



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2026

No. 56

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Honorable PETE RICKETTS, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Matchless Heavenly Father, we praise You for this wonderful day, for Your countless blessings, and for our loved ones whose support has given us strength. Lord, provide us the wisdom, courage, and faith in these uncertain times so that we will stay within the circle of Your will.

We acknowledge that only You know what tomorrow holds. We ask You, therefore, to elevate our Senators, world leaders, and committed citizens to continue to seek solutions for the living of these days. From every grain of Florida's sand to the currents of the Potomac, from sea to shining sea, give us gratitude for Your generous beneficence. Lord, use us to bring peace to these turbulent times.

We pray in Your majestic Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2026.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable PETE RICKETTS, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. RICKETTS thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message with respect to S. 1383, which the clerk will report:

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany S. 1383, a bill to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Thune motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill.

Thune motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with Thune (for Schmitt) amendment No. 4420 (to the House amendment to the bill), in the nature of a substitute.

Thune (for Husted) amendment No. 4732 (to amendment No. 4420), to require voters to provide photo identification.

Thune motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Rules and Administration, with instructions, Thune amendment No. 4772, to change the enactment date.

Thune amendment No. 4773 (to the instructions) amendment No. 4772), of a perfecting nature.

Thune amendment No. 4774 (to amendment No. 4773), of a perfecting nature.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2026—Motion to Proceed—Resumed

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147, a bill making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we are on day 40 of Democrats' shutdown of Department of Homeland Security—day 40. And that is on top of Democrats' recordbreaking 43-day full-government shutdown in the fall.

Altogether, thanks to Senate Democrats, a lot of DHS employees have been working without pay for more than 80 days so far this fiscal year.

That is shameful. It is no wonder TSA agents are quitting in droves—anyone would be if they had been working without pay for almost 50 percent of the fiscal year so far.

My Democrat colleagues, of course, are working with pay, having rejected a Republican proposal to stop Senators' pay while DHS continues to be shut down. I am hoping that Democrats can at least envision what it is like for stressed-out Homeland Security workers wondering if they will be able to

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1589

pay their rent, and I hope they will recognize the situation can't continue.

Homeland Security workers are hurting; travelers are beyond fed up with the disastrous situation at U.S. airports; and we cannot continue to keep this critical Department unfunded. Democrats have a proposal before them with legislative text—the latest serious offer from Republicans to get this Department back up and running.

Democrats have repeatedly said that they want to pay TSA, Coast Guard, FEMA, and employees who defend America from cyber attacks. This bill would do it. I hope Democrats will work with us to finalize an agreement and reopen the Department of Homeland Security this week.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. President, since we began debate on the SAVE America Act, my Democrat colleagues have spent a lot of time hedging. And that has been particularly evident on the issue of voter ID—something that Democrats have spent years decrying as a tool of voter suppression but are now suggesting they somehow support.

Democrats can read the polls as well as any of us, and I suspect that Democrats are not eager to be seen as on the 20-percent side of an 80–20 issue, so they are trying to have their cake and eat it too.

So the Democrat leader is out there claiming Democrat support for voter ID—as long, of course, as he doesn't have to vote for any ID proposal that we actually put forward.

On Thursday, the junior Republican Senator from Ohio offered an eminently reasonable voter ID proposal. All that it would have done is require a photo ID for voters when they go to the polls—a driver's license, military ID, Tribal ID, passport—the types of IDs that are sitting in wallets right now that the American people use on a regular basis.

Democrats said: No, we don't like that. And so they blocked it.

And more than blocked it. The junior Senator from Oregon offered an alternative bill that would have actually banned voter ID for absentee ballots.

And then yesterday—yesterday—Democrats said the quiet part out loud. The Democrat leader came down to the floor and made it clear when Democrats say they support voter ID, they mean that they support voter ID just as long as the ID requirements in question are meaningless.

That is right. The Democrat leader brought up a bill Democrats introduced a few years that included a voter ID requirement—well, sort of.

Let me read a few of the IDs that the Democrats' bill would have accepted: A debit card, a lease or mortgage document, a utility bill, any document containing the individual's name—name, not photo—issued by a government, or a photocopy of any one of the above.

Now, sure, Mr. President, some of these things are accepted or requested as adjunct documents when you are

trying to get something like a driver's license or a library card—along with, you know, things like photo ID or a birth certificate. But just showing a utility bill to prove your identity? Give me a break.

If someone asked you for an ID in any other circumstance, are you going to pull out your electric bill? Can you get into a bar by showing your lease? Can you prove eligibility to work at your new job by pulling out the water bill? No, you cannot. Now, I would like to see someone try to get on a plane by presenting a photocopy of their debit card.

When Republicans say voter ID, we mean an actual ID with a picture issued by a government. The kind of ID that is required for a whole bunch of things in our daily lives—starting a new job, driving a car, doing an early pickup at school, opening a bank account, getting a library card.

The Democrat leader suggested that photo IDs are somehow out of reach for voters—that they need “inclusive” voter ID options. How does the Democratic leader think Americans are navigating all of the scenarios I just mentioned? Well, I will tell him: With their photo IDs. And yet, it is somehow an intolerable burden to ask Americans to bring those IDs with them to the polls.

Give me a break. Requiring a photo ID isn't onerous. It is common sense, and the American people agree. Poll after poll shows that Americans of both parties strongly support requiring a photo ID at the polls. And just to reassure my Democrat friends, a 2019 study published by the National Bureau of Economic Research found:

[S]trict ID laws have no significant negative effect on registration or turnout, overall or for any subgroup defined by age, gender, race, or party affiliation.

Democrats are going to have another chance tomorrow to support election integrity by implementing a common-sense photo ID requirement. Will they stand with Americans, or will they continue to oppose any meaningful ID requirement at the polls?

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this morning, Democrats sent Republicans our counteroffer on legislation to reopen DHS, pay TSA workers, while at the same time rein in ICE with commonsense guardrails. Our offer is a reasonable, good-faith proposal that contains some of the very same asks

Democrats have been talking about now for months.

Leader JEFFRIES and I have spoken about this agenda, and he agrees we need these strong reforms.

Now, over the last day, Republicans have made the outrageous and bad-faith claim that Democrats are somehow moving the goalposts back in these negotiations. They are saying Democrats changed the ask. They are saying Democrats are backtracking and suddenly introducing new demands at the last minute.

This is nonsense—nonsense.

Democrats and the American people have been very clear from the beginning about what we need in order to move forward. We have been talking about ICE reforms from day one. These are not new demands. These are not surprise demands. They are not things we came up with yesterday.

They are commonsense reforms, reasonable reforms, reforms that police departments across America follow every day. These are reforms the American people overwhelmingly support and things that Republicans know perfectly well we have been seeking since these negotiations began—since these discussions began as well.

So for Republicans to now act as though Democrats have changed our position as though we have moved the goalposts is poppycock, bad faith. And for Republicans to send us a proposal that has no reforms is bad faith as well and will only slow things down. They know it is bad faith.

In fact, over the weekend Democrats had constructive conversations in person with our Republican colleagues. They—the Republican colleagues—conceded that some of the reforms, verbally, that we have been looking for, they said: These make sense.

We thought there might be a path forward on some of the ways to reform ICE and to get some of the things everybody knows ought to be in Federal legislation. We thought there had been some progress.

But then Republicans sent us their offer yesterday, and it contained none of what had been talked about, none of the reforms we had been discussing. So if anyone is slowing down negotiation and hurting TSA workers, it is the Republican leadership who did not include one single reform.

Republicans, frankly, are struggling to get on the same page among themselves. That is probably why they have been so erratic here.

