

to utilize existing funds as they see fit to improve community-based services that these folks rely on.

Our Medicaid provisions allow the States flexibility to route funds to regions impacted by public health emergencies, which include disastrous weather events like hurricanes. Instead of being applied as a block grant or based on per capita caps, under our legislation, emergency funding will be applied where and when it is needed.

Lastly, under our Medicaid revision, States can add expansion populations under existing block grants if they choose to do so. Medicaid will always be as it has been—a Federal-State shared expense. By allowing States to be flexible in their Medicaid application, we can help them fill the gaps that the mandates under ObamaCare chose to merely gloss over. For example, in Texas, we were not a Medicaid expansion State. So young adults between 100 percent of poverty and 138 percent of poverty will now get access to a tax credit with the innovation and stability funds and these waivers, which will allow them, for the first time, to get access to private health insurance. That is good for them, and I think represents a vast improvement on the status quo—about 600,000 in Texas alone.

Our new draft includes an additional \$70 billion to encourage States and help them implement these new reforms. What I have come to learn is, people don't really trust Washington, DC. Certainly, based on the experience of ObamaCare—this failed experiment where people were promised certain things that ended up not being true and created the problems we now are having to fix—I think people will have a lot more confidence in a plan that lets the Governors and lets the State leaders manage this money and address the healthcare needs of their population by people who are closest to those people rather than out of Washington, DC.

Our bill does that in a dramatic way. It takes that authority and power grabbed by ObamaCare and gives it back to the Governors and the States to manage. Based on the polling I have seen, people certainly have greater confidence in the States and their leadership at the local level to deal with this than they do under ObamaCare. If Governors want to try to come up with unique healthcare products to drive down premiums, cost sharing, or increased funding for health savings accounts, this legislation gives them greater flexibility and gives them additional funding through the Innovation and Stability Fund to do just that.

Many of us have quoted Louis Brandeis, who served on the U.S. Supreme Court, who said: States are the “laboratories of democracy.” It is true. You don't see any innovation at the Federal level. It is more like dealing with the Politburo. It is all command and control—central planning, which we know doesn't work very well. The States are the laboratories of democ-

racy. If we give them the freedom to innovate and the resources to do so, I think we can expect our healthcare system to move forward.

Soon we are going to have a critical vote, one that has been 7 years in the making. While our plan is not perfect, it is certainly better than the status quo, which is why we call it the Better Care Act. This is not the end, as Dr. Tom Price, of Health and Human Services, points out. This is just the next step. We know we are going to have other opportunities to address healthcare, most notably in September, when we reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, but this, by any measure, represents an improvement over the status quo.

I think there are some very useful parts of this bill that people will like if they look at it objectively and consider it fairly, but if we don't take up the bill, well, it can't be changed, and millions of Americans will continue to be harmed by the status quo. That is a decision we all have to make when we move to the bill.

Do we have enough confidence that we can make it better or are we simply going to throw our hands up and say, “Well, I give up,” before we even start, leaving people with the failure of the status quo?

I would like to encourage our colleagues to work with us to make this legislation better. It is unfortunate that healthcare has become such a polarizing and partisan issue. It doesn't need to be that way, but it started off with ObamaCare, which was passed along purely party lines, creating a situation where there is not bipartisan support for healthcare, generally, which is a real tragedy, given the importance this has to all of us and all of our families. Given the hand we have been dealt, we are going to plow ahead and do the best we can.

I sat down at my computer this morning, and I started to write a list of things I liked about the Better Care Act that perhaps most people haven't heard much about. No. 1, it repeals the individual mandate. This is the fine that has been imposed on people for not buying government-approved health insurance. It repeals the job-killing employer mandate. This bill will lower premiums, repeal burdensome taxes, and restore choices. It will help stabilize insurance markets and protect people with preexisting conditions. It will allow people to use pretax dollars to pay for their healthcare costs, including insurance premiums. It provides substantial resources to fight opioid and other substance abuse. It provides better quality coverage to low-income Americans that will improve medical outcomes for low-income Americans, and it puts Medicaid on a sustainable path.

