

are their kids, and this is a product that is addicting their kids, and the company does nothing about it.

Research and a poll that we saw last week said 86 percent of Americans—86, a pretty good majority there—now say that they want tech companies to be held accountable for their role in the social media addiction crisis, and Congress should listen to them.

Last year, Senator BLUMENTHAL and I reintroduced the Kids Online Safety Act. That legislation passed the Senate on a 91-to-3 vote. It has a veto-proof majority of 75 Senate cosponsors. I thank each of my colleagues who have cosponsored this bill. This legislation would place a duty of care on social media companies to ensure their platforms are safe for children—a duty of care, safety design, safety as the default.

Now, I think it is important to note that every industrial sector has safety standards and safety-by-design requirements. Whether you are buying a car or a toaster or a mattress or a curling iron, safety standards have to be met. The only industrial sector without safety product design is the virtual space—these AI companies and social media platforms.

We are finally seeing momentum that is saying: Let's pass some restrictions. Let's get the Kids Online Safety Act to the President's desk.

Last week, Vice President VANCE called KOSA a "great piece of legislation about child safety online."

There is a reason Big Tech has fought us over the last 5 years, trying to keep this bill from passing. It is because they put profit over our children's safety. When a child is online, they are the product. The longer they are online, the richer their data. The more eyeballs they collect to a platform, the longer those eyeballs stay on that platform, and the data is richer.

And what do they do with that data? They sell it. They sell your child's data. They don't want to change their business model.

So last year, Meta spent roughly \$20 million fighting the Kids Online Safety Act—greed, selfish.

They hired—get this—one lobbyist for every six Members of Congress. That is the extent they will go to to make certain they keep their business model and they keep your kid scrolling on their site. They have even gone so far as to assign a dollar value to each kid who is on their platforms.

SOCIAL MEDIA BIAS

Mr. President, more than 150 million Americans have an iPhone, and each of those phones is preloaded with Apple News. But according to some shocking new reports, Apple has suppressed conservative, center-right publications while boosting left-leaning outlets, turning their app into a tool of political propaganda for the left.

The Media Research Center—that is a watchdog group—analyzed every story featured by the app during the mornings of January 1 to January 31. Mr.

President, 620 top stories were featured, and 440 of those stories were published by left-leaning outlets. The remainder? They came from centrist or unaffiliated sources. But there were zero—not one, nada, none—zero that came from center-right and right-leaning outlets. Zero. Nothing from conservatives. Zero.

A separate study analyzed stories featured on Apple News over a 2-week span in October and, once again, guess what. There were zero articles from right-leaning publications, and 54 percent came from left-leaning sources.

We have seen this playbook before. For more than a decade, social media platforms have suppressed and censored conservative speech. If you criticized Democrats' COVID lockdowns, they took down your post. If you objected to the far-left BLM movement, you were banned. If you reported on Hunter Biden's laptop and his foreign entanglements, like the New York Post did just days before the 2020 election, your post was suppressed. This censorship undermined the free and open debate that has sustained our Nation for now 250 years.

Apple has another thing coming if they think—Big Tech thinks they are going to pull this off again.

Earlier this month, FTC Chairman Andrew Ferguson sent a letter to Apple CEO Tim Cook calling on the company to review its policies and warning that the suppression of viewpoints, regardless of political affiliation, could violate consumer protection rules.

Last week, I sent a letter to Tim Cook demanding answers about how featured articles on Apple News are chosen, how the company reviews or audits those decisions, and how third-party news outlets can appeal unfair exclusions from its platform. We want to know: What is their criteria? What is their decision making? Is this subjective?

So we have given a deadline of March 4 to hear from Mr. Cook. I am looking forward to his reply.

I think it is important to note that Americans increasingly rely on services like Apple News for their information. They deserve to have the point and the counterpoint, to know two sides of the story.

I am grateful that under President Trump, the era of Big Tech censorship is drawing to a close. We are going to continue to fight until these companies abandon their blatant bias and censorship against conservatives.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UKRAINE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am here to mark a solemn anniversary.

