

predictable and sensible tax and regulatory policies. We have seen the fruits of this approach under the Trump administration. So let's not, through the Green Deal, kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

The Green New Deal is both breathtaking in its professed ambitions and, quite frankly, laughably weak. It is just a resolution calling on the government to enact a whole range of policies.

Then, why not introduce a bill that actually does something rather than a resolution calling for future implausible actions?

It is supposed to be about protecting the environment. As someone with a track record of real bipartisan achievements that have resulted in a cleaner environment, I don't get it. If you want to know my credentials there, I am the father of the wind energy tax credit, just as an example. We get 38 percent of our electricity from wind in Iowa.

What do universal healthcare—another item of the Green New Deal—or free college tuition or a Federal jobs guarantee program have to do with the environment anyway? All of those things are in the Green New Deal.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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 (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. SCHUMER. By the end of this week, the Senate will vote on a resolution to terminate the President's emergency declaration. I have laid out the number of reasons why the Senate must vote to terminate. The President has not demonstrated that an emergency exists. During the announcement of the declaration, the President said he "didn't need to do this." A few weeks later, 58 former national security officials, including former Secretaries of State and Defense, said there was "no factual basis" for an emergency declaration. For the sake of the facts, the Senate must vote to terminate.

We also have no idea which military construction projects might be on the chopping block. Republican Senators who vote against this declaration do so at their own peril. They may be voting to deprive necessary funds from military installations in their States. For the sake of the brave men and women of our Armed Forces, the Senate must vote to terminate.

Of course, the constitutional questions loom largest. The President failed to convince Congress, the American people, and, perhaps most glaringly, Mexico to pay for his border

wall. Now he is attempting to use emergency powers to subvert the will of Congress. If allowed to stand, this emergency declaration would be a defacement of our constitutional order and one of the largest power grabs for the executive branch in the more than 200 years this Nation has been in existence.

My colleagues must contemplate the possibility that if President Trump were to succeed with his phony emergency declaration, future Presidents would have a precedent to claim emergencies whenever Congress failed to endorse their policies. In effect, Congress would no longer be a coequal branch of government. It would change the balance of power rather dramatically in ways the Founding Fathers would never have contemplated. In fact, it would horrify many of the Founding Fathers, who were so worried about an overweening Executive in the personage of King George.

I know many of my Republican friends are afraid to cross the President. We know he can be vindictive. I know that several support the idea of building a wall but want to oppose the emergency declaration. I would say to my colleagues respectfully: You have been able to express your support for a border wall numerous times in the past Congress and in this one. Another amendment vote will accomplish nothing new; it will only poison Congress's ability to pass this resolution.

This is not about policy at our southern border; this is about one thing and one thing alone—Presidential overreach.

Later this week, the Senate ought to vote a clean resolution to terminate the emergency. The bottom line is very simple: If we were upholding the Constitution, it would be 100 to nothing against the emergency. If there were no politics, no fear, no worry about crossing a President, the vote would be 100 to nothing. If people read the Federalist Papers and the Constitution and what the Founding Fathers intended, the vote would be 100 to nothing. I hope it is as close to that as is possible.

BUDGET PROPOSAL

Mr. President, earlier today, the Trump administration released its annual request. In recent years, these budget requests have become statements of principles and priorities rather than working documents. Purely as a statement of principle, the latest budget proposal from the Trump administration is not only extremely disturbing, but it is totally against what the President talks about when he talks to his supporters.

The budget request we received today would be a gut punch to the middle class and a handout to powerful special interests and the wealthiest few. It would dismantle America's healthcare system as we know it, and it would dramatically widen the gap in income and wealth between our Nation's richest citizens and the rest.

Now listen to this: The President talks about how he wants to get better healthcare for Americans. Certainly our Republican colleagues do. By cutting healthcare coverage and increasing healthcare costs for millions of Americans, this budget belies those promises. President Trump's budget would repeal the entire Affordable Care Act, taking away insurance from 32 million Americans and eliminating protections for Americans with preexisting conditions. How many Republicans are for that?