Moderates in the Republican caucus say one thing; conservatives say another. Donald Trump is all over the place, seemingly without a clue of what is going on. They are still worried about and afraid of what he might say or do. That is what this is all about.

So let me say this: We are ready to discuss these issues at a moment's notice with Republicans. We will not walk away. We are not walking away, and we want to get to a solution.

We now have given Republicans our response. It is a serious offer, and time

is of the essence, I say to my Republican colleagues. The Easter holiday is coming. Families are going on spring break. TSA lines are literally stretching out the door at airports. People are exhausted. And our TSA agents need to be paid.

Enough is enough. It is time for Republicans to drill down and work with us to solve this thing. We have asked the Republicans nine times already to support TSA. We have told Republicans: Just support TSA while we settle these disputes with ICE, and they have refused nine times. They say they want their position on ICE met first before they do anything to fund TSA and pay our workers.

The way to pay TSA is to vote to send their paychecks now while we settle this dispute regarding ICE. We can and must do both—negotiate reforms to ICE but vote to pay our TSA workers now.

That is why, today, for the 10th time—10th time—Democrats will go to the floor so that we can pay TSA immediately as we negotiate ICE. We hope our Republican colleagues will finally see the light and join us.

Let me say it again: Enough is enough. It is time for Republicans to drill down and work with us to solve this thing.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. President, finally, on the SAVE Act, which seems to have now been intertwined in these negotiations because of Donald Trump and Republican obeisance to him, let me say this to our Republican colleagues: If you want to shove the SAVE Act into reconciliation, then have at it. We are going to fight you tooth and nail throughout the reconciliation process every step of the way.

You are going to find it very difficult to jam massive changes to the American election system, to turn the American election system inside out, as it were, by using a process that was never designed for that purpose. Reconciliation was not, is not, and will not be intended to be a backdoor for sweeping election law; that is not what it is for.

So if Republicans want to head down that road, they should understand it will be a hard road. Democrats will fight them every—every—step of the way on that road, and it will not go the way they think or want.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as you and we can all see, the cherry blossoms are popping out along the Potomac River and around the Capitol and are approaching peak bloom.

We all know what comes next; we get a lot of visitors who come to the Nation's Capital at this wonderful time of year to see the cherry blossoms. They come during spring break, and it is good to see friends from back home come to the Nation's Capital to visit and learn more about how our govern-

ment functions or sometimes how it doesn't function as well as we would like.

Families taking a vacation, as well as elementary, middle, and high school groups, are learning about civics, which is a good thing. More of our kids need to know how our government works because they are going to be the leaders of tomorrow.

So I am glad the Senate is still debating a very important piece of legislation called the SAVE America Act because it really goes to the very foundation of self-government.

All it says is that in order to be an American citizen—excuse me, in order to vote, you need to be an American citizen, and in order to cast a ballot, you have to produce a voter ID.

So it makes you wonder, with the polling showing that 70 to 80 percent of people polled—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike—support both of those provisions, why is it that our Democratic colleagues oppose it?

Surely, it can't be because they want people other than American citizens to vote or they want to make it easier to cheat. But sometimes I struggle to figure out what the reason is that they reflexively oppose even commonsense provisions like this.

By now, we have heard the argument on both sides. Our Democratic colleagues argue that the SAVE America Act is just too hard for ordinary Americans to comply with. They are claiming that the same people who can present a valid government ID to board a plane, buy a beer, drive a car, rent a hotel room, or open a bank account simply won't be able to do the same to cast a ballot.

We know that is not true, and it just doesn't make any sense. It is clear that this is just a pretext to say that they apparently don't care whether illegal aliens vote in our elections. Republicans, on the other hand, believe that every illegal vote cast dilutes your vote and undermines the integrity of the election system.

We want more people to participate in the election system. We need to build confidence that it is going to work and operate with integrity. So by resisting commonsense measures like demonstrating American citizenship and producing a voter ID—which would contribute to building confidence and thus, hopefully, get more people to participate in our elections—that is something they apparently are not interested in.

President Trump, I think, is right to make this a priority, but I am sure like me, he scratches his head and wonders, What is the contrary argument?

If we don't stop illegal aliens or non-citizens from voting in our elections, it is not long before we will have a country that is not representative of the American people.

You know, the very basis for our form of government is as stated in the Declaration of Independence: The authority that we exercise on behalf of

the people who vote for us in elections is based on consent of the governed. The power doesn't come top down, it comes bottom up. And if people who are not qualified because they are not citizens to vote in our elections—it undermines that very basic foundation and compact between the people and those who exercise power on their behalf here in Washington, DC.

I am committed to doing whatever it takes to muscle this through the Senate, including using the reconciliation process, if necessary, to get around Senate Democrats' obstruction, but at the same time, we are not giving up on moving it through regular order here on the Senate floor.

Our colleague Senator LEE from Utah has been a proponent of using the talking filibuster; in other words, not letting people sit on their hands and just object and stop progress on important bills like this but to force people to talk and debate because I think the American people need to hear the arguments—pro and con—and they can make up their mind whom they agree with and what they believe.

That is what the world's greatest deliberative body was supposed to be all about, which is otherwise known as the U.S. Senate.

So if Democrats really don't believe that illegal aliens should be able to vote, they need to come to the floor and prove it.

If they think we should not make it easier to cheat in elections by not requiring people to show a photo ID, they need to come to the floor of the Senate and debate it. I would love to hear the arguments to the contrary.

As I said, a recent Harvard-Harris poll showed that 71 percent of voters, including 50 percent of Democrats and 69 percent of Independent voters, support the SAVE America Act. It is hard to find that kind of consensus anywhere in America today, as polarized as we are. But this means that Senate Democrats are defying the wishes of their own voters, their supporters.

Now, we have heard this nutty idea that somehow the SAVE America Act will disenfranchise voters. Well, the only people it will disenfranchise are people who are not qualified to vote.

But if you extend that logic a little further, in other words, 70 to 80 percent of people polled support the SAVE America Act; and if you believe it will disenfranchise voters, that means that 70 to 80 percent of people polled are willing to disenfranchise themselves—again, what a silly, absurd, and false argument.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. President, it is beyond shameful that Senate Democrats have continued to keep the Department of Homeland Security unfunded and shut down.

I would have thought, by now, with some of the lines at the TSA security checkpoints in places like the Houston International Airport—the Bush International Airport—that finally people would wake up and say: You know, we

are causing too much needless pain and collateral damage to people who have nothing to do with this fight.

We know that essential operations of ICE, or Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, like the Homeland Security Investigations, which is an important office that conducts operations to prevent human trafficking, are hamstrung; and we know TSA workers are continuing to work without pay. These are not wealthy people. These are public servants who are performing an important function keeping us all safe, and they have to show up. They are showing up and working without pay.

But then there are some who simply can't outlast the political stunts here in Washington, DC, and more than 300 of them have left their jobs. And you can't blame them. If you are not getting paid because of the politics here in Washington, DC, you may not be able to wait that out. You may just have to look for a job—another job.

But each new hire to replace a TSA agent requires 4 to 6 months of training and certification, and I can't imagine that there is a long waiting list of people who want to become TSA agents if they have this sort of environment to look forward to. So it certainly doesn't help with recruiting new people to fill the gaps.

But we know that President Trump, left with no other alternative, has asked ICE to assist and help out at the airports. And some Democrats are getting downright hysterical about the fact that now ICE is necessary to help process people through the airports.

Some are even saying that the traveling American public is in danger when these professional law enforcement officers are working to help assist people to move through these security checkpoints at our airports.

