This one is different. I am not opposed to discussing what role government should play in providing actual relief from the pandemic. We can and should have that debate. I welcome it. I would love to have it right now. In fact, that is a question that I think merits its own debate. This bill is not about that, not anything close to that. It is riddled with poor economic reasoning and rank political favoritism. It will only worsen our debt and our economic health in the long run. It doesn't help America's small businesses and families in the short run. It doesn't do anything to materially advance the cause of getting our children back to school at a time when they have suffered so greatly, not only academically but socially and in so many other ways. That is where we ought to be focused.

This bill comes nowhere close to addressing that issue, and, instead, it directs itself in other directions that are not only helpful, but in many cases they are the opposite of that.

It is sad. It is disappointing. And on that basis, I can't support this bill but would urge my colleagues to figure out ways to make it better. We don't have to do it this way. It doesn't have to be a deeply partisan vote. We can still choose a different path. I, for one, hope we will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, the circumstances that we face today in the Senate are so disturbing. This is really, really unbelievable. I mean, there is so much good news out there on the healthcare front, on the pandemic front, on the economic front. But what we are going to do in this Chamber is absolutely, absolutely appalling.

The Members of this Chamber came together five times last year and passed overwhelmingly bipartisan bills to deal with this pandemic, to deal with the economic crisis that came from the lockdown that we experienced—five times, about $4 trillion, completely unprecedented in scope and scale, the nature of it. Never imagined before, but we did it. We did it because we needed to, and we came together. I think it was the biggest of the bills passed—the biggest by far—without a single ''no'' vote in this whole Chamber, completely bipartisan.

So President Biden gets elected, gives a great speech, a great inaugural speech, about uniting the country, coming together: We don't have to be divided the way we have been. We can work together and find common ground.

So 10 Republican Senators go down to the White House and say: Well, Mr. President, I know you would like to do $1.9 trillion, whatever it is, but we think there is a good case for $600 billion.

Now, I don't happen to agree with those 10 Republican Senators, as it happens. I don't think even that is appropriate, but they did. And the reason that is significant is that there were 10 of them, which just so happens to be exactly the minimum number needed of Republican Senators to join with the Democrats to pass anything they want on a bipartisan basis. So there, handed to him on a silver platter, to the President, was the opportunity to do a bipartisan bill to figure out where that common ground was. The Republicans were offering to negotiate from there. This probably could have ended easily at $1 trillion or so after just weeks before passing a $1 trillion bill. The President could have gotten so much of what he wanted, but President Biden didn't want any part of that. You have to ask yourself, why is that when he campaigned as the guy who is going to unify America, and he had every Republican vote he needed sitting in his office, asking him to work this out? He said: No, not interested. Effectively, that is what he said.

Well, when you look at the bill, it is clear why President Biden chose this path, because there is no justification for this bill. There is no medical justification. There is no pandemic justification. There is no economic justification. This isn't about coming together and doing something about a crisis; this is about a partisan leftwing wish list. And, of course, Republicans aren't interested in that kind of political gesturing that is going to do economic damage.

I am reminded of the words of Rahm Emanuel, who famously said: ''You never want a serious crisis to go to waste.'' Rahm Emanuel must be very proud of our Democratic colleagues and President Biden because what they have done is they have taken a crisis that is rapidly receding—let's be honest—and they decided this is their chance to make one last mad dash to the door with a staggering amount of money and presumably claim credit for the recovery that is already well underway.

The good news is—there is a lot of good news, right? We went through one of the most trying times we have been through in a very long time in this country. This pandemic was devastating. It was deadly, it was scary, and the economic crisis was very, very real. But now we have over 100 million doses of vaccines that have gone into people's arms. You figure that we might very well have 100 million Americans who have had the disease and recovered. We have to have well over half of the American population who has either recovered or been vaccinated and is therefore no longer at risk to this disease—not a significant risk. That is fantastic news.

By the way, the vaccine administration is accelerating. Following that, we are unsurprisingly seeing this terrific collapse in the number of new cases. The daily count of new cases of the coronavirus, of COVID–19, peaked at around 250,000 new cases in a single day. We were running at that pace. By the time we got to the inauguration of President Biden, we were down to 185,000, and yesterday was about 60,000. So we are less than a quarter of the number of new cases on a daily basis that we were experiencing at the peak, and it continues to drop. It is going to continue to decline probably very rapidly as we continue to roll out these vaccines. That is terrific.

There is a sort of parallel recovery of the economy underway. If you go back to April of 2020, when it was at its worst, the unemployment rate was almost 15 percent, 14.8 percent. That is a terrible, terrible unemployment rate. As of January of this year, just a few months ago, the unemployment rate was 6.3 percent, less than half of where we were. We are not back to the fantastic economy we had a year ago just before this pandemic broke, but we are getting there. Eighteen States across the country have unemployment rates below 5 percent, so we are going to get there.

