

20 percent of greenhouse gas pollution by 2050, and that ain't good. So by using HFCs, we are fixing one global environmental problem—the hole in the ozone—but we are contributing to another, and that is just as serious.

To address this negative side effect, on October 15, 2016, in a place called Kigali, which is in Rwanda—that is why they call it the Kigali amendment or Kigali treaty—more than 170 countries agreed to amend the Montreal Protocol, including ours.

The goal of this agreement is to achieve more than an 80-percent reduction in global HFC production and utilization by 2047. It doesn't say you have to stop using it tomorrow. This is a phaseout and a phasedown. If we don't do anything by 2047, we will see an increase of about half a degree Celsius—that is almost a full degree Fahrenheit—in global warming by the end of this century. We can't afford to do that. Our planet can't afford to do that. Our kids, our grandchildren cannot afford for us to do that.

U.S. industry strongly supports the Kigali amendment because U.S. companies have already invested billions of dollars in order to be able to produce the next-generation technologies that are going to replace, over time, HFCs. Phasing down HFCs allows U.S. companies to capture a large portion of a global market that is—listen to this—\$1 trillion in size, which will create 150,000 new direct and indirect American jobs in less than a decade.

These new jobs are expected to generate close to \$39 billion dollars—\$39 billion—in annual economic benefits for our country; again, in less than a decade.

Industry also believes ratification of the Kigali treaty will mitigate unfair Chinese dumping of HFCs in the United States, hurting our businesses.

Ratification of the Kigali amendment is a no-brainer, and even those who are skeptical about climate change ought to be able to admit that it would be great for U.S. competitiveness and good-paying American jobs.

This is a real win-win situation. If we don't seize the opportunity, we should have our heads examined. That is why we have some pretty strange bedfellows supporting the Kigali ratification.

There is a chart behind me. Among others, we have the National Association of Manufacturers, Natural Resources development folks, the spirit of enterprise, FreedomWorks, the American Chemistry Council, Business Roundtable, and Sierra Club.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CARPER. They are not all wrong. They are right. I say to my colleagues across the aisle: Listen to these folks, and let's use our heads and our hearts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

SOCIALISM

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, as strange as it seems, socialism is having

a bit of a resurgence here in the Nation's Capital these days.

Why, you might ask, has this failed economic theory that is so destructive of individual freedom captured the attention of some of our friends in the Democratic Party? I admit, to me, it is somewhat of a mystery.

My guess is I am not the only one who assumed that every American has learned the lessons of history and that those lessons are common knowledge. Apparently not. One other possibility is that socialism is a stalking horse for other, less obvious goals. I will have more to say about what the Founders believed about the concentration of government power that would be needed to implement these utopian schemes at a later time. I also will return to the Senate floor at another time to talk about the well-funded efforts, including in the State of Texas, to advance the cause of socialism, unbeknownst to most of my fellow Texans.

Maybe self-identified socialists or democratic socialists—by the way, that is an impossible contradiction in terms. You can't be democratic and a socialist at the same time. Obviously, people put those two terms together to try to mask their true intentions.

Obviously, these self-identified democratic socialists have never learned what it is or what it stands for. Recent polling suggests that Americans have vastly different ideas about what socialism really means. A Gallup poll, for example, found that 23 percent of the people who responded understood that it means economic equality—though the definition of what equality looks like varies pretty significantly. About the same number of people said they didn't know or had no opinion of what socialism means. Roughly 17 percent understand it to mean government ownership or control of business and the economy.

There were a variety of answers, ranging from government-guaranteed benefits to communism, to people simply being social and getting along. That is what some people think socialism is. This confusion about what, exactly, socialism is has allowed its supporters to push this discredited idea back into the political mainstream.

The so-called democratic socialists are trying to convince the American people that bigger government and less liberty are the solutions to economic inequality. But they don't just want economic opportunity or equal opportunity; they want equal outcomes. They clearly want to put the government in charge of Americans' lives.

To be sure, they will not be honest about the means by which that equality would be accomplished under socialism. They use a lot of feel-good phrases to mask the consequences of their argument. They say things like "give a voice to the voiceless" or "to achieve a more just society." What they don't tell you is that in order to redistribute economic benefits, you would have to marshal the power of the

government to coerce the American people to give up the fruits of their labor in pursuit of socialist, utopian aims.