How about this: \$1.5 trillion in cuts to Medicaid, \$845 billion in cuts to Medicare, \$506 billion in cuts to tax credits that help lower income Americans afford insurance. Not only is this cruel, it is hypocritical. It is against everything our Republican friends talk about. It is against what the President says. He is going to preserve Medicare and Medicaid, and then he slashes them. It still befuddles me how he can get away with this even in these times.

Second, the budget slashes domestic programs, including investments in infrastructure, housing, education, and the environment—a third of the EPA budget and one-fifth of the Department of Transportation budget.

My Republican friends, when your commissioners and Governors come to you and say they need more highway funds, are you going to support a budget that cuts them by 20 percent?

On top of all this, it gives more tax breaks to the wealthiest few. It would permanently extend the Trump tax cuts, costing \$1.9 trillion over 10 years. Seventy percent of the benefits go to the top one-fifth of America. The staggering costs of these tax cuts are the reason for all the proposed cuts to healthcare and infrastructure. The Trump budget proposes the blind theft of the middle class to line America's deepest pockets.

It is really a disgraceful budget. My guess is that Mr. Mulvaney at OMB put it together. He was one of the five most rightwing people in the Congress. He wanted to slash everything. The President just green-stamped it so he can tip his hat to those on the very far right.

The vast majority of the President's supporters—they are a dwindling number; they are now less than a third of America—don't support this. They don't support this at all. How many people who count themselves as supporters of President Trump support cutting Medicare by close to \$1 trillion? How many of those who consider themselves supporters of Trump support cutting Medicaid by \$1.5 trillion? How many of the President's closest supporters think we should eliminate protections for preexisting conditions when people have them? How many of the President's supporters want to cut infrastructure by one-fifth or cut the clean water and clean air budget by one-third? Hardly any. This budget is just sort of an "Alice in Wonderland" document.

Of course, it wouldn't be a Trump budget if it didn't include the fantasy of another \$8.6 billion in funding for the border wall. The fiction that Mexico would pay for the wall has long been debunked, although that is what the President ran on, but it is still amazing that the Trump administration proposes year after year that the American taxpayer pay billions of dollars for a border wall that President Trump said would be completely free.

It is difficult to overstate the callousness of President Trump's budget. The cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and numerous middle-class programs are devastating but maybe not surprising. This budget will be on the backs of the Republicans. They support President Trump.

The Republican Party's systematic efforts to rip away Americans' healthcare, its continued embrace of the tax cuts for the rich, its refusal to accept science, facts, and the urgent need to address climate change have made cruel and unthinkable budget proposals like this one par for the course with our fellow Republicans. It is sad; it is a shame; and it basically is total hypocrisy because not one single Republican would campaign on these proposals.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. President, this week the Senate will vote on three controversial nominees, including two circuit court judges: Paul Matey for the Third Circuit and Neomi Rao for the DC Circuit, the second most powerful court in the country.

Mr. Matey's nomination, in keeping with Leader MCCONNELL just ripping apart whatever bipartisanship we have left, has advanced without a blue slip from either home State Senator, Mr. BOOKER or Mr. MENENDEZ. In case it wasn't clear how little Republicans care about this once-vaunted tradition, Mr. Matey has skipped even the courtesy of meeting with Senator MENENDEZ.

Mr. Matey has never made an oral argument before a Federal Court of Appeals—never. He barely has any litigation experience either. He has spent most of his career as a political aide to Governor Christie. Yet he is nominated for a lifetime appointment to a circuit court of appeals, not even a district court, where his qualifications would still be questionable, but to a circuit court.

Ms. Neomi Rao, despite her experience, might even be worse. As the Trump administration's regulatory czar, she has been in charge of rolling back consumer protections, environmental protections, and healthcare protections. So as a nominee for the DC Circuit, which hears cases on Federal regulation, Ms. Rao is hopelessly compromised. Yet she refused to commit to recusing herself from regulatory matters on which she has worked when pressed by Senator FEINSTEIN during the Judiciary hearing.