The economy is growing. After a collapse in the second quarter of last year, the third quarter came roaring back, and the fourth quarter grew. The Congressional Budget Office thinks that in this whole calendar year of 2021, our economy will grow almost 5 percent. Most private economists think it will be more than that. There is a lively debate about whether we will even reach 6 or 7 or more percent growth. We were told never again to expect to see 3 percent. But that is how strong this economic recovery is because of the resiliency of the American people, the tremendous ingenuity of the private sector to come up with vaccines that are incredibly effective—several of them—and do it in a record time, I mean a fraction of what was the previous record time. It is amazing.

And yes, you know what, we played a role in this too. I think we did. The bipartisan cooperation of Congress to pass one bill after another on a huge scale—like I said, five bills. The biggest was without a single dissenting—actually, I am not sure any of them had a dissenting vote in the Senate. And there was almost a trillion dollars in December, leaving tens of billions of dollars that we approved that haven't even been spent yet. The intended beneficiaries haven't gotten the money yet. It takes a little while to get the money out the door.

Given this context, given this history, this is why it is so dispiriting to see our Democratic colleagues insisting on a bill that has almost nothing to do with COVID. That is the truth. It is not about reopening the economy; it is a partisan leftwing spending binge. That is what it is. Let's take a look at some of the individual items.

We have these so-called stimulus checks—I never heard anything more inaptly named—$414 billion. The fact is, real, personal income in the country

today is higher than it was just before the pandemic. Disposable, real, per capita income rose at its highest rate since 1984. Personal savings rate hit an alltime record high in 2020. Why? Because we more than replaced lost income through all of the bills that we passed. What about that data suggests we need another round of universal payments to people? It is not going to stimulate the economy. Even the last check—60 percent of that money went to savings accounts or paying down debt. According to a Penn Wharton study, about 75 percent of these checks are going to go into savings.

Why in the world are we sending so many checks to tens of millions of people who never had any lost income? Under this bill, the Federal Government is going to send out $5,600 to a family of four—$5,600 to a family of four who makes $160,000 a year and never had a dime of income loss, no interruption of income, no loss of income. They are going to get $5,600. By the way, that is on top of the $5,800 they already got last year, with no need, no demonstrated problem here. So $11,400 of money that we don't have, we are going to send to people who never had a dime of lost income. That is a big chunk of this bill.

It may not be the worst. It may be that the worst is the $350 billion we are going to send to State and local governments to bail out the mismanaged blue States and cities. The amazing thing is, you can't possibly make the case that they need the bailout. They don't even need it. Why do I say that? Well, if you look in 2020—the books are closed now. We know what we didn't know early in the year of 2020. We are in 2021 now. We know what happened in 2020.

What happened was States and municipalities in the aggregate brought in more revenue in 2020 than they did in 2019, which was a record year. So they set an alltime new record for tax revenue collected—alltime new record. And that does not include the $500 billion we sent them anyway. I mean, these States are loaded with cash. I don't know what they are going to do with it.

There is $60 billion in rainy day funds. We heard: Oh my goodness, these States are going to have to cut essential services. All the teachers are going to be laid off. The firemen and the police officers are all done.

How is that when they have taken in more revenue than they ever have before in their history and then we sent them another $500 billion? Now we are going to send them yet another $350 on top of this? How does this make any sense at all? We are going to borrow or print this money so we can send it to a bunch of States, many of which are sitting on so much cash, they are going to probably cut taxes. It is just unbelievable.

Then there is the ObamaCare expansion. What does that have to do with COVID? This is just a decade-long goal of our Democratic colleagues to continue the endless expansion of ObamaCare. There is $45 billion in this bill to pay insurance companies more money to cover people who already have health insurance. That is what they are doing. Sixty-three percent of these new subsidies will go to people who already have health insurance through ObamaCare. By the way, it includes huge numbers of people who make over $100,000 a year. Never miss a chance to make more people dependent on government.

It has policies, big policies, that will absolutely slow the economic recovery. Let me be clear. This bill will slow down the economic recovery underway. Why do I say that? Well, the bill insists on adding $400 a week on top of whatever States are paying in unemployment benefits. Well, what does that mean? It means that more than half of everyone who is unemployed is going to get paid more not to work than they get paid working. Who could even think this up?

We have had unemployment insurance for decades in this country. We have never said: Let's systematically make sure that people can make more money not working than they can make if they go to work.

I hear some of my colleagues talk about the dignity of work. I think there is a lot of dignity in work. What is our message to people about the dignity of work when we say: You are worth more to us sitting on the couch than you are at your job. That is what this is. It is a terrible idea.

