

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