

judges to clear out the backlog of asylum cases.

Now, today, the results speak for themselves. These numbers are compelling. They are breathtaking. In November 2024, there were 106,333 reported border encounters. In January 2025, the number dropped to 61,465. Think about that. From November 2024 to January 2025, the number dropped from over 106,000 to 61,000. It was down to 8,000—8,326 to be exact—by the next month.

And a year later, in April 2026, apprehensions on the southern border were 94 percent lower than the monthly average during the Biden administration presidency. Imagine that: 94 percent lower.

What about the seizure of drugs? The seizure of drugs—cocaine, methamphetamine, heroin, fentanyl, and marijuana—has increased, by weight, 60 percent—60 percent—since just April of 2024. And we just marked an entire year of zero releases at the southern border.

Now, a nation that does not control its borders—that cannot enforce its laws—is a nation that willingly surrenders its sovereignty or, as Ronald Reagan once put it:

A nation that cannot control its borders is not truly a nation.

Abandoning our right to determine who participates in that process—indiscriminately allowing all comers to enter our country—it endangers our citizens, it burdens our taxpayers, and it makes a mockery of the rule of law.

It is also dangerous to the immigrants themselves, many of whom perish on their way to our southern border. Americans realized this, even if some of their leaders did not. And this is why President Trump and congressional Republicans acted with a bias for action so that we might end the border crisis.

And how can you tell? The relative silence in the mainstream media and on this floor from many of our Democratic colleagues tells you all you need to know.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

C-SPAN2

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today we mark 40 years since C-SPAN began its coverage of the U.S. Senate, bringing the work of this body directly into people's living rooms. It doesn't seem very radical right now. We are all used to it. But back then, it was revolutionary.

C-SPAN's commitment to providing a crucial connection between the U.S. Senate and the people we serve has remained strong ever since that day 40 years ago. That commitment can be seen in the incredible volume of coverage since June 2, 1986, when C-SPAN2 was born. And the presiding officer on that late spring day? Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY.

Altogether, C-SPAN2 has recorded more than 43,000 hours of Senate sessions, capturing more than 169,000 Sen-

ate floor speeches—169,000. These recordings have preserved the voices of 359 different Senators, including 185 Republicans and 167 Democrats and 7 Independents.

These hours include memorable moments like that of Senator Bob Dole on that first day of televised coverage, saying, "No longer will the great debates in this Chamber be lost forever"; of then-Senator Tom Harkin, author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, closing his farewell speech in American sign language; or of the Dalai Lama serving as the Senate guest Chaplain in 2014. All of those moments would have been lost to history, but they were captured by C-SPAN.

As we celebrate these last four decades of coverage in the Senate, think back to 1986. Prince, whom we sadly lost 10 years ago, had recently released his eighth album, "Parade"; the film "Top Gun" was released; and, yes, the Bemidji State Beavers of Bemidji, MN, won the Division III men's ice hockey national championship. But back then, Senators were hesitant to embrace C-SPAN2—the lighting wasn't great in those first few years—but they eventually came around to see this great asset to our democracy for what it is: a way to shine the light on the work in the Senate and a way for Americans, whether they agree with us or not, to stay up to date on what is happening.

When there are big votes or big debates going on, people tune in or they see the clips and the coverage later. It is not just the people who are able to come to Washington—as exciting as that is—to sit in the Chamber, as some people are doing today, but what this does is extend it to everyone.

Last year, on its 39th birthday, Senator GRASSLEY and I passed a resolution celebrating all that C-SPAN2 had accomplished. In our resolution, we urged all television providers, including streamers, to carry C-SPAN because we need to make sure that access to C-SPAN keeps up with changing technologies so that every household in America can see their elected Representatives—the work they do, the positions they take, the votes they make. Since our resolution passed, YouTube TV and Hulu have begun carrying C-SPAN on their platforms. Now we need to extend that beyond.

C-SPAN's live coverage across multiple platforms continues to keep the American people informed and keep them engaged with their democracy.

