

speak with a united voice and set a good example for our Nation at a time like this.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of my resolution at the desk; further, that the resolution be agreed to; that the preamble be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I appreciate my colleague's interest in expressing support for the brave men and women of law enforcement. That is exactly what my resolution does. Why, then, would my colleague object to my resolution and propose his own to accomplish the same thing?

At first, his resolution appears to resemble my own. I note, however, that my resolution condemns not only the cowardly attacks of this past week on the Los Angeles County sheriff's deputies but also condemns the rhetoric and policies that have incited this recent spike in targeted violence against law enforcement. My colleague's resolution makes no such condemnation.

My resolution calls out the radical politicians, reckless media figures, and organized protest movements that have sought to vilify law enforcement officers as a whole and incite, encourage, or celebrate widespread criminal activity and violence against law enforcement officers. My colleague's resolution is silent about this.

My resolution calls out the radical politicians for pursuing a dangerous campaign to defund the police and starving law enforcement agencies of much needed resources to combat the crime wave sweeping through our communities. My colleague's resolution makes no such condemnation.

We have to be honest about what is happening here and across our great country. We have rioters chanting "Let them die" outside a hospital caring for two police officers who were violently attacked. "Let them die"?

Americans have the right to peacefully protest, and I support that right. But that is not what we are talking about here. We are talking about acts of violence against law enforcement, families, and businesses. My colleague's proposal takes out all references to this bad behavior.

Expressing support for law enforcement without condemning the people and groups who are perpetrating, instigating, and celebrating the violent acts committed against law enforcement officers is not enough. We can't be afraid to condemn violence against law enforcement and the defund police movement. I have no such fear.

Those radical politicians, reckless media figures, and organized protest movements deserve to be condemned for inciting, committing, and cele-

brating acts of violence against law enforcement. I stand firmly behind my resolution and behind our Nation's law enforcement.

If my colleague would be willing to work with me, we may be able to find common ground to ensure any resolution includes language that firmly denounces the violence and the causes of that violence in our communities, but my colleague's resolution does not go far enough, so I therefore respectfully object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. UDALL. Yes, there is. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. UDALL. 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. BRAUN. 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 Senator from Indiana.

50-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE VINCENNES UNIVERSITY JASPER CAMPUS

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I rise this evening to recognize the 50-year anniversary of Vincennes University Jasper Campus.

Vincennes University was founded in 1801 as part of the Northwest Territory back then that would later become the State of Indiana. For over 200 years, Vincennes University has been a premier institution of higher learning for those seeking knowledge in manufacturing, logistics, aviation, and other important fields of study.

In 1970, when I was a mere junior in high school, this university expanded and established a new campus in my hometown.

With open enrollment and concentrating on jobs with fields where there were employee shortages, Vincennes University Jasper Campus is providing opportunities for all Hoosiers to add new skills to their resume that will ultimately lead to good-paying jobs, mostly right there in Indiana.

Notably, with their partnership with Purdue University, this campus provides low-income students or those in need of remedial coursework with a stepping stone to one of the Nation's top engineering schools.

I have to admit, VU Jasper Campus holds a special place in my heart. At the company I founded in the early eighties, we use this as an excellent source of recruiting people into our own company who generally come there fully skilled, ready to go, and generally end up sticking with the job, which is great.

As a Jasper native, I have seen firsthand what an asset this campus has been to our community and the economic benefit it has added to Dubois and surrounding counties.

We are lucky to have VU in Jasper, and I am happy to be here on the floor of the U.S. Senate to celebrate with them on their golden anniversary.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss this unprecedented obstruction that American families are facing from the Democrats. In a time when Congress really should be working toward bipartisan solutions on coronavirus, Democrats keep obstructing—over and over and over again.

It does seem to be their singular focus. It seems to me that they are going to continue to obstruct all the way until November 3, election day, putting politics first and American families last.

The obstruction has reached levels that has even made Members of their own caucus "uncomfortable," "alarmed," and "frustrated." Now, those are not my words; they are the words of Democrats sitting in Congress, in the United States, in this very building. Democrats are telling their leaders that the leaders are failing them by failing to compromise and work together toward solutions that would benefit the American people.

So the bad news for American families is that, last week, Democrats in this body, in the U.S. Senate, blocked, obstructed a targeted coronavirus aid package with policies, amazingly, that the Democrats had at one time supported. But they came here to the floor of the Senate and voted, in lockstep, no—no to children, no to jobs, no to paychecks, no to fighting the disease.