Yesterday marked the fourth anniversary of Vladimir Putin's unprovoked, unjustified, brutal, full-scale invasion of Ukraine. He sought to extinguish a democracy. He sought to erase a whole people's identity, their culture, their way of life, their language. He sought to redraw the map of Europe by force, against all of the norms and accepted rules that have preserved a peace for decades since World War II.

He failed.

Four years later, Ukraine stands proudly, resolutely, bloodied, scarred, but unbroken. Russia is not winning. There is a false narrative, in fact, that Russia is prevailing because it is taking bits and tiny pieces of territory at humongous cost in lives and resources. That false narrative must be dispelled, and I am here to say to my colleagues, to America, to the world: We know Ukraine can win if it has the tools to prevail. It has the will and the determination, unquestionably. It has the courage and the strength. It needs the weapons and the economic sanctions that will enable it to prevail.

Peace is our devout hope, but peace will be achieved only through strength because Vladimir Putin is unserious about peace now and will become serious only by demonstration—unequivocally and unambiguously—of strength.

I have just come back from a trip to Ukraine, both to Kyiv and to Odessa, meeting the engineers who are repairing the electric generation sources that Putin has bombed—he has bombed all of the nonnuclear sources—children who have been kidnapped and saved and brought back; they are among the 20,000 that Putin has abducted; President Zelenskyy, who remains absolutely firm in his determination to lead the people of Ukraine, to push back the Russians; and in Odessa, the frontline forces on the Black Sea who are not only detecting but destroying the invading drones and missiles; and the faith community there who have remained so absolutely supportive.

The fact is that Putin is bombing not only Ukraine—civilians in their hospitals, homes, and education centers, schoolrooms—he is also bombing American businesses. Of the 600 major corporations with operations in Ukraine, almost half of them—300—have been damaged or destroyed in some way by Putin's bombing, drones, missiles. Putin is attacking Ukraine, but he is also attacking America, and America should be outraged by these attacks on American businesses.

In the meantime, my main takeaway from this trip—my ninth—was the incredible endurance and resilience of the Ukrainian people. But they don't want our applause; they want ammunition. They need weapons. They want weapons, not words. And so I am here to advocate, on this fourth anniversary, that we give them the tools they need to prevail because they are fighting on.

This conflict is the most destructive in Europe since the Second World War.

Entire cities have been reduced to rubble. Tens of thousands have been killed. Millions have been displaced. Families sleep under the threat nightly of drone and missile attacks. And they are fighting not only for their homes and their children but for a principle that protects us all. We all have a stake in it. Our national security is at risk here. And the principle is that borders cannot be changed by tanks and terror, sovereignty is not negotiable, and democracy is not disposable through force.

I have traveled to Ukraine—in fact, nine times—and I have met soldiers defending their homeland with extraordinary guts and grit. I have met parents who have lost sons and daughters in Russian bombing. I have met families whose children were kidnapped and taken across the border in a really grotesque campaign of abduction and indoctrination—war crimes that stain the people of Russia, not just their leader. And the world has demanded accountability, designating Vladimir Putin as a “war criminal.”

He is not seeking peace. He is seeking domination. He is unserious about the negotiations that are taking place right now. He wages war not only with artillery and armor but with cyber attacks, propaganda, disinformation, energy blackmail, systematic brutality. And he believes that time is his ally. He believes that democracies grow weary and that America will blink. And we must prove him wrong.

The Senate has demonstrated bipartisan resolve before, and it must do so again now. We have proven that when freedom is under assault, this body will rise above partisanship. We need to sustain that unity and make unmistakably clear to Putin and the people of Russia that aggression carries consequences. That means advancing stronger sanctions on Russia’s war economy; designating Russia a “state sponsor of terrorism” if it fails to return those abducted children; shutting down the Kremlin’s shadow fleet transporting oil and gas to the countries that are buying it and fueling Russia’s war machine; and, in fact, sanctions and even tariffs targeting those countries, focusing on them because they are truly enabling this slaughterous invasion by Vladimir Putin.

The Russian assets that now are in bank accounts in Europe can be used to finance the purchasers of weapons, Tomahawks, F-16s, interceptors for the Patriot systems, 155s, all of the munitions and weaponry that Ukraine needs to win.

