

Why do we do these things? Why would any government do these things to so many innocent people?

In this case, very simply, it is to give tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans and the biggest corporations. The richest Americans will be seeing \$400,000 more in tax cuts in their pockets every year because of this legislation. I don't know how their lifestyle—if you are a millionaire or something like that and you get a tax break of \$400,000, what does that money do to change your life?

Well, I can tell you this: One thing that will change your life forever is to face a dramatic medical challenge in your family and not have health insurance to cover you. I have been there, and I have lived through that. It is something you never wish on anyone. And yet 17 million Americans, unfortunately, will lose their health insurance under this bill, the Big Beautiful Bill, signed by President Trump.

Despite a last-ditch effort—there was a failing attempt at buying votes and pretending to care about rural areas, like my area of Downstate Illinois—more than 300 rural hospitals and 500 nursing homes may be forced to close because of these cutbacks in Medicaid. That is because this Big Beautiful Bill cripples the Medicaid Program that keeps our rural hospitals and communities afloat. That includes HSHS St. Francis Hospital in Litchfield, IL, where Medicaid pays for 53 percent of the hospitalization; St. Mary's Hospital in Centralia, IL, where Medicaid pays for 42 percent of hospitalizations; and OSF St. Clare Hospital in Princeton, IL, where Medicaid covers 45 percent of the hospitalizations.

The administrators in these hospitals have warned us that this could be the breaking point. Many of these hospitals barely survive, barely keep their doors open. Now, all of these hospitals—already operating on the margins—may face impossible decisions to scale back services. For what? To pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest people in this country.

Aside from hospitals, there is also going to be a major consequence on American energy. I commend to my colleagues and those who are following this debate, in today's New York Times, an article by Thomas Friedman. He talks about the impact on energy from the decisions made by the signing of this bill.

This bill kills solar, wind, and EV tax credits enjoyed by companies and consumers alike, all but ceding the future of electricity to China and risking billions of dollars of investments in renewable energy—ironically, mostly in Republican States.

While working families grapple with the consequences of these cuts, they are going to see the family home expenses increase by \$1,000 a year. Utility bills are going up because of this bill—this bill signed by the President, the Big Beautiful Bill.

The Chicago Tribune recently shared a story of Isaiah Rogers, a 61-year-old

man who lives in the West Pullman neighborhood in Chicago. Several years ago, Isaiah was diagnosed with type 2 diabetes. As a result of this diagnosis, he has not been able to return to his job, trimming trees, and has been working small side jobs. Medicaid pays for Isaiah's doctor visits and his insulin.

A single father without a high school degree, Isaiah is concerned that the bill's cuts and changes to Medicaid will result in his losing his health coverage. And if Isaiah loses Medicaid, he will no longer be able to afford his insulin and other medications. He may face a diabetic complication or coma or even suffer a stroke. What will that mean to his 12-year-old son?

It is unconscionable to think that the other party would pull the plug on lifesaving health coverage and deny food to our most needy children, but that is exactly what they voted for and celebrated on July 4.

As Republicans moved this megabill through Congress, Democrats did our best, in the minority, to push back. Over the course of 27 hours, Senate Democrats forced votes on many amendments to put Republicans on notice and show their constituents what their real positions are on issues. It was the longest vote-arama in the history of the Senate. It included putting Republicans on the record, voting against nursing home care, home healthcare, food assistance for children of veterans, protections for Medicaid, clean energy jobs—and the list goes on. And an expansion of the child tax credit, an idea that has proven successful—all that was sacrificed to give billionaires tax cuts instead.

In the end, three sensible Senate Republicans looked at this ugly betrayal of a bill and agreed they couldn't be part of the process. I commend them. But, sadly, three votes on the other side of the aisle wasn't enough. We needed one more.

And who swooped in to cast his vote—the decisive vote? Vice President VANCE. He showed up at the last minute and cast a tie-breaking vote in the Senate to push the bill across the finish line.

A few short years ago, then-Vice President Harris broke a tie in this very Chamber to pass the largest climate investment bill in history and to lower prescription drug prices for millions of Americans—what a sharp contrast. This Vice President cast a deciding vote that will be painful for so many families across America, and he could have done so much more and so much better for the people of this Nation. That is the difference in priorities. In politics, it basically boils down to: Whose side are you on?

As the effects of this bill take shape and slither their way through our communities, our Republican colleagues will have to look their constituents in the eyes and explain their votes. They will have to explain to a farmer who now must drive an additional 50 miles

to the nearest hospital why they had to shut the community hospital doors. They will have to explain to the grandmother at a nursing home why her care is being slimmed down or eliminated because of cutbacks to Medicaid. They will have to explain to the young mother preparing to have a baby why there is no longer a maternity ward in her county.

This bill flies in the face of American values that we celebrate on the Fourth of July and everything we stand for. The other party has a lot of explaining to do, and the American people are going to face the consequences.

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.

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

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

WHISTLEBLOWERS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I would like to address a whistleblower complaint that I received the morning before Emil Bove's nomination hearing. That is the complaint that was given to the New York Times for them to report on it the very same morning.

One group has publicly accused this chairman of the Judiciary Committee of undermining that whistleblower. That group also said:

I used to be a champion of whistleblowers.

Then the whistleblower and his lawyers took part in a political hit piece on my handling of this situation, and so now my Democratic colleagues have all of a sudden found whistleblowers to be of benefit to them.