They actually blocked relief that would, one, have gotten kids back to school so kids wouldn't fall further behind from the school they have already missed, and it would have let parents get back to work. They voted no. They blocked people getting back to work safely. They blocked paycheck protection money so that paychecks could continue to go and businesses—small businesses—could remain open.

They blocked money for vaccines and treatment, for testing, so we could put the disease in the rearview mirror.

Now, the good news is that the majority of the Senate did support the legislation to help children and their parents and workers and the small businesses and the medical personnel fighting against the disease. But all those votes came from the Republican side of the aisle. Republicans are united. The Republican bill received 52 "yes" votes. All 52 were Republican. Not one single Democrat voted yes, even though the majority of that body had backed the relief efforts.

When you talked to them, they said, oh, yes, they are for this and this and this, but they voted on the U.S. Senate floor to block it. It is interesting. They even blocked allowing the Senate to discuss these issues. All we did was

come to the floor and say: We have some proposals. Let's discuss them. If you don't like them, offer amendments. We can discuss those, debate those.

They even blocked a motion to move to get that bill to the floor of the Senate—step 1 of legislating. They said no. So they may say they want to help the American people, but that is not what happened on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

The New York Times had a headline that said: "Hopes Dim for More Stimulus as Democrats Block Narrow GOP Plan." Well, they are right; it is a narrow plan because it is targeted. It is targeted to kids and schools, to workers, jobs, and the disease.

It doesn't include all of the extraneous things that NANCY PELOSI and the House put in: money for environmental justice; money for the National Endowment; money for this, that, and the next thing; money for—you name it—direct paychecks to illegal immigrants. That is just the tip of the iceberg when you take a look at their entire list. To me, it was NANCY PELOSI living on "Fantasy Island."

POLITICO said of the vote: "Senate Democrats block Republican COVID relief proposal"—Senate Democrats block—once again, blocking the things that the American families all across this country are asking when they look to Congress for help and relief.

USA TODAY had the headline: "Senate Democrats block \$300 billion coronavirus stimulus package, leaving little hope for relief before November"—\$300 billion. That is a huge amount of money that could do so much to help our schools, to help our students, to help small businesses, to help our workers, and to help fight the disease.

Unfortunately, this has been the record that we have seen coming from the Democrats ever since the pandemic began. While the virus was raging in March, Democrats delayed help for Americans by blocking the CARES Act.

The New York Times headline at that time, on March 22, said: "Emergency Economic Rescue Plan in Limbo as Democrats Block Action." So they were blocking it back in March, and they were blocking it last Thursday.

In April, as small businesses were forcibly shut down by the government, they were fighting to, one day, reopen their doors—that is all they wanted to do, get back to business; they wanted to keep employees on the payroll—Democrats, once again, blocked funding for the Paycheck Protection Program.

This is a wonderful program, Mr. President. Thirteen thousand of these loans were taken in the State of Wyoming by small businesses. I am sure, in your home State of South Dakota, similar small businesses took advantage of this opportunity. Our average loan was about \$78,000. These are small businesses that just needed help making the payroll, keeping people work-

ing, keeping people on the payroll, looking forward to the days that they could return to business as usual.

What was the NPR, National Public Radio, point on this on April 9? It was this: "Senate Democrats Block GOP Efforts to Boost Small Business Aid"—Senate Democrats blocking aid for small businesses all across the country.

Then, in August, as unemployment insurance was set to expire, Republicans asked for consent on this floor to extend the program. Democrats came to this very floor and, once again, objected.

So, today, with an opportunity to finish the fight against coronavirus, the Democrats have a full roadblock in place against any further relief. The cold, hard truth that we face is that they have delayed aid, and they have divided this country all year long.

I would go so far as to say this has hurt the country; it has hurt families; it has hurt our students; it has hurt our schools; it has hurt our healthcare providers; and it has certainly hurt people trying to recover from the disease.

Remember that the year started with the Democrats' completely partisan impeachment farce. We sat here, day after day, listening as the Democrats brought forth charge after charge against the President. That is how we started the year, and now we are ending with their blocking of coronavirus relief.

Let me assure the country, Republicans will not let you down. Republicans will continue working to put the virus in the rearview mirror and deliver what we are seeing right now, and it is the great American comeback. It is people getting back to work—over 10 million Americans back to work over the last 4 months. It is an unemployment rate down below 9 percent. It was over 9 percent for 4 months.