While socialists will not tell you what the government would have to do to force that redistribution, they like to point to Scandinavian countries as a model for socialism's success. But there are some problems with that.

They will say: Look at Denmark. They have free higher education, universal healthcare, and subsidized childcare, and they are doing great. So, they say, socialism works. But facts are stubborn things. For one, Denmark is not a socialist country. Just ask the Danish Prime Minister, who said:

Denmark is far from a socialist planned economy. Denmark is a market economy.

The left argues: It is still a good model. We want that.

OK, so how are they paying for all of these programs? It is certainly not just from the top 1 percent of the wealthiest of Americans. It is the middle class too. Margaret Thatcher once said: "The problem with socialism is that you eventually run out of other people's money."

Let's look at tax rates. Danes pay some of the highest taxes in the world. In the United States, tax revenue accounts for just over a quarter of the size of our economy. In Denmark, it is 50 percent—or double.

Let's also compare our two countries. The population of the country of Denmark is roughly 1/60th the population of the United States. In terms of landmass, it is about 16,000 square miles. Texas is almost 17 times the size of Denmark.

So if the model used in Denmark is, one, not socialism and, two, unaffordable, let's instead look for a better example of a country that has embraced socialism. I would suggest Venezuela would be a good candidate.

In the late 1990s, then-Presidential Candidate Hugo Chavez delivered impassioned speeches promising to lead Venezuela into a socialist paradise. He talked about the country's wealth being stolen by evil capitalists and greedy corporations and promised hope and change if he was elected. That sounds similar to some of the snake oil being sold by a number of radical Democrats today. By the way, you don't see caravans of people attempting to immigrate to socialist countries like Venezuela. It is just the opposite.

We now know that Chavez's promises were empty and dangerous, and while Venezuela certainly saw a lot of change, it wasn't the kind they wanted or the kind they expected. The government took over businesses; they shut down free markets; and they suppressed free speech. As a result, one of the richest countries in the world is now among the poorest. Basic commodities like food, medicine, and water are in short supply; freedom of the press has disappeared; crime rates have skyrocketed; and millions have fled.

Of course, it is no surprise that self-proclaimed socialists in the United

States refuse to accept this as an example of socialism. But this is the truth. That is why socialism must be soundly rejected.

Sir Winston Churchill, who had an incredible gift for words, once said:

The inherent vice of capitalism is the unequal sharing of blessings. The inherent virtue of Socialism is the equal sharing of miseries.

Clearly, misery would be a result of a current fad celebrating socialism, and we must firmly and clearly reject it.

In a society like ours, based on the free enterprise system, business owners compete for business and make decisions based on what the customer wants and needs, and this helps keep the cost of living low while offering consumers choice.

Competition and free enterprise are the opposite of centrally planned and administered socialist economies and the only economic system compatible with individual liberty.

In a socialist country, the government owns or controls everything. If you don't like it or insist on going your own way, you will be squished like a bug. Socialism forces citizens to be submissive to the government's plan—a far cry from the freedoms and liberties promised under our Constitution.

Most Americans don't want the government to run their lives. They want less government, which is to say they want more freedom. So while things like free healthcare or free higher education or free housing sound pretty good superficially, they are a fantasy and part of the agenda to move the United States toward a socialist, government-controlled economy.

Under our free enterprise system, people work to earn their living. The harder you work, the more you benefit and the better you can provide for yourself and your family. That is something we call the American dream. But with socialism, that kind of motivation doesn't exist at all. Why would you put in the extra effort? Why would you work longer hours when you will receive the same pay and benefits as everybody else? Why would you pursue an advanced degree and pour your heart into researching new medical cures when you know, at the end of the day, the person who chooses to do nothing will receive the same benefits you do? Well, you wouldn't. That is why socialism doesn't work.

In a recent Washington Post column, George Will defined today's understanding of socialism as this:

Almost everyone will be nice to almost everyone, using money taken from a few. This means having government distribute, according to its conception of equity, the wealth produced by capitalism.

The problem is, as he said, the government will take and take until eventually there is nothing more to take. Once that happens, the economy will tank; jobs will dry up; taxes will get higher to pay for the benefits promised; and those utopian sentiments will not feel quite so good anymore.

