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.

Check, check, and check. We have been doing this already, and we continue to look ahead to create thoughtful, well-considered policies. I do not question the intent of the authors of the Green New Deal, but they don't know what they don't know, especially about agriculture. They need to catch up with the Agriculture Committee and with the farm country in general.

In fact, we on the Agriculture Committee are so forward-looking that we have embraced innovative methods of investing in agriculture research with the creation of the Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research—something new.

The Foundation leverages public and private dollars to bring together experts to identify and investigate the researchable questions whose answers have the potential to enhance the economic and environmental resilience of our food supply and the environment.

I encourage the Senator from Massachusetts and the leader and other cosponsors to simply ask for a briefing from the folks at FFAR. I would say the same to vocal colleagues on the House side who helped author—and pardon the acronym—the GND, Green New Deal. But given their unfortunate focus on our livestock industry, I simply do not have time, I don't think, to fully discuss emissions emitted from all livestock or, for that matter, for Congress. Maybe that would be a better answer—perhaps later, after riding point on the herd and getting the cows milked.

What is worth our time and what is worth their time is a defense of American agriculture, the best in the world, from attacks by those who are either uninformed or misinformed regarding organic, processed, and precision agriculture—all modern miracles and all sustainable with regard to our environment.

America's farmers, ranchers, and others in rural America are constantly working to produce their crops and to raise their livestock in order to feed a growing world and to do so with constant challenges presented to them from other nations.

The distinguished minority leader just mentioned the floods we are experiencing in Nebraska, Kansas, and Iowa. This seems to have happened about every 10 years. I am not sure it has happened because of global warming, but at least it has with regard to climate change. We are doing everything possible to bring aid and help to those folks who find their farmland underwater.

Farmers are natural stewards of the land, and they must be good at problem-solving. They identify the issues or the trend, find ways to adjust their business and respond to that issue, and improve their way of operating. They would like to do that under a Green New Deal. If they don't adjust to address those challenges and simply do the right thing, their farm or ranch and their livelihood will not be sustainable.

It is pretty simple. Every living, breathing person on this Earth needs food in order to survive. Obviously, we cannot and do not produce food in the same manner that our grandparents did because those methods were not sustainable and, today, would not produce food at the scope and scale our troubled and hungry world demands.

American farmers and ranchers, who live by the concept of continuous improvement, sound science, and voluntary-based conservation, are a model for other industries and other countries on how to address problems like climate change in a very practical way.

America's farmers and ranchers raise the same amount of beef as they did in the 1970s, but they do so with 33 percent fewer cattle. Over the last 50 years, American farmers have reduced water use in pork production by 41 percent, and the list goes on. These are real success stories that speak to how farmers are already managing natural resources responsibly and voluntarily making contributions to address the issue of climate change. Examples like these abound in agriculture.

The American farmer, through continuous improvement, embracing sound science, implementing new technologies, such as biotechnology and no-till farming, and being conservation-minded, has achieved unprecedented success that I do not believe the proponents of GND—i.e., the Green New Deal—realize.

In the recent farm bill, which passed Congress with overwhelming margins, we strengthened the conservation programs, increased investments in agriculture research, supported risk management tools that will benefit producers of all crops in all regions, and provided additional authorities to address animal health concerns. This legislative package bolsters the sustainability of U.S. farmers, ranchers, and others in rural America while being environmentally sound.

Unfortunately, vague proposals or resolutions, such as the Green New Deal, which contain no real details or no metrics are not going to solve the issue of climate change in any meaningful way. Regulating American farmers and ranchers out of business will only result in food and fiber production being outsourced to countries that do not have the same conservation-minded producers that we have here in the United States.

Let's face it: Nobody—no one I know of—likes being told what to do, what to drive, or what to eat. Consumers value free choice. They also expect access to reasonably priced food and nutritious food.

In fact, consumers will surely continue to demand the choice of animal protein here in the United States, and so any reasonable discussion on the agriculture sector's contributions to solutions on climate change must begin with this acknowledgment.