I would like to encourage all of our colleagues to work with us to help make this legislation even stronger. Everybody will be able to offer an amendment and get a vote on the

amendment when this bill comes to the floor. I believe the alternative is a disaster for our country, and we simply can't afford to let it stand.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I came to speak on a different subject and will not speak at length about the healthcare bill because this Senator has spoken on a number of occasions about the healthcare bill. Suffice it to say, in light of what the majority whip has just said; that if we really did want to seek a bipartisan solution to the healthcare situation in expanding healthcare for as many people as we possibly can, then what we do, in a bipartisan way, is start saying: We have a current law. Let's fix what needs fixing.

This Senator can say there are a number of discussions going on between Democratic Senators and Republican Senators about doing just that—about such items as a reinsurance fund to ensure companies against catastrophe, the likes of which, in a proposal this Senator has filed, has been costed out. In my State of Florida, it would reduce insurance premiums for health insurance 13 percent. Ideas like that—in a bipartisan way—will solve and bring stability to the marketplace. That is why insurance companies, in fact, are being vigorous in their opposition to the Senator CRUZ part of the bill that basically destabilizes the market by taking all of the older and sicker people and putting them in one pot and putting the younger and healthier people in another pot, which is exactly the opposite of what the principle of insurance is. The principle of insurance is, you spread the risk over as many people as you can and thereby can bring down the per-unit cost.

If we really wanted to fix it in a bipartisan way, we would be able to, but still, as you can see, there is not the appetite for that in this highly polarized, highly ideological, and highly partisan atmosphere we find ourselves in on this particular topic.

#### PROTECTING THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY

Mr. President, this Senator came here to talk about another thing that is equally disturbing because there is a blatant, coordinated effort by some elected officials to muzzle the scientific community. When you start muzzling scientists, you don't come up with the facts, and you don't come up with the truth. What is being presented as facts doesn't really match the truth, and certainly the rhetoric doesn't match what is happening.

For example, just last month in the State of Florida, the Florida Legislature passed, and the Governor signed into law, a bill that allows any resident of the State—regardless of whether they have a student in school—any resident can challenge what is being taught in the public schools. So if a single resident objects to a certain subject that students are being taught

having to do with science, a subject such as what is happening in the climate and the changes; the fact that the Sun's rays come in and reflect off the Earth and go back—reflect out and radiate the heat back into space—but when you start putting what are known as greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide and methane, up there, they suddenly act as a ceiling, a greenhouse gas ceiling having a greenhouse effect, trapping the heat and causing the Earth to heat up. Two-thirds of the Earth is covered with water. Most of that heat is absorbed in the oceans. What happens to water when it is heated? It expands. That is a fact. Sea level rise in South Florida is a fact. It is a measurement over the last 40 years. The seas have risen 8 inches in South Florida. That is a fact, but if there are some who object to that climate science, then under this new law just signed by the Governor, they are going to be able to object to that subject being taught in our public schools. A single hearing officer will determine—Lord only knows whom that officer is appointed by—that single person will determine, under the new law, if the objection is justified. They can force a local public school to remove the subject from its curriculum.

Does that sound a little bit strange? Does that sound a little bit scary? It seems like this is the most brazen attack on science we have seen in a long time. It is a blatant attempt to cover up the truth. Instead of accepting the fact that the seas are rising and what is going to be a very real threat—and already is to a coastline like Florida's—they want to literally rip the subject right out of our children's textbooks, while at the same time silencing the teachers and the scientists. I don't think we can sit back and allow our public schools to become political battlegrounds, and we shouldn't allow politicians to silence our teachers and scientists just because they don't happen to like that part of the science.

While this bill was just enacted in Florida, it may be one of the most egregious examples of hiding the truth. Unfortunately, I am sad to report, it is not the only one. In fact, in 2015, Florida's Governor went so far as to reportedly ban State officials from even using the term "climate change" in their reports. Doesn't that sound like muzzling? Yet the effect of sea level rise is still painfully evident in South Florida. What about the water washing over the curbs on Miami Beach at the seasonal high tide? What about the water that is coming over the streets in the Las Olas section of Fort Lauderdale at the seasonal high tide?