We must be unified in this Chamber and so must America across this great land with other democracies that are under attack through the hybrid warfare that Putin is waging. We have reaffirmed our deep partnership with the Ukrainian people, their Parliament, their President. And as Ukraine conducts the business of democracy while sandbags literally line their hallways, we must be behind them.

Four years of this unjustified invasion, and Ukraine is fighting not only for itself but for all of us—all democracies. Russia remains the most immediate and direct threat to NATO. Supporting Ukraine is not about charity; it is a strategy. Appeasement is not a strategy, nor is hope. Appeasement and reliance only on hope are the way to further conflict, wider war, which we must avoid.

Ukraine has endured these 4 years standing strong for democracy, and they are not only in this fight for themselves; they know that peace going forward is also at stake. Democracy is at risk.

I want to shift to the democracy that is at risk here at home, the democracy that is dependent on free and fair elections, the democracy that we must preserve against efforts to degrade and decimate it.

President Trump has called for a nationalization of American elections. Now, Americans may ask themselves: What is nationalization of elections? Well, you need to look no further than the so-called SAVE America Act, which would create absolutely horrendous burdens for all Americans registering to vote and then, in fact, voting.

It would create burdens for States which have the constitutional responsibility to administer elections. It would require Americans to use their driver’s license or other governmental-issued IDs alone in registering to vote.

Now, I support the requirement that voters identify themselves when they go to vote. It is mandated in Connecticut. I do it every time I go to vote, presenting my driver’s license.

But the SAVE Act is not about voter identification; it is about voter purges. In effect, it would require States to provide information—private information that is not available to the public—to the Federal Government, which would then purge voter rolls.

Purging voter rolls is an anathema when it relies on inaccurate ICE information. That is essentially what the SAVE America Act would require. The SAVE America Act requires voters not just to present voter identification; it enables voter purges and federalizes that requirement in a way that is antithetical to all the principles of our Constitution that maintain State responsibility for voting.

I am proposing that we also protect our elections by ensuring that ICE cannot be used at the polls, that ICE agents and officers be barred from the polls. We need to make sure that there is an absence of intimidation and fear when voters approach the poll because, otherwise, they will be discouraged from voting.

ICE has no business in front of voting booths. It has no right or responsibility at the polls. The discouragement of voters is happening in realtime, sending Tulsi Gabbard to Fulton, GA, continuing the false narrative that somehow there was fraud in the Georgia

vote, continuing the false narrative that there is voting fraud rampant in the Nation. The statistics and facts prove that contention absolutely wrong. The intimidation of poll workers, the demand for voting information, all of it absolutely unjustified.

President Trump is pushing Republicans in Congress to pass the SAVE America Act, a bill that would constitute the most significant restriction on the right to vote in generations. He has devoted a full web page to the bill on the White House website, and ironically, it would make it harder to vote than to buy an assault rifle. Voting by noncitizens, which is the issue the bill claims to address, is already illegal, and it has been proven time and time again: Voter fraud rarely, if ever, occurs.

But while the problem is a fake, the bill would have real effect. It would make the sacred act of voting exponentially more difficult for all Americans. Over 20 million American citizens—1 in 10 voting-age Americans—simply don’t have the access to the documentation that this bill would require to vote.

Voting identification in some form ought to be required but not in the way that this bill does it, restrictively and discriminatorily.

Mr. President, 250 years ago, America broke from the chains of monarchy and chose democracy—a government that is supposed to be by and for the people—but as we approach this Nation’s birth date, we are challenged as never before to defend democracy, to defend it in Ukraine by supporting the brave freedom fighters there, and by supporting it here by defending and advocating the right of every American to vote in free and fair elections.

Thankfully, we still have our democracy. It is under threat as never before, but as the saying goes, “Democracy is not a spectator sport.” We will have it only as long as we can keep it, as Benjamin Franklin said to the person who asked him about it after the Constitutional Convention. We have a republic only as long as we can keep it.

We need to emulate the courage of the people of Ukraine and of our Founding Fathers and to fight back against President Trump’s effort to silence us and to potentially threaten our democracy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Maine.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 3924 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

36TH ANNIVERSARY OF SMOKE-FREE SKIES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, one of the most important votes that I ever cast in the House or the Senate was the result of a challenge from a complete stranger. The year was 1986. I was running late to the airport, heading back to Chicago from Phoenix, AZ.

