



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2026

No. 75

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, thank You for reminders. We are grateful for Your reminding us of the greatness of our Nation's past, the strengths of our Nation's present, and the opportunities for our Nation's future. Lord, we appreciate Your reminder of the importance of continuing to unite in serving the causes of freedom in our Nation and world. We praise You for the reminder that what we do speaks as loudly as what we say.

May the memories of what we have been and the challenges of what we can be empower us to seize this day for Your glory. Continue to bless and keep our lawmakers as they seek to not only challenge the status quo but to remember the good things about the way we were.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Iowa.

NATIONAL FENTANYL AWARENESS DAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the illegal drug fentanyl kills tens of thousands every year. Today marks National Fentanyl Awareness Day. I want to thank the senior Senator from New Hampshire for her collaboration with me in recognizing this day and the dangers that come from fentanyl.

In recent years, we have become too familiar with fentanyl's dangers. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have lost their lives, with the number totaling tens of thousands each year. That is why I worked with Senator CASSIDY of Louisiana in getting legislation that we entitled the HALT Fentanyl Act passed into law and signed by the President last year. So now fentanyl is permanently scheduled, and law enforcement has more tools to remove the dangerous drugs from Americans' streets.

I want to commend President Trump and the Department of Justice for using those tools. Under President Trump's leadership, fentanyl seizures continue to reach record highs, and countless Americans are safer as a result.

I also want to thank law enforcement for their tireless efforts to keep Americans safe and their daily choice to protect all of us from dangerous drugs like fentanyl.

Now, there is another recent problem that has come up with fentanyl being mixed with another dangerous drug, xylazine. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I am committing to continue to combat dangerous drugs mixed with fentanyl. Again, xylazine is an example.

Under my leadership, our committee recently reported an important, as well as bipartisan, bill that would do just that. I will continue to push for passage of that legislation to stop the xylazine and fentanyl mixture.

Today, though, I join many in raising awareness concerning fentanyl's impact and in expressing my solidarity with those affected by this poison.

I yield the floor.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we need law enforcement. Nowhere was that more evident than on Saturday night, when a gunman attempted to storm the White House Correspondents' Dinner in an attempt to kill the President, individuals in the line of succession to the Presidency, and civilians who got in the way.

We need law enforcement. We need the police officers who patrol our streets, the first to respond when someone is in danger or needs help. We need the FBI agents who investigate Federal crimes, from money laundering to kidnapping. We need the Secret Service agents who protect the President and Vice President and other dignitaries. We need sheriffs' offices and transit police and ATF agents, and, yes, we need the Federal law enforcement officers who patrol our borders and take dangerous illegal aliens off of our streets.

You could be forgiven for thinking that I am stating the obvious. Ask most Americans, and I think you would find they say: Of course—of course—we need law enforcement.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2089

But that doesn't always seem to be obvious to my Democratic colleagues.

The "defund the police" movement and "abolish ICE" movements were both embraced by Members of the Democrat Party, and now Democrats are at it again.

The Department of Homeland Security has been shut down because Democrats decided they don't want to fund border security or immigration enforcement. They refuse to fund the Border Patrol. They refuse to fund Immigration and Customs Enforcement. They are refusing to fund any physical presence at our borders or any agents to take dangerous criminal illegal aliens off of our streets.

Not only that, the Democrat leader made it very clear that his party doesn't ever—he doesn't even, I should say, respect the work these law enforcement agents are doing.

"Nobody in this country respects ICE and Border Patrol," the Democrat leader said on the floor last week. And when asked to clarify his comments to say whether he really thinks nobody respects agents who put their lives on the line to, for example, stop dangerous individuals from crossing the border, the Democrat leader declined to answer. He declined to answer.

And I guess it is no surprise. Declining to fund these key law enforcement Agencies is a pretty good clue that Democrats don't respect the sacrifices these agents make to protect our country.

Why do we need law enforcement officers? Because there are dangerous individuals out there who choose to do harm. That is just a fact of living in a fallen world. And no government program or liberal fantasy is going to erase that reality.

And just as there are dangerous individuals already in our communities, there are dangerous individuals who would like to make their way illegally across our borders: drug traffickers, human traffickers, other criminals, terrorists.

Border Patrol agents stop them. And when dangerous individuals do make their way into our country, Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents work to take these dangerous individuals off of our streets.

