

would be safe until it meets Washington bureaucrats' standards of greenness. But if you can believe it, other aspects of this proposal make these things sound downright practical, by comparison.

The resolution also includes a far broader socialist wish list that gestures toward a new government-run healthcare insurance system, a new system for government-guaranteed housing, and a new government system to guarantee everyone—everyone—“economic security.”

The last point is a little vague, but, helpfully, before it was scrubbed off the internet, the original sponsor's background document made the long-term goal perfectly clear—listen to this: “economic security to all those who are unable or unwilling to work.”

That is the background document they rushed to delete. The Democrats' long-term vision is taking hard-working people's taxpayer dollars to pay those who choose not get off their couch day after day simply because they are unwilling to work.

So my Democratic colleagues' brilliant new idea—their rallying cry—is snatching away the energy sources that middle-class families use, shuttering the industries that provide many of those families with their livelihoods, and changing the homes they live in, the cars they drive, and the healthcare plans they rely on.

Remember what our colleague said: “You cannot go too far.” Our colleagues are certainly putting that to the test.

I haven't even gotten to what American families would have to pay—to pay—for the privilege of being lab rats for all of this far-left social engineering—for being lab rats for all of this social engineering. My Democratic colleagues have been fairly quiet on that subject. I guess it is a lot more fun ordering off the menu than taking a look at the check.

Families would almost certainly be faced with much higher utility bills. Then, there is the cost to replace appliances. Presumably, electric cars would have to be purchased. Then, there is the Federal tax burden.

Just how much of other people's money are Democrats proposing to burn in this effort to turn the country into a far-left fiction novel?

One initial rough estimate found that all of the pieces of the Green New Deal might add up to as much as \$93 trillion.

That is just over the first decade. That is quite a tab. It exceeds the annual GDP of the entire world—the annual GDP of the entire world as of 2017. It would mean historic tax increases, historic new debt, and even that would only begin to scratch the surface. Bear in mind, the sticker price doesn't even begin to capture the full national cost of the economic wound this plan would inflict on our country while all our competitors would be roaring on by.

My colleagues want to pull the emergency brake on the U.S. economy be-

cause it isn't “green” enough, but global carbon emissions are a global problem. We only produce about 15 percent of the global total. China has already soared past us. They are the world's largest emitter. In recent years, while U.S. emissions have actually been declining, China's share has been growing fast.

We will certainly get to test their new economic security payments for those unable or unwilling to work after the Green New Deal drives all of our domestic manufacturing jobs over to China, India, and our other competitors, who will gladly gobble up our jobs and continue to emit with reckless ambition.

My Democratic colleagues have settled on quite an interesting strategy—maximum pain for American families, with no meaningful change in global carbon emissions.

Since I announced last month that Senators will actually have the opportunity to go on record and vote on this socialist wish list, a funny thing has happened. I am not sure I have ever seen the self-professed supporters of a piece of legislation more angry or irritated that they will actually have to vote on it. They are angry and irritated that they will actually have to vote on it.

Merely bringing their own plan up for a vote—a plan they had characterized as “an amazing step forward”—is now declared to be a “diversion” and a “sham.” By one colleague's assessment, by getting their proposal a floor vote, I was creating “a ploy to try to undermine the Green New Deal by calling a vote.”

I have to say, it is remarkable enough to see a major political party coalesce around a proposal to forcibly remake the entire country according to what is fashionable in Brooklyn and San Francisco, but it is even more stunning to see my colleagues so angry and upset at the opportunity to back up their new philosophy with their votes. What an outrage, to actually vote on something we say we are for.

Well, later today, we will see—the American people will see which of their Senators can do the commonsense thing and vote no on this destructive, socialist daydream, and they will see which Senators are so fully committed to radical, leftwing ideology that they can't even vote no on self-inflicted economic ruin that would take a sledgehammer to America's middle class.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, last night, President Trump's Justice Department issued a letter to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals calling for the elimination of healthcare coverage for tens of millions of Americans.

Up until last night, the Trump administration had said one aspect of the Affordable Care Act was unconstitutional, but last night, the Department of Justice declared that the entire law and all of its vital healthcare protections must go.

Make no mistake about it—this is an escalation of the Trump administration's and Republicans' attacks on protections for people with preexisting conditions. All the protestations for keeping preexisting conditions—President Trump said it as recently as this past campaign—out the window. This court case says get rid of preexisting conditions, and the Trump administration is pursuing the case. What are they saying to the 52 million Americans who are dependent on protections for preexisting conditions? What are President Trump and his Justice Department saying to a mom whose son or daughter has cancer and the insurance company says “We are not covering it” and they have to watch their child suffer because they can't afford it?

The move by the Trump administration is a slap in the face to American families, a devastating blow to Republicans who promised to protect people with preexisting conditions. How many of our Republican colleagues will go to the floor today and condemn the Trump administration? I will bet, not one. I will bet, not one. I hope I am wrong, but I will bet, not one.

In two short sentences, the Trump administration crystalized its position that the healthcare coverage enjoyed by nearly 20 million people, as well as the protections for tens of millions more with preexisting conditions, should be annihilated. That is now the official position, full stop. And the Trump position ties a 2-year anchor around the neck of every Republican for the next 2 years. Yet again, they will be forced to defend the indefensible. It is a stark reminder of the difference between our two parties. Democrats are fighting to expand and improve healthcare coverage and lower costs, while Republicans are trying to take it all away and raise costs.

The bottom line: From the moment this administration and this Republican majority came to power, they waged a wholesale attack on our healthcare system. They have pushed policies that would rip away people's healthcare coverage, spike their premiums and prescription drugs costs, slap older Americans with an age tax, and reverse protections for people with preexisting conditions like cancer, asthma, and diabetes.

Democrats condemn, in the strongest possible terms, this attack against the American people and demand we take action to protect our healthcare.

I know that the administration is very happy with the Mueller report, and so are our Republican friends. This move by the Trump administration to take away healthcare will prove far more detrimental to the administration and the Republican Party than any gains they might have made by the issuance of Mr. Barr's letter. Mark my words. It is far more important to the American people—far more important to the American people—because it involves their lives and the lives of their families. The Trump administration is hurting them badly.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Madam President, on another matter, today, Leader McConnell will follow through on one of his specialties, "gotcha" politics, by forcing a vote of the Republicans' version of the Green New Deal.

Make no mistake—Republicans want to force this political stunt to distract from the fact that they neither have a plan nor a sense of urgency to deal with the threat of climate change. With this exercise, the Republican majority has made a mockery of the legislative process. It is a political act, a political stunt.

Everyone here knows it is a stunt, including the majority leader himself, who will put something on the floor and then vote no. What is the point of that, other than showing how hypocritical this act is?

With this exercise, they have also elevated the issue in a way, I am sure, they never intended, and, for that, I want to thank them because now we are finally talking about climate change.

For 5 years, the leader hasn't brought one bill to the floor that will deal with the issue of climate change. He may not agree with what some people are for. What is his plan? What is his plan?

Leader McConnell and every Republican, with one exception, has refused to sponsor a resolution.

Leader McConnell has refused to answer these questions, which he has been repeatedly asked. One, is climate change real? Do you believe that, Leader McConnell? Do you believe that, Republican Members?

Two, climate change is caused by humans. Do you believe that? Say it. Come to the floor and do something about it.

And this is three: Congress must act on climate change. This is a simple resolution. Every Democrat is for it. Will Leader McConnell sign it? Will any other Republican sign it? No. It shows where the party is.

We are going to continue asking these questions over and over again because our Republican colleagues want to play a stunt and vote no on another bill, but they don't want to say what they are for.

The scientific consensus is clear. Disasters are getting stronger and stronger. The great irony here is that right after this bill goes down and the McConnell stunt bill goes down, we are going to vote on disaster relief.