These policy decisions must recognize the complexity of the agriculture and food value chain of growers, input suppliers, processors, handlers, consumers, and the list goes on. They must be based in reality to facilitate a genuine conversation between rural and urban constituencies.

I know. I understand. I realize. I get it. There are those who think the Green New Deal is a moral imperative, and it may well be, but farmers continuing to feed the world is also a moral imperative. Too many go hungry each day in America, and ending this is also a moral imperative. Too many people go hungry in a troubled and hungry world as well. In restricting American agriculture in any way, whether it is in resolution form or legislative form, the Green New Deal does not match up with these moral responsibilities.

I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for allowing me to step in front of him. That doesn't happen very often. So, Coop, you are up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Kansas, the chairman of the Senate Ag committee, who was incredibly instrumental in getting that last Farm Bill passed. I have the privilege of serving on his committee, and we do a lot of important work for our farmers and ranchers in this country. As he very aptly pointed out, one of the things that could undo a lot of the good work we hope will improve the economic outlook for farmers and ranchers, which today is a very difficult one—something that could really undo that is passage of something like this Green New Deal. It could do irreparable harm to the Ag economy in this country and would be disastrous for farmers and ranchers.

This afternoon, Senate Democrats will have a chance to vote on the Green New Deal, and the American people will have a chance to see just how many Democrats embrace this new government expansion.

The Green New Deal, as the name suggests, is largely about energy policy, but there is a lot more to unpack. The Green New Deal is a comprehensive socialist fantasy that would put the government in charge of everything from healthcare to the way you heat your house.

Do you like your car? With the Green New Deal you almost certainly will not be able to keep it. The Green New Deal also wants to eliminate fossil fuels, which means the engine that currently powers your car will likely be illegal. It also means, roughly, 3.5 million American truckdrivers will be out of a job.

Presumably airplanes would also be grounded, drying up the aviation sector and the travel, tourism, and business it supports.

Do you like your house? That may not matter if the government decides your house doesn't meet the Green New Deal's guidelines. Enjoy rebuilding your home according to plans provided by Washington.

Do you like your job? The Green New Deal will eliminate millions of current energy jobs, but that is not all. The energy industry in this country powers the American economy. Our supply of reliable, affordable energy allows businesses to flourish. So what happens when the Green New Deal drives up the price of energy or when businesses are hit with Green New Deal taxes or when American manufacturers can't meet the Green New Deal's stringent emissions goal? Well, I will tell you what will happen: American jobs will be lost or move overseas.

I mentioned Green New Deal taxes. That is because paying for this plan would require massive tax hikes on just about everybody. One think tank has released a first estimate of what the Green New Deal would cost, and the answer is between $51 trillion and $93 trillion over 10 years. That is almost an incomprehensible amount of money. Ninety-three trillion dollars is more than the amount of money the U.S. Government has spent in its entire history. That is right. Since 1789, when the Constitution went into effect, the Federal Government has spent a total of $83.2 trillion. In other words, it has taken us 230 years to spend the amount of money Democrats want to spend in 10.

How do Democrats plan to pay for this? Well, they don't actually have a plan. The Green New Deal resolution itself refers vaguely to ''community grants, public banks, and other public financing.'' That is all very well, but unless the Democrats' plan is to just print a lot of money, that public financing has to come from somewhere, and since the government is not currently sitting on a spare $9.3 trillion a year, that money is likely going to come from taxes—new and heavy taxes on just about every American.

Let me be very clear. This is not a plan that can be paid for with Democrats' favorite solution of taxing the rich. Taxing every millionaire in the United States at a 100-percent rate for 10 years would only bring in a tiny fraction of $93 trillion. In fact, there aren't enough millionaires in the entire world to cover $93 trillion. In 2017, the combined wealth of all the millionaires in the world was $70.2 trillion. So you could confiscate—you could literally confiscate all the money from all the millionaires in the entire world, and you still wouldn't have $93 trillion. The Green New Deal is not a plan that can be paid for by taxing the rich. This massive government expansion would be paid for on the backs of working families.