In just a month, the new head of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency fired several members of the Board of Scientific Counselors—the very people responsible for overseeing the Agency's science and research programs. These were scientists at the top of their fields working on behalf of the American people, and suddenly, in one fell swoop,

the new head of the EPA fired them all and wants to replace them with—you guessed it—industry representatives, scientists from the very industries that the EPA is supposed to monitor and oversee. If this is not what completes the picture of putting the fox in charge of the henhouse, I don't know what is.

The henhouse is not just climate science, but it includes basic research in all fields, including healthcare—NIH. By the way, thank goodness we have a head of NIH who is a guy who broke the code on the human genome, Dr. Collins. It includes the fields of astronomy—how about NASA—and it includes the origin of the universe—quantum physics in multiple agencies.

This disturbing trend of hiding the truth if it doesn't match their rhetoric is a trend that is spreading across all levels of government. If information can't be removed from the public domain altogether, then guess what they try to do: They try to discredit it.

For example, look at what has been done now in an effort to pass this disastrous Republican healthcare bill. Instead of—as I have just made comments preparatory to this science subject—trying to work together on a bipartisan bill aimed at improving our Nation's healthcare system, some on the other side of the aisle have resorted to attacking whom? Attacking the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office after it said that the bill will take healthcare coverage away from tens of millions of people.

The nonpartisan CBO is just that; it is nonpartisan. It is responsible for estimating the costs and effects of nearly every bill that Congress considers. Yet suddenly, when the conclusions of CBO don't match the rhetoric coming from one side, they turn their attacks on the scientists and the mathematicians who release the findings.

Listen to these quotes:

"I have a lot of questions about the accuracy of the CBO," one of our Republican colleagues said here in the Senate.

CBO's time has "come and gone," the White House Budget Director said earlier this year.

"We disagree strenuously with the report," HHS Secretary Price said. "The CBO report's coverage numbers defy logic."

"If you're looking at the CBO for accuracy, you're looking in the wrong place," said the Press Secretary at the White House.

If that is not enough, just last week, the White House itself released a video saying that the CBO's score of the Republican healthcare bill is based on "faulty assumptions and bad math."

It is clear what is going on. This administration's war on science is not a myth. It is not fake news. If you want to know an administration's true priorities, you need to look no further than their budget, and if you look at the President's most recent budget request, you will see dramatic cuts to some of our most important scientific

agencies. This Senator has seen that in the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee—in the NOAA programs and in the NASA programs.

The President's budget calls for more than a 30-percent cut to EPA. It calls for the firing of nearly one-quarter of its staff and the elimination of all funding for programs aimed at fighting climate change. Climate change isn't just about Florida nor is it a coastal State problem; it is a problem of the entire country. The extreme weather events caused by climate change affect us all. Droughts become more frequent, floods become more severe, and major storms like hurricanes and tornadoes become stronger and even more deadly.

The scientists at NOAA, the National Weather Service, NASA, and most of the other agencies, including our military, who study climate change aren't trying to create a mythical problem that doesn't exist. They are trying to solve real-life problems that affect all of us and that affect them in the carrying out of their duties.

They work at Federal agencies across the country with one goal in mind—to make credible, valid data publicly available for researchers, academic institutions, and businesses that use the information to better understand things.

I see the leader is here to speak. I will conclude with just a couple of thoughts.

These scientists know that we can't just stick our heads in the sand. Science doesn't work like that. Facts are facts. And the fact is that the Earth is heating up, and there is a reason for that, which I explained. If we don't do something about it, the communities that are already affected in my State are going to be communities all over the world. These are not alternative facts.

Yet, instead of helping these scientists do their work, some political leaders are using their positions to hide this information and to make it unavailable. We ought to be speaking out against it, and that is what this Senator is trying to do.

I have filed legislation to protect scientists' rights to speak publicly about their research—not to let them be muzzled—and to ensure that all agencies maintain their scientific integrity.

I hope we can stop this nonsense of hiding the truth. Let's stop this war on science. Let's accept facts as they are and then debate the issues, the policy. The American people deserve an open and honest government that works for them, not a government that distorts the truth to match its rhetoric.

I thank the Senate for indulging me, and I thank the leader for listening patiently.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

THANKING THE SENATOR FROM FLORIDA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I want to tell my colleague from Florida