Now, those were the days when you could get a ticket at the airline counter at the last minute, but if you were too late, the good seats on the plane would all be gone. When I was handed my boarding pass in Phoenix, I saw that I was put in a middle seat in the smoking section at the back of the plane.

I asked the United Airlines attendant: Isn't there something you can do about this?

She looked down at my ticket and my title and said: No, but, Congressman, there is something you can do about it.

I thanked her and made the flight. As I squirmed in my seat to try to avoid the smoke clouds, I began to look around the plane. In front of me, only a few rows away, was an older person. Near him was a new mom with a baby. I thought to myself: This makes no sense at all. These people are supposed to be sitting in the nonsmoking section. I am in the smoking section, yet they are just a few rows ahead, breathing the same secondhand smoke that I am breathing.

When I got back to DC, I called my House staff together and told them I had an idea: I wanted to ban smoking on airplanes. My staff told me I was crazy. The tobacco industry was the most powerful lobby force in Washington, with support from the top leadership of both political parties.

I can remember going through orientation in the House when a leader who will go unnamed on the Democratic side in the House closed the door to the room for all 50 new Members of the House—Democrats—and said: Let me explain to you about tobacco and politics. Keep your hands off of it.

That was the advice.

Here I was, a relatively new Member of Congress who wanted to take on the tobacco lobby. Everyone said I didn't have a shot. With the leadership on both sides against me, I didn't have a prayer. But this was personal to me and to a lot of people who served in Congress. My father died of lung cancer when I was 14 years old. He was 53 years old. He smoked two packs of Camels a day. I thought of him when I was sitting on that flight from Phoe-

nix, and I remembered him as I began to pursue this cause.

One thing I did have going for me was that the U.S. House of Representatives was, I thought, the largest frequent flyer club in the world. Many other Members told me privately they hated breathing in cigarette smoke on airplanes just as much as I did. But to pass the bill, we would need to overcome opposition from many of our colleagues who were avid smokers, including the then-chairman of the House Public Works Committee.

One of those colleagues was on the Appropriations Committee, where I served, the late Congressman Marty Sabo of Minnesota. He had the power to make or break our bill, and he was a chain-smoker. I went up to him, and I said: Marty, what is the longest you can go without a cigarette?

He told me: Two hours.

So I said 2 hours it will be. We introduced a bill that would ban smoking on all domestic flights that were 2 hours or less so I could clear the hurdle of Marty Sabo. We passed the bill in the House by some miraculous chain of events after the Rules Committee literally defied the Speaker and let me offer an amendment.

The chairman of the Rules Committee was a man named Claude Pepper. Claude Pepper was a legendary Congressman from Florida and a spokesman for senior citizens across the Nation. He had a unique way of speaking, and I won't try to imitate it. But when he voted for me over the Speaker and gave me a chance to bring my amendment to the floor, I went to meet with him personally afterwards and thank him. He said to me: You know I was a Member of the Senate at one time.

I said: Yes, I do. And you came back after you lost running for the Senate to serve in the House for many years.

He said: When I was in the Senate, I created the National Cancer Institute, so I wanted to give you a vote.

Thanks to his help and the help of the late Senator Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey, the bill cleared the Senate shortly thereafter.

It seems strange that major legislation can be determined by such minor personal details like how long a Congressman can go without a smoke, but the personal issue is everything in Congress. Pick any cause championed by myself or one of my colleagues, and there is a good chance there is a story behind it and a personal story it is. When we take the time to sit down with our fellow Members and hear their stories, their interests, their worries, we often can find a compromise that makes a difference. That is how we got the support we needed to ban smoking on airplanes.

The 2-hour ban became law in 1988. Two years later, it was expanded to all domestic flights. People had experienced smoke-free skies, and they were not going back.

Today is the 36th anniversary of that law prohibiting smoking on all domes-

tic flights. It is also the anniversary of one of the biggest tipping points in the fight against smoking and Big Tobacco. After my ban passed, Americans started asking obvious questions: So if secondhand smoke is dangerous on an airplane, why isn't it dangerous in a bus or a train or an office building or a restaurant or a hospital? And as more Americans asked these questions, smoking disappeared gradually from public life.

