

A few said they did believe in climate change and offered some examples of minor legislation where our parties could work together to begin tackling this crisis. I give them credit for that. But here is the problem: When is Leader MCCONNELL going to schedule time for consideration of this and other climate change legislation? We Democrats are ready to work. Will Leader MCCONNELL bring his own Members' clean energy legislation to the floor?

Others have said that climate change is happening, but the free market could take care of it through "innovation." With all due respect, that doesn't mean much. Most of us would agree we live in an incredible time of innovation and technology, yet we continue to pour even more carbon into the atmosphere than in previous years, not less. Left alone, the market has proved incapable of curing climate change for the simple reason of what economists call externalities. You run a coal plant; you make the profits from selling the electricity that the coal plant produces, but you don't pay the price for the carbon you put in the air. So it is not going to happen through the free market alone because of what even Adam Smith recognized: There are externalities that have to be captured, and it is government's job to at least make sure they are captured.

Another block of Republicans took a different tack. A few of our Republican colleagues said yesterday that climate change was real but only because the climate has always been changing and all flora and fauna contribute to it. "What are we to do," they say, as they throw up their hands and look to the sky, "ban volcanoes?"

Unbelievable. What an amazing canard that is. Those who said it—and there were a few right here yesterday—would get an F in middle school Earth science with that kind of reasoning. We all know—at least we all ought to know—that human activity, particularly the burning of fossil fuels, has pushed the amount of carbon in our atmosphere to record levels, trapping more heat than ever before and changing the climate in ways not seen before in our history.

Maybe denying or misleading about climate change is considered acceptable in the modern Republican Party, where it has come to be expected, and we wonder why that is so. Some argue it is because people don't believe in science. Some argue it is because they just are stuck in the status quo. And some argue it is because there is a lot of oil money cascading into the Republican Party, when you read about all these multimillionaire and billionaire new oil magnates who send tons of money there. Some argue that. You can't prove which one is true, but we do know it leads to terrible, terrible inaction.

So I would like to see my colleagues who don't admit the severity of climate change go talk to the farmers in Iowa dealing with drought, the fisher-

men in Alaska and North Carolina, the homeowners in Florida and the Mountain West. See if denying recent climate change works there. It sure doesn't work on the south coast of Long Island, where we had Sandy, which made believers out of many who were skeptical in the past.

Nonetheless, we made some progress yesterday. At the very least, my friends on the other side know they will not be able to execute their standard playbook. Democrats are not going to sit around while Republicans come to the floor and yell about socialism as they have the past two decades. We are going to make Republicans answer core questions about real change. That is what America wants.

One of the reasons all of these scare tactics didn't work in 2018 and the House is now Democratic and we kept most of our seats, even in very red States—I suspect many of my more reasonable colleagues would prefer that—a real debate—over "gotcha" politics that Leader MCCONNELL is so adept at playing and is playing once again with this cynical Green New Deal ploy.

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on another matter, voting rights, today marks the 54th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, the protest march in Selma, AL, that led ultimately to the passage of the Voting Rights Act.

It was one of the most noble acts in American history. The courage of those who marched across that bridge, including our colleague, JOHN LEWIS, will be remembered centuries from now. It is a reminder that one thread of the American story is about how, despite our founding, our democratic principles, there has been a long march toward achieving the franchise.

We had democratic principles in the beginning. It was brand new. It was great, but remember, in 1789, in almost every State, the only people who could vote were White, male, Protestant property owners. I would imagine that would probably leave out even a majority in this Chamber who would be able to vote.

We have to keep improving that democracy. No one says we should only have White, male, Protestant property owners vote today because it was true in 1789. We have to move forward. We have to make voting more available and easier because the right to vote, without barriers, is what our soldiers, for centuries, have died for and what the people on that bridge marched for.

The march is still not over. In the wake of the disaster that was the Supreme Court's Shelby decision, 19 States rushed to pass discriminatory voter restrictions.

In North Carolina, the Republican State legislature drew up laws that "targeted African Americans with almost surgical precision." How despicable. How despicable that the Re-

publican legislature did that. Those are not my words; those are the court's words after looking at the evidence.

Fifty million Americans are now not registered to vote. Even though we don't talk about it enough, we have a population larger than two States living here in Washington, DC, without full congressional representation. We Democrats are ready to work.

Again, Leader MCCONNELL gets up, and he talks about all of this negativity, exaggeration, hyping, and scaring just like Donald Trump. Why doesn't Leader MCCONNELL put some legislation on the floor? Today, on the anniversary of Bloody Sunday, I want to mention three things we could do right now to bolster voting rights: one, undo the damage of the Shelby County decision by restoring the formula for preclearance; two, automatic voter registration; three, DC statehood.

Anyone who has been observing the floor of the Senate will have noticed by now just how vociferously our Republican leader opposes H.R. 1, which, among other things, would make election day a Federal holiday and attempt to get Big Money out of politics. Leader MCCONNELL has gone on to call these ideas a power grab, labeling the bill the Democratic politician protection Act.

Leader MCCONNELL, we are proud that we want more people to vote. Why are you ashamed of it? Why do you run away from it?

Leader MCCONNELL, we are proud that we want to get the influence of big, special interest money out of politics. Why do you say that is partisan? It is the wrong thing to do, and 90 percent of all Americans, Democratic and Republican, don't like to see Big Money cascading into politics. Argue the merits, Leader.

When you think doing those things are democratic things, we are proud, and the Republican Party should be ashamed that they are not for them and have to call them names. To say that allowing more Americans to vote and getting Big Money out of politics is bad for Republicans and good for Democrats, that says a lot right there.

