In the UK, it is not just long waits patients have to contend with, it is flatout denials of care. In the first quarter of last year alone, Britain's National Health Service abruptly canceled 25,000 surgeries—canceled them.

Imagine that—being fully reliant on the government for healthcare, planning on a medically necessary procedure, and being told at the last minute the whole thing was called off. Welcome to socialized medicine. Needless to say, if some Democrats had their way, you wouldn't have to imagine much longer.

Before I conclude, I want to highlight one more thing. I suppose no far-left wish list like this would have been complete without radical policies on the issue of abortion, without trying to hurt pro-life Americans.

Sure enough, this legislation would shatter the longstanding consensus—consensus—that Federal dollars should not pay for abortions and force taxpayers to fund abortions nationwide. That has been the longstanding consensus. Talk about a perfect case study in the perils of a Federal takeover. Talk about a perfect example of why Washington Democrats should not get the power to twist American healthcare to suit their own radical views—$32 trillion, every family kicked off its insurance plans, no choice, no options for the middle class, just a huge bill.

The Democrats are so confident the American people will love their new government plan that they feel the need to make other kinds of insurance illegal, and Democratic Presidential candidates are rushing headlong to embrace all of this—watching them embrace all of this. Goodness. If this is one of their best and brightest new ideas, I would sure hate to see the bad ones.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

VIETNAM SUMMIT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, several hours ago, in the middle of the night here in the United States, we received word that the summit in Hanoi between the United States and North Korea would be ending prematurely. Unable to reach an understanding on either sanctions relief or denuclearization, President Trump decided to walk away from the talks without an agreement.

Though I don't know the details yet, and I look forward to speaking with Secretary Pompeo, I was pleased to see the President recognized North Korea's unwillingness to strike a comprehensive deal. President Trump did the right thing by walking away and not cutting a poor deal for the sake of a photo op.

Just like the President, I want a deal with North Korea that will bring an end to the conflict and change the course of the region. However, I have always been concerned about the possibility of a bad deal, especially with the other pressures currently on the President. A deal that fell short of complete, verifiable denuclearization would have only made North Korea stronger and the world less safe, and it would have squandered the substantial leverage our negotiators have now thanks to the bite of sanctions.

President Trump must now apply the lesson of North Korea diplomacy to our trade negotiations with China. President Trump must have the courage to do the same thing with China as he has done for North Korea. The President must be willing to hold the line and walk away if China does not agree to meaningful, enduring, structural reform of its unfair trading policy. President Trump should not fall into the trap of seeking a deal for the sake of a deal, especially now that talks with Pyongyang are on hold.

What he did in North Korea was right. He must do the same thing in China—hold out because he has the upper hand—until we get China to do the right thing. Just because an accord is, for the moment, out of reach in North Korea does not mean that the President should be any more eager to strike one with China if the terms are inadequate or unacceptable.

The President deserves credit for bringing China to the negotiating table with tariffs, but he must not squander that opportunity by cutting a deal that fails to achieve American priorities. Unless China promises to end its predatory cyber theft of American intellectual property and know-how, unless China promises to stop artificially propping up its businesses, unless China promises to end its practice of forcing American companies to give away their IP to their future Chinese competitors in order to do business in China, President Trump should walk away from the negotiations once again.

As important as North Korea is to national security, China is just as critical—maybe even more critical—to American economic security. President Trump and his team have a generational imperative to get this one right. They have a generational imperative not to squander the chance to achieve permanent reforms to China's economic relations with the world, changes that would finally put American investors, businesses, and workers on a level playing field.

BIPARTISAN BACKGROUND CHECKS BILL

Madam President, on guns, I was so glad to see the House passage of a background checks bill. I urge Leader MCCONNELL to take it up in the Senate.

Background checks are supported overwhelmingly by close to 90 percent of the American people—a majority of Republicans, a majority of gun owners. It doesn't take anyone's guns away. It simply says that if you are a felon, spousal abuser, or adjudicated mentally ill, you shouldn't have a gun, and it takes the means to make sure that happens.

Now there are so many loopholes in the background check law—the Brady law, which I was proud to lead the charge on back in the House in 1994. Now, some 25 years later, they have found ways around it through the internet and through gun shows. Just as it was the right thing to do to close the loopholes that existed in 1994 with the Brady law, it is the right thing to do to close those loopholes that have come about since the law passed. It simply updates the Brady law, which has saved tens of thousands of lives.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Madam President, finally, on climate, in a short time, I will be returning to the floor to lead a group of Democratic Senators in talking about climate change. One of the great but positive ironies of Leader MCCONNELL's stunt to put the Green New Deal on the floor is that it has inspired Members of both parties to talk about climate change—more than ever before, maybe—under the Republican leadership in the Senate.

Democrats are more than happy about that. We want to turn the spotlight back to the issue of climate change and keep it there, where it belongs. Climate change is an existential threat to our planet, not just in the future but right now. We should be talking about climate change nearly every day, and more than that, the Senate should be taking bold action to address it.

So I am glad at least Leader MCCONNELL is talking about climate. He just says what he is not for.

So I will repeat the three questions I have asked Leader MCCONNELL repeatedly: One, Leader MCCONNELL, do you believe that climate change is real? Two, do you believe, Leader MCCONNELL, that it is caused by humans? Three, do you believe Congress should take immediate action to address the crisis of climate change?