Thank you again to Senator GRASSLEY for working with me to highlight C-SPAN's critical role, and thanks to him for presiding over the Senate on that first day of coverage 40 years ago. I am sure he doesn't look one bit different today. And thanks to everyone who has had a hand in C-SPAN's continuing, important role in our democracy over the last 40 years.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The Senator from Louisiana.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we both know that there are people in Washington who like to muddy the water to make it look deep. They don't want the American people to know the truth because, for these people to which I am referring, truth is a concept that does not interest them. Politics does.

Now, there has been a lot of controversy in and around the U.S. Senate for the last 2 weeks. If we are honest with ourselves, we have to admit that the Senate has been functioning like a broken arm with the bone sticking out. That is not anybody's fault, in my judgment, on my side of the aisle. It is certainly not the majority leader's fault.

So I want to try to refocus us on the issue. I don't really want to talk about the ballroom or the Anti-Weaponization Fund or any of the myriad of issues that my Democratic friends tried to inject into our discussion.

I want to talk about the issue, and the issue is this: Are we going to fund the Department of Homeland Security, or are we not?

Part of DHS, as we call it, as you know, Mr. President, is funded. But a very important part is not: the Border Patrol and ICE. We are paying them as best we can out of another pool of funds that is about to run out of money. Why are they not funded? Because my Democratic colleagues have refused.

At one point my Democratic friends agreed to fund Border Patrol and ICE. And then they changed their minds, and they said: No, we are not going to do it, which forced Republicans, if we want to see that portion of DHS funded, to proceed under what we call reconciliation where we don't need Democratic votes. I regret that that is the case, but we are doing what we have to do.

Why are we having this controversy? I don't get it completely. I don't. Unless you are industrial-strength stupid, you know that illegal immigration is illegal. And that is what our Border Patrol agents and ICE agents do—they enforce the law. And we have a problem with respect to immigration.

During the Biden administration, with the encouragement of some—not all, but with the encouragement of some but not all Democrats, open the borders. They said: Come on in. And about 8 to 12 million—some say 20 million—people did.

Some of them were good people and are good people. They are still breaking the law. Some of them who are here are not. They are rapists and they are murderers and they are sex traffickers and they are drug dealers and they are pedophiles.

We don't know which is which. We don't know where they are. And it falls to the responsibility of the Department of Homeland Security, in part through Border Patrol and ICE, to find out.

Now, why did this happen? Why do we now need Border Patrol and ICE more than ever? You know, I have thought about that a lot. It could be just pure, plain vanilla incompetence. It could be that the people that President Biden put in charge of immigration and securing the border were not qualified to play dead in a western movie. It also could be, and could have been, intentional.

I think some of my Democratic friends—not all of them. I am talking the Platner wing of the Democratic Party, the Mayor Mamdani wing of the Democratic Party, the Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ wing of the Democratic Party, the wing of the Democratic Party that is in control—some of them believe that vetting people at the border is racist. They do.

It doesn't matter that every other country in the world vets people at their border. These members of the—whatever you want to call it—progressive wing, loon wing, wocketopus wing—whatever you want to call that wing of the Democratic Party, they think that vetting people at the border is racist.

There are other folks who support open borders for political reasons. I think they honestly think that if they admit a bunch of people into America in violation of the immigration laws or not, that it is a rich source of potential voters. We are not supposed to say that, but I really do believe that. Not much happens around here that doesn't have a political bent to it.

But regardless, we have a problem, and that is what we have to deal with. And that is what we are going to be voting on, I hope, in the next couple of days.

If you disagree with the law—this is America. You are entitled to disagree with it. I get it. Try to change it. Go change it. But you can't just ignore our immigration laws. They are not some second-tier statutes that you can ignore without consequence, that you can ignore when you think it is convenient. They are the law, and we have to enforce the law.

And more to the point, we have to clean up the mess that President Biden and some of my Democratic colleagues in the Platner wing, the Ocasio-Cortez wing, the Mamdani wing—whatever you want to call those Democrats who created it.

And more even to that point, we have to have Border Patrol and ICE officers to do it. We have to.