Meanwhile, the truth is, as we have seen in videos and social media, ICE agents are handing out water bottles to travelers and helping keep the flow of traffic organized and hopefully expedited.

I think it is encouraging that these men and women are willing to jump in and become team players, even in this difficult and charged environment where Democrats continue—this is the party of “defund the police” or “abolish ICE.”

Now they have found a new way to try to prevent the enforcement of our immigration laws by saying: We are not going to fund ICE.

That is not what the American people voted for last November—in November 2024. The reason why President Trump was elected, among other reasons, was because of open borders and 40-year-high inflation. And, of course, we know President Trump has effectively secured the border, but now Democrats have found a new way to prevent people from—who got here in the first place, who don't deserve to be here—from being removed from the country by saying: We are simply going to refuse to fund immigration enforcement.

And then, of course, we know that, despite the fact that the President was elected by the American people, having won the electoral vote and the popular vote in every single swing State, Democrats continue to try to oppose the duly elected President of the United States out of a demonstration of what has become known as Trump derangement syndrome.

In other words, whatever he proposes, they oppose. It is just reflexive. More than 70 percent of Americans support his efforts to remove criminal illegal aliens from our country. And almost daily we hear of tragedies, of innocent individuals being killed or harmed, as a result of some of the people that were let into the country during the Biden administration that need to be removed.

Well, I am hopeful that we are moving closer to a deal which will help these good men and women that work at the Department of Homeland Security get a paycheck. President Trump knows how to make a deal, and I am confident that, under his leadership, we will find a way. Unless the Democrats continue to move the goalposts, which the minority leader continues to try to do, I am optimistic that we will find a way to get them paid by the end of the week.

These antics are not a way to govern. We need paychecks for our TSA agents and secure elections, both. This is what the American people chose during the last Presidential election, and I am confident, under the President's leadership, we will accomplish these priorities and, finally, after more than a month, reopen the Department of Homeland Security.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today having heard the minority leader talk about the ongoing problem that the country is seeing before their very eyes, which is the shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security caused by the Democrats.

Republicans have continually come to the floor to vote to open the Department of Homeland Security, and working with the Democrats, there have been a number of proposals, one of which the Democrats actually agreed to the other day. And yet today, on the floor the Senate, the minority leader said: Oh, no, that is just “poppycock.” That was his word.

The Democrats have continued to move the goalposts over all of this time when we were talking about the importance of funding the Department of Homeland Security—a Department that was set up after 9/11 to deal comprehensively with our Nation's security.

There are issues of border security, cyber security, flight security. The TSA is part of that. This has gotten so bad. I saw on the news this morning that there are members of the Depart-

ment of Homeland Security, who are not getting paid, who are working every day, and who are now donating their plasma—not donating it but giving it to get paid.

That is what the Democrats—they talk about getting blood out of it. That is what the Democrats are doing. Blood is on their hands. We are seeing this today with the unfunding of the Department of Homeland Security.

Americans are rising up to say to the Democrats: We care about these people that are working and not getting paid.

My own Rotary Club in Casper, WY, came out today with an email to all the Rotarians. One of the members of the club has offered a matching donation of up to \$2,000 for supplies and gift cards to be donated to TSA employees at the airport. Now, these people have been working without pay because of the shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security.

It says: Please consider supporting the local TSA personnel and help secure the matching donation by donating supplies or gift cards.

It goes on to say: Currently, there are approximately 40 TSA employees in Casper who are not being paid. The airport is collecting food and other supplies—dog food, cat food, toilet paper, et cetera—because of what we are facing here and with an offer that we have made, and the Democrats are now saying, well, it is all “poppycock.” They don't seem to care.

The employees cannot accept cash, cannot accept cash-equivalent cards like Visa gift cards. However, they can accept gas cards and gift cards to places like Walmart or Target, which give them the flexibility to purchase what they truly need.

This is what we are seeing here in this Chamber with what the Democrats are doing because they do not want to fund the Department of Homeland Security that keeps our Nation safe.

Well, there is now circulating, and that it is evident, that the Republicans have all seen, which is a Member of the Senate—a Democrat Member of the Senate—on television telling the Nation—this is a clip where a Member of the Senate says—this is a Democrat—the people we care most about, he says, are “the undocumented.”

Not these people who are working every day—the people the Democrats care most about are the undocumented, the illegal immigrants, the people who are not citizens of this country but are here and have been unleashed into this country—10 million or more—during the Biden administration.

And that is what we are talking about here today on the floor, and why we will be voting later today on the proposal that the Republicans have made that the Democrats agreed to 2 days ago. But now they have withdrawn their support because, as we hear from a Democrat spokesman and a Democrat Senator, the people that they care most about are not the citizens of the United States; they are the

undocumented, the illegal immigrants who are here among us today.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. President, I have also heard Senate Democrats on this floor say, when it comes to voting, they are open to the requirement of a photo ID. Senator SCHUMER said, just last week, that his Democrat caucus is not opposed to a photo ID when you show up to vote.

We now have a pending amendment to the SAVE America Act to do just that. It is a straightforward amendment from Senator JON HUSTED of Ohio. It simply requires a photo ID when Americans show up to vote.

Democrats blocked this very bill on this floor last week. Then they offered a counterproposal, a nationwide ban—a ban—on photo ID requirements. I mean, it is the exact opposite of what the American people want. I mean, it is hard to believe, but that is what they said. They wanted to ban photo ID. Democrats did this even though 32 States currently require photo ID. So I guess they want to rip it out of all the States that already have it.

Mr. President, 21 Democrat Senators on that side of the aisle in this very Chamber represent States where voter ID is the law of the land.

They live by it. They vote under it. They were even elected under it. Why do Democrats believe that voter ID is fine for their home States but not for our Nation?

We are going to give every single Democrat in this Chamber the chance to go on the record on that very topic. They are going to have the opportunity to show the American people where they stand on commonsense requirements for photo ID.

The vote is a clear yes or no for Democrat Senators. It doesn't touch voter rolls. It doesn't touch mail-in voting. It is a clean up-or-down vote on whether voters should be required to show a photo ID in order to vote.

The bill offers a clear, broad definition of photo IDs. Voters can use a driver's license. They can use State ID. They can use a U.S. passport. They can use a military ID. They can use a Tribal ID. Those are identifications Americans carry with them every single day. They use it to cash a check, to board a plane, to buy a beer. People use it every day. It is just common sense.

Asking for a photo ID at the ballot box is common sense and a common practice in States all across the country.

As I said earlier, 36 States require or request an ID to vote. Of these 36 States, 32 require a photo ID. That is most of the country. And yes, that includes Democrat States. Of course, we know that there are many large and liberal States that lack voter ID laws—sanctuary States like California, New York, Oregon, Illinois—and they don't protect the voter rolls.

So, once again, we are seeing Democrats angling for illegal immigrants to have an impact on our elections. Why is that? As I said earlier, the people we

care most about, the undocumented. He said, the illegal immigrants who are here among our Nation.

That is who the Democrats will tell you they care most about, not law-abiding citizens but illegal immigrants.

Democrats allowed 10 million illegal immigrants. They flooded in the country. The lesson is clear. We cannot allow illegal immigrants to undermine and erode the integrity of our elections. That is why we are in this shutdown right now because of the Democrats' preference of illegal immigrants over American citizens and the safety and security of our Nation.

But adding photo ID requirements would be a significant step toward restoring confidence in elections in all 50 States.