That is to say nothing of Ms. Rao's alarming views. In past writings, Ms.

Rao has expressed skepticism about climate change, called sexual and racial oppression "myths," and argued that independent Federal Agencies are unconstitutional. Perhaps worst of all, she has implied that sexual assault victims are to blame for the despicable crimes committed against them.

Honestly, where do my Republican colleagues find these people? The majority party always nominates judges that have a particular bent, but the Trump administration's nominees, by and large, are not mainstream conservatives; they are rightwing ideologues, many of whom lack the experience, candor, and moderation that we would expect in a public servant, let alone a lifetime judge. For a few of these judges, the sole qualification is not their judicial experience, not their knowledge or erudition, but they are active members of the Federalist Society.

I know this is what my friend the majority leader cares about: a hard-right bench. He doesn't care about their qualifications; he doesn't care about moderation; he doesn't care about representing middle-class people when he nominates these judges. He is running a conveyor belt of political partisans, many with extremely thin legal resumes, onto the courts. He gets a talking point for his base, but the quality of these nominees degrades the Federal bench and cheapens the cause of justice in America.

I will vote no on both Mr. Matey and Ms. Rao, and I strongly urge my colleagues to do the same.

CHINA TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. President, finally, on China—the ongoing negotiations with China have been something I have been following closely. Over the past few weeks, there has been a drumbeat of reporting that the Trump administration is poised to accept a weak trade agreement with China.

Last week, the New York Times reported that China's draft new foreign investment law, meant to pacify the United States, would not include a complete end to the forced technology transfers. The most recent published draft made no mention of preventing national government regulators from demanding technology transfers. This morning, the Times reported that China has agreed to few, if any, major restrictions on how it manages its currency.

For years, China manipulated its currency to suit its purposes, typically devaluing the renminbi to prop up its manufacturers. I was the first, with Senator GRAHAM of South Carolina, back in the early 2000s, to point out China's currency manipulation, and it has continued unabated. In recent days the renminbi has been allowed to rise, but, curiously, it fell 10 percent against the dollar after President Trump's announcement on tariffs.

According to the Times, that move alone negated, at least temporarily, the impact of President Trump's latest

round of tariffs. The Chinese have done everything they can to gain advantage over us, to steal our jobs, steal our wealth. They have not played fairly, and now the President, with his tariffs, has them where we would want them.

They need to come to an agreement. But they are hanging tough, and the President's inclinations seem to be, from press reports, to back off so he can get any deal, so the stock market will go up temporarily. Make no mistake about it—in the long run, this will hurt America dramatically. The best paying jobs will be created in China, not here. The ability of the best American companies to compete worldwide will be dramatically curtailed.

It is abundantly clear that China is playing us. They want to give up as little as possible while getting out from under the sting of tariffs.

So I say to President Trump, whom I have praised on his China policies thus far—a lot tougher, a lot better than President Obama or President Bush. I say to President Trump: Do not get played. If you don't achieve what you set out to achieve, namely, the permanent reform of China's most abusive trade practices, then walk away, just as you walked away from North Korea when Chairman Kim would not make real commitments.

President Trump, you must walk away from China if President Xi refuses meaningful and enduring economic reforms. To do otherwise would be to squander maybe the last best chance of putting American workers and businesses on a level playing field with our No. 1 economic competitor.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAWLEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIALISM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, in thinking about some of the debates swirling about here in Washington, DC, as to whether capitalism or socialism should be a preferred economic model, I recall a story that involves Boris Yeltsin, who went on to become the Russian President, who happened to be in Houston, TX, in 1989, visiting the Johnson Space Center—a very important part of NASA in Houston—when he decided to visit a grocery store in Clear Lake, TX. Though it sounds like it could be, this isn't the beginning of a Wes Anderson film.

It was nearly 20 years ago, in 1989, when the Soviet Union had not yet imploded and when the Berlin Wall was still standing. It would be 2 years before Yeltsin would be forced to take steps to begin to transform the Soviet