Until Leader MCCONNELL puts something positive on the floor and starts talking positively, no one is going to pay much attention to his stunts and his gambits, but, certainly, we Democrats are energized to talk positively about the things we want to do to deal with this issue, and we will be positive and discuss positive proposals until we get something done in this Chamber.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip is recognized.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, just in getting started this morning, I wanted to take a minute to mention the good news on economic growth we received this morning.

While headlines mentioned the very solid 2.9 percent growth number for

2018, if we use the measure that economists prefer, the news is even better—3.1 percent growth from the fourth quarter of 2017 to the fourth quarter of 2018. This is just more evidence that Republican economic policies are working.

We lifted burdensome regulations and passed a comprehensive reform of our Tax Code to put more money in Americans' pockets and make it easier for businesses to grow and expand jobs. Now we are seeing the effects.

Unemployment is low. January marked the 11th straight month that unemployment has been at or below 4 percent. That is the longest streak in nearly five decades. The number of job openings hit a record high in December, and, once again, there were more job openings than job seekers. Wage growth has accelerated. Wages have now been growing at a rate of 3 percent or greater for 6 straight months. The last time wage growth reached this level was in 2009. Median household income is at an all-time, inflation-adjusted record of $61,372. The list goes on.

What does all of this mean? It means more money in American families' bank accounts, more jobs and opportunities for American workers, more Americans feeling hopeful about their future.

Republican economic policies are making life better for American families, which is why it is particularly disturbing that Democrats are currently advancing policies that would not only destroy the economic progress we have made but would severely damage our economy for the long term.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Madam President, yesterday, I came down and talked about the so-called Green New Deal, which is a fantasy put forward by a number of our colleagues on the other side. I think 11 Democratic Senators have cosponsored that legislation, which the early analysis shows would cost somewhere between $51 trillion and $94 trillion over the next decade. To put that into more personal terms, that is $600,000 per family in this country—the cost of the Green New Deal.

My colleague from Illinois, the Democratic whip, was asked about it on an interview recently, and he responded by saying that he had read and reread the proposal and still doesn't know what the heck it is. Well, that is an honest answer. But I think what we do know is that this is a proposal that will dramatically, massively drive up costs for American families. It would be a disaster for the pocketbooks of the people of this country, which brings me to my topic for today.

On Tuesday, POLITICO released an article with this headline: ''House Democrats to release 'Medicare for All' bill—without a price tag.'' That was the headline.

This is becoming par for the course for Democrats. First we get the Green New Deal resolution without a pricetag. Now we get Medicare for All, also without a pricetag. Why? Well, because there is no way to actually pay for these socialist fantasies. They sound nice, until you actually look at the staggering costs.

Imagine if you decided that you needed to repair the plumbing at your house, and the plumber came and suggested that not only should you repair the plumbing, you should rebuild the house from the ground up. Then he wanted you to sign on for demolition and reconstruction without telling you how much it would cost.

That is what Democrats are trying to do on a grand scale here. They want to overhaul large parts of the economy and rebuild them on socialist lines, all without telling you what it will cost or how they will pay for it.

Of course, while it is irresponsible, it is not surprising that Democrats don't want to discuss the pricetag for their fantasies, because there is no way to pay for these massive government takeovers without taxing ordinary Americans.

Democrats make vague suggestions that these programs can be paid for by taxing the rich. That is always the line. But the truth is that taxing millionaires at a 100-percent income tax rate would not pay for these programs. Taxing Americans making much less than $1 million at a 100-percent rate wouldn't pay for these programs.

The cost of these programs will never be borne just by millionaires. These programs will be paid for on the backs of working families in this country. That is the pure and simple reality.

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—$32 trillion—and it is possible that the House Democrats' plan could cost even more.

POLITICO noted in their story that, unlike the plan of the Senator from Vermont, the House Democrats' plan would also ''fund long-term care, a particularly expensive part of the health system.''

But moving away from the staggering pricetag, let's talk about what life would be like under Medicare for All.

For starters, of course, it would mean that Americans would lose their private insurance, even if they like their private insurance. Democrats have been very clear about this.

At a CNN townhall just this week, 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 Senator from Vermont's response: ''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's an urgent goal?

Her response:

> Oh yeah, it is a goal. An urgent goal.

So if you like your health insurance, you definitely will not be able to keep it. You will be forced into the government healthcare plan, whether you like that plan or not. Then, of course, you will be facing long wait times and likely a limited choice of doctors and hospitals, and you will have fewer options if the government decides a particular treatment isn't cost-effective and shouldn't be covered.

Democrats can talk all they want about generous coverage, but what happens when they don't have the money for that generous coverage? We already know this program is likely to cost more than $30 trillion over just 10 years, and government programs aren't exactly known for staying under budget.

What happens if it ends up costing more or if the government can't even pay the $32 trillion that we know it is going to cost? Well, there will be still more taxes, undoubtedly, but also reductions in coverage and care.

Our Nation's current Medicare Program is going bankrupt. If action isn't taken, in 2026 Medicare will not be able to pay the benefits that are promised under current law. Yet Democrats are suggesting that we more than quintuple the size of the program and that somehow we will be able to pay for that.

If we ever do pay for Medicare for All, we will pay for it by taking the money from the American people through devastating tax increases that will permanently reduce Americans' standard of living and permanently damage our economy.

Like all socialist dreams, Medicare for All would quickly become a nightmare for the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Senator UDALL and Senator COLLINS pertaining to the submission of S.J. Res. 10 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

Ms. COLLINS. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. SCHUMER pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 9 are printed in today's RECORD under