So I want to thank Senator JON HUSTED of Ohio. Senator HUSTED knows exactly about administering elections, and he knows it better than any Member of this body. He spent 8 years as Ohio's secretary of state. His job was to run fair, safe, and secure elections; and he succeeded at it.

He knows how to do it. He knows what works. And he succeeded in one of the most closely watched battleground States in our Nation. His amendment makes it easy to vote, harder to cheat, and it does so nationwide.

A clean, simple photo ID amendment leaves Democrats with no excuses. They can't claim photo ID is too hard. They can't claim it is too confusing. They can't claim it is too burdensome.

The question before the Senate is, Will Democrats take a reasonable and responsible step toward what most Americans consider common sense?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The minority whip.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, not once, not twice, 10 times we Democrats have brought to the floor of the Senate an opportunity to restore all of the appropriations in the Department of Homeland Security but for one Agency, ICE and a related Agency, Border Patrol. Ten times the Republicans have voted no—ten times. Let's get it done this week and done as quickly as possible.

We proposed this to the point where the Republican leader met with the President and said: We ought to be for this. He said: No, not until you pass this voting bill.

This voting bill is controversial. It seems to change. My friend from Wyoming—he is my friend—the Senator from Wyoming said: We are offering an amendment to change this bill.

This bill has been changed over and over again because it is a mess. Why is it a mess? Because the premise is wrong. The premise that there are illegal aliens voting in the United States in any measurable number is wrong.

We did a survey. We looked at 24 years, 1999 to 2023. How many illegal aliens were caught voting in the United

States? There were 50 million every election cycle who were registered to vote. How many of those were illegal aliens?

Over a period of 24 years, what is your guess? Seven million? You would think so, wouldn't you, from Senator BARRASSO's statements? How about 700,000? How about 70,000? How about 700? How about 77?

That is the exact number that was found. Mr. President, 77 people over a span of 24 years were not eligible to vote as illegal aliens and voted anyway, 77 over 24 years.

So now the Republicans want to change the system. They want people to reregister. This is the first I have heard that they are going to accept a driver's license. Up until now, you needed a passport. How many Americans have passports? Forty-nine percent.

If you wanted to get a passport in time to register to vote for November, what do you have to do? Well, you have to fill out a form and you have to write a check and you have to wait weeks to receive it.

How big is that check that you have to write so you can be sure you vote? Mr. President, \$165 for you to get a passport—\$165. You wait weeks and maybe months before it is delivered to you to prove you are an American citizen so you can vote in November.

What is wrong with this picture? For 77 voters or attempted voters, in 24 years, we are going to require every American to come up with this proof? Oh, there is an alternative. Your birth certificate, you can prove you are an American that way in this reregistration effort by the Republicans.

Have you found your birth certificate recently? I think mine is upstairs in the bedroom closet in a cardboard box. I am not sure. I would have to go look. Some people don't have access at all to them.

Why are we going through all this? The bottom line is: There is a good reason and a real reason. The good reason is to make sure that noncitizens don't vote. I agree with that premise. The real reason is: Donald Trump is scared of this election in November.

Remember when he said: The States give me some more Republican Members of the House? Redistrict your State. Draw up your map, save it for unusual times. He did that because he is concerned about the outcome of the election.

So when you hear this explanation about voter fraud, remember 77 in 24 years, 77 examples. And for that they want to change it.

In terms of showing their driver's license as an ID, I do it every day, and you do it too. It is pretty normal. That is not a problem, but that is not what this bill says. They think they want to change it. Let's see them change it.

In the meantime, let's pay everybody: TSA, FEMA, Coast Guard, and the basic Agencies at Homeland Security except for ICE. We are working

with the White House and negotiating new terms for the ICE agents. Let's get it done this week.

For 10 different occasions, we have come to the floor and said: Fund the rest of the Agencies including TSA. I still think we should be there.

POLITICAL PRISONERS

Mr. President, I come to the floor at this time to discuss a separate issue, totally unrelated. Over the course of the time I have served in the Senate, I have pointed out political prisoners jailed around the world. Others have joined me over the years. Our current Secretary of State Marco Rubio joined me on the floor one time to help further history of bipartisan support for those pursuing freedom and democracy around the world.

Sometimes those released as a result in pressure from this Chamber actually come to see me in Washington, and they say how important it is to know that they were remembered.

I want to salute my staffer Chris Homan, who joins me on the floor here. This has been his personal project for many years with great success.

Thanks, Chris.

Today, let me raise a few issues and cases for your consideration. Let me start with the United Arab Emirates. We are one of that nation's top human rights defenders. Ahmed Mansoor tragically has marked 9 years in jail. He was arrested under the guise that his social media posts advocating for human rights threatened social harmony.

Despite the dismal conditions of his incarceration, Mr. Mansoor has remained steadfast in his commitment to human rights, even conducting multiple hunger strikes to protest jail conditions.

We have strong ties and many shared interests with the UAE, but its continued involvement in this horrific Sudanese civil war and jailing Mr. Mansoor complicates the relationship.

Adding to the strain is Emirati Ambassador Otaiba's bewildering refusal to engage on these issues. I appeal to him to finally release Mr. Mansoor.

Next, Azerbaijan. Vice President VANCE recently visited this country. In 2023, anti-corruption researcher and advocate Dr. Gubad Ibadoghlu and his wife were forcibly dragged from their vehicle and severely beaten. His dubious arrest was a tragic result of writings about the rampant corruption stemming from Azerbaijan's oil and gas industry.

While eventually placed under house arrest in 2024, he has still been denied a trial and medical care; and his family continues to suffer harassment.

In fact, his son Emin, who desperately hopes to reunite with his father, is here today in the Senate Gallery. He is one of the many wrongfully detained individuals in Azerbaijan who should be fully released immediately.

In a number of cases in China, starting with Gulshan Abbas, a doctor serving a 20-year sentence—20 years—likely

a result of her sister's advocacy for the Uyghurs.

Hong Kong publisher Jimmy Lai, jailed since 2020, a tragic example of that island's loss of freedom under Chinese rule.

Pastors Jin Mingri and Gao Quanfu and his wife Pang Yu, arrested amid a crackdown on religious freedom.

I apologize for mispronouncing the names.

The Chinese have worked with my office on such cases in the past and made some important gestures, but it is time to do something. Release these individuals.

I urge President Trump to raise with Chinese President Xi when he visits China the fate of these prisoners.

In Tunisia, last July, I came to the floor to call for the release of prominent Tunisian lawyer and political commentator Sonia Dahmani. She was arrested in May 2024 for peaceful radio and television political commentary and subjected to appalling prison conditions.

Her sister Ramla was also sentenced in absentia to 2 years in prison, simply for publicly advocating for her sister's release.

While I am glad Sonia was conditionally released last year, the government is still harassing her with non-sense charges.

I urge President Saied to end this vendetta against Sonia and Ramla and take steps to restore press freedom in Tunisia, once a symbol of great democratic hope after the Arab Spring.

Lastly, Equatorial Guinea, an oil-rich African nation with a history of repression and growing ties with the Russian military, human rights advocate Joaquin Elo Ayeto had been arrested in 2019 and eventually released a year later, not long after which he came to meet me in my office here in Washington.

Unfortunately, he was rearrested under new spurious charges in 2024. It is time to end this official harassment against Mr. Ayeto.

I urge President Mbasogo to show the same compassion displayed in 2022 and release him without delay on humanitarian grounds.

What we have here really matters, not just to these individuals and their families. My friend and jailed Russian dissident Vladimir Kara-Murza often reminded me that for political prisoners the worst nightmare is the thought that people have forgotten them.