It is businesses reopening, kids going back to school, a vaccine on the way—great, optimistic ideas and thoughts regarding the vaccine. I met with the Secretary of Health and Human Services earlier today. I am very encouraged and optimistic about a vaccine being available to many at the end of the year.

So there is a lot to be optimistic about as the country comes back from the coronavirus because this is the great American comeback.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. BARRASSO assumed the Chair.)

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here on the floor this evening to talk about what Congress needs to do right now to help the American people with regard to this coronavirus pandemic. We are not out of the woods yet. People are still struggling, with the economy being weak, and we still have a real healthcare crisis to deal with.

Since this crisis began, Congress has come together as Republicans and Democrats both here in the Senate and

over in the House, working with the White House, to pass five coronavirus bills—five. Legislation addressed both the healthcare crisis and the economic free-fall that were caused by the virus and also by the government-imposed shutdowns. The biggest of these bills was the one you hear most about; that is, the roughly \$2 trillion in the CARES Act that was passed by a vote in this Chamber of 96 to 0—totally bipartisan.

Unfortunately, since May, when the last of these bipartisan bills was enacted, partisanship has prevailed over policy, and Washington has been paralyzed, unable to repeat the coming together for the public good.

Democrats in this Chamber have consistently insisted that the only way forward is a bill called the Heroes Act. This is a \$3.5 trillion piece of legislation that passed the House of Representatives 4 months ago along partisan lines.

By the way, \$3.5 trillion would be the most expensive legislation ever to be enacted.

When this bill passed the House 4 months ago, POLITICO and others in the media accurately called it a messaging bill that had no chance of becoming law.

It is disappointing that Democrats have continued to push this "my way or the highway" approach because this bill is a nonstarter for a lot of reasons, including the price tag and the fact that it includes non-COVID-related provisions. To name one example, it repeals the State and local tax deduction cap. That is a \$135 billion Tax Code change, and most of the benefit is going to go to the top 1 percent of wage earners. What does it have to do with COVID-19?

Now is not the time to give tax breaks to the wealthy, to make changes to our immigration policy, or impose unprecedented mandates on State election procedures that are normally in the province of the States, not us—all of which are part of the Heroes Act. Instead, this should be a time where we focus on what the American people need right now and help them to handle this healthcare and economic challenge they are facing, but that hasn't happened.

Last week I spoke on this floor about all the things in the targeted bill that was voted on last Thursday in this Chamber, where there is bipartisanship, where Democrats and Republican actually agree.

I talked about the need to extend the PPP program—Paycheck Protection Program—which is helping small businesses keep their doors open, but it expired on August 8. A lot of small businesses are saying to me back home in Ohio: I am barely holding on. When is this coming? I need an extension to this program.

Yet we can't seem to get our act together here even though it is totally nonpartisan, as far as I can tell.

The bill we voted on last Thursday also has more funding for something

desperately needed in my home State of Ohio and other States around the country, which is more money for testing. It also has more money, by the way, for developing a vaccine more quickly and effectively and for getting these anti-viral therapies up and going. All of this is stuff we should be able to agree on, right? No, we haven't been able to.

Another thing that was in that bill last Thursday was providing funding for the schools so they can reopen—K-12 but also for our colleges and universities. These schools are starting to reopen, and they need the help badly. Actually, it had enough funding in there that it was slightly more than the funding that was in the Heroes Act, the Democrats' proposal, for the same purpose—\$105 billion. Why couldn't we get together?

What else did it have? It had something very important for a lot of people who lost their jobs through no fault of their own. It had an extension of the current Federal supplement for unemployment insurance in the States. It had a \$300-per-week, Federal-taxpayer-paid additional supplement on top of the roughly \$350 that States already provide on average for unemployment. Yet that was rejected.

We couldn't even have a good vote to proceed on the bill, to have a debate on the bill so we could have an honest debate and say, oh, \$300 is too much, or it is not enough, or maybe the PPP program needs to be slightly changed this way or that way, or maybe there is less money for schools needed or more money for schools.

We couldn't even get on the bill because you need 60 votes to do that, and we only had 52, which is a majority of this Chamber, but it is not the 60-vote supermajority. Fifty-two Republicans supported it. Unfortunately, no Democrats were able to support it. I don't get that because all we were saying was, let's get on this bill and have a debate, and if later on in the process you don't like where we ended up, there is another 60-vote margin, and you can filibuster it again.

We couldn't even get on the bill to have a debate. To me, that is really sad because the American people weren't given the opportunity to get some help, but also they weren't given the opportunity to see what the differences are and have this out in the open.