The enemy of socialism isn't greed. It is experience. That is why there are no socialist success stories. Venezuela, the Soviet Union, Ethiopia, Zimbabwe, Tanzania—time and again, we have seen socialism fail. That has been the universal experience.

As President Trump said in Miami last week:

Socialism promises prosperity, but it delivers poverty. Socialism promises unity, but it delivers hatred and it delivers division. Socialism promises a better future, but it always returns to the darkest chapters of the past.

Slapping the word "democratic" in front of the word "socialism" doesn't make it any less radical or any less terrifying. In fact, democracy and socialism are at war with each other.

This is not about lifting up the poor. It is about taking our freedom away and turning it over to our government overlords and taskmasters.

As so many seem to have forgotten the lessons of history, I plan to return to the Senate floor to discuss this disturbing trend further and remind the American people why socialism is the enemy, not a friend, of our country.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 2 minutes, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF ANDREW WHEELER

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I say to our colleagues that I stand before you today as a Vietnam veteran—5 years of naval service during the hot war in Southeast Asia, trying to make sure that the force of communism was stopped. I served another 18 years beyond that, right to the end of the Cold War, as a naval flight officer and retired as a Navy captain.

I am not a socialist. I am somebody who cares deeply about this planet. I am someone who believes it is possible to have clean air, clean water, better public health, and to foster economic growth.

As it turns out, there are a lot of companies in this country that believe the same thing. They believe the same thing. A lot of them build cars, trucks, and vans. They want a 50-State deal on fuel efficiency standards, CAFE standards, and tailpipe standards. They want a 50-State deal so they don't have to build a car for 13 or 14 different States and then a different kind of car or truck for the rest of the country. They don't want to do that. They want certainty and predictability so they can build one model for one car. They want to be able to be successful in competing in the world marketplace in the next 10, 20, or 30 years.

We need someone leading the Environmental Protection Agency who believes that it is possible to have cleaner air and, frankly, to foster economic growth in the auto companies. That is what the auto companies want. They are not socialists. They are free-marketeters.

There is something called HFCs, or hydrofluorocarbons. It is a terrible pollutant for the environment. It is 1,000 times worse than carbon for our global warming challenges. There are a bunch of American businesses that have new technology to replace HFCs. They want to be able not just to develop it, but they want to be able to sell it all over the world. The marketplace is \$1 trillion, and we are holding it back.

Unfortunately, the person whom we are going to be voting on here today to be our EPA Administrator is part of holding us back because he will not agree to a treaty that the administration wants to put forward. It is crazy.

Those companies that developed the follow-on products to HFCs—Honeywell, Chemours, and others—are not socialists. They are business people. They want a piece of the international market, and they want to do good things for the climate at the same time.

I just want to say to my colleagues: We can do both. We can have clean air. We can have clean water. We can have strong economic growth. We need somebody running the EPA who actually believes in that too. I am sorry to say here today that right now I don't believe it is Andrew Wheeler, and I say that with no joy.

Thank you very much.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, throughout the country and in the great State of Illinois, a host of environmental issues are plaguing Americans. From air pollution, to ground-water contamination, to the increases in climate change-related harm that we are already facing, there is no more crucial time to have strong national leadership on environmental issues than right now. However, in the midst of all these issues comes the nomination of Andrew Wheeler—a former lobbyist for corporate polluters—to lead the Environmental Protection Agency.

If there is one major thing we have learned from the Clean Air Act, it is that regulations save lives and money. Regulations that ensure clean air mean fewer premature deaths and health issues, as well as fewer asthma attacks in children and health-related missed work days. However, the EPA under this administration that is now led by Acting Administrator Wheeler, consistently works to roll back clean air and water rules. This exposes the most vulnerable members of our society—including children and the elderly—to toxic and deadly chemicals. The people in Illinois are no exception. We are facing several environmental issues in Illinois that require immediate action by the EPA, and so far, I am not satisfied that EPA is doing everything it can and should be doing under Mr. Wheeler's leadership.

The Sterigenics facility is causing is a public health threat in Willowbrook, IL due to emissions from cancer-causing ethylene oxide. The EPA's own risk assessment from 2016, showed that ethylene oxide exposure increases the risk of cancer more than what was previously thought. However, given this