Let me remind Ahmed, Gubad, Gulshan, Jimmy, Pastors Jin and Gao, Pang, Sonia, Ramla, and Joaquin you are not forgotten, and we will continue to speak out for your freedom.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

IRAN

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today nearly a month into President Trump's ill-advised war of choice in Iran, which has obviously destabilized

the region, disrupted global supply chains, degraded our munitions stockpiles, cost the lives of 13 American servicemembers, with more than 200 additional suffering injuries.

Fortunately, it is clear that even though this was a war of choice and can be decided by the President's own timing, he started this with no clear endgame and without adequately preparing for Iran's very predictable response, which obviously would have included the Strait of Hormuz, which obviously would have included Iran attacking other gulf nation-states.

The intelligence on this is consistent and overwhelming for years and, frankly, closes the Strait of Hormuz, which is one of the world's most strategically vital maritime checkpoints.

Now, look at the Strait of Hormuz for a moment.

Way back in the seventies, when we had an oil shock, 7 percent of the world's oil went through the strait. Today, 20 percent goes through. Back in the seventies, no natural gas went through the Strait of Hormuz. Now it is close to 20 percent. So the closure of the strait has wreaked havoc on both the global oil and gas supply chains. As I said, normally, about 20 percent of the world's oil and liquefied natural gas passes through the strait.

Today, traffic through the strait has nearly grounded to a halt. It is literally down 95 percent since the start of the war. The International Energy Agency has already called the effective closure of the strait and all of the other ancillary items coming out of it the worst global energy disruption in history, eclipsing even the Arab oil embargo of 1973—I am old enough to remember that, and the Senator from Maryland is old enough to remember that—which caused huge gas lines and damage all around the world.

So, if we just measure what has happened so far in these 3 weeks-plus—the date of the closure of the strait—it has removed approximately 400 million barrels of oil—around 4 days of the world's supply—from the market. Again, much of the oil that is still getting through had started on tankers before the war started. Those 400 million barrels of oil that have been removed—and that number will rise exponentially now—have led to price increases of around 50 percent for Brent crude. That is the global benchmark for oil.

As well—and this has gotten some coverage in our country but not enough—Iran has also carried out significant strikes on oil and gas facilities throughout the gulf. In total, more than 40 energy sites in 9 countries across the Middle East have been severely damaged due to the conflict, including the world's largest liquefied natural gas facility in Qatar, which is to be closed down. That produces about a fifth of the world's LNG.

Many of the facilities that were not even attacked still took out all of the natural gas from the facilities because, if a missile were to hit them with the

gas in the facility, it would cause a massive explosion. While I am no expert here, I have been told to restart those facilities will take weeks to months. The truth is, even if the President feels in his bones today or tomorrow that we have won the war and he stops the bombing—with no guarantee that Israel will stop or that Iran will stop—and the strait starts to get reopened, we are still going to see economic pain across the globe for weeks, months, or, potentially, a year.

For consumers in the United States, the conflict, obviously, has led to a severe shock at the gas pump. Since the war began, average gas prices in the United States have increased by about \$1 a gallon—30 percent. I will take a bet with anybody in this Chamber that we are going to see an average gas price of \$4 that will be maintained for some time. That \$4 price will be the highest since 2022.

And, here, let's take the optimistic view. Even if the strait is reopened today, the average household in our country will still be expected to pay about \$740 more in gas prices for the remainder of the year. That is just gas.

What about diesel?

While Americans are struggling at the pump, skyrocketing diesel costs are threatening to increase the pain for households across a series of domains. Last week, diesel prices eclipsed \$5 per gallon on average. That was only the second time in history that diesel got above 5 bucks, and that is about 40 percent higher than before the war began. Diesel is the trucking industry's second largest expense, and for most trucking firms, that diesel cost accounts for about 20 percent of the total operating costs. For most freight companies, a 40-percent rise in the diesel cost results in about an overall increase of 10 percent on all the items that are shipped. We depend on the trucking industry to ship goods. If their costs go up 10 percent, they are not going to pay it. That is going to get passed on to consumers. That will mean everything in the supply chain from lumber that is used to construct homes to groceries and everything in between.

And while we Americans are already feeling the impact at the pump, many nations across the globe, particularly in Asia, are facing even more extreme costs. Of the, roughly, 20 percent of the world's oil and gas that goes through the Strait of Hormuz, about 80 percent goes to Asia, and the impacts there have been even wilder. Oil prices have hit 150 bucks a barrel.

As the supply tightens and prices skyrocket, one country, the Philippines—literally because they get 100 percent of their oil from the gulf—has said we can't operate a full economy, so there is a mandatory 1-day-a-week holiday.

Vietnam has urged its residents to work from home. Cambodia and Laos have closed about a third to 40 percent of their gas stations because they just don't have fuel.

Now, we buy a lot of stuff from Asia—from Vietnam, from Bangladesh, from the Philippines, from China, from everywhere. If those costs have gone up 40 percent, all the stuff we buy from those countries are going to go up for American consumers as well. So whether it is electronics, clothes, appliances, if you haven't seen a price increase yet, don't worry. It is coming very shortly, and it will be significant.

Let's talk about jet fuel.

Americans can also expect to pay more on air travel due to the war in Iran as the price of jet fuel has more than doubled since the conflict has begun. In many cases, airlines have already responded by raising fares and canceling flights. Some estimates indicate the airlines have raised fares about 20 bucks each way—going and coming—on average. As a matter of fact, United recently raised its fares 15 to 20 percent just last week. Also, United, which, I think, is a precursor of things to come, has literally eliminated a number of long-haul flights. So, for anyone who is planning on going to Europe, who is planning on going to Asia or who is planning on going to South America—maybe not cross-country flights yet—your choices are going to drop dramatically.

This is all related to oil, natural gas, and jet fuel, but the fact is that the President's war in Iran and the subsequent closure of the Strait of Hormuz is really wreaking havoc on a lot of industries from semiconductors to new cars. Let me tell you why.

For example, the current situation is threatening to upend the global semiconductor industry and other advanced technology industries by impacting the availability of a crucial input—helium.

Now, most of us here at home think about helium as what we use for party balloons. Senator VAN HOLLEN, I know, has used it many times to make his voice sound higher as well, but—and I didn't realize this—helium is also a critical input in many advanced technology industries: chipmaking, medical imagery, aerospace. The truth is, there is no viable replacement for this helium.

Qatar is the world's second largest supplier of helium behind the United States, and they literally produce, approximately, a third of the world's supply—about 63 million cubic meters out of a total of 190 million cubic meters produced globally.

So, if the strait stays closed, you get rid of 27 to 30 percent of the world's supply of helium. Again, it is a global market. Spot prices on helium have already doubled, and the costs could rise another 50 percent if the strait remains closed.

The nations, again, that are going to get hit first on this are Japan, Singapore, and Taiwan, which, again, are home to some of the world's most advanced chip facilities. None of the chips we put in our rockets in the most advanced jet fighters are made in America. They are all made in Taiwan.

So what is going to happen?

The chip facilities in Taiwan and South Korea believe that about 70 percent of their helium comes from the gulf. If it goes away, they can't replace that. There are no such things as helium strategic reserves.

Again, if the President says, OK. He feels it in his bones, "I won the war. I am going to stop," it will take weeks, not days, to restart the Qatar helium production, meaning that, even in these next couple of weeks, with already the spot pricing doubling, there is going to be a supply chain risk that will take place over the coming weeks and months.

