americans nod their heads and say, "That is a pretty good idea," and just get it done?

I yield the floor.

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

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

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I could not help but respond in realtime to my very able colleague from the great State of Oklahoma. I really wish things were as simple as my Republican friends would have us believe.

They want us to believe that this is simply a basic voter ID bill. Let me say the same thing I said several days ago. I believe that you should have to prove that you are who you say you are before you vote. But this is not a voter ID bill; this is a voter suppression bill. They really ought to call it what it actually is. They ought to rename this bill: "Your Driver's License is Not Enough to Register Bill."

Not only is your driver's license not good enough in most States, except those States where your citizenship is a part of your driver identification—and that is literally a handful of States—you will not be able to register to vote using your driver's license. You will not be able to register to vote using your student ID. You will not be able to register to vote using your military ID.

Let's be very clear: The Republicans know that their policies are failing; that they have kicked 15 million Americans off of their healthcare; that they have doubled healthcare premiums for some 22 million Americans. They have dragged us or they have enabled this President to drag us into a war—and he can't even explain why we are there—and they want to make it difficult for everyday Americans to hold them accountable. This will not stand. It will not succeed.

This bill especially disenfranchises women. There are many people right

now who are listening to me at home who are registered to vote right now, and you say: Well, I have never had to prove my citizenship in order to vote. If this bill is passed, you will. If you move, you will have to reregister. If you change your name if you get married, you will have to register to vote as we do, and all of a sudden your driver's license will not be good enough. Even though you have been voting for years—decades—that will not be good enough.

Imagine being a woman and your birth certificate does not match your current name, so you have got to go drag out documents you haven't seen for years in order to certify that you are a citizen.

And the question you ought to ask is, Why would they go through all of this? Why is this necessary when there is no evidence at all that we have some major problem of voter fraud through voter identification.

It is already illegal to vote if you are not a citizen. It is illegal. They will deport you. You will be prosecuted under law if you register to vote, and you are not a citizen. If you try to vote, and you are not a citizen, it is a crime. You can be deported.

And they are trying to convince us that there are droves of people in this country who are willing to risk deportation, risk being arrested, risk the abuse that we are seeing visited upon American citizens by ICE agents in realtime—that they are willing to risk all of that in droves in order to change the outcome of an election. It defies credulity, and it is simply not true.

Donald Trump wants to meddle with the outcome of the midterm elections because he knows that he is losing. And citizens who are watching this right now, not only ought you to reject this, as we are doing on your behalf, you ought to register in droves and put this nonsense to an end.

Democracy is the very house we live in. It is the place in which we get to fight for the things we say matter. And little by little, they are chipping away at the democracy itself.

Let the people speak. Let people cast their votes without having to jump over all kinds of unnecessary barriers. Why would you disenfranchise hundreds of thousands, millions of Americans, while chasing a problem that does not exist? Why are you so afraid of the voices of the people, I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle.

The most powerful words in a democracy are "the people have spoken." And we must ensure that no voter suppression bill prevents them from speaking.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mrs. MOODY. Mr. President, I, like you, I know, am incredibly frustrated at the lack of funding for one of our most important Agencies in the Nation—the Department of Homeland Security. Due to my Democratic defund