Do you know what has made disaster relief so much more necessary and so much more expensive? Climate change. The warmer the air, the warmer the globe and the wilder the weather gets, as the people in Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas have just experienced.

So this idea that we are voting for disaster relief after a stunt, a sham vote on climate change—and the Republican leader and the Republican Senators have nothing to say on climate change—reveals in bright lights their ostrichlike behavior, putting their head in the sand, ignoring reality, doing nothing about it, and playing games.

Every single Democrat and a few of our Republican colleagues have joined in the resolution that says these three simple things. We will not rest until we have most every Republican joining because the public is on our side, science is on our side, and the need to help protect America—farmers, urban dwellers, suburban dwellers—from the devastating changes that climate is bringing upon us is very real.

Let's stop the nonsense. Let's get serious. Our children's future depends upon it. Our planet depends upon it.

MUELLER REPORT

Madam President, now there is one final matter. Yesterday, I came to the floor and asked unanimous consent on a very simple matter—that the report completed by Special Counsel Mueller and all of the corresponding evidence and documentation be made publicly available for the American people.

There was a request, above all, to achieve the greatest level of transparency possible into the very serious matters of Russian interference in our elections. Transparency—that is all we want.

I am hardly alone. It is the same resolution that passed the House unanimously, with the President's strongest defenders voting for it. They want transparency.

Why has Leader McConnell objected to making the report public? What in the world is he hiding? He got up and objected when we asked to make it public. If he had not gotten up, it would have passed.

President Trump has called for the report to be made public. So why is the leader, the Republican leader, blocking all attempts at transparency? There is no conceivable reason for the Mueller report to remain hidden from public view. It is a shame—a darn shame—that Leader McConnell thinks otherwise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, I thank you for your hard work on the sometimes powerful Senate Agriculture Committee. I would have liked to respond to the leader—but I know he is busy, and he is leaving the floor—just to say that I think all Republicans understand there is climate change,

and all Republicans know that human activity does contribute to it, and, yes, we ought to do something. The point I am trying to make here is we don't want to do the wrong thing and cause a great deal of disruption in the process.

I also thank Senator Thune for allowing me to speak out of order. I know this is a hardship on his schedule, but he has been very kind to let this happen.

I thank the sponsors of the Green New Deal for enabling all Senators the opportunity to discuss the practical challenges this resolution actually presents. For me, as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, it allows me to discuss the real stewards of our land—our farmers, ranchers, growers—and how this legislation will affect them and their ability not only to feed this country but a troubled and hungry world as well.

Those of us who represent farm country are grateful for the opportunity to underscore something that too many take for granted. Farmers, ranchers, and growers in the United States now grow the safest, most affordable and abundant food supply in the world. As I just said, we know that it is a troubled and hungry world that needs farmers, ranchers, growers, and their protection to help feed and clothe the world's increasing population. Yes, and I think it will probably go longer than 12 years.

As chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I am proud of our bipartisan record on behalf of American agriculture and, in turn, our record of respecting our Nation's natural resources. These things go hand in hand. Lawmakers on both sides of the aisle on the Agriculture Committee and those privileged to work in agriculture have always sought to grow and raise more, using as few resources as possible.

The men and women who make their living off the land have an imperative and keen interest in the responsible use and management of our natural resources. Show me a farmer who does not practice conservation or does not have access to precision agriculture or the latest technology, and I will show you a farmer who is really in trouble.

In short, within agriculture, there is nothing new with the Green New Deal. It calls for "working collaboratively with farmers, ranchers, and growers in the United States to eliminate pollution, greenhouse gases, and emissions from the agricultural sector as much as is technologically feasible"—that is the language—"by supporting family farming"—that is also in the language—"investing in sustainable farming and land use practices that increase soil health," and "building a more sustainable food system that ensures universal access to healthy food." That is in the resolution, the legislation over in the House.