Aluminum. This closure is also disrupting the aluminum supply chain—a material essential for construction, transportation, energy generation, and more. The region, again—and I didn't realize this before the war—accounts for, approximately, 9 percent of all global aluminum production. Major smelters—I think there are four in the world, and two are in the region—have been forced to curtail supply due to the continued closure of the strait. Since the war began 3 or 4 weeks ago, global aluminum prices have spiked to their highest rate in the last 4 years.

Again, that is what we have seen so far, and a prolonged closure could see significant impacts here in America. Today, we rely on the Middle East for about 20 percent of our imported aluminum. Even before the war with Iran had started, aluminum prices in our country were at record highs due to the President's tariff policy of putting 50-percent tariffs on aluminum products. So, if you add the tariff policy with already high aluminum prices and shut down some of the smelters, this is going to drive up the cost of aluminum not just around the world but in the United States as well. A lot of aluminum goes into autos. If you are thinking about buying a new car, it may not be a good time. It may be better to buy today than a month from now, but the cost is going to go up.

The President's war of choice in Iran is also threatening global food production and the livelihood of farmers in the United States and across the world. Typically, about one-third of all fertilizer shipped globally passes through the Strait of Hormuz; but not dissimilar to the oil and gas production and transit, that fertilizer exiting the gulf has literally ground to a virtual 100-percent halt just as the spring growing season is starting in America.

I talked to a farmer in Amelia County in central Virginia. His costs have already gone up 40 percent, and that means that the back end when he collects—when his products grow, who is going to eat those costs? American consumers.

The United States relies on the Middle East for about 15 percent of our fertilizer inputs. This has already caused—as I said, in Amelia, it was 40 percent—nationwide, a 30-percent increase in fertilizer prices in America.

That fertilizer shortage has also been already shortened because we are short on nitrogen, and we are short on potash, which we get from Canada, again, because of the tariff policy. So what we grow and what the costs are for this growing season are going to be dramatically affected. Where is that going to show up? Prices at the grocery store.

Now, how has the President responded to this energy crisis caused by his war of choice?

On Truth Social, he stated: When oil prices go up, we make a lot of money. Who exactly is making that money?

It is not ordinary Americans who were paying more than \$380 million a day just on the increased price of gasoline before the war started.

As a matter of fact, if you are going to pick winners and losers at this point, American consumers are losers across five or six different domains. The winners? Russia and Iran.

And this is the one that kind of just blows my mind. In response to rising oil prices, President Trump and his Secretary of the Treasury announced he was lifting sanctions on 140 million barrels of Iranian crude. What does that translate into? That translates into more than \$14 billion to the bad Government of Iran, who is shooting at American soldiers, who is bombing our allies. That \$14 billion could be a lifeline to that government.

I still remember like back under Obama, where I think there was some payment around the JCPOA with \$300-plus million released to Iran. Every one of my Republican colleagues said: Oh my God. This is the worst thing ever—the worst thing ever. How could this happen?

Well, now, in the middle of a war—we weren't in a war at that point—in the middle of a war where Iran is attacking us, this President has given a green light to fund \$14 billion to the Iranian regime—funding our enemies. How is that in America's best interest?

In another master stroke by the "king of deals," President Trump lifted the sanctions on approximately 130 million barrels of Russian oil, directly helping Vladimir Putin's invasion of Ukraine.

You know, recent reports indicate that Russia has already earned about \$230 million per day on crude oil exports during the first 2 weeks of Iran's war. Since February, that is about \$10 billion. What is that \$10 billion going to buy? It is going to buy Russian drones, Russian tanks, Russian missiles—maybe call me old-fashioned—that are attacking and killing our allies in Ukraine—the allies that, thank goodness, we have supplied military equipment to, and we are funding their enemy.

Now, again, you start a war of choice, you think about these things. You think about the ramifications and the cost increases. You think about how this would affect our allies. You think about, do we really want to benefit our enemies? You think about the fact that

maybe we ought to have a plan to get American nationals out of the Middle East before the war starts. You might even say, maybe I will quietly tell Saudis and Emiratis and others: Hey, store up some oil and natural gas because this war is going to start.

The President says he didn't think they would close the Strait of Hormuz; he didn't think Iran would attack the gulf countries.

I sit as vice chair on the Intelligence Committee. The intelligence community has been absolute not for weeks, months, but for years that if you start a war with Iran—and the Iranians are bad guys. Prior Presidents, including President Trump—I remember one time he was going to bomb Iran in his first term, and he pulled back because of all of the implications of starting that war without enough planning.

So he started into this war of choice with no planning on how we protect Americans, on what this is going to do to American consumers. Hey, does it really make sense in this war to fund our enemies Iran and Russia?

This is what happens when strategy, actual strategy, is replaced with impulse; planning is replaced with wishful thinking; and warning from our intelligence professionals whose job it is to make these predictions, who made the prediction that there was no imminent threat—when those intelligence professionals are ignored instead of heeded.

Now, we can't fully predict the full, long-term impacts of President Trump's war of choice in Iran, but we can make a pretty damn good conclusion at this point on who is going to get hit the worst: working-class Americans.

We all talk about affordability—both sides. You know, it is hard for a single political figure—even the President—to dramatically bring down prices, but it sure is not hard for a single political figure—in this case, the President of the United States—to raise prices: fertilizer, aluminum, helium, jet fuel, diesel fuel.

I just hope everybody will remember every time you go to the gas pump and you look at that price—Lord knows this happened when prices rose under Biden. There were these cute little stickers saying: Joe Biden did this.

Well, there is no doubt in my mind and, frankly, on any factual basis, when you gas up your car every week and you see that extra dollar or dollar-and-a-half increase in price, that price was brought to you by one political figure in America: the President of the United States.

We are going to feel the consequences of this war for a long time to come, and everything I talked about here gets exponentially worse—not on a linear timeline but an exponentially long, worse timeline—if the strait remains closed.

Americans deserve better. Our servicemembers who are in harm's way deserve better. Frankly, the world deserves better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

ENERGY

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I will try to truncate my remarks. I know we have a vote coming up at 2 o'clock. I will try to keep the floor running on time.

I rise today in support of my colleague's effort to overturn the IRS's new rule which is making it harder for wind and solar projects to qualify for critical clean energy tax credits.

Families across the country are already struggling to get by with rising costs—costs that are going up at the grocery store, at the doctor's office, when you are trying to pay the monthly rent or your mortgage, at the pump, and, increasingly, our energy bills.

Since President Trump took office last January, California household electricity costs have increased by 15 percent. That is more than five times the rate of inflation. So it makes no sense that this administration is making it harder to build the very energy projects that would help—energy projects that would increase supply of electricity, energy projects that would help bring down the cost of electricity. One of the many ways they are doing it is with this new IRS rule that is changing the rules in the middle of the game.

For years now, companies could qualify for a clean energy tax credit once they had invested at least 5 percent of a project's cost into the project. It is what we refer to as the "5 percent safe harbor." That is how businesses make their plans, that is how businesses make their investments, and that is how businesses were able to break ground on a number of necessary projects.

But now, even with projects that are already underway, they may not qualify for the tax credits anymore that they were counting on, that they were planning on. The net result—not project by project but overall—is that fewer of these projects will get built, and the projects that do power through somehow may get to the finish line, but they will be more expensive. That means less energy comes online, and once again the price of that electricity is going to be higher for families and for businesses and for everybody.

I am proud to represent California, where we are leaning in on clean energy production, not just to meet the growing demands on the grid of our growing economy and our growing population but also modernizing in a way that will make us more resilient to the threats of wildfires and extreme heat.

We have experience in this, and we know. I can share with you, colleagues, that building more clean, reliable, and affordable energy projects isn't just an option; it is fundamentally essential.

