



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 21, 2026

No. 87

## Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. 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.

O Maker of the earth, sea, and sky, speak to our hearts today that we may cling to things that cannot fail. Speak to our lawmakers that they may embrace Your purposes and do Your will. Give them strength for the work before them in that they may not become weary in well-doing, realizing that, in due season, the harvest will come.

And, God, we also ask You to bless this land we love. Defend it from the forces that seek to destroy our freedoms. May its citizens never forget that righteousness exalts a nation but that sin is an equal opportunity destroyer.

And, Lord, let there be peace on Earth, and let it begin with us.

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. SHEEHY). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### MORNING BUSINESS

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

The President pro tempore.

### RURAL COMMUNITY HOSPITAL DEMONSTRATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as I travel through Iowa, the issue of rural healthcare comes up frequently. In living in rural Iowa, I understand the importance of my fellow Iowans' having access to healthcare close to home.

In pursuit of that goal, I have led the charge to protect and expand access to rural healthcare. Some of the items that I have worked on over the years would be extending telehealth flexibilities; extending the rural hospital programs, like the Medicare-Dependent Hospital Program and the Low-Volume Hospital Program; also enacting pharmacy benefit manager reform and expanding access to rural pharmacies—I hope that the pharmacy benefit manager reform leads to lower drug costs for all Iowans—and then establishing the Rural Emergency Hospital Program and establishing the \$50 billion Rural Health Transformation Fund that was in the tax bill of last year.

Most recently, I have introduced the Rural Community Hospital Demonstration Reauthorization Act, which extends this demonstration program for another 5 years.

Since 2005, the Rural Community Hospital Demonstration Program has supported what we call rural “tweener” hospitals and has given policymakers insight into improving rural healthcare.

Now, how do you get that name “tweener” hospitals? They are hospitals like those that are too large to be classified as critical access hospitals and yet still face lower volumes.

The program tests innovative hospital payment models under Medicare. Nationally, up to 30 hospitals can participate in this program. Iowa is fortunate enough to have four hospitals in this program, which are located in Fort Dodge, Grinnell, Newton, and Spirit Lake.

Until last year, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services underuti-

lized the program by leaving spots open. I am happy that the Trump administration acted at my urging to correct this.

I recently visited one of these hospitals in Grinnell, IA. As a result of the Grinnell Regional Medical Center's participation in this demonstration program, the hospital has been able to improve access to mental health, maternal health, and recruit more providers.

The data shows that the demonstration program has benefited rural healthcare generally. Hospitals in the program have significantly improved their margins and have had higher capital investments. The program has also helped with staff retention and adding services.

While Congress has extended the Rural Community Hospital Demonstration Program before, we need to reauthorize it again to continue this important work. I am glad to partner with a bipartisan group of 16 Senate colleagues to introduce the bill that reauthorizes the program.

I am happy to report that, last night, the Senate passed the Rural Community Hospital Demonstration Reauthorization Act. Now I look forward to working with my House colleagues to make this law.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant 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.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2431

## RECONCILIATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the Democrat Party has gone off the rails.

It is no secret that the Democrat Party has drifted sharply leftward in recent years and that it has become increasingly divorced from the concerns of ordinary Americans.

“Many Americans Say the [Democrat] Party Does Not Share Their Priorities”—that was a headline noted last year from the New York Times. But it is remarkable just how extreme Democrats have become.

Everyone remembers the Democrat Party’s flirtation with “defund the police” a few years ago. But when it rapidly became apparent that we actually need the police, Democrats seemed to rein things in. But no more. In today’s Democrat Party, “defund the police” is back and more strongly than ever.

The reason we are here today, I would say the sole—sole—reason we are here today is because we are considering this reconciliation bill because Democrats refuse to fund law enforcement at the Department of Homeland Security. They refuse to fund Border Patrol, and they refuse to fund Immigrations and Customs Enforcement—at all. They wouldn’t agree to provide a single dollar for either of these Agencies—not a single dollar for a physical presence at our border, not a single dollar to take criminal illegal aliens off of our streets.

Really think about that for a minute. Is there any country in the world that doesn’t have officers to protect its borders? Well, if Democrats had their way, that would now be the United States of America.

The public record provides ample evidence of the fact that among those who try to make their way illegally across the border, there are bad actors whose presence in this country would endanger Americans. Democrats don’t want there to be a single individual at the border to stop those individuals from entering our country, and they don’t want there to be a single individual to enforce immigration law in this country.

The various women who were murdered by illegal immigrants who entered the country under the open borders Biden administration—what about them? Well, Democrats apparently don’t think that even one of those individuals should have been deported.