I used to joke that when Members of Congress were elected back in the 1980s, one of their first stops was at the stationery store to buy a big, honking ashtray that they stuck on their coffee table in their office for all the visitors all during the day who came in with either a "yes," a "no," or a "maybe" and smoked their cigarettes. You can't even find those ashtrays anymore, thank goodness.

In the year 2000—listen to this—almost 30 percent of high school students smoked cigarettes—30 percent; today, 2 percent. And thousands of lives have been saved from deadly disease along the way.

This accomplishment is more than my own, and I am not taking personal credit for it. It is a culmination of work over decades from activists, lawyers, doctors, and so many other people who decided to fight Big Tobacco, against the odds. Their bravery and efforts deserve recognition. Their contributions are felt every time we take a breath of fresh air in public.

I tell this story because more Americans—essentially, young people—feel they have no control over their destiny. They see endless doom on social media and feel as if their lives are controlled by powerful sources with the money, resources, and time to dictate policy. But that can be overcome. It may not feel like it, but in our democracy, there is no limit to what we can accomplish in defense of the public good.

The tobacco lobby was the big boy in town. They had billions of dollars, lawyers, politicians, and more money than friends and investigators who were ready to squash any threat. Yet I beat them. We beat them. They still lost. They lost to a group of concerned citizens who had fewer resources and far less power than they did, but these citizens had the truth, a noble cause, and resilience.

As we confront the big battles of today, may that spirit of resilience and justice propel us against those hoping we sit on the sidelines. It was a memorable day in my career that changed America, and, like Malcolm Gladwell writes, it was a tipping point. I didn't know it was coming. I thought we were just going to make the flight on airplanes a lot more comfortable for most passengers, but it changed America.

Now, that is not the end of the challenge. Many of those young high school students who no longer smoke tobacco cigarettes are into vaping and other things that are going to be dangerous

to them if they become addicted to it. So let's be vigilant, let's be realistic, but let's never give up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, we all swore an oath to uphold the Constitution, and that means that we have an obligation to fund the government—but only a government that is complying with the Constitution, that is obeying and being restrained by the Bill of Rights, that is upholding the laws of the land.

Right now, the Department of Homeland Security is out of control. They are not upholding the Constitution. They are not complying with the law. They are not respecting Americans' rights.

They are tear-gassing schools. They are murdering American citizens. They are disappearing legal immigrants to this country.

Right now, we are not funding the Department of Homeland Security because Democrats have made it clear that we would be violating our oath of office if we funded a Department that is using taxpayer dollars to violate the Constitution and the law.

I wanted to come down to the floor this evening to remind my colleagues about what is happening all over the country, because now that we are trading legislative texts, now that we are deep in the weeds of immigration policy, the real life experience of people in this country, of communities that are being terrorized by an out-of-control ICE, risks getting lost in the discussion.

So I want to spend just a few minutes reminding my colleagues on both sides of the aisle what the stakes are here, what the real world looks like out there if you are on the receiving end of a Department of Homeland Security that doesn't care about your rights as an American citizen or as a resident of this country.

And so I want to go through some of the most egregious, out-of-control, illegal, unconstitutional practices that ICE has been utilizing all across the country over the course of the last year. I want to get specific with you so that you know why we believe this moment is so serious, why American citizens believe this moment is so serious, because this isn't just an opinion held by Democrats, who are simply saying: If we are going to fund ICE, it has got to be an ICE that is obeying the law.

This is what the American people think, who have watched images like this and others that I will show you and have said from both sides of the aisle—Republicans, Democrats, Independents—that we don't want this ICE; we don't want this Department of Homeland Security. We want the immigration laws of this country to be upheld but not through the abuse of people's rights, not through violence.

This is a screenshot of a video that went viral all across the country about

a month ago. The man in this video's name is Ramon Menera. He was stopped by a Border Patrol agent outside his home in a Minneapolis suburb.

First of all, you may ask: Why is a Border Patrol agent outside a Minneapolis suburb? That is not on the border.

