

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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

100-percent tax rate for 10 years would still leave Democrats far short of \$93 trillion.

The Green New Deal is not a plan that can be paid for merely by taxing the rich. Actually implementing the Green New Deal would involve taking money not just from the well-off but from working families—and not a little bit of money either. Ninety-three trillion dollars breaks down to over \$650,000 per household over 10 years. That is more than \$65,000 per household, per year—more than the median household income in the United States. In other words, the cost per household for just 1 year of the Green New Deal is more than the yearly income of 50 percent of American households.

Let's leave aside the stratospheric cost for just a minute and talk about the other consequences of the Green New Deal.

Democrats' Green New Deal would put the government in charge of a large portion of the economy and significantly shrink Americans' freedom. Under this bill, the government will impose new and stringent regulations on your appliances, your car, your house, and your place of business. It will limit your electricity options. It will put the government in charge of your healthcare. I know that is not really energy-related, but the Green New Deal's authors went beyond energy to include a full socialist wish list.

Your options for travel may be limited. A fact sheet released—and later deleted—by one of the authors of the Green New Deal called for a plan to “build out high-speed rail at a scale where air travel stops becoming necessary.” Well, that might work between DC and Boston, but it is not going to work so well if you have family in Hawaii. I don't think the high-speed rail is going to reach that far. I would say that you could make the trip by passenger ship, but, of course, we don't know whether ships as we know them would exist under the Green New Deal. After all, the plan's authors want to eliminate fossil fuels, which power ships, as well as your car and your home.

Incidentally, while we are on the subject, it is worth mentioning that the Governor of California recently scaled back California's high-speed rail project. Why? Because it was costing too much money.

Under the Green New Deal, if you like your car, you probably won't be able to keep it. If you like your healthcare, you probably won't be able to keep it. If you like your house, you may not be able to keep that either. That same fact sheet from one of the Green New Deal's authors says that we need to “upgrade or replace every building in [the] U.S.”

There is no question that we need to protect our environment. There is no question that we should be developing clean energy sources and building on our existing clean energy technologies.

I would tell the Chair that my home State of South Dakota is leading the way on this issue. In fact, my colleagues may be surprised to know that according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, South Dakota generates an average of two-fifths to half of its electricity from hydroelectric facilities along the Missouri River. Combined with our abundant wind generation, which provides roughly 30 percent of our electricity, South Dakota's net utility-scale energy generation is over 75 percent renewables.

I am proud of South Dakota's renewable energy achievements, and I think we should be encouraging improved domestic energy production, increasing America's renewable energy supply, and reducing consumption through improved efficiencies. What we should not be doing is adopting a wildly irresponsible, completely unworkable, and utterly unrealistic proposal that would drive taxes through the roof, reduce Americans' standard of living, and permanently damage our economy.

We are going to be voting on the Democrat's Green New Deal proposal in the coming weeks, and it will be interesting to see where all of my colleagues stand on this socialist fantasy.

You just heard the Democratic leader, the Senator from New York, say that it is a gimmick and we shouldn't be voting on this. It is the first time I think I have ever heard a leader of one of the parties here in the Senate come forward and say that we shouldn't vote on something that 11 of his Democratic colleagues have cosponsored. He doesn't want to vote on a piece of legislation that is put forward by 11 Democrats here in the Senate.

Well, I think it is important for the American people to know. I think it is important for Members of the Senate to go on record on whether they think this is a good idea or whether they think, as I think most Americans would believe, this is a crazy idea that would wreck the economy, cost Americans' jobs, and punish working families in this country with higher costs for literally everything they face in their daily lives.

For the sake of our economy and for working families, I hope that when this vote comes, at least some Democrats will slow their party's headlong rush to become the Socialist Party and not what we have historically known as the Democratic Party in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Ohio.

NOMINATION OF CHAD A. READLER

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, judges are making decisions around the country right now on voting rights, on civil rights, on women's rights, on LGBTQ rights, decisions that could limit those rights not just for a year or for a decade but for a generation. They make decisions on healthcare; they make decisions on sentencing; and they make decisions on corporate power. We have seen judge after judge, especially on

the Supreme Court, put their thumbs on the scales of justice by favoring corporations over workers, by favoring Wall Street over consumers, and by favoring health insurance companies over patients. That is, fundamentally, why we in Ohio cannot afford to have Chad Readler on the bench.

Look at an op-ed he took upon himself to write as a private citizen, which reads we should allow the execution of 16-year-olds—kids, children who are 16 years old.

This is at a time when we are taking important, bipartisan steps forward on sentencing reform, and this Senate doesn't come together very often. This Senate, under Senator McCONNELL's leadership, actually came together in a bipartisan way. After all of the mostly unworkable pieces of legislation he has written that always help the rich, the President of the United States signed a bill, in this case, in which we did the right thing by taking bipartisan steps forward on sentencing reform.

How do you turn around and put someone on the bench for life who supports executing children? That is what a 16-year-old is—still a teenager, still a child under the law. Yet he thinks it is something we should do—execute children who are found guilty.

During his nomination hearing, it was pretty unbelievable that Readler stood by his op-ed and refused to disavow his support for using the death penalty on high schoolers and, possibly, on even younger children. I guess I give him credit for consistency.

His record on voting rights is equally despicable. He worked on behalf of a far-right group and argued for the elimination of Golden Week, something passed by Republicans that had been in effect for more than a decade, which means he was limiting the amount of time people can vote early, and he defended restrictive voter ID and provisional ballot laws. We know exactly whom those laws target—people of color, the elderly, young voters. They are the same people, in many cases, who face literacy tests and poll taxes. They are the people JOHN LEWIS and the foot soldiers of Selma were marching for 54 years ago tomorrow across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

It is shameful that, half a century later, we are fighting that same fight. Chad Readler again is on the wrong side. We can't afford another judge on the bench who works to undo Selma's legacy.

We can't afford another judge who has made it his mission to take away Americans' healthcare. Chad Readler's work threatens the healthcare coverage of 20 million Americans who have preexisting conditions. Last summer, Readler did what three career attorneys with the Department of Justice refused to do. He filed a brief that challenged the law that protects Americans with preexisting conditions. He filed a brief nobody else was willing to file. They all recused themselves. They all refused to do it. They thought it was