It is a dark day—a dark day—for the Republican Party if their leader in the Senate has to argue against more Americans voting because it would hurt their party at the polls. Maybe we should go back to the old days and have fewer people vote, like in 1789, when only White, male, Protestant property owners could vote. Come on. This idea that having more people vote is a Democratic power grab, when it is part of the fundamental root of our democracy—it is an act of desperation by the Republican leader.

I don't think it is a coincidence that the Republican leader has pledged to bring up his version of the Green New Deal for a vote but not H.R. 1. He is happy to twist words against it himself, but he knows voting rights are a hard thing to argue about.

If he wants to try to bring it up on the floor, we welcome it. We welcome a

discussion. Make no mistake, Democrats are going to fight to make the ballot access easier, challenge all attempts to disenfranchise American citizens, and get the influence of big special interest money out of politics.

CHINA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally, on China, news reports continue to suggest that President Trump is close to cementing an agreement with Beijing that, unfortunately for America and for American workers, would fall far right of expectations.

Earlier this week, the New York Times reported that China is drafting new laws on foreign investments to pacify the United States, but those new laws do not include any changes to how China forces American businesses to transfer technology and know-how as the cost of doing business.

If our best companies were allowed to sell to China unfettered, they would have huge amounts of profit, and they would employ huge amounts of people in America more. China doesn't let that happen, but they can sell freely here.

The President was right to target China. The President was right to impose tariffs on China. The President will have taken defeat out of the jaws of an almost victory if he now backs off for the sake of a photo op or some brief changes in what China purchases and forsakes American wealth and American workers, while China is stealing our wealth and jobs from our workers every single day.

If President Trump accepts a short-term purchase of American goods in exchange for a reduction in our tariffs without structural reform to China's predatory trade practices, shame on him. If he thinks that photo op will help him; it will not. If he thinks a temporary, little bump in China buying more soybeans or more steel products will help; it will not. He will lose because one of the best things he has done—something I, many other Democrats, and many other Americans have praised him for—will be gone. I have publicly given the President credit when he has taken on China.

As I said, Americans have lost millions—trillions—of dollars of wealth and millions of jobs to Chinese IP theft. The President has been right to challenge China on those issues. His tariffs have brought China to the negotiating table, but now that China is at the table, President Trump must not walk away without achieving what he set out to achieve.

In short, to cut an unacceptable deal—a weak deal, a photo-op deal—at this stage would be to squander the historic moment to put American businesses, workers, and inventors on a level playing field at long last, and it would be viewed as a capitulation by the President on one of his signature issues. It would be the inverse of what he did on North Korea.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Eric E. Murphy, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

MEDICARE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I am sure everyone remembers the Democrats' ObamaCare promise: "If you like your health care plan, you can keep it." That promise was named PolitiFacts' "Lie of the Year" in 2013 after it became clear that millions of Americans would not, in fact, be able to keep their healthcare plans. There are no worries about being deceived on the question of keeping your insurance this time around because Democrats are loudly and proudly announcing their intention of getting rid of private insurance with their Medicare for All plan.

At a CNN townhall in February, the junior Senator from Vermont was asked: "Will these people be able to keep their health insurance plans, their private plans through their employers, if there is a Medicare for All program that you endorse?"

The answer of the Senator from Vermont was no.

Another Democratic candidate for President, the junior Senator from New York, was recently asked: "Should ending private insurance, as we know it, be a Democratic . . . goal? And do you think it is an urgent goal?"

Her response: "Oh yeah, it is a goal . . . an urgent goal."

If you like your health insurance, you definitely will not be able to keep it. In fact, the employer-sponsored insurance that you have today would be

illegal under the Democrats' plan. In the minds of Democrats, Americans are supposed to be enthusiastic about Medicare for All because it would give them free healthcare. The problem, of course, is it will not really be free. Americans are still going to be paying for healthcare; it will just be in the form of much higher taxes.

A left-leaning think tank modeled a version of the Medicare for All plan proposed by the junior Senator from Vermont and found that it would cost a staggering \$32 trillion over 10 years. To put that in perspective, the entire Federal budget for 2019 is less than \$5 trillion. That is Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, defense spending, education spending, law enforcement, infrastructure—everything. In other words, Democrats are talking about increasing Federal spending by more than 60 percent each year just for healthcare. One Medicare expert estimates that doubling the amount of individual and corporate income tax collected would not be enough to cover the cost of Medicare for All.

I don't know about my Democratic colleagues, but I don't know a lot of working families who could afford to have their tax bill literally double. Of course, this is assuming that the cost of the program would be limited to \$32 trillion. The Medicare for All proposal the House Democrats released last week could substantially exceed the \$32 trillion estimate because, unlike the Vermont Senator's plan, it includes funding for long-term care, a notoriously expensive part of the healthcare system.

Democrats' last attempt to have the government fund long-term care fell apart before it was even implemented because the program was not financially viable.

It is not just the cost of Medicare for All that is completely unrealistic; the timeline for implementation is as well. House Democrats' proposal would put every American on Medicare for All within 2 years. We have 2 years to completely do away with healthcare as we know it and create an entirely new healthcare program to cover almost every single American.

I am sure most Americans remember the fiasco that was ObamaCare implementation. The Obama administration had 3½ years to get ObamaCare up and running, and they couldn't even build a working website in that amount of time. The ObamaCare exchanges were intended only to cover a tiny fraction of the number of people who would be covered under Medicare for All. The idea that the Federal Government could smoothly transition all Americans over to an entirely new government-run healthcare program in 2 years is absolutely ludicrous. Making the attempt would cause Americans an incredible amount of pain. Every aspect of this proposal would cause Americans an incredible amount of pain.

There are the heavy taxes that would be required to even partially pay for