How do you know for sure that nobody on the other side is even pretending that this is really about the economic recovery? Well, you know for sure because the Congressional Budget Office has told us that only a fraction—a small fraction—of this money is even going to be spent this year. How long do we think the pandemic is going to be with us as a pandemic? How long do we think we are going to have these lockdowns? We are going to be out of the woods pretty soon here.

As I said, half of all Americans have already been either vaccinated or recovered from this. But the school numbers are a good illustration, the elementary and secondary education. This bill has $128 billion—$128 billion—and $6.5 billion is going to be spent in 2021. The rest gets dribbled out for years and years. How long do they think before schools can reopen? Oh, by the way, this bill doesn't require schools to reopen. You don't even have to reopen. Just throw billions and billions of dollars at schools whether or not they are actually having kids in the school.

Some of these provisions are so blatantly unrelated to COVID or the economy that it is really just hard to even read them with a straight face.

There is $86 billion to bail out multiemployer pension plans without any reform whatsoever. Look, we all know we have a multiemployer pension problem in this country, and there has been a lot of discussion about what do you do about these grossly underfunded pension plans and how do you fix this. The conversation has always been, what kinds of reforms come with what kind of cash so that these errors of the past are corrected? There are no reforms here. None. Nothing. Just a big pile of cash. It is a clear message that you don't have to fix anything. You don't have to reform the flaws of these programs that got us here. And by the way, it is the same message to the insolvent public pension plans of most of the major cities in many States: Don't worry. Look what Congress will do if the Democrats have their way. They will just send you so much cash, you don't have to worry about the insolvency you are dealing with.

What a terrible message.

There is $270 million for the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities. That is COVID-related. Thank goodness that is there.

There is $91 million for ''outreach'' to student loan borrowers. I don't even know what that means.

There is $50 million for environmental justice grants. I have no idea what that means.

But this one is really rich. There is about $4 billion for ''socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers.'' I say ''about $4 billion'' because it says ''such sums as may be necessary.'' Here is what the money is for. It is going to pay off 120 percent of the debt of these farmers and ranchers, 120 percent of the borrowings.

So what in the world are the requirements to have 120 percent of your debt paid off? Well, you actually have to have debt. OK, so you have to have borrowed money from the USDA farm loan. There are tens of billions of dollars out there. They lend a lot of money. And you have to be a member of one of the following groups: African American, American Indian, Alaskan Native, Asian, Hispanic, Pacific Islanders, refugees, or immigrants.

As long as you are in one of those categories of mostly racial and ethnic groups, then the taxpayers are going to pay off 120 percent. It is not the whole loan but more than the whole loan—120 percent.

The thing that is so disturbing about this is that the essential criterion is your skin color. The essential criterion is your race. This is unbelievable to me. By the way, there is no income test and no asset test for the underlying loans. There is no requirement whatsoever that COVID caused any problem—caused any lost income or any other problem. It is not mentioned.

So what is the effect of this?

This means that, if you have a wealthy Hispanic rancher who has a $1 million loan from the USDA, he is going to get $1.2 million and pay off the loan—200,000 bucks with which to do whatever he likes. Meanwhile, if you are a poor White farmer in rural Pennsylvania and you have a $100,000 loan, you get nothing, exactly nothing. How

is that even remotely fair? I don't even know how that could be constitutional. It is, certainly, not in any way COVID related.

There was an amendment in the House that would have limited the payment. It would have allowed the program, which I object to, but it would have allowed this repayment of debt but only for debt incurred during the COVID crisis. The Democrats all voted that down. That failed. This is unbelievable stuff.

Even the provisions that purport to be about public health are completely divorced from any reality. As I think I mentioned earlier, we are administering almost 2 million doses of vaccines every day now. That is terrific. It is actually the highest daily rate of doses administered anywhere in the world. The government has already purchased 700 million doses. Now, we have fewer than 350 million Americans, and not all Americans are going to need two doses. You can do the math: We have bought more vaccine doses than we need to administer, and that is fine. Yet how many more do you need to buy when you have already bought more than enough for every single American?

That is not all we paid for. Through the previous bills that we passed, we paid for the research and development. We paid for the production. We paid for the transportation. We paid for all of the accompanying supplies, like the syringes, the vials, and the dry ice. We paid for all of that, and we should have. That was the right thing to do. Insurance covers the cost of the administering of the vaccines. Between Medicare and Medicaid and private insurance, it is free. What is left to spend money on? I am all ears, but I haven't heard what we need to spend money on.

So what do we have in this bill?

We have no justification for it in terms of public health. We certainly have no justification for it in terms of the economy. We certainly have no justification for it in terms of basic fairness. Frankly, it is going to do more harm than good, but you don't have to take my word for it. We could take the word of prominent liberal Democrat economist Larry Summers. He was the Treasury Secretary under President Clinton, and he was the Director of the National Economic Council under President Obama.