If what I am saying sounds extreme, let me confirm: It is. But it is also an accurate description of the Democrats’ position.

If this were about making reforms to the way ICE or Border Patrol does business, then Democrats would have accepted the robust package of legislative reforms they were offered by the White House or engaged in serious negotiations to tweak the package, but they didn’t. They put up a good show for a little while. But it rapidly became clear that Democrats were not interested in actually reaching any kind of agreement, and eventually they just

walked away presumably because they felt that it was more valuable for them to have a political issue than to actually agree to any reforms.

Of course, I am not sure what political constituency they were appealing to because I don’t think mainstream Americans believe in, for example, completely defunding our Nation’s Border Patrol. But then again, I am not too sure the Democrat Party really understands or thinks about mainstream Americans. They are in the pockets of the far left, and so they embrace positions guaranteed to appeal to the far left, no matter—no matter—how out of step those positions are with those of mainstream Americans.

In recent days, perhaps realizing just how extreme “defund the police” could seem to mainstream American, the Democrat leader has attempted to obfuscate what is happening here by suggesting that Republicans’ consideration of this bill somehow means that Republicans are not concerned with the challenges facing ordinary Americans. To which I say: Give me a break.

This from the same Democrat leader who oversaw passage of legislation that plunged our country into an inflation crisis. From legislation to drive down the cost of prescription drugs at the pharmacy counter to our signature Working Families Tax Cut, which permanently cut American taxes and put more money in workers’ pockets, Republicans have been focused—focused like a laser—on making life easier for hard-working Americans.

But, remarkably, it is possible to walk and chew gum at the same time. And we can protect Americans by protecting our borders and continue to pass legislation that will alleviate some of the pressures facing hard-working Americans. We not only can do both; we have a responsibility to do both. Republicans are going to fulfill that responsibility.

As long as we are in charge, there will be agents at our borders to prevent terrorists, traffickers, and other dangerous individuals from making their way into our country, and there will be agents to take criminal illegal immigrants off of America’s streets. Our Nation’s security demands nothing less.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant 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.

The President pro tempore.

## MEDIA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in the past several Congresses, my investigative work has resulted in the public release of thousands of pages of information once hidden from the public.

Much of it is evidence of political bias in law enforcement and intelligence community investigations, and I will give you 10 examples of how this information has been hidden and how our efforts have brought it to light. They are Crossfire Hurricane, Arctic Frost, Plasmic Echo, Round River, the Clinton Foundation, Rampart 12, the Biden Family Investigation, the Clinton annex, Durham annex, and the 2017 Intelligence Community Assessment. But those 10 aren’t the total; there are many others I could mention.

I have made public record after record, and the partisan media continues to turn its very negative sights on my and Senator JOHNSON’s work.

Most recently, The Hill published an article attacking our work on Arctic Frost. Specifically, the article took offense for daring to make public largely unredacted records that the Biden administration had kept from the public—records by and large I obtained through protected public whistleblower disclosures and not from government officials.

In doing so, The Hill also raised questions about the identities of who provided legally protected whistleblower disclosures. For example, when referring to my and Senator JOHNSON’s making public Jack Smith’s subpoenas, The Hill said it raises “questions about the identities of the whistleblowers who shared them with Grassley.”

It sounds like The Hill is trying to improperly identify whistleblowers who stuck their necks out for the truth just like Jack Smith’s prosecutors have gone after them. For example, J.P. Cooney and Molly Gaston reportedly filed a complaint with the Justice Department inspector general. Cooney and Gaston asked for that Office to investigate what they claim is the improper disclosure to Congress of 197 Jack Smith subpoenas. So Cooney and Gaston want the inspector general to investigate whistleblowers who have exposed the bad conduct by Jack Smith and his staff. That is obviously a conflict of interest.

By the way, Cooney and Gaston are the same Jack Smith prosecutors who wanted to prosecute nuns present on January 6. More precisely, Cooney said:

I would like to prosecute any nun who still wears [a] head habit.

Instead of attacking patriotic whistleblowers, this partisan media ought to do a deep report on how invasive Jack Smith’s operation was because Jack Smith sought communications of Republican groups and what these Republican groups had to do with the legislative branch as well as the media.

All this time, I thought the partisan media held the First Amendment in very high regard. Evidently, they do not.

The Hill also failed to report on the emails that we publicly released from Special Agent Thibault. Thibault’s own emails show he violated the FBI’s no self-approval rule in opening up the Arctic Frost investigation. Those