So we have to recognize the impact of this rule and recognize that it is part of a broader pattern. Over the past year, we have seen repeated efforts to block or delay clean energy projects,

whether it is halting offshore wind, canceling funding, or undermining projects that are already underway, as I just explained. At the same time, as my colleague and friend from Virginia just articulated, global instability is driving up fossil fuel costs even further.

This, colleagues, is a perfect example of why the Congressional Review Act exists. When an Agency takes an action that harms the American people, we in Congress don't just have the authority, we have the responsibility to step in. That is what this resolution does. It overturns the misguided IRS rule, it can restore certainty for business, and it can help get clean energy projects back on track.

So I urge my colleagues to support the energy investment credit CRA.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, let me thank my colleague from California for very important remarks with respect to this issue. And I am very pleased to be able to join Leader SCHUMER and Senator CORTEZ MASTO on the floor to talk about energy costs and particularly clean energy jobs.

Here is what people need to know about our resolution: American families and businesses from coast to coast have been getting battered by rising energy costs. Data centers are gobbling up energy while Americans get roasted during hotter summers and freeze during icy winters.

Donald Trump got back into office last year, and instead of bringing down costs, he and fellow Republicans sabotaged wind and solar—the cheapest and cleanest ways of getting energy on the grid. Then we had to deal with utility costs continuing to rise. The cost of trucking consumer goods shot up around the country. And Republicans looked at a multitrillion-dollar global market for clean energy—absolutely explosive growth and upside for whoever dominates that kind of manufacturing, and they said the United States isn't interested in being a leader. They surrendered to China and the Europeans.

If that wasn't enough incompetence and mismanagement, Donald Trump started a war that is driving energy costs into the stratosphere. Americans didn't even have to think about the Strait of Hormuz before a month ago. Now every time they pull up at the gas station to fill up the tank, they are reminded that Donald Trump singlehandedly created an energy crisis unlike anything we have seen in generations.

And it is not just about the price Americans pay at the pump; this is rippling through our economy. As I noted, utility bills are continuing to rise. The cost of trucking consumer goods? Continuing to rise. The cost of food in grocery stores? Continuing to rise because fertilizer and fuel are more expensive. We could spend the day with more and more examples.

Donald Trump doesn't seem to know or care about this. When he talks about the war he started, it sounds like he is not sure what is going on. When he talks about energy production in our country, it seems like he is stuck in the middle of the last century. It is a nightmare scenario for American families and businesses getting buried by rising costs today.

On top of that, the job market is in sorry shape. The Trump economy isn't producing the jobs Americans need. That is particularly true in manufacturing.

So my colleagues and I are putting forward a proposal that is a first step toward fixing the energy crisis in the country. We believe it is common sense. It would overturn a regulation from the Trump administration that tied up wind and solar projects with a whole lot of additional bureaucratic redtape.

Almost a decade ago, I wrote a set of tax credits for clean energy in the Inflation Reduction Act. It was a very new approach to energy policy. It kicked off a manufacturing boom unlike anything that has been seen in decades.

Donald Trump and Republicans killed much of it in 2025, and they specifically targeted wind and solar. They clobbered those industries by cutting off the tax credits as of 2027. If that wasn't enough, Donald Trump and the Treasury Department tied them up with even more redtape last summer.

So here is what our proposal is all about. Leader SCHUMER, my colleague from Nevada, and I say in our resolution: Let's ditch the extra redtape. That is what I hear Democrats and Republicans say most of the time: Ditch the redtape. That way, more projects could get underway. We would get more energy on the grid helping to fight the cost increases people deal with all around America.

It is a real head-scratcher to me why anybody would oppose this commonsense resolution. If you do, you are voting for higher energy prices for your constituents at home.

My view is, the entire Trump approach to energy production and energy costs ought to go into the dustbin. It is not working. But what my colleagues and I have put forward is not a total rewrite of the law. It is one step—a practical, commonsense step that we believe ought to get support from both sides.

So that is what we are saying on our side: Let's get rid of some system-clogging redtape. Let's get more projects underway and produce more energy, and let's fight these terrible energy hikes.

That is what we are after. That is what my colleagues and I are trying to do. I urge the Senate to support our resolution. And I want to thank Senator CORTEZ MASTO and Leader SCHUMER for their excellent work over many months.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 107.

The resolution seeks to overturn a Trump administration IRS notice intended to prevent abuse of the forthcoming phasedown of tax credits for wind and solar projects by requiring project developers to take meaningful steps toward project construction.

While Democrats assert that reversing this notice would help with affordability issues, the result would actually be exactly the opposite. Overturning this notice would create more uncertainty and unpredictability for current projects and discourage focus on more reliable and affordable energy sources.

Under the Biden administration, the Democrats enacted massive new incentives for "green energy" projects under the Inflation Reduction Act, abandoning secure, reliable American energy sources for unreliable and costly solar and wind projects. As Republicans predicted, the cost of the Biden administration's Inflation Reduction Act subsidies far exceeded predictions. A 2023 report by Goldman Sachs found that the cost of these Green New Deal incentives could exceed \$1.2 trillion—more than three times what the Democrats claimed.

As part of the Working Families Tax Cut Act, Republicans succeeded in reining in these high costs while also preserving tax incentives for reliable baseload power like hydroelectric and nuclear. Congressional Republicans also imposed new, prohibited foreign entity restrictions to prevent the flow of American taxpayers' dollars to Chinese companies and encourage energy supply chains to return to the United States.

This resolution would ultimately disrupt important progress toward achieving President Trump's "America First" energy agenda, create unpredictability by overturning guidance, while also impeding the Treasury Department's official work to implement the Working Families Tax Cut Act.

I encourage my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I know we are waiting for the Senator from Nevada to come to the floor to make a few remarks, and I want to thank Senator WYDEN for his remarks.

I am just looking around the floor here and thinking this would be a great time to propose a unanimous consent request that we fully fund TSA. I won't do it at this moment. I see the chairman of the Finance Committee here. But I want to make the point, Mr. President, that we could get it done right now. We could end the lines at airports around the country, we could fund TSA, we could fund FEMA, and we could fund the Coast Guard as we continue negotiations to rein in a lawless

ICE operation—an ICE operation that took the lives of two American citizens in Minneapolis; a lawless ICE operation that is not focused, as President Trump promised, on the worst of the worst; a lawless ICE operation that is trampling over people's First Amendment rights around the country and due process rights.

So as I was looking around the floor, I didn't see any Republican colleagues for a moment, and I think it is worth making the point to folks watching that we could have gotten unanimous consent to open FEMA, to open TSA, and to open the Coast Guard. That is what we should do, and we should do it now.

I see the Senator from Nevada.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I don't have to stand here and tell Nevadans that energy prices are high. They see it every day at the gas pump and on their electricity bill statements.

In the United States, the average residential energy bill in 2025 was about 30 percent higher than it was in 2021, but the Trump administration seems insistent on making it even harder for working families to afford their energy bills.

Overseas, President Trump's war with Iran is causing oil prices to shoot through the roof, resulting in high costs for Americans at the gas pump.

Add to that this administration's war on clean energy. Specifically, President Trump's IRS recently submitted a rule that makes it harder for wind and solar energy companies to claim a vital tax credit. This rule makes it more expensive to build America's clean energy future, makes it harder for the United States to meet the increased demand for electricity in this country, and will lead to higher energy prices for working families.

But the Senate has the power to do something about this misguided tax policy. That is why today I am leading an effort with my colleagues to pass this Congressional Review Act to overturn this IRS damaging rule.

