

The President has also decided to cut or delay \$3.6 billion in military construction projects. The President might not think these projects are timely or important, but it was just weeks or months ago when the administration said just the opposite and asked Congress to appropriate money—examples: \$800 million for essential training facilities like the National Guard readiness centers, simulators and firing ranges in the States of Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, and Montana, to name a few; \$1.4 billion worth of maintenance-related projects such as aircraft hangars and vehicle maintenance shops in Arkansas, Indiana, Missouri, and Oklahoma, not to mention many other States affected; \$1 billion worth of projects for medical and dental care facilities for the men and women in uniform; schools for military families, military barracks, and other essential facilities in Arizona, Missouri, Texas, and beyond.

Fort Campbell, KY, needs a new middle school for military children. The current building dates back to 1967 and is in serious disrepair. We were told that was a priority, but it could be stopped, cut, and eliminated if we are not careful to build this wall.

Also on this list is a new rifle range at Parris Island, SC, a training base for 20,000 new Marines every single year.

There is a new training center at Fort Bragg, NC, to provide top-notch training and prevent injuries among our Special Forces. They are using an old warehouse right now, and they want a modern facility. If it were your son or daughter serving our military at Fort Bragg, you would give them nothing less. The list goes on and on.

Are we really going to tell our military—the very people who are protecting and defending this Nation—that the needs they have identified and we have appropriated money for are going to be put on hold because President Trump made a campaign promise that he can't keep—that the Mexicans were going to build the wall?

Republicans and Democrats in the Senate should join the House in rejecting the President's emergency declaration. The Senate should reject any effort by the President to take money from our troops, from the military—from the Marines, from the Air Force, the Navy, the Army, the National Guard units—to build this wall. We may not agree on much, but we used to agree on fundamental things. The Department of Defense was a priority. The men and women serving there deserve not only our gratitude but the investment in their training, operations, readiness, and a way of life that shows our respect for what they are doing in service to this country. We can do nothing less.

When we face the vote—quite likely a week from today or tomorrow—on whether we agree with the House, I hope that the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, will put the national defense of our Nation first and our mili-

tary first and vote no on President Trump's effort to extend this emergency designation and to try to assume constitutional responsibilities beyond what is already written.

We are a branch of government—article I of the Constitution. Our responsibility is to appropriate funds. When we give away that responsibility, we walk away from the reason we were elected. I hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will consider that as we face this historic vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

#### NOMINATION OF CHAD A. READLER

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of Mr. Chad Readler to the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court.

There are certainly many reasons to oppose Mr. Readler's nomination. His track record paints a very clear picture of what he values and what he does not. Mr. Readler fought to uphold President Trump's travel ban that targets people because of their religion. He has argued in favor of a business turning away customers simply because they are LGBT. He worked to unravel programs made during the past administration that would ensure low-income workers would actually receive their hard-earned benefits. Of the things that Mr. Readler values, protecting Americans from wrongful acts of discrimination is clearly not among them.

Yet it still remains difficult for me to understand why Mr. Readler—and any of my colleagues who choose to advance his nomination today—would support going back to an era when health insurance companies are allowed to discriminate against people with preexisting health conditions. I have heard plenty of my colleagues from across the aisle make public statements in favor of preexisting coverage protections. That is probably because they hear, like I do, from people all across my State who fear losing coverage as a result of having that pre-existing condition.

What are preexisting conditions? Well, it is things like diabetes, asthma, or even high blood pressure, and they are a reality for over 4 million Michiganders. This range of fairly common to fairly complex conditions is experienced by one in every four children, over half of the female population, and 84 percent of adults in their late fifties and in their sixties.

Today, there is a broad consensus that we need a Federal law in place that prevents insurance companies from denying coverage or jacking up prices based on someone's health status, their age, or their gender. We have a law on the books right now that protects people with preexisting conditions, but this law must be defended, not undermined.

I worked hard to pass this important coverage during my first term in the Congress, and I have fought to preserve it every day since then. Although this

fight has been successful so far, it is based on the premise that the laws passed and upheld by Congress will be defended in court. Yet the Department of Justice Civil Division, under Mr. Readler's leadership, decided not to do so. His actions fit into the story of the Trump administration's ongoing partisan efforts to sabotage our healthcare system and dismantle strategies that would lower premiums and expand quality, affordability, and coverage, generally. The President is constantly looking for ways that he can sidestep Congress and attack legislation that has brought health insurance to over 20 million Americans and cut Michigan's uninsured rate in half.

We should not be advancing a Federal court nominee whose disregard for the rule of law comes at the expense of the health and the financial stability of millions of Americans. I urge my colleagues to vote no on Mr. Readler's nomination and his track record of promoting discrimination.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

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

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

#### THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from Iowa, Senator ERNST, for organizing this opportunity for several of us in the Senate to discuss the Green New Deal and to do it this week.

To put it mildly, the Green New Deal is ambitious. To frame it more accurately, it is an unworkable, pie-in-the-sky attempt to reshape every aspect of everyday Americans' lives.

First, let me say that I am proud of my record in successfully advancing the availability and affordability of renewable energy. Many have called me the father of the Wind Energy Incentives Act. I suppose after—what?—probably 26 years, that makes me the grandfather of the Wind Energy Incentives Act. My legislation sought to give this alternative energy source the ability to compete against traditional, finite energy sources. At that time, we never knew about fracking for natural gas and for oil. We thought we were going to be completely dependent upon Saudi Arabia for our energy. Now we know that is not true, but back in 1992 and before, we did everything to think up every alternative energy we could in order to be less dependent upon the Saudis. One of those acts that I was involved in was wind energy.

The wind energy bill—now law—has been extremely successful. Iowa supplies more than 35 percent of its own electricity from wind. We were the first State in the country to generate more