Well, that is the first thing that has gone wrong here. CBP, HSI, and all sorts of Agencies that we fund in order to do very specific jobs are now doing an entirely different job—interior immigration enforcement. That is violative of the appropriations law. We don't fund CBP to be wandering suburbs in Minneapolis, looking for people who they want to detain.

This should be a prerogative that matters to both Republicans and Democrats. Our spending power and the spending power in the Constitution is vested in the legislative branch. Our spending power is mute, is pointless—we are powerless—if we tell the administration we are giving you this amount of money to spend on protecting the border, and they just say: Screw it. We are not going to use that money to protect the border. We are going to take those people, and we are going to put them on a different job that they are not trained for.

Well, when you have CBP agents who are not trained to wander apartment complexes, searching for people they want to detain, things like this happen every single day.

Ramon Menera was stopped and cuffed because of his accent. This is actually what the agent tells him in this video. If you go online and watch this video, you will hear the agent tell Ramon Menera that he is being detained because he has an accent.

Ramon Menera is a U.S. citizen. Guess what. There are a lot of U.S. citizens who have accents. Frankly, most of us have forefathers that, when they came to the United States, had an accent. That is not a justification for you to be detained.

He was even carrying his ID on him. All the agent had to do was check his ID to confirm that he was a U.S. citizen. But the agent did not check his ID. Instead, that agent arrested him, put his wrists in zip ties, and took him away from his property. He was forcibly detained by Border Patrol even though he was a U.S. citizen.

This didn't happen just once. This has happened thousands of times all across the country. It is still happening today—that individuals who are legally in this country are being detained, zip-tied, and arrested because they have an accent, because they look like they might be from Mexico or from Central or South America.

It gets worse, though. Ramon's 5-year-old daughter was inside and watched this entire incident through the window—5 years old. To this day, she has refused to go outside since because she fears for the masked men that arrested, zip-tied, and detained her U.S. citizen father.

The reason that we are demanding that these indiscriminate roving patrols—these "show your papers," "arrest you if you have an accent" patrols—end is because they are fundamentally un-American, and they are illegal. And yet they continue. So unless we restrain them in law, unless we stop ICE and CBP and HSI from wandering through suburban neighborhoods, listening for people who may have accents and zip-tying them until they can prove that they are an American citizen, then they will continue.

This should upset Republicans just as much as it upsets Democrats—the idea that this man, a U.S. citizen, was zip-tied, detained, and arrested while his 5-year-old daughter watched, even though he had ID on him proving he was an American citizen. This has to end, and we shouldn't fund ICE until it does end.

In another quiet Minnesota suburb—this one called St. Peter—a woman sat alone in her car, observing and recording ICE officers as they patrolled her community. This should go without saying, but it clearly needs to be said anyway: What this woman was doing is fully protected by the Constitution. Observing and recording Federal agents and local law enforcement is a First Amendment right. You get that right by being born in the United States of America, being a resident of the United States of America. It is not suspicious. It is not a crime. But ICE doesn't like that people are watching them, tracking their illegality.

So what happened next should alarm every American citizen. Three unmarked ICE vehicles began chasing this woman down a rural road. When she didn't pull over, they boxed her in. As soon as she stopped, these three masked agents jumped out of their vehicles immediately with guns drawn, screaming at her to get out of her car.

Again, she has committed no crime, no traffic violation. She refused. She calmly asserted her rights. The agents then forced her door open, dragged this woman onto the road and handcuffed her. This is an unarmed woman who had committed no crime. She is alone on a country road, and an unmarked car boxes her in, and out jump masked men with guns and drag her out of her car.

That is not the United States of America. That is Stalinist Russia. That is Maduro's Venezuela. We don't allow, in this country, masked men to pull over law-abiding citizens, in unmarked cars, and drag them out onto the road.

They put her in her vehicle. They began driving her in this car to Minneapolis. About 20 minutes later, the agents received a call from their supervisor. The woman's husband had contacted the St. Peter Police Department and reached the police chief, and the chief called the ICE officers and told them they were violating the law and to let this woman out.

The only reason we know this story is because, when her husband arrived,