Democrats may not like this reality. They may not like the fact that we need border security and immigration enforcement. But the fact remains that Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement are two Agencies that play a key role in our safety.

And the enormity of what Democrats have opted for cannot be overstated: no agents—zero agents—at the border; no one—no one—to stop dangerous individuals from making their way into our country; and no one—no one—to catch and deport these dangerous individuals if they do make it in.

Republicans, of course, are not going to let that happen. As long as we are in charge, we are going to do everything we can to protect our borders and keep

dangerous criminal illegal aliens off of our streets.

And that is why, after weeks and weeks of attempting to negotiate a funding agreement with Democrats before they ultimately walked away, we are now set to consider a reconciliation bill to fund border security and immigration enforcement for the next 3 years.

We have passed the budget resolution that will open the way for the final bill, and I hope my colleagues in the House will pass it in short order.

We need law enforcement. It is too bad the Democratic Party doesn't always agree.

I yield the floor.

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

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

CARBON DIOXIDE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise for two reasons: First, I talked last night about carbon capture—carbon dioxide capture—injection wells in Louisiana. I am not going to regive that speech.

Carbon dioxide, while a naturally occurring gas that God created—when you breathe, what you blow out is carbon dioxide. The world couldn't exist without carbon dioxide. Plants couldn't conduct photosynthesis. But carbon dioxide is also a gas that is heavier than air, and it rises. And it is also dispersed throughout our atmosphere.

And while there are many good things about CO₂, as we call it, one of the bad things is that carbon dioxide acts as a blanket over our world. And what happens when you are in bed, under a blanket? The blanket holds in heat. And carbon dioxide acts as this blanket, and it holds in the Earth's heat. And that can—that can affect your climate and your temperature. That is what all this discussion about carbon dioxide is all about.

A number of years ago, Congress decided to encourage companies that produce carbon dioxide. And one of the ways you also produce carbon dioxide, I should also add, is by burning fossil fuels. So a petrochemical plant, which uses natural gas when it produces the chemicals, it also produces CO₂, or carbon dioxide, just like I have been producing it as I have been breathing while we are talking.

In any event, Congress passed a statute and said: We want to try to minimize the production of carbon dioxide, which can affect our climate when we burn fossil fuels.

So Congress came up with this idea of paying companies money to capture that carbon dioxide so that it is not re-

leased into the atmosphere—and, boy, do we pay a bunch of money. It is about \$30 billion in spending every year. We are paying it to private companies to capture this carbon dioxide. It will be about \$30 billion that we are spending by 2030.

One of the things that companies do when they produce the carbon dioxide and they want to capture it—after they capture it, they have to do something with it. One of the things that many of you probably know is that they drill—well inject it underground. In my State, that is very controversial. Some people support it. Some people don't.

I am not here to debate the merits of carbon capture and what we call carbon capture sequestration. All I am saying is that under Louisiana law, if you own property and you don't want a company drilling a well and putting carbon dioxide under your property, you should have the right to say no.

My legislation—Louisiana passed a statute. I am not saying they were right or wrong to do it, just like I am not debating the merits—or lack thereof—of carbon capture and sequestration. All I am saying is that under my State law, if a company captures this carbon dioxide and wants to drill a well and inject it beneath the surface and if they want to put it on my property and I don't want them to put it on my property, then they come to me and say "I want to drill a well and inject carbon dioxide," I am entitled to say "Yep, you got it. Happy to help" or I am entitled to say "I don't want you to do it." They say "Pretty please?" and I say "The short answer is no. The long answer is hell no."

Under my State law, those private companies can force me to let them drill that well. We call it expropriation. Some States call it eminent domain. It is just like if a State wants to put a road through your property and it can't put it anywhere else, they can take your land, but they have to pay you for it. Well, in my State, the legislature says they can do the same thing with the drilling of these wells.

All I am saying is, in the great State of Louisiana, we go about this business of debating carbon capture and climate change and that sort of thing. If you own property, which, under my State constitution and the Federal Constitution, is an inalienable/unalienable right—you have the right to own property in America—and if a company wants to drill a well on your property and put carbon dioxide down there and you don't want them to, then you ought to have a right to say no, and the State can't make you, and the companies can't make you. And that is all I am saying. That is the only point I was trying to make last night.

If the powers that be in my State start bullying people—I am not saying they will, but if they start bullying people and taking their property when they don't want to give it up, in order to inject carbon dioxide beneath their