The energy industry has been a bright spot for American families over the past few years. Between 2007 and 2017, as the price of healthcare soared and education and food costs increased, household energy costs decreased. That is a big deal for working families, but that progress would go away under the Green New Deal. Energy costs would go up, not down, and the price of a lot of other items would likely rise sharply as well, as everyone from farmers to manufacturers would struggle under the Green New Deal's mandates and taxes. Needless to say, families' paychecks would shrink by a lot.

The size of the tax hikes that would be required to even begin to finance the Green New Deal would usher in a new era of diminished prosperity for American families. Gone would be the American dream of giving your children a better life than you have enjoyed. Under the Green New Deal, American families could look forward to permanently narrowed horizons.

So this afternoon, my Democratic colleagues face a choice. They can double down on their socialist fantasies and vote for the Green New Deal resolution—perhaps the most costly resolution ever to come before the Senate—or they can reject this green nightmare and resolve to work with Republicans to advance clean energy in a way that will not devastate the livelihoods of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to speak about the urgent need for the United States to take action to confront climate change. I think it is pretty clear from the evidence and from the science right now that the following is true: climate change is real, and it is a threat to human life; second, that climate change is caused by human activity; and third, we must take action against it by reducing substantially greenhouse gas emissions.

We have an obligation, all of us—in both Houses of Congress and in both parties and in both branches of government, the legislative and executive branches—we all have an obligation to care for and protect God's creation. We don't have time. We don't have time for cynical political games. We need to be serious about this challenge.

According to the World Food Program, over 120 million people face ''crisis-level food insecurity'' worldwide. Too often we don't focus on that challenge.

Developing countries across Africa, Asia, and Latin America have been hardest hit by frequent and intense floods, droughts, and storms. These climate events can quickly spiral into full-blown food and nutrition crises.

The U.S. intelligence community, the intelligence agencies of the United States of America, have linked global food insecurity to instability that can lead to a rise in violent extremism and international crime that puts the United States at risk. The January 2014 ''Worldwide Threat Assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community'' reported that the ''lack of adequate food will be a destabilizing factor in countries important to United States national security.''

We know the following is true: Climate change leads to humanitarian crises; humanitarian crises lead to hunger, death, and insecurity; hunger, death, and insecurity lead to desperation, instability, extremism, and terrorism. Inaction on this issue predicated on denial or indifference will result in millions around the world suffering extreme hunger resulting from climate-related disasters, which in turn leads to a rise in extremism and terrorism. Ignoring climate change undermines U.S. national security.

Similarly, failure to address climate change will have negative consequences here at home. In one example—among many—a 2015 paper titled ''Growing Stronger: Toward a Climate-Ready Philadelphia'' reports that since 2010, Philadelphia has experienced the following: the snowiest winter on record, the two warmest summers on record, the wettest day on record, the 2 wettest years on record, and two hurricanes. That is just in 5 years, in one city, in one State.

The same paper projects:

> Philadelphia may experience four to 10 times as many days per year above 95 degrees, and as many as 16 days a year above 100 degrees by the end of the century. Up from the 1950 [to] 1999 average of fewer than one.

Fewer than one.

All of these changes have negative consequences for local economies and for the well-being of all of our constituents. Increased heavy rainfall can lead to more flooding in communities along, just for example, the Delaware River and the Schuylkill River in my home State, which places additional stress on our already outdated wastewater infrastructure.

Older Americans and lower income American families are particularly hard hit by heat waves. We know nearly one-quarter of the children in Philadelphia suffer from asthma, a condition that is exacerbated by ground-level ozone, which is made worse by hot weather.

So as Americans we have a duty to develop a strategy and to take action to confront climate change. We must also provide robust assistance, training, and support for workers who may be adversely impacted by the steps we take, but we don't have time to waste. We need a serious bipartisan effort to develop a strategy to take action to prevent the horror that results from inaction on climate change. Everyone knows that today's vote will do nothing to help us deal with this grave crisis.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. 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 GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, you either believe it or you don't believe it.