

privilege of watching television commercials attacking their own beliefs and the candidates they support and knowing their own tax dollars bought the airtime for candidates they oppose.

All of this is what House Democrats are debating on the floor this very week—H.R. 1—all of this and more. I have only scratched the surface of the Democratic Politician Protection Act: running roughshod over States' and communities' control of their own elections, regulating and chilling the American people's exercise of the First Amendment, forcing taxpayers to indirectly donate to the politicians they don't like, and a dozen other bad ideas to boot.

Behold the signature legislation of the new House Democratic majority.

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. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, just briefly, I heard my good friend, the Republican leader, decry H.R. 1. He called it the Democratic protection act. Well, if making it easier for people to vote and getting Big Money out of politics hurt the Republican Party and is good for Democrats, what a sad commentary on the Republican Party that they don't want to see people vote, make it easier to vote, and that they don't want Big Money out of politics—a sad commentary on the Republican Party to be afraid of H.R. 1.

NOMINATION OF CHAD A. READLER

Madam President, later this afternoon, the Senate will vote to take up the nomination of Chad Readler to be a judge on the Sixth Circuit. Mr. Readler was the man behind the curtain last year when the Trump administration decided to side with Texas and 19 other States with Republican attorneys general in suing to repeal our healthcare law. Mr. Readler didn't merely work on the case; he was the lead lawyer who filed the Justice Department brief declaring the administration would refuse to defend the laws of our country.

His recommendations were so outrageous that many career Justice Department attorneys refused to sign it. Mr. Readler argued that protections for Americans with preexisting conditions should be eliminated. Let me repeat that. The nominee up for a vote later this afternoon argued that protections for Americans with preexisting conditions should be eliminated. Then, a day after Mr. Readler filed this awful brief hurting average Americans—hurting tens of millions of average Ameri-

cans—he was nominated for a lifetime appointment on the Federal bench. Coincidence? I think not. You see, in the Trump administration, depriving people of protections for preexisting conditions is actually something to be rewarded. Shame. Shame on the Trump administration. Shame on anybody who votes for Mr. Readler, particularly those who claim they want to protect preexisting conditions. Those who say they want to protect them and vote for the chief cook and bottle washer who pulled them away and was given this nomination the next day, shame on them.

During the past campaign, as I said, many Republicans stood up and said, rightly, that they supported keeping protections for Americans with preexisting conditions. That is all well and good, but that is what is so typical of our Republican friends in the Senate. They talk the game that we do—they are for more healthcare, they are for protecting Americans with preexisting conditions—but their votes on the floor of the Senate are exactly the opposite. It is all well and good to say you want to protect them, but those promises and pronouncements mean next to nothing if they will not vote to reject a lifetime appointment for the man who played the starring role in the legal effort to take these conditions away.

Republicans who vote yes on Mr. Readler, I believe, will regret that vote in future years. A vote to confirm Mr. Readler is an endorsement of the Republican lawsuit to eliminate protections for preexisting conditions and repeal healthcare for millions of Americans.

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Madam President, on another matter, the national emergency. It seems with each passing day, another Republican comes out to oppose the President's declaration of a national emergency at the border. Over the weekend, Senator RAND PAUL, who often speaks his own mind, became the fourth Republican to officially announce his support for terminating the President's emergency declaration, apparently guaranteeing enough votes for passage in the Senate. I hope and expect that Senator PAUL will not be the last Republican to announce their support because this should be an issue that transcends party. The President's emergency declaration gnaws at our very fabric, particularly the separation of powers. The President—this President—is trying to bend the law to his will, to accrue powers that are not his.

There is no evidence that some new emergency exists at the border. The President himself has said he "didn't need to do this." An emergency, by definition, is something that you need to do. Everyone here knows the truth. The President didn't declare an emergency because there is one. He declared an emergency because he lost in Congress, threw another temper tantrum, and wanted to go around it. That, my

friends, is a gross abuse of our constitutional system.

Article I—not article II, the executive branch article, not article III, the judiciary branch article, but article I, Congress—gives Congress the power of the purse, not the President. Were we to permit an Executive—any Executive—to declare an emergency every time they lost in Congress, what would be the point of Congress? We would be trading our democracy for a monarchy, the very thing our Framers abhorred and that our Constitution guards against. Remember, back then, why did the colonists—the brave colonists—rebel? It was against the overreaching power of King George. They said: We need a government that is going to protect us from the overreaching power of any individual, particularly one empowered to lead a nation. That is why they did it. It is relevant today. Donald Trump has shown more desire to overreach than any President. Some people may like that, but it goes against 200 years of wisdom in this country, and I hope people will reject it.

Whatever you think of the policy at the southern border—I suppose Senator PAUL is very much for the wall—no President should be allowed to discard the Constitution on a whim and do an end run around a coequal branch of government.

This vote on the resolution to terminate this emergency is not a vote about policy, it is not a vote about party. It is a vote about Presidential power and the precedent it will set, which will reach far beyond the current debate about the border. The debate about the border will be forgotten, but the fact that this Congress, this Senate, allows a President to so overreach and rearrange singlehandedly the balancing blocks in our democracy will be regarded by historians as a bleak day.

I say to my colleagues, that doesn't just apply to how you vote. It applies to whether we have enough votes to override the President should he veto this resolution when it passes.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Madam President, on climate, Leader MCCONNELL has spent a great deal of time talking about bringing his version of the Green New Deal to the floor. Everybody knows it is nothing more than a political stunt. Everybody knows the same Republican leader decried bringing bills to reopen the government because the President wouldn't sign them, and he said those were stunts. Now he is doing the same thing. It is amazing sometimes that there can be a 180-degree turn so quickly.

So let's talk about some of the things Leader MCCONNELL could actually do to move the ball forward on climate change, which now more and more people—two thirds of Americans, if you believe in polling—believe is a real threat to our planet that demands the Senate's action, not stunts, not games.

All 47 Democrats have introduced a resolution that affirms three simple things; one, climate change is real;