That is legislation that 52 Republicans supported. We are ready to go. Let's have the discussion. Let's have the debate.

The Federal funds to help the unemployed get by was a particular concern of mine, and I want to focus on that tonight. That unemployment benefit is a classic example of where Senate Democrats have blocked what I think is a reasonable compromise—I will explain why I think that—and instead have decided to provide nothing. Nothing.

What we should do instead is we should embrace a compromise together for these families who continue to

struggle to make ends meet because some people can't go back to work still because their movie theater or their bowling alley or their motor coach company can't hire them. Either they are shut down or they simply can't hire them back. There are people who are unemployed who still need our help.

Early on in this pandemic, both Republicans and Democrats recognized this. We recognized the need to bolster the State-run unemployment insurance programs to help offset the massive job losses we saw in March and April. That is why the CARES Act we talked about earlier—this bipartisan bill—contained an unprecedented \$600-per-week additional Federal supplement on top of the State supplement for 4 months.

By the way, the State benefit in Ohio on average is \$360. The \$600 was on top of \$360, coming up to \$960 per week. We did that for a period of 4 months. That provided an important income source for a lot of people. It made a huge difference in the lives of a lot of people who early on couldn't work because the government was actually closing down businesses, saying: You can't open.

Some say that was too much. We will talk about why they say that. But it was a big help, and it was appropriate in a sense at the time to do something that big because the government itself was saying: You are going to lose your job through no fault of your own. We the government are saying you have to shut down, so we are going to provide you an unemployment benefit.

It was also used for other things—to pay rent, to pay that car payment, to just get by.

As the year has gone on, we have made progress now on slowing the spread of the coronavirus, adding testing, adding more personal protective gear, and so on. Many parts of our economy have been able to reopen in a safe and sustainable manner. And that is good. Without the help we provided in the legislation—the five bills we passed—we wouldn't be so far along. They helped. They helped keep the doors open at a lot of small businesses. They helped provide the money for our healthcare system, for testing.

With that reopening around the country, hiring picked back up, and now we have far fewer people on unemployment than we did at the beginning of this pandemic. So there are fewer people who need unemployment insurance. Unemployment is at about 8.4 percent. That is what it was last month. That is down from over 15 percent in the spring. Now, 8.4 percent is still too high, particularly compared to the record lows we saw just before this pandemic. It is more than twice what it was then. But it is undoubtedly a step in the right direction. Unemployment claims are either holding steady or dropping now in most States. That is good.

With this positive progress we were seeing, I think it was fair for Congress to want to take another look at the original unemployment insurance sup-

plement, which expired at the end of July, and see whether there was a new supplement that we could continue to help those in need while better reflecting this improved economy and the need for workers rather than a situation where the government was actually imposing shutdowns of much of our economy.

That is where things broke down. At the end of July, the \$600 supplement ended. Everybody knew it was going to end then. But Republicans and Democrats couldn't agree on how to best structure an additional UI supplement.

By the way, having differences isn't unusual around here. We have debates all the time. That debate was a big part of the negotiations in July and August. What is disappointing to me and to many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and to so many people we represent is that instead of taking us up on our offer that we offered—to extend the \$600 per week to be able to negotiate something, for 2 weeks, which would have put a lot of pressure on the negotiations—think about it—the Democrats said no. I don't know why they said no, but Democrats would not even allow us to extend the \$600 to put pressure on negotiations. Deliberately, they allowed these benefits to expire. It went from a \$600 benefit on top of the State benefit to zero Federal benefit.

Let me repeat that. Rather than work to agree on a weeklong extension of a lifeline for so many people to buy time to work something out, Democrats instead chose to let these benefits expire and allowed millions of Americans to go without benefits.

When we hit this impasse on the UI issue that Congress just couldn't break, the Trump administration stepped in, and President Trump quickly signed an Executive order on August 8—so a week after the benefit expired—which authorized FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, to begin distributing an emergency lost wage assistance unemployment check.

So the government stepped in at the executive branch and said: You guys in Congress can't figure this out. The \$600 has gone to zero, so you just have the State benefit now, and you have a lot of people still unemployed through no fault of their own. It is tough to get by on 360 bucks a week.

So President Trump and his administration stepped in and said: We will provide it temporarily—temporarily, because that is all the money they had through what is called the Wage Assistance Program. Under this program, \$44 billion from the Disaster Relief Fund was made available to States to use as a supplement to their unemployment insurance programs—still leaving \$25 billion, by the way, in that fund for natural disasters.

