

real enemies are their political opponents, I assume, will follow his lead and vote no. They can tell American families they care more about politics than helping them.

But Senators who want to move forward will vote yes. They will vote to advance this process so we can shape it into a bipartisan product and make a law for the American people. That is what working families need. They need us to act. They need us to legislate. Today, they will see exactly who has their backs.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Hala Y. Jarbou, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, once again this week, Republicans are bringing forward a proposal to provide additional coronavirus relief to help protect jobs, to get kids and teachers back in the classroom safely, and to provide funding for the treatments and vaccines we need to defeat this virus, and once again, Democrats are objecting. It is the same old song: Republicans' bill doesn't spend enough. Well, let's talk about that for a minute.

First of all, Republicans are not claiming that the bill we put on the floor this week contains the last dollars we will need to spend in response to the coronavirus. We may need to spend more. This bill is simply an attempt to direct relief funds to some of the biggest priorities right now, like helping the hardest hit small businesses weather this crisis and providing more resources for testing, treatment, and vaccines. These are areas we should all agree on.

Second of all, Democrats' coronavirus proposal—the \$3 trillion bill they proposed—is both unrealistic and irresponsible.

Our Nation is deeply, deeply in debt right now. Next year, our country will owe more than we produce for the first time since the end of World War II. That is a very bad place to be. That is getting toward the kind of debt-to-GDP ratio that helped bring about financial disaster in Greece. While the United States is not Greece, if we grow our debt enough, what happened to the Greek economy could happen here.

Being the United States of America does not exempt us from financial realities. In times of crisis, sometimes you have to borrow money, and that is what we had to do earlier this year with the CARES Act and other coronavirus relief legislation. But we have an absolute responsibility to every American, to every hard-working individual in this country to ensure that we are only borrowing what is absolutely necessary.

Democrats' proposal doesn't even come close to meeting the definition of "necessary spending." To give just one example, Democrats have proposed appropriating a staggering \$1 trillion for States even though the States still—still—haven't spent the money we provided for them in the original CARES Act. Now, it is certainly possible that at some point, we will have to provide some kind of additional assistance to States, but to create a trillion-dollar slush fund for States before they have even spent the money they have already been given would be an incredibly irresponsible use of taxpayer dollars. At least some of that money could be used for coronavirus relief.

Other money in the Democrats' bill would go to measures that have nothing—absolutely nothing—to do with the virus, things like diversity studies in the cannabis industry, a soil health study, federalizing elections, and tax cuts for millionaires in States like New York and California.

One of the biggest priorities in the wake of the coronavirus is helping Americans keep their jobs or to find new ones. It should be front and center in any relief bill. Yet Democrats' massive bill—over \$3 trillion in the Democrats' bill—manages to mention the word "cannabis" more often than the word "job." Diversity studies for marijuana are more important, evidently, than jobs—at least if you look at the Democrats' bill. That should tell you all you need to know about the seriousness of the Democrats' proposal. I would love for the Democratic leader to come down to the floor and explain how a bill that mentions the word "cannabis" more often than the word "job" is a serious coronavirus bill.

Of course, despite the unseriousness of the Democrats' proposal, Republicans have been willing to compromise on a coronavirus bill from the very beginning. We understand how negotiation works, and we knew that we would have to give some ground and that Democrats would have to give some ground. We were and are willing to do just that. But from the beginning,

Democrats have rejected serious negotiation. Sure, they sat in meetings, and they talked about a bill, but at the end of the day, Democrats refused to compromise. It was their bill or no bill, which means that so far, they have chosen no bill.

The only way to get a bill through the Senate and to the President's desk is to develop a compromise bill. Even if the majority leader puts Democrats' exact bill on the floor today, there is no way—no way—it would make it through the Senate, much less be signed into law by the President. So if the Democrats really want a bill, they are going to have to compromise, and that is something they have continued to refuse to do, which leads to the logical conclusion that Democrats don't want a bill at all.

If Democrats really wanted to get relief to Americans, they would work with Republicans to pass a compromise bill even if it didn't contain all the money Democrats want, because even if it were true that the Republican legislation is inadequate, some money is better than no money. If you can't get someone in need all the money you think they should have, you should get them what money you can.

If Democrats really thought it was of overwhelming importance that we deliver relief to Americans right now, they would be working with Republicans to get as much relief as they could through Congress. But, for Democrats, delivering relief to Americans is not really of overwhelming importance. What is of overwhelming importance to Democrats is keeping coronavirus alive as a political issue, and if that means no bill, well then Democrats are OK with that. They would rather have no bill, zero funding, and a political weapon than to have a bill and allow Republicans to say that we helped Americans. So all indications are that when we have a vote later today, they plan to filibuster this bill.

This is not the first time we have seen this. Think back to the end of June. In the wake of George Floyd's death at the knee of a police officer, Americans of all parties came together to push for police reform. Republicans put a police reform bill on the floor of the Senate for debate and amendment—a substantial bill that included 75 to 80 percent of what both Democrats and Republicans said they wanted, the product of years of research and work by Senator TIM SCOTT, who has personal experience on this issue.

And Democrats? Well, Democrats filibustered. That is right. In the face of a nationwide call for police reform legislation, Democrats refused to even move forward to debate the legislation. Why? Because agreeing to work with Republicans on legislation would have taken away much of Democrats' ability to exploit police reform as a political issue. So Democrats filibustered even though, remarkably, they were offered by Senator SCOTT and other supporters