Let me be absolutely clear. I appreciate the whistleblower's disclosure being sent to my office. My door is open to anyone, but that doesn't mean that I am going to jump at every allegation in a way that some may want this Senator to do. So let me respond with a very short history lesson.

Last Congress, during the Biden administration, I worked to protect many whistleblowers, as I have throughout my Senate career. I recall with pride the work that I did during the Reagan administration with Department of Defense whistleblowers.

In some cases, my whistleblower work never sees the light of day because the situation demands nonpublic attention. In other cases, publicity is required.

In my efforts to protect the IRS whistleblowers who came forward during the previous administration, my Democratic colleagues didn't join me. In my efforts to protect the Department of Homeland Security whistleblowers, my Democratic colleagues refused to join me.

And those whistleblowers even disclosed problematic conduct during the Trump administration, conduct which that administration actually tried to fix.

In my efforts to protect Health and Human Services' whistleblowers, my Democratic colleagues didn't join me in that effort either.

Last year, I hosted two oversight roundtables, one on the Biden administration's failure to protect unaccompanied children from trafficking, another on the Biden administration's failure to collect DNA at the border, resulting in Americans being subjected to senseless crimes from illegals.

At that roundtable, the witnesses said that Rachel Morin's murder by an illegal could have been prevented had his DNA been taken by the border people, as required under law.

At both of these roundtables, my whistleblowers testified. On both roundtables, not a single Democrat attended, even though I invited them to come.

During Trump's first term, I made a public statement that it appeared the Ukraine complaint followed whistleblower laws. I said that even though I had serious concerns about the complaint's substantive legitimacy—concerns which have been proven right over time. Now, at that particular time, Democratic groups praised me.

During Trump's first term, I investigated Russian collusion, then-Ranking Member Feinstein joined me in that effort. We and our staffs interviewed Donald Trump, Jr., and other Republicans. As we found out, there was nothing there.

And what ended up happening is the exposure of the Clinton campaign and Democratic National Committee paying for the fake Steele dossier.

Yet, with overwhelming evidence of Biden family corruption, my Democratic colleagues didn't do any investigation of that matter. And when I say "overwhelming," I made bank records public proving the case, and it was still crickets from the other side.

During the Kavanaugh nomination, many alleged whistleblowers came forward. I directed my oversight and investigative staffs to dig in: 45 witnesses were interviewed, 25 written statements, and an over 400-page report.

Some of those witnesses were sent to us by my Democrat colleagues. The conclusion of that, no evidence to support the allegations that were brought forward against Kavanaugh. Indeed, what ended up happening were several criminal referrals for felonious lies from these same witnesses. This committee made four criminal referrals for materially false statements and obstruction, two of these four referrals also included criminal conspiracy.

One witness was referred to my staff by a fellow Senator who also referred that witness to a reporter. That witness's information was used to question Kavanaugh under oath. That witness later publicly admitted that they lied.

When individuals provide fabricated allegations, it diverts committee resources when other time-sensitive investigations are ongoing. Resources were diverted away from whistleblowers to handle the Kavanaugh matter. Such conduct impedes the Senate's work. During Kavanaugh, my investigative staff spent hours, days, and many weeks investigating one claim after another.

So getting back to the matter I opened with, Emil Bove, my first question to him at a public hearing was directly about the whistleblower complaint that my staff received the very single day before the hearing.

So the nominee, Mr. Bove, denied the allegations under oath. The Deputy Attorney General has denied the allegations publicly. Two high-level principals have made outright denials publicly. The whistleblower also signed papers acknowledging the Justice Department had complied with court orders. So right now that is the state of the play.

Every day my office receives many whistleblower cases. My investigative staff study them and run down the facts.

There are many government employees who need help. And just this year, I have had a lot of success with whistleblowers that were discriminated against, investigated against, maybe fired, maybe put on administrative leave. But in most cases, it was all an attempt to hurt them professionally, besides being out of a job.

So in regard to the IRS whistleblowers, they were finally helped—one of whom is a Democrat. My Department of Homeland Security whistleblowers got their guns, badges, and retirement back. On another example, I spent significant time helping FBI whistleblowers, and it appears their cases are trending in the right direction.

And guess what. One of those whistleblowers is also a Democrat.

I would always welcome more bipartisan oversight. It is just that the Democrats apparently don't want to join my efforts.

So when I read unfounded public broadsides about my operation in that political piece I have already referred to, let what I said today be a reminder of my dedication to helping the whistleblower community. And let me also remind everyone that sometimes what I do to protect whistleblowers is non-public, as it should be. And I don't care about that. All I care about are the results of helping whistleblowers and bringing attention to the wrong that the whistleblowers say are wrong within our government.

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.

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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 64.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Jonathan Gould, of Virginia, to be Comptroller of the Currency for a term of five years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill 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 nomination of Executive Calendar No. 64, Jonathan Gould, of Virginia, to be Comptroller of the Currency for a term of five years.

John Thune, John Barrasso, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John R. Curtis, Rick Scott of Florida, Bernie Moreno, Pete Ricketts, Eric Schmitt, Jon A. Husted, Roger Marshall, Jim Justice, Tommy Tuberville, Bill Hagerty, Joni Ernst, James E. Risch, Marsha Blackburn, Tim Sheehy.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 261.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Whitney D. Hermandorfer, of Tennessee, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows: