

it Medicare for all. They can call it what they want—it means higher costs and more Washington control over the healthcare American families need.

The State of Vermont looked at this idea a couple of years ago. Even in this very small, very liberal State, they dropped the idea almost immediately. Why? Because they said it was too expensive.

That didn't stop other States from looking at it. Recently, this occurred in the State of California. Democrats in California recently offered a plan to have the State take control of all healthcare for everyone who lives there. Universal healthcare for all, they call it—doctor visits, hospitals, inpatient care, outpatient care, emergencies, dental, vision, mental health, nursing homes, everything, cradle to grave, universal health coverage.

So what do the stories in the California papers say about this? Well, they did a budget analysis. The budget office of the State of California did a budget analysis and said: What would such a thing cost? They came up with a cost of \$400 billion a year. That sounds like a big number, but how do you put that in perspective? What else can you do? Four hundred billion dollars. So they said: Well, let's compare it to the budget of the entire State of California. The entire budget for the State of California today is \$190 billion, so the cost of universal healthcare alone is twice the budget of the whole State of California. That includes teachers, firefighters, police, everything. They are proposing to spend twice the amount that they spend on everything on universal healthcare.

So what do the Democrats say? Well, we will just have to raise taxes. That is their answer to so much of everything. I guess they figure that hard-working families in California would need to pay these taxes every year—not just once but every year because that price tag is \$400 billion each and every year.

Democrats have no good ideas on how to deal with this collapse of ObamaCare. Republicans are offering real solutions. We are looking for ways to bring costs down, to give people more freedom, and to give people more control over their own healthcare. We are working to make sure people can get the care they need from a doctor they choose at a lower cost. We don't have that with ObamaCare.

The Democrats are pushing the exact opposite approach. They are offering higher costs, higher taxes, more government control, more government say in your family's life.

ObamaCare has failed. Republicans are committed to finding long-term solutions to our Nation's healthcare needs.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

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

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

Mr. CARPER. Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon.

#### PARIS AGREEMENT

Mr. President, there is an African proverb that goes something like this: If you want to go fast, go alone; if you want to go far, go together.

The Paris Agreement was developed in that spirit; that 195 nations and territories can do more to protect our planet from climate change, the greatest environmental challenge of our lifetime, than the United States or any country can do isolated or on its own. Nearly 200 countries now have agreed to do their part to limit our global temperature rise by developing national plans to reduce their own emissions.

We know climate change is a global challenge that does not respect national borders. Emissions anywhere affect people everywhere, with the poorest and most vulnerable populations affected most. There is a reason why we call it "global warming." We know no one country, no one region, no one continent can solve this problem alone.

President Trump's inner circle has a different take on this historical agreement. For instance, during an appearance on "Fox and Friends" last month, Scott Pruitt, the EPA Administrator, denounced the Paris Agreement, calling it "a bad deal for America."

Asked about his biggest objection to the accord, this is what he said. He claimed China and India had no obligation until 2030—no obligation until 2030—even though "they are polluting far more than we are."

Well, that is just false. First, in 2015, the United States on a per capita basis produced more than double the carbon dioxide emissions of China—more than double—and eight times more than India. Also, contrary to what the Administrator continues to espouse, both China and India have pledged to reach their carbon emissions reduction goals by 2030, which means they are taking steps now—not 5 years from now, not 10 years from now, not 13 years from now—now, to meet those commitments. India is on schedule to be the world's third largest solar market by the end of 2017. In fact, last year, India unveiled the largest solar power facility in the world.

Meanwhile, Chinese leaders have ordered their country's coal companies to cut 1.3 million jobs over the next 5 years. Some of these workers will find jobs in the clean energy sector, which Beijing expects to generate more than 13 million jobs by 2020.

Make no mistake, if the United States cedes its leadership position on climate change, China will be ready and willing to assume that role—our role. In doing so, they will move ahead, and we will fall behind. It is just that simple.

We have a chart here that includes a quote from China's top climate negotiator. He told Reuters about 6 months

ago that if Trump abandons efforts to implement the Paris Agreement, "China's influence and voice are likely to increase in global climate governance, which will then spill over into other areas of global governance and increase China's global standing, power and leadership."

The Chinese clearly understand that the Paris Agreement affords their country the opportunity to emerge in the 21st century as a clean energy superpower.

I have been there. A year ago, I was there. In the trains they built and the train systems they built, the huge electric buses, all electric buses that I rode, it is clear they know what they are doing, and their intent was to eat our lunch by pursuing this clean sustainable energy approach.

Unfortunately, those in the Trump administration seem to be the only ones who don't recognize that. Some day they will wish they had, and the rest of us will wish we had too. Withdrawing from this pact doesn't put America first, it puts America behind.

You don't have to take my word for it. Just ask our business community. They see the clear benefits for their businesses and for America if we continue to play a lead role in the implementation of the Paris Agreement. Over 1,000 American companies and investors, some of which are represented here on this chart, have written to President Trump urging his administration and him to address climate change through the implementation of the Paris Agreement. The businesses, which include Exxon, Starbucks, Apple, General Mills, Walmart, Nike, Morgan Stanley, and BP—just to name a few—this is what all these companies and their leaders said: Failure to embrace the Paris accords "puts American prosperity at risk. But the right action now will create jobs and boost U.S. competitiveness."

I have another chart.

We have two letters here. One was written to a new President, President Obama, in 2009. Again, this is a full-page ad.

This is another ad that appeared in the past week to another new President, in this case, President Trump. Interesting enough, back in 2009, a Manhattan businessman named Donald J. Trump agreed with the 1,000 companies I mentioned earlier—the 1,000 companies that said we ought to do something about climate change. We ought to get on board and lead the way. Businessman Donald J. Trump agreed with them and joined CEOs to run an ad in the New York Times urging then-President Obama to "lead the world by example," ahead of the U.N. Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen.

In the ad right here, Donald Trump called on President Obama to allow the United States of America "to serve in modeling the change necessary to protect humanity and our planet."

Eight years later, the person who signed this letter and joined all these

other CEOs in saying to President Obama: “Wake up. Let’s do something about this climate change stuff. Make sure we are leading the parade”—8 years later, he is not signing the letter. He is the addressee on the letter, from, again, hundreds of CEOs from around the country, and they are urging him to do the very same thing Donald J. Trump had urged Barack Obama to do 8 years earlier. If you ever want to think of something that is ironic, find an example of two full-page ads that sort of represent the term “irony,” this is it. This is it.

The companies noted in this second full-page ad that the Paris Agreement provides just the kind of framework we need. So U.S. businesses still recognize that our country leading the world in addressing climate change is the right approach. We might want to ask: Why doesn’t our President, Donald Trump, realize that? With the Paris Agreement, the global community rightly recognized that there are challenges bigger than any one State and came together to do what is best for our collective future.

It is not the first time the global community came together for the greater good. In 1944, the world came together at the Convention on International Civil Aviation to regulate international air travel so planes could avoid flying into one another in the not-so-friendly skies of the future.

In 1968, the nonproliferation treaty helped prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, promote the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and further the goal of disarmament to help keep our world safe.

In 1977, the Chemical Weapons Convention outlawed the production, stockpiling, and use of chemical weapons, which the world agreed were inhumane.

On these critical issues, the world came together overwhelmingly to do what was in the best interest of humanity rather than the best interest of one single nation, but even these other historic and frankly commonsense agreements don’t have as many signers as the Paris Agreement does.

We hear numbers thrown around a lot when we talk about the Paris Agreement, but to put the number of signers in context, let me just say it is nearly the whole world—nearly the whole world.

If you wonder what 195 national flags look like, pretty much the whole world, this chart depicts that. There are two flags down here that have not signed, and one of those is Nicaragua. They didn’t sign because they thought the Paris accords didn’t go far enough. The other country that didn’t sign on is Syria. So, in effect, there is really only one country that has refused to accept the basis of the Paris Agreement, this huge Paris accord, and that one nation is Syria.

Our withdrawing leaves the United States in company with Bashar al-Assad. We will be his wingman. That is

not the company we ought to be keeping, and that is not who we are.

When it comes to global challenges such as terrorism and cyber attacks, the United States doesn’t sit back and wait for someone else to lead. We lead. America leads the way. We always have. It is part of the fabric of our Nation.

To win our freedom, we took on the mightiest nation on Earth at the time, England, not once but twice, and beat them. A half century later, we survived a bloody Civil War that took hundreds of thousands of lives and left hundreds of thousands more crippled and wounded. After that war, our President was assassinated and his successor, Andrew Johnson, was impeached. Somehow we survived all that and we went on to lead our allies to victory in World War I and World War II. We led our country out of the Great Depression and into victory in the Cold War as well.

Americans should, once again, be leading the world to combat what is likely to be the greatest challenge we will face in our lifetimes. Our children and their children are counting on this, and we should not let them down.

Somebody asked me how long it would take to read a list of the 195 nations that have signed on to the Paris Peace Accords, and I have the names right here. I am not sure I can correctly pronounce all of the names—maybe page 1 and the last page, and I will leave it at that.

It starts out with Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, and Barbados.

That is the first page, and it goes on and on and on.

I will finish up with Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

There are 195 in all. We ought to be in company with the names of all of the countries that are on that list. We should not be in the company of the one that is down here by itself—Syria.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 13 minutes remaining until the vote.

Mr. CARPER. Thank you.

IRAN

Mr. President, one of the countries on this list of the 195 subscribing to and signing on to the Paris Agreement was the country of Iran. I want to talk a little bit about Iran in the time that remains.

I came home from church this past Sunday. My wife and I were in the kitchen—we were fixing breakfast—when I turned on the television and watched, I think it was, CNN. They were broadcasting live from Saudi Arabia our President’s talking to a large group of national leaders representing

Muslim countries from around the world, hosted by Saudi Arabia. The President was giving his speech. He was using a teleprompter, but a lot of Presidents use teleprompters. He was reading a speech off of the teleprompter. As I was listening, I actually thought that this was a pretty good speech. Closer to the end of the speech—I do not know if he went off camera or went off the teleprompter and just did an inaudible or if this was part of the speech—he started talking about Iran and why they are a nemesis to a lot of the world and are not to be trusted—somebody we should not be doing business with or going into any kind of agreements with, even an agreement that causes them not to be able to build a nuclear weapon.

In any event, I thought to myself that there is a real irony here because, as he was going on and berating Iran, they were still counting the votes in Iran from the election that had occurred the day before, which is unlike many of the countries that were represented and that President Trump was addressing in that they do not have elections in those countries. Women do not get to hold office or run for office in many of those countries.

Let me just be the first to say that, clearly, Iran is not a Jeffersonian democracy, and, as some would suggest of late, maybe our credentials are somewhat tarnished on that too. I think of the over 1,600 people who registered to run for President in Iran. There were 1,600 people in Iran who wanted to run for President this year, and Iran’s Guardian Council only allowed 6, ultimately, to run.

Iran has never allowed a woman to run for President. Women do hold elected positions. They serve in the parliament and in municipal positions, but none of them has ever run for President. We have had one or two or maybe three.

Iran does not enjoy a free press. International election observers are strictly forbidden, and there are widespread allegations that Iran’s 2009 Presidential elections, in which Ahmadinejad was supposedly re-elected—I doubt that he was, but there are a lot of people who think those elections were rigged.

In Iran, most of the final decisions rest with the Supreme Leader, at least decisions of consequence, and the Supreme Leader, as we know, is not popularly elected by the people of that country.

Here is what happened in the elections in Iran over the weekend. A lot of people turned out to vote, and they were willing to support a candidate who openly advocates for engagement with the West, including with us. The Supreme Leader of Iran, frankly, did not want President Rouhani to be re-elected, but he was, with nearly 60 percent of the vote. In fact, the Supreme Leader, I think, and others urged others to get out of the race so that there would be just a one-on-one against a