



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 2019

No. 52

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.

Ever-present and ever-gracious God, touch the hearts of our lawmakers today with the warmth and wonder of Your wisdom and grace. Infuse their lives with an exemplary integrity that illuminates the darkness of cynicism, division, and despair. May our Senators see beyond baffling events to the power of Your prevailing providence, providing them with a vision of a better nation and world. Lord, use our legislators with such power that they may honor their calling by faithfully serving You and country.

We pray in Your great 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 (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will pro-

ceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Bridget S. Bade, of Arizona, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF BRIDGET S. BADE

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday the Senate voted to advance the nomination of Bridget Bade of Arizona, the latest of President Trump's qualified judicial nominees. Today we will vote on her confirmation as a judge on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Ms. Bade's nomination comes with the bipartisan support of our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee and a "well qualified" rating from the ABA's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary.

Given that 77 Senators voted yesterday to advance this nomination, it is obviously clear to the vast majority of us that the President has made yet another excellent choice to the Federal bench. I hope each of my colleagues will join me in voting for Ms. Bade later today.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Madam President, on another matter entirely, this afternoon the Senate is going to vote on the far-left wish list that many of our Democratic colleagues have rushed to embrace—the so-called Green New Deal.

For a relatively sparse resolution, this proposal has already traveled quite a fascinating path in Congress. It originated with the most radical, farthest left Members of the new House Democratic majority. The Speaker of the House quickly praised its "enthusiasm."

Its principal sponsor rolled out the first version of the plan alongside an extensive background document that laid out the policy's true goals in can-

did detail but which Democrats then rushed to hastily scrub off the internet.

It is not exactly an auspicious start, but, nevertheless, a number of our Democratic colleagues here in the Senate rushed to embrace it as well. Every Democratic Senator who is currently running for President has embraced the Green New Deal.

The energy, the momentum, and the defining new voices in today's Democratic Party seem to be all in for the Green New Deal. "It is ambitious. It captures your imagination," said one current Presidential candidate.

"I'm in all the way," said one of our Senate colleagues, who is also running.

When asked if the proposal might go too far, another of our Senate colleagues running for President replied on this issue: "You cannot go far enough."

So just how far does the proposal go? What exactly is in this thing? What is it?

For starters, the proposal addresses the small matter of eliminating—listen to this—the use of all fossil fuels nationwide over 10 years—get rid of it all. This might sound like a neat idea in places like San Francisco or New York—the places that the Democratic Party seems totally focused on these days—but, frankly, the communities everywhere else would be absolutely crushed by this.

It is killing off entire domestic industries, winding down millions of jobs, and, basically, outlawing the only sources of energy that working-class and middle-class families can actually afford. By one rough estimate, these steps could lead to a spike in household electricity bills of \$300 a month—that much increase in your utility bill. Keep in mind that this is just a warmup act.

While they are at it, our friends on the far left also propose a federally mandated overhaul of every building in America—every building in America. No family home or small business

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



Printed on recycled paper.

would be safe until it meets Washington bureaucrats' standards of greenness. But if you can believe it, other aspects of this proposal make these things sound downright practical, by comparison.

The resolution also includes a far broader socialist wish list that gestures toward a new government-run healthcare insurance system, a new system for government-guaranteed housing, and a new government system to guarantee everyone—everyone—"economic security."

The last point is a little vague, but, helpfully, before it was scrubbed off the internet, the original sponsor's background document made the long-term goal perfectly clear—listen to this: "economic security to all those who are unable or unwilling to work."

That is the background document they rushed to delete. The Democrats' long-term vision is taking hard-working people's taxpayer dollars to pay those who choose not get off their couch day after day simply because they are unwilling to work.

So my Democratic colleagues' brilliant new idea—their rallying cry—is snatching away the energy sources that middle-class families use, shutting the industries that provide many of those families with their livelihoods, and changing the homes they live in, the cars they drive, and the healthcare plans they rely on.

Remember what our colleague said: "You cannot go too far." Our colleagues are certainly putting that to the test.

I haven't even gotten to what American families would have to pay—to pay—for the privilege of being lab rats for all of this far-left social engineering—for being lab rats for all of this social engineering. My Democratic colleagues have been fairly quiet on that subject. I guess it is a lot more fun ordering off the menu than taking a look at the check.

Families would almost certainly be faced with much higher utility bills. Then, there is the cost to replace appliances. Presumably, electric cars would have to be purchased. Then, there is the Federal tax burden.

