

## 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

emails were made public in January of last year. Thibault's own words paint the picture. And this is the same agent who violated the Hatch Act for anti-Trump partisan conduct. Not only was that fact not reported by The Hill, the outlet also couldn't be bothered to report on those emails that we released.

By the way, we didn't get those records from the government either; we got them from patriotic whistleblowers.

The Hill's reporting accuses our record production of playing a significant role in FBI agents being fired. Now, The Hill knows this, but they don't report it: The FBI makes personnel decisions, not we, Members of Congress.

The Hill's reporting failed to take into account the Department of Justice and Federal Bureau of Investigation names that I have made public which gave them credit for doing good work. For example, last year, I issued a majority staff report on then-Secretary of State John Kerry's interfering in the FBI arresting high-level Iranian nationals and the targets that those nationals were. I also released FBI records about agents attempting to investigate the Clinton Foundation. Credit ought to be given to those government officials who did their job. I have received no complaints about making their names public.

Yet The Hill focused on Arctic Frost, and in doing so, buried the lede:

The documents released by Grassley include names of nearly 70 FBI agents and employees. That includes some figures already known to the public, as well as other agents whose case history the bureau is well aware of.

Now, I have five points.

First, it is common practice to make public the names of taxpayer-funded government officials whose conduct is within the public interest. That is especially the case when their names are already public. Now, I call that and I hope everybody around here calls that accountability.

Second, not all of the named individuals have been fired.

Third, The Hill article fails to explicitly note that three of the FBI agents who sued over their termination had their names public before we released them. In fact, one name was public as early as 2016.

Fourth, our document production made those three names public on January 30, 2025, during Kash Patel's nomination hearing to be FBI Director. Clearly, he and then-FBI leadership didn't give us those records. Who gave us those records? Well, where we get most of our records—patriotic whistleblowers did that.

The fifth and last point, Patel fired those three agents approximately 10 months after we made their names public on January 30. But, again, their names were public years before our release.

Now, the point I am trying to make is that The Hill is not doing its job.

They failed to mention all those critical facts.

Next, The Hill takes a shot at the FBI 1023 document that Chairman COMER and I made public in the last Congress. That is the one about the Biden bribery allegations. Also, The Hill failed to mention that Senator JOHNSON and I made public two additional FBI 1023 documents last year. Both of those documents provided additional information from FBI informants about Biden family criminality.

So there are at least three different FBI confidential human sources. Each provided information about the Biden family criminality on three separate occasions. And the sources provided that information to three different FBI agents.

Question: Did DOJ and FBI prosecute those other two FBI sources? No.

So, last year, I asked Director Patel about the initial FBI 1023 document that Director Wray was supposed to investigate. I asked whether an investigation was carried out into the alleged records. Patel answered this way:

Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chairman.

I am not saying the allegations are true. I just want to know if the investigation has been carried out. The Hill failed to mention any of that very important context.

The Hill also failed to take into account some of my whistleblowers. They failed to take into account that some of my whistleblowers have faced years of retaliation and face serious abuse by officials who have since been fired.

Wrongdoing should be punished. It is called accountability. And I have also said lower-level personnel who appropriately follow directives without violating procedures ought to have that taken into consideration.

Now, The Hill should endeavor to report on the heroic and brave efforts that whistleblowers have undertaken to expose government abuse, instead of providing a forum for government agents to smear them.

To my patriotic whistleblowers, I want them to know that this Senator's work will continue in full force.

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. SCHUMER. 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 MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

---

#### RECONCILIATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, Republicans still haven't released the

text of their radical MAGA reconciliation wish list, just hours before we are expected to vote on it.

Where the hell is the bill? Where the hell is the bill? We were supposed to get it yesterday before lunch—no bill. We were supposed to get it yesterday afternoon—no bill. We were supposed to get it before dinnertime—no bill. We were supposed to get it around midnight—still no bill. And now it is Thursday morning—still no bill.

Why don't we have a bill? I will tell you why. The Republican Party is in complete disarray. They are in complete meltdown. They can't come to an agreement with each other. They are angry with each other.

Why? They are pulled between two poles, and they can't decide which way to go to. The first pole is the pole they should go to: Help the American people. Help the American people with higher costs, whether it is groceries or gasoline or housing or healthcare; work with Democrats to help get those costs down. That is where they should be. And they should also be with us when we want to end the chaos—the chaos on the streets of our cities—by having ICE and Border Patrol have reasonable guardrails so they don't kill Americans on the streets. And, of course, end the corruption. They should be angry, as we are, as the American people are, at the corruption that is coming out of the White House.

So on the one pole is to work for the American people, but on the other pole is Donald Trump, who is exactly the opposite of what Americans want, and Republicans know it. Trump doesn't give a damn about costs. He has already said that. Pay more for gasoline? He says: I don't care. The American people can pay more for groceries, can pay more for housing. He doesn't care about that. He is a billionaire. He doesn't go shop for groceries. He doesn't go get gas at the pump.

Chaos—he loves chaos. His Iran war is one of the most chaotic foreign misadventures America has ever gone on, and it gets worse all the time, as gas prices go above \$4.50. I heard today it is above \$4 in every State.

And he is the originator—the chief cook and bottle washer—of corruption. He comes up with corrupt scheme after corrupt scheme to benefit himself, his family, his cronies, criminals whom he has encouraged to act criminally. He is the originator of the corruption.

The ballroom. They have become ballroom Republicans, the Republican Senators.

The MAGA slush fund to be given out to cronies—probably, a lot of it would end up in Trump's pocket or his kids' pockets. Your dollars, American taxpayers.

So they are stuck. They are sort of like that cartoon, the old Popeye cartoon, where Olive Oyl is pulled in one direction by Popeye and the other by Bluto. She keeps going back and forth. That is who they are. They don't know what to do.