

down the path of capitulation on both North Korea and China, prepared to trade away our leverage in exchange for flimsy agreements. The President can't seem to stick to a policy, even when it is beginning to work. So eager is he for that quick photo op.

There is an old expression that March comes in like a lion and goes out like a lamb. Well, based on all reports, when it comes to North Korea and China, spring is coming a little early at the White House. President Trump, on both China and North Korea, came in like a lion, with tough rhetoric and hard-line policies, but now President Trump is poised to go out like a lamb, meekly accepting half-baked agreements from both capitals for the sheer sake of it.

In North Korea the highest priority of U.S. foreign policy has been the complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, as well as the cessation of human rights abuses by the brutal, despotic, and murderous Kim regime. But just this weekend, before leaving for Hanoi, President Trump said: "I don't want to rush anybody; as long as there's no testing, we're happy." That is a far cry from the complete denuclearization that he called for in the past, and it signals a dangerous softening of our position before the talks even started.

The irony of ironies is that for all the talk of "maximum pressure" and "fire and fury," President Trump's stance on North Korea may wind up far weaker than Hillary Clinton's. I know he doesn't like to hear that, but the truth is the truth.

President Trump seems more interested in touting his warm relationship with Chairman Kim as an accomplishment in and of itself. President Trump's calling a brutal autocrat a friend on Twitter is no substitute for actually achieving something for the American people in Hanoi.

I hate to say it, but it would be absolutely incredible and even pathetic if President Trump were giving in to North Korea for the sake of a photo op to knock Michael Cohen's hearing from the front page, but if the past behavior of the President is any guide, something like that is, unfortunately, totally conceivable.

CHINA

Now, Mr. President, the same situation is playing out in China. After starting down the right path, press reports indicate that President Trump appears to accept something far short of his initial aims. President Trump has already started promoting a "signing summit" at Mar-a-Lago before an agreement has even been inked. Just imagine how that undercuts our negotiators—to say already he is going to sign something when we are eyeball to eyeball with the Chinese. That is not the art of the deal. That is the art of capitulation.

As the Times reported this morning, "Mr. Trump has grown impatient with the talks, and a consensus is growing

in Washington that Mr. Trump will ultimately accept a weak deal." Shame on him if he does.

China is robbing and stealing our family jewels: American industrial know-how, American information technology, Americans' ability to do things.

When we are good at it, China doesn't let us in and compete, unless we give them all of the knowledge of how to do it themselves, and China steals our intellectual property. Just 2 weeks ago, there was another hacking—and now we are going to capitulate?

What the Times goes on to say is that "the Chinese have so far declined to make concrete commitments to reform their economy that the administration has demanded"—these are the words of the New York Times—"including ending China's practice of subsidizing companies, engaging in cyber-theft and forcing American companies to hand over intellectual property to Chinese partners in order to do business there."

Even our business community does not want the President to capitulate. I met with a bunch of them. They want him to stay strong. Everyone wants him to stay strong. Now he is caving.

This President cannot take a policy and pursue it to its end. His attention span is so small, his desire for immediate gratification seems to be so large that the American worker loses. If we capitulate to China, that American worker will lose for decades. That American worker's children will lose.

So I say to President Trump, it would be a momentous failure if you relent now and don't receive meaningful, enforceable, and verifiable commitments on structural reforms to China's unfair trade policy. Simply buying more soybeans or buying more materials or planes is not going to solve the structural problem, and in a few months China will continue to unfairly gain on us—not right.

So, I wonder, where are all the supposed hawks? Where is Secretary Pompeo on China and North Korea? Where is Ambassador Bolton? Do they feel they can argue internally with the President and he overrules them and that is that? What good is it for them to be there? Oh, yes, they can say: It would have been even worse if we weren't there. That is no way to do policy when either American safety, in regard to North Korea, or American economic prosperity in the future, in regard to China, is at stake.

I believe Ambassador Lighthizer has made a sincere effort to do the right thing on China, but his efforts are constrained by a President who seems intent on weakening his hand every few weeks. Again, where is Bolton? Where is Pompeo? Where are they? They have been hawks on these two issues their whole lives. Now they get in the administration; they just go along, when they were among the loudest critics of President Obama and President Clinton? Not right. Not good for America.

It just so happens that two of President Trump's signature foreign policy issues will come to a head at roughly the same time. There are historic opportunities here to make America safe by removing nuclear weapons from a rogue regime and to end two decades of rapacious Chinese trade policy. We can finally put American companies on a level playing field with our largest competitor. If the President, having brought the Chinese to the table with tough sanctions and tariffs, takes 10 percent or 20 percent of what we can get, that would be very bad for this country, American workers, and American incomes. As they continue to stay flat or decline, one of the main reasons is unfair trade practices by China. We have to be strong and tough. We can win this fight if we can stay strong.

The bottom line is this. If over the course of the 1 month President Trump capitulates to both Beijing and Pyongyang, the foreign policy of his Presidency will be in shambles. It will zig and zag to no real accomplishment. More importantly, the national security and economic security of the American people will greatly suffer as a consequence.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in a document later removed from her website, one of the Green New Deal's sponsors had this to say about the Green New Deal: "The question isn't how we will pay for it, but what we will do with our new shared prosperity."

"The question isn't how we will pay for it . . ." That was the quote. That is a pretty staggering statement when you consider that the Green New Deal plans to upend most of American society as we know it, from transportation to healthcare, but I suspect there was a simple reason the Green New Deal authors didn't want to talk about how to pay for it—because they couldn't figure out how.

This week, one think tank released a first estimate of what the Green New Deal would cost, and here is the answer: between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion over 10 years—between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion. Those numbers are so large that they are almost impossible to process.

Just for perspective, consider the fact that the entire Federal budget for 2019 is less than \$5 trillion. That is the entire Federal budget—defense spending, domestic priorities, Medicare and Medicaid, Social Security, everything.

The Green New Deal could end up costing \$9.3 trillion each year—double the current Federal budget—and the government would still have to pay for a lot of other priorities on top of that. That money wouldn't cover defense spending, or Social Security, or a number of other urgent needs.

The Green New Deal would assuredly raise Americans' energy bills, but that is just a tiny fraction of what Democrats' Green New Deal, which goes far