The other point I would make: We see the pushback by this wing of my Democratic friends' party. We see what is going on in New Jersey. It is despicable.

Look, you have the right to protest. That is as American as the NFL or baseball. You have the right to protest. You don't have the right to protest violently. And what we have seen at the Delaney Hall detention center: We have seen ICE officers and some Border Patrol officers; we have seen the protestors cursing at them and spitting

at them and threatening their families and hitting them and scratching them and biting them and blocking ingress and egress in and out of the detention center. They are breaking the law, and they have been arrested.

I think the Border Patrol and ICE and the State law enforcement officials in New Jersey have shown a lot of restraint.

But what the protestors did—not all of them—was illegal. It was illegal. You can't hit a cop just because you don't like him.

And here is a free tip. I know you know this, Mr. President. Most Border Patrol agents, most ICE agents, most cops, they will leave you alone unless you do illegal stuff. But if you do illegal stuff, they are going to enforce the law.

So let me end as I began. We need to vote to fund Border Patrol and ICE. These men and women are running out of money. I am sorry that my Democratic colleagues have taken the position that they want to defund ICE. They have every right to believe that. I am sorry that they have taken the position they want to defund the Border Patrol. My Democratic friends have every right to believe that, but they are wrong.

I have the right to my opinion. And if they don't want to fund them, they need to go change the immigration laws. Until then, we have got to enforce them, and we are going to have the chance here in the next couple days.

And all we are going to be voting on—you are going to see all kinds of amendments and talking about everything in the world. All we will be voting on: Do we or do we not want to fund Border Patrol and ICE? Do we or do we not want to enforce America's immigration laws in accordance with due process and the rule of law? And that is the issue that is going to be before us.

And I am ready to saddle up and ride. I am ready to get to it. I am tired of all the rhetoric and the tangential issues. I am tired of all that. Let's get after it. Let's do the right thing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

---

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

---

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

---

#### HASKELL FREE LIBRARY AND OPERA HOUSE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, on June 10, Vermont and Canada will come to-

gether to celebrate the inauguration of a new entryway on the Canadian side of the Haskell Free Library and Opera House, a building that straddles the U.S.-Canada border. For 200 years, Derby Line, Vermont, and Stanstead, Quebec, have functioned as one community. Citizens of the United States and Canada—but born in the same hospital, colleagues in the same factory, and teammates on the same sports teams. They even drink the same water.

They also shared the same cultural center, the Haskell Free Library and Opera House.

A surveyor's error in 1771 mistakenly mapped the border between Quebec and Vermont roughly  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile north of the 45th parallel, and the Webster-Ashburton Treaty of 1842 finalized the physical coordinates, cementing the original surveying error in place, somewhat arbitrarily dividing properties and roads between the U.S. and Canada.

For over a century, the Haskell Free Library and Opera House has stood as a symbol of lasting goodwill and mutual friendship. Since 1903, this small but mighty beacon of bi-nationalism has been welcoming people in from both sides of the border with nothing more than a strip of black tape on the floor to demarcate the international border, allowing both Canadian and U.S. citizens to enter the library through the U.S. door in Derby Line, VT. Where else can you see a theater production in which much of the audience is seated in one country, while the performers onstage are in another?

While it has been a challenging period of shared history that brought us to this moment, we celebrate the continuation of the library's commitment to continue sharing municipal services and resources such as this one, just as Martha Stewart Haskell had originally envisioned. The municipalities of Stanstead and Derby Line, located in Quebec and Vermont, are committed to community collaboration in all of its forms.

June 10 will be a celebration of what we here in the Northeast do best: embrace community, and embrace collaboration—especially between neighbors.

Thank you to all of the members of this very special bilateral community who are working together to help make this happen.

---

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

---

#### REMEMBERING PRINCE ROGERS NELSON

● Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of the late artist and musician Prince Rogers Nelson. A global legend, a Minnesota icon, Minnesota's Purple North Star, Prince was a once in a generation talent from the moment he stepped on stage for the very first time.