Just how much of other people's money are Democrats proposing to burn in this effort to turn the country into a far-left fiction novel?

One initial rough estimate found that all of the pieces of the Green New Deal might add up to as much as \$93 trillion.

That is just over the first decade. That is quite a tab. It exceeds the annual GDP of the entire world—the annual GDP of the entire world as of 2017. It would mean historic tax increases, historic new debt, and even that would only begin to scratch the surface. Bear in mind, the sticker price doesn't even begin to capture the full national cost of the economic wound this plan would inflict on our country while all our competitors would be roaring on by.

My colleagues want to pull the emergency brake on the U.S. economy be-

cause it isn't "green" enough, but global carbon emissions are a global problem. We only produce about 15 percent of the global total. China has already soared past us. They are the world's largest emitter. In recent years, while U.S. emissions have actually been declining, China's share has been growing fast.

We will certainly get to test their new economic security payments for those unable or unwilling to work after the Green New Deal drives all of our domestic manufacturing jobs over to China, India, and our other competitors, who will gladly gobble up our jobs and continue to emit with reckless ambition.

My Democratic colleagues have settled on quite an interesting strategy—maximum pain for American families, with no meaningful change in global carbon emissions.

Since I announced last month that Senators will actually have the opportunity to go on record and vote on this socialist wish list, a funny thing has happened. I am not sure I have ever seen the self-professed supporters of a piece of legislation more angry or irritated that they will actually have to vote on it. They are angry and irritated that they will actually have to vote on it.

Merely bringing their own plan up for a vote—a plan they had characterized as "an amazing step forward"—is now declared to be a "diversion" and a "sham." By one colleague's assessment, by getting their proposal a floor vote, I was creating "a ploy to try to undermine the Green New Deal by calling a vote."

I have to say, it is remarkable enough to see a major political party coalesce around a proposal to forcibly remake the entire country according to what is fashionable in Brooklyn and San Francisco, but it is even more stunning to see my colleagues so angry and upset at the opportunity to back up their new philosophy with their votes. What an outrage, to actually vote on something we say we are for.

Well, later today, we will see—the American people will see which of their Senators can do the commonsense thing and vote no on this destructive, socialist daydream, and they will see which Senators are so fully committed to radical, leftwing ideology that they can't even vote no on self-inflicted economic ruin that would take a sledgehammer to America's middle class.

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. 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.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, last night, President Trump's Justice Department issued a letter to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals calling for the elimination of healthcare coverage for tens of millions of Americans.

Up until last night, the Trump administration had said one aspect of the Affordable Care Act was unconstitutional, but last night, the Department of Justice declared that the entire law and all of its vital healthcare protections must go.

Make no mistake about it—this is an escalation of the Trump administration's and Republicans' attacks on protections for people with preexisting conditions. All the protestations for keeping preexisting conditions—President Trump said it as recently as this past campaign—out the window. This court case says get rid of preexisting conditions, and the Trump administration is pursuing the case. What are they saying to the 52 million Americans who are dependent on protections for preexisting conditions? What are President Trump and his Justice Department saying to a mom whose son or daughter has cancer and the insurance company says "We are not covering it" and they have to watch their child suffer because they can't afford it?

The move by the Trump administration is a slap in the face to American families, a devastating blow to Republicans who promised to protect people with preexisting conditions. How many of our Republican colleagues will go to the floor today and condemn the Trump administration? I will bet, not one. I will bet, not one. I hope I am wrong, but I will bet, not one.

In two short sentences, the Trump administration crystallized its position that the healthcare coverage enjoyed by nearly 20 million people, as well as the protections for tens of millions more with preexisting conditions, should be annihilated. That is now the official position, full stop. And the Trump position ties a 2-year anchor around the neck of every Republican for the next 2 years. Yet again, they will be forced to defend the indefensible. It is a stark reminder of the difference between our two parties. Democrats are fighting to expand and improve healthcare coverage and lower costs, while Republicans are trying to take it all away and raise costs.

The bottom line: From the moment this administration and this Republican majority came to power, they waged a wholesale attack on our healthcare system. They have pushed policies that would rip away people's healthcare coverage, spike their premiums and prescription drugs costs, slap older Americans with an age tax, and reverse protections for people with preexisting conditions like cancer, asthma, and diabetes.

Democrats condemn, in the strongest possible terms, this attack against the American people and demand we take action to protect our healthcare.