

knowing central planners here in the Nation's capital are raring to remodel the entire country.

Up next: ending all fossil fuel and nuclear energy production. Forget about coal and all of the jobs it supports in my State of Kentucky and around the country. Forget about the oil and natural gas industry and all of those jobs as well. The list goes on.

Oh, by the way, forget about nuclear, too—proving that this proposal doesn't even pretend to be a serious effort to reduce carbon emissions. It is just a statement of what sounds trendy in New York and San Francisco.

Anyone seriously concerned about carbon would know that nuclear power generates a majority of America's carbon-free electricity. You would think the carbon police would be glad that from 1995 to 2016, American nuclear power met the emissions equivalent of keeping 3 billion cars off the road.

Let me say that again. You would think the carbon police would be glad that from 1995 to 2016, American nuclear power met the emissions equivalent of keeping 3 billion cars off the road.

Oh, but alas, these Democrats will not let facts get in the way of what is fashionable.

Besides, why should America bother being a net exporter of energy when we could leave all of that economic potential to competitors like China?

Naturally, as background documents explained, this means eliminating all combustion engines—cars, lawn mowers, commercial airliners. Everything must go. Everything must go.

By the way, that background really helps clarify another goal behind all of this. It is providing "economic security," even those who are "unwilling to work."

All of this and more can be ours for the low, low price of a staggering expansion of centralized government and—wait for it—upward of a mere \$93 trillion. Ninety-three trillion is more than every dollar our Federal Government has spent in its entire history to date—combined. It is more than the combined annual GDP of every nation on Earth.

As our colleague Senator BLUNT and the policy committee have pointed out, this amount of money could rebuild the entire Interstate Highway System every single year—just for the heck of it—for 250 years, and you would still have a little left over—a little left over.

Or maybe Americans would rather have something nicer to drive on the roads we already have. For the comparatively cheap price of just \$66 trillion, I am told the government could buy every American a Ferrari. What a great idea. For the comparatively cheap price of just \$66 trillion, the government could buy every American a Ferrari. But, of course, everyone would have to get their driving in before Democrats ban the internal combustion engine.

To be clear, \$93 trillion is just one number and one attempt to estimate the pricetag of this fantasy novel. The proposal is so lacking in details and math that it is almost impossible for analysts to even know where to begin trying to connect it to the real world.

Let's talk about where this money would come from. That is always a question worth asking.

If we spread that \$93 trillion out over 10 years and over every American household, we get about \$65,000 per household—\$65,000 every year for every household. The median income in this country is around \$60,000. So, like any good socialist plan, I am sure we would hear a lot about soaking the rich.

We always do. We would hear that wealthy Americans could pay for this whole thing, if only they were sufficiently civic-minded, but, of course, that is not even close to accurate. A huge share of the bill would land at the feet of the American middle class. There are not enough billionaires—there are not enough billionaires to pay the trillions needed for this massive government plan.

Even if Washington decided the IRS should grab every single cent of adjusted gross income above \$1 million, all of it taken, it would only bring in a little over one-tenth—one-tenth—of what the Green New Deal is estimated to cost every year. Take all the money away from the millionaires, it would only bring in a little over one-tenth of what the Green New Deal is estimated to cost every year.

In fact, in order to break even on this proposal alone, the Federal Government would have to take \$9 of every \$10 that every single American earns. The Federal Government would have to take \$9 out of \$10 of everything every American earns.

You had better believe that families' last dollar would need to go toward keeping the lights on. By one analysis, middle-class families could see their power bills jump by more than \$300 a month under the Green New Deal. That would take up the last dollar they had left.

I know Senator ERNST and several of our colleagues will be speaking at greater length on this issue later today, and I am sure each of them will point out that there certainly is one green thing about this sprawling proposal, one green thing: the huge, unprecedented pile of middle-class families' money that Democrats are itching—itching—to grab.

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. President, on one final matter, I want to discuss something that will be happening on the floor of the House perhaps as soon as today.

Remarkably, for the second time in just the last 3 weeks, Speaker PELOSI apparently feels compelled to have her Members vote on a resolution that will reportedly condemn anti-Semitism—a resolution that will purportedly condemn anti-Semitism.

