

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 CO<sub>2</sub>, 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 CO<sub>2</sub>, 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

land without their permission or consent, then I am going to have something to say about it because this money that we are paying companies to do that is from a Federal statute. It is called, I think, a 45Q tax credit. And do you know what? That 45Q tax credit can be changed. I can't make the legislature pass or not pass a law, but I sure can offer a bill to change that amount of money that we are paying companies to do this if they are going to force people and take their land in order to put in these wells.

I wasn't very clear last night. I think I was tired, and it was late, and I was also in a hurry to get home to watch "Wheel of Fortune."

#### TRIBUTE TO PATRICK TAYLOR

Mr. KENNEDY. Now, Mr. President, the other reason I am here, which is just as important, is for this man sitting right here. His name is Patrick Taylor. He is a fine American, and he and I work together.

Much to my sorrow—well, it is sorrow, but it is also pride—Patrick is going to work for another Agency. And I mean that my feelings are mixed about it.

Here is my strategy. I am not saying people who don't follow my strategy are doing it wrong. This is just the way I have always done it. I have been in government and politics for a while, and I have known some politicians that don't want to hire anybody smarter than them, OK, because they don't want anybody around them who will make them look bad. That is cool. To each his own. I don't do it that way, OK? I figure, if I hire people smarter than me, they will make me look better. That is what I have always tried to do, and I fully concede that Patrick is smarter than me.

But one of the downsides of hiring people smarter than you is that they are ambitious, they learn all they can, and somebody comes in and hires them away. That happens, and it has happened to me a number of times. Every single time, even though I am disappointed, I also try to say to myself: You know, this is a compliment, and I am sad, but I am happy. And that is what has happened with Patrick.

Patrick, as I told you, is really smart. He is a graduate of Colgate. I wrote it all down here. He has a master's from Hillsdale College. He studied at the Claremont Institute. He is on my communications team. This guy is a master at digital media. I mean, he can make posts and stuff on digital media. He can make that social media stuff walk, talk, and whistle "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," man, and he gets people to watch, and it is awesome.

Patrick is going to work for the U.S. International Development Finance Corporation. I asked him about it, and he said: It is top secret. If I told you, I would have to drown you in the ocean.

He didn't really say that.

It is a great job, and I am happy for him. He has been with me for 3 years, and it has been a great 3 years.

Patrick, Godspeed. Come back and see us. You are going to do great.

I just wanted to come by and acknowledge his service to the good people of America and to the good people of Louisiana and thank him for all of his help. It has been a lot of fun.

If you write a book, I reserve the right to edit it first, OK? You can't include everything in that book.

Patrick, thank you, man.

That is all I have, Mr. President. I can show my way out. My work here is done.

So I suggest the absence of a quorum. Is that OK, Madam Parliamentarian? Thank you, ma'am.

This is our Parliamentarian, Mr. President. She is pretty smart too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### WHITE HOUSE CORRESPONDENTS' DINNER SHOOTING

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, every American should be grateful that President Trump, Vice President VANCE, the Cabinet, and thousands of other attendees were not harmed during Saturday's disturbing shooting that took place at the White House Correspondents' Association dinner.

We now know that the shooter was attempting to kill the President, and this was the third assassination attempt we have seen on his life in the past couple of years.

Now, some Democrats—and I would include former President Obama in this—some have claimed that we don't have details about the suspect's motives, but we do have plenty of details, and we know that the shooter actually laid a good bit of this out. He did a manifesto, and he sent that manifesto to his family shortly before the attack. The shooter said he was going to target administration officials "prioritized from highest-ranking to lowest." It shows you he thought this through. Now, his reason for this, he said President Trump is—and I quote his wording here again—"pedophile, rapist, traitor."

Now, this is unhinged rhetoric. It is completely in line with the lies that the Democrats have repeated on just about a daily basis every day regarding President Trump. We have heard it on TV, on podcasts, on social media, in their speeches, and it is something else that they continue with this rhetoric.

And Gov. Tim Walz who, of course, was the VP nominee in the last election once said:

No one has ever been more dangerous to this country than Donald Trump, and he is a fascist to his core.

Again, that was Gov. Tim Walz.

Now, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have called the President an "existential threat to democracy," "the most significant threat to American democracy since the Civil War," and an "authoritarian." And some of them have chosen to compare him to historical figures, and that historical figure they usually use is Hitler. And, of course, Kamala Harris once compared him to a "communist dictator."

This is reckless rhetoric. This is the kind of rhetoric that needs to stop because this places a target on our President, and this is the type of rhetoric that has no place in civil public life.

Now, we are celebrating America 250, and we are looking at how this Nation has remained strong and free. Indeed, I think that as you look at our history, those tenets of faith, family, freedom, hope, and opportunity have served us well. And how do we achieve that American dream? Well, we have kept ourselves free and focused on achieving that dream for each and every person. They all look different. Everybody's dream is different of what they want, what their goals are, the type of community they want to live in. They are all different.

But we arrive at decisions of what kind of communities we will have, what kind of country we will have—those issues of importance—we arrive there through robust, respectful, bipartisan debate. We don't get there by exercising reckless rhetoric, some of which I have quoted. It is so disappointing to hear this from some of our colleagues and then to see the type of vitriol that this spurs.

Now, when we have robust, respectful, bipartisan debate—I share my opinion; someone else shares their opinion—what this does is to empower not only us, but the people that we represent, to enter into that debate, to be a part of the public square, to defend our freedoms, to build consensus, and to serve the American people and to preserve the freedoms that we enjoy.

Now, without it, without having that marketplace of ideas, without that robust, respectful debate that leads to exchange and asking: What if we did this? What if we did that? If we did not have that, then this Nation would head to a very dark place. And this latest assassination attempt on President Trump is another reminder of what can happen when Americans abandon the possibility of working together and instead of settling their differences by debate in the public square, they choose to settle these differences by violence, by reckless rhetoric.

So as we approach our Nation's 250th anniversary, we need to remember that it is this exchange of ideas and this robust, respectful debate that has helped to sustain the freedoms that we enjoy in this country.