The clean energy industry is producing some of the fastest growing and most cost-effective new power across the world. We need industries like solar and wind that will help us meet growing demand. It will create jobs—good-paying union jobs—and it will bring down energy costs for American families. It is obvious we should be embracing clean energy and investing in it, but instead, we have seen President Trump do just the opposite by passing regulations that are killing clean energy jobs in the United States.

We know the President's tax law—the so-called Big Beautiful Bill—gives tax breaks to the President's wealthiest friends at the expense of hard-working Americans. It is actually blowing up our national debt by \$4 trillion. It is cutting \$1 trillion from Medicaid and

kicking an estimated 16 million Americans off of their healthcare. What people may not know is that it also decreased incentives for solar and wind companies that are helping keep energy prices down for hard-working American families.

While the Democrats' Inflation Reduction Act that we passed expanded tax credits for clean energy projects, created jobs, and put us on a future of lowering energy costs for families, President Trump gutted them. That alone is estimated—what he has done is estimated to increase electricity prices by up to 18 percent.

The President's tax bill shortened the timeline for when solar and wind companies can claim these tax credits. He did it because he wants to phase them out. He wants to phase them out in favor of fossil fuel. He wants to pick winners and losers.

You know, the only losers in this country because of the picking and choosing of this administration of winners and losers is the American public and these companies.

If these companies want to claim these clean energy production and clean electricity investment tax credits now, they must begin construction on the projects by July 4, 2026—this year. This year, they have to begin construction. If they begin construction after that date, they don't get this tax credit. That was in the Big Beautiful Bill.

Here is where the problem gets worse. To pass his Big Beautiful Bill out of the House, President Trump made a deal with the far-right Republicans in the House to use the IRS to further diminish the solar and wind projects because he just hates them.

Last August, the IRS proposed a new rule to completely change an established standard for what it means to begin construction under the IRS Code on these solar and wind projects.

Now, remember, since 2013, the standard for what was considered beginning of construction included two of the following: You either had continuous physical work on or off the job site as beginning construction or you had a project in which 5 percent of the total costs had been spent, and they called this kind of a safe harbor.

What the new IRS guidance rule does is revoke that second prong. It revokes the longstanding 5 percent safe harbor. What does this mean?

This rule, keep in mind now, is only for solar and wind. Again, this President is picking winners and losers. He doesn't like solar or wind. So this IRS guidance only applies to solar and wind, not for other energy projects.

It is going to have a huge impact in Nevada, where we have solar year-round, and it is going to have a huge impact across the country. Solar and wind projects were already scrambling to stay eligible for the tax credits they rely on after Trump passed his bill, but with the new IRS rule, companies will have to delay their projects or halt them altogether.

This harmful new rule will potentially eliminate thousands of jobs, it will drive up electricity bills for American families, and it will risk power for millions of homes in Nevada and across the country.

It is clear that this action is yet another attempt by this administration to strangle the types of energy that the President personally does not like.

Demand for electricity is higher now more than ever, and we need to prepare for an electrification future that is going to bring us emerging technologies like AI, and we need solar and wind as part of that generation.

That is why I stand before you today and ask my colleagues to join me to revoke this IRS rule. I can't stress this enough. If we as a Congress want to prepare for the future and have the energy needs that we demand as a country, we have to include solar and wind, we have to include clean energy. What this IRS rule does is just the opposite.

So I hope my colleagues will join me in passing this resolution.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today's vote is simple. Will Republicans join us to save good-paying energy jobs, strengthen our grid, and undo the damage from Donald Trump's war on clean energy; or will they bow before the throne of Big Oil once again?

This CRA vote is a necessary step to reverse the damage from Donald Trump's anti-clean energy vendetta. It will overturn the IRS's eleventh-hour rule change that makes it harder for wind and solar companies to claim tax credits needed to expand investment, increase output, and put Americans to work. This IRS rule does nothing but raise taxes on energy producers. Experts have warned this could raise electricity by 10 percent.

Do you hear that, America? What Trump has done is going to raise your energy costs 10 percent just on this alone. It is going up higher because of other things. It also hurts local communities that rely on jobs.

It is nothing but another front in Donald Trump's war on affordable American energy, and in this case—this is a harsh word, but it is a corrupt giveaway to his Big Oil and Big Gas donors.

It was public. It was in the newspapers. They said: If you give us a billion dollars in campaign contributions, we will get rid of all the deregulation and giveaways they could possibly imagine. It is a crooked, corrupt scheme that is raising people's energy costs along the way.

If you are a Senator and you care about good-paying jobs, care about our

grid, and want to lower people's energy costs, support this resolution.

I thank Senators CORTEZ MASTO, WYDEN, and everyone who has shown leadership on this issue, and I want to thank my Democratic colleagues for leading the way.

Last week, Senate Democrats released our newest "Broken Promises" report, exposing how Donald Trump is driving up people's energy bills. Trump made a promise to the American people on the campaign trail: I will cut your energy bill in half. But has he done that? Of course not. Energy prices are up. And they aren't just up; they are rising and at triple the rate of inflation. Some States are seeing double-digit increases over the last year. And now, thanks to Donald Trump's idiotic war with Iran, gas prices are at \$4 a gallon.

We must put a stop to all of this today, and that is what this vote is all about.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE RELATING TO "BEGINNING OF CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS FOR PURPOSES OF THE TERMINATION OF CLEAN ELECTRICITY PRODUCTION CREDITS AND CLEAN ELECTRICITY INVESTMENT CREDITS FOR APPLICABLE WIND AND SOLAR FACILITIES"—Motion to Proceed

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 363, S.J. Res. 107.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 363, S.J. Res. 107, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Internal Revenue Service relating to "Beginning of Construction Requirements for Purposes of the Termination of Clean Electricity Production Credits and Clean Electricity Investment Credits for Applicable Wind and Solar Facilities".

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 70 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Aisobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—53

Armstrong	Fischer	Moran
Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Boozman	Hawley	Ricketts
Britt	Hoeben	Risch
Budd	Husted	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Justice	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sheehy
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Curtis	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	McCormick	Young
Ernst	Moody	

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the cloture vote from March 12 on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147, a bill making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Bill Hagerty, Marsha Blackburn, Eric Schmitt, James Lankford, Bernie Moreno, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Steve Daines, Josh Hawley, James C. Justice, Shelley Moore Capito, Kevin Cramer, Ashley Moody, Jim Banks, James E. Risch, Tim Sheehy, Joni Ernst.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a couple of

observations and remarks before this vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, let me just say that this obviously is a vote which we have had multiple times now. It is on the House-passed legislation that would fund the Department of Homeland Security in accordance with the agreement that was reached between Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate, some time ago.

But I would say, to reflect on it, there have been a lot of conversations over the past couple of days with respect to how do we get the Department opened up and funded again, and this vote will reflect the amendment that was proposed by Senator COLLINS and others that would fund all of DHS, except the Office of ERO.

So this is the one office that would be—that the Democrats have indicated, particularly over the weekend, this is what they had desired to see happen, and so this vote will reflect that particular provision that was put forward by Senator COLLINS. It is in response to what Democrats have insisted on and said that they wanted all along, which was to fund everything but the Office of ERO, the Office of Enforcement and Removal Operations at the Department of Homeland Security.

So this vote should reflect that, and I hope Members who are interested in getting all of these Agencies within the Department opened up would cast a "yes" vote when the opportunity comes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 7147, a bill making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 71.]

YEAS—54

Armstrong	Budd	Cramer
Banks	Capito	Crapo
Barrasso	Cassidy	Cruz
Blackburn	Collins	Curtis
Boozman	Cornyn	Daines
Britt	Cotton	Ernst