Unfortunately, again, for the second time in just the last 3 weeks, this

seems to be in response to the invocation of crude, hateful, and backward anti-Semitic stereotypes by one specific freshman member of the House Democratic majority.

This Democratic Congresswoman already stoked controversy in mid-February, having publicly proclaimed that Israel's supporters are only in it for the money. Apparently, she believes the only reason leaders would stand with the Jewish people and the State of Israel is Jewish money. Well, I think we have all heard that kind of talk before, and we must not tolerate it.

During my time in the Senate, I have had the honor of traveling all over America. I know I speak for colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say that support for the State of Israel and the U.S.-Israel relationship is deeply felt—deeply felt—all across America. Our relationship is built on common values and democratic principles, our shared interests, close partnerships, and deep friendships. The support for Israel that you see in this Chamber is not the work of some shadow conspiracy. The Members of this body support Israel because so many Americans support Israel.

I had hoped this regrettable episode might have caused this lawmaker to be more careful with her language, but, alas, just a few weeks later, here we are again: more anti-Semitic tropes. This time, she claims that supporters of Israel actually have "an allegiance to a foreign country." That is that old, ugly, dual loyalty smear, plain as day.

We should also not overlook that in a few cases, these anti-Semitic statements have provoked offensive, anti-Muslim comments in response. That is hateful and completely inexcusable as well.

So now the House of Representatives seeks to distance itself from this Member's remarks and will apparently soon vote to condemn anti-Semitism for the second time in just a few weeks. I hope this time the message is clear.

Support for Israel isn't about the "Benjamins," it is about the hearts and minds of the American people. It is unconscionable for any Member of the U.S. Congress, even less a Member of the House Foreign Relations Committee, to repeatedly traffic in base stereotypes.

The long, bloody legacy of anti-Semitism is spread out over the pages of history, but, regrettably, this scourge is not confined to history.

Long common across the Middle East, violent, hateful acts of anti-Semitism have been increasing throughout Europe. Less than a lifetime after the Holocaust, 9 out of 10 European Jews say anti-Semitism has increased—in increased—in the past 5 years.

Eighty-eight percent of French Jews say they actively worry about targeted vandalism. That country alone saw 541 anti-Semitic incidents in 2018, a massive 74-percent increase from just the prior year.

In France, in 2006, a Jewish man was kidnapped for ransom because criminals assumed his Jewish family had to be rich. When their plan failed, they tortured and killed him. A memorial tree was planted in his honor. Earlier this month, that tree was found chopped down—anti-Semitism on top of anti-Semitism.

Trends here in America are troubling too. Every year, hundreds and hundreds of anti-Semitic incidents take place in America, everything from vandalism to harassment, to threats in schools, college campuses, and other public places, to targeting Jewish institutions.

This racial and religious hate-mongering deserves swift condemnation—swift condemnation. So I am glad the House is at least taking up this short, symbolic resolution and rejecting the anti-Semitic tropes this Democratic Congresswoman keeps peddling, but at the end of the day, it is just a symbolic resolution.

If House Democrats wanted to, they could pass real legislation to take action against anti-Semitism and shore up America's relationship with Israel. I know they could because last month the Senate did just that. We did that in the Senate last month. The House should take up and pass S. 1, the bipartisan foreign policy legislation that the Senate passed last month, 77 to 23. That legislation walks the walk. It supports Israel and gives local communities the flexibility to combat the so-called BDS movement, which is a kind of anti-Semitic economic warfare that opponents of Israel are trying to wage against the Jewish State.

The bill also attends to other critical priorities, such as renewing U.S. commitments to Jordan's security and providing for the Assad regime's butchers to be brought to justice.

S. 1 is not just about combating anti-Semitism or bolstering the U.S.-Israel relationship; it is about standing with an Arab partner like Jordan and providing justice for the Syrian people. So my point is this: Resolutions are fine, but the House could do something that mattered by taking up S. 1 that we sent them last month that deals with the BDS boycott against Israel.

Words are one thing. Meaningful action is another. House Democrats should walk the walk and pass S. 1 without any further pointless delay.