He said about this bill:

> [M]acroeconomic stimulus on a scale closer to World War II levels than normal recession levels will set off inflationary pressures of a kind we have not seen in a generation.

Or consider the words of Steve Rattner, who is a liberal economist. President Obama named him the ''car czar.'' You may recall him administering that program.

He said of the American Rescue Plan, which is, apparently, what they call this:

> The American Rescue Plan is also partly a legislative Trojan horse—an enormous aid package aimed at addressing needs that, in some cases, go well beyond the immediate challenges of COVID. Some of the most expensive provisions are the least well targeted to help the neediest.

That is from a liberal Democrat who, I think, supports the bill, but at least he is being honest in his description of it.

So my suggestion, my plea, to my Democratic colleagues and to the new President is to listen to some of the things you have said. Try an approach that is actually informed by the facts on the ground—the health facts, the economic facts, the reality. Look at what the science is currently telling us about the course that this virus has been taking. What about actually attempting to bring people together—the path of unity—after we demonstrated five times last year that we can work together and do something on a bipartisan basis?

I urge my colleagues: Don't push through this radically partisan bill that will probably, in the end, do more harm than good.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, let me first say that I wish this Chamber were full of our colleagues who had listened to my Republican colleague's description—the Senator from Pennsylvania—of what this bill is and what this bill isn't. It is not a COVID relief bill. Senator TOOMEY did an excellent job. I am hoping that people are watching it on their TV screens. They really can't be reading the bill yet because it is not constructed. I don't want to repeat all of the excellent points the Senator from Pennsylvania made, but I wanted to come down because I think we have grown immune to these vast amounts of money.

I always knew we were going to be in big trouble when we stopped talking about hundreds of billions of dollars and switched to talking about trillions of dollars. When we talk about $1 trillion or $2 trillion, it just doesn't sound like as much as $200 billion or $800 billion, which was in the stimulus package under the Obama administration. The fact of the matter is we have already authorized $4 trillion in COVID relief. That is 18 percent of last year's GDP, and, roughly, $1 trillion is yet to be spent. Some of that isn't even obligated, and we are going to be debating, over the next couple of days, $1.9 trillion. So I just wanted to come down here to the floor and try to illustrate what a massive amount of money $1.9 trillion is. You have to use analogies. Again, the human mind really can't contemplate what ''a trillion'' is.

I found this first analogy—my wife talked to me about it—in terms of time. This one is simply talking about, if I would give the Presiding Officer $1 per second, how long would it take me to give her $1 million? You see the chart here. It would take 11.6 days. Again, with $1 per second, how long would it take to give her $1 million? 11.6 days.

The next question: How long would it take you to accumulate $1 billion?

Again, when you do the math, you find out it would take 31.7 years. That was back when the Chinese had their protests in Tiananmen Square.

The next question: What about $1 trillion?

This is what becomes mind-boggling. If I gave you $1 every second and I wanted to give you $1 trillion, it would take 31,688 years to give you $1 trillion. That takes us back to beyond the last glaciation period, a period in time when Wisconsin was under a mile-thick glacier.

By the way, as a quick aside for my colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island, since that point in time, about 20,000 years ago, the water level in the San Francisco Bay has increased 390 feet. Now, that is global warming—that is a rise in sea level—but that is what happened through natural causes. That was an aside.

How long would it take to accumulate $1.9 trillion? Over 60,000 years. Again, put that in context. The human race began to develop language about 50,000 years ago. So that is the time analogy.

Another way of looking at this is through distance and volume. So here is the calculation. I should have brought a $1 bill to just demonstrate its thickness, but the thickness of a $1 bill is 4.3-thousandths-of-an-inch thick. To illustrate how much $1 trillion is, let's start with $1 million. If you stacked a million dollar bills on top of each other, they would stack up to be 358 feet high. You can see the calculation here. That is about a 30- to 35-foot-story building.

How big would a stack of a billion dollar bills be? It would be 67.86 miles.

Now, there is something called the Karman line. I think I am pronouncing that right. That is the point at which the atmosphere ends and outer space begins. That is 62 miles. So a stack of a billion dollar bills would actually exceed the atmosphere and extend into outer space—62 miles.

Then, the next question is: How big would a stack be of a trillion dollar bills? Well, it would be 1,000 times that. So it would be 67,866 miles high. That is an astonishingly large stack of dollar bills that equals $1 trillion.

Again, we are not just talking about $1 trillion. We are not talking just about 67,000 miles worth. We are talking about $1.9 trillion, which would stack up to be 135,732 miles high. The distance to the Moon is 238,900 miles. So that stack of $1.9 trillion worth of $1 bills would be more than halfway to the Moon. That is what we are debating spending—a stack of dollar bills that extends more than halfway the distance to the Moon. This is at a point in time when we are about $28 trillion in debt. That single stack would be