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. Mr. 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 MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

(The remarks of Senator SCHUMER pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 97 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NOMINATION OF CHAD L. READLER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on Readler, later this afternoon, the Senate will vote on the confirmation of Chad Readler to the Sixth Circuit. As this Chamber by now is no doubt aware, Mr. Readler was the chief cook and bottle washer of the Trump administration's decision not to defend the healthcare law in court. In a brief submitted to the court on behalf of the Department of Justice, Mr. Readler said that protections for the 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions are unconstitutional.

I say to my Republican friends: Do you want to vote for a judge who says that protecting preexisting conditions, which affect 130 million Americans, is unconstitutional?

Well, that is what you are going to do if you vote for Readler.

Even my Republican colleague Senator ALEXANDER, who oversees the committee that created these protections, calls his arguments "as far-fetched as I have ever heard."

Can you imagine the lack of compassion it takes to argue that 130 million Americans with cancers, respiratory ailments, and all the way down to asthma don't deserve the guarantee of affordable healthcare? Can you imagine voting for a man who is so cold-hearted that he doesn't protect a mother who has a daughter or a son with cancer and the insurance company cuts them off, and they have to watch their child suffer?

Can our Republican colleagues actually vote for a nominee who feels that way not just in his words but in his action? This vote is going to be remembered for a long time—a long, long time.

Can you imagine sitting at your desk on an average workday and arguing for a policy with such catastrophic consequences for a third of our country? I, for one, cannot. That is what Readler did.

The very next day, after he wrote that brief, he was nominated for this lifetime appointment on the bench. Go figure. Only in the Trump administration could a person be rewarded for efforts to take healthcare away from average Americans. That is exactly what happened.

Yesterday, regrettably, the Senate proceeded to Readler's nomination over the objections of one of his home State Senators, Senator SHERRON BROWN. Republican leaders are so eager to confirm judges that they are willing to break the blue-slip tradition even when the nominee is the literal encapsulation of their party's most heartless policy, I might add—a policy that helped them lose the House and could help them lose future elections, if they only care about that.

Republican Senators still have a chance to reject the cynicism behind Mr. Readler's nomination. They have a chance to stand up for healthcare. I would ask my colleagues, is the confirmation of one circuit judge really

worth endorsing the position that our healthcare law should be repealed and Americans with preexisting conditions should not be protected? The answer to that question ought to be obvious.

I urge my Republican colleagues to vote no on Mr. Readler's nomination this afternoon.

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. THUNE. 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. THUNE. Mr. President, the more you look at the Green New Deal, the worse it looks. Last week, one think tank released a first estimate of what the Green New Deal would cost. Here is the answer: between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion over 10 years. Between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion. That is an unfathomable amount of money. The 2017 gross domestic product for the entire world, for the whole planet, came to \$80.7 trillion—more than \$10 trillion less than what Democrats are proposing to spend on the Green New Deal.

Mr. President, \$93 trillion is more than the amount of money the U.S. Government has spent in its entire history. Since 1789, when the Constitution went into effect, the Federal Government has spent a total of \$83.2 trillion. That is right—it has taken us 230 years of American history to spend the amount of money the Democrats want to spend in 10 years. Look at it this way: \$93 trillion is enough money to buy more than 7,000 Ford-class aircraft carriers. To put that in perspective, guess how many aircraft carriers the Navy currently has in its entire fleet. Eleven.

It is like the Democrats are playing pretend. It is like they are on a road trip, and they are trying to pass the time, and they say, "What would you do if you won the lottery?" or "What would you do if you had all the money in the world?" It is a fun game to play for a few minutes, but this is not a game. The government doesn't have all the money in the world. That \$93 trillion is going to have to come from somewhere.

Democrats like to suggest that we can pay for it and pay for just about anything simply by taxing the wealthy, but the truth is, taxing the wealthy or even the merely well-off isn't going to pay for this proposal. Taxing all the millionaires in the United States at a 100-percent tax rate for 10 years wouldn't add up anywhere close to \$93 trillion. Taxing every household making more than \$200,000 a year at a 100-percent tax rate for 10 years wouldn't get Democrats anywhere close to \$93 trillion. Let's take it a step further. Taxing every family making more than \$100,000 a year at a