I spoke to Labor Secretary Scalia on Friday. I asked him: Is there any money left in that fund?

Remember, this was done on August 8, and they had a limited amount of money.

He said: No, ROB. Actually, it was a temporary program, meant to be a bridge so Congress would get its act together between August 8 and now.

So basically, in a month and a week, surely Congress would do something here, but we haven't. Now, that money has run out. Now, people who were getting the \$600 benefit, down to zero, and then back up to \$300, which most are getting in a lump sum because it takes a while to process this money—that \$300 is now ending. No more \$300-per-week Federal supplement.

By the way, almost every State and territory except for two has applied for and received some of this funding from the Feds. Ohio was able to receive enough funding to cover 6 weeks of lost benefits, so basically from August 1 until now. Ohio got \$1.4 billion from the fund. It is sending out its unemployment insurance benefits this week. Next week it ends because they have run out of money. They have used the Federal money.

The \$300 supplement has now ended. It is surely time for us to act. It would be timely this week and next week to now do something to provide for a supplement for people who lost their job through no fault of their own.

We could have solved this last Thursday with the targeted relief bill that came to the floor for a vote that I talked about. The timing was perfect. We could have done that because part of the negotiations that we had among ourselves, Republicans, over this and with some Democrats, I suppose, was, what is the right level? What we came up with was \$300. That was part of the bill that got 52 votes last Thursday but needed the 60 votes, and Democrats blocked it. Even though it got the majority of the Senate, it didn't get the supermajority of 60 that it needed. Again, we couldn't even get on the legislation to talk about it. That \$600 supplement in this bill was changed to \$300, which was consistent with where the administration has been over the last 5 or 6 weeks. That helps the vast majority of unemployed individuals make ends meet without driving our deficit even higher.

The \$600-a-week supplement was not sustainable over time, in part, because people were actually making more money on unemployment insurance than they were with their jobs. You were being paid more not to work than to work at \$600 on top of the State benefit. In fact, under that supplement of \$600, the median wage earner in America received 134 percent more of his or her previous wages, making it harder, therefore, to jump back into the workplace and get our economy moving again.

By the way, I heard this all over Ohio, and I know every single one of my colleagues has. They heard it from businesses, particularly small businesses but also larger businesses. The Ford Motor Company told me they had a 25-percent absenteeism rate when I visited them over the August break be-

cause people weren't coming back to work because of the benefit that they had been getting of \$600. So it was felt in small businesses, yes, but also midsize and larger businesses and also a lot of nonprofits.

I heard it from hospitals. I heard it from people who provide addiction services, recovery services, treatment programs. Nonprofits are having a hard time getting people to come back because, again, the \$600 on top of the State benefit average of the, say, \$350—\$950 a week was more than they were able to pay them. People were making more on unemployment insurance than they were at work. This was as the economy was starting to pick up. We needed jobs.

We said: How about \$300? Why did we pick \$300? Well, again, \$600 is so generous that it is paying people more. By the way, the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan group here in Congress, analyzes these things. They analyzed it and said, if you continue the \$600 until next year, which is what the Democratic proposal is in their legislation, the Heroes Act—if you continue the \$600 until next year, that would result in 8 out of 10 people on unemployment insurance getting paid more on unemployment insurance than they would at work, 80 percent. That is from the CBO.

What is the right number instead of having 80 percent paid more by not working? Well, I think \$300 is about the right number. Some could say that is too high, too, but the \$300 on top of the State benefit was what was rejected last Thursday by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

By the way, when 80 percent of people are making more money by not working, it hurts everybody. It hurts these businesses. Small businesses and these nonprofits are not able to get people to come to work. Look at the "Help Wanted" signs you may see in your own community. It hurts the economy when you don't have this workforce and you don't have these jobs coming back.

It also hurts the workers. I think all of us should want to reconnect people to work. That is where people get their healthcare. If they have it, they are likely to get it at work. That is where about 80 percent of us get it. It is where people get their retirement, if they have it. We want more people to have that, but a 401(K) is going to be through work. This is where people get the training they need to keep up with what is happening with their job. It is where people connect with other people. It is where people get self-respect and self-esteem by working. We should be encouraging work.

Again, I think somewhere there is a number there where you are helping people who need the funds to be able to get by because they are unemployed through no fault of their own, yet you are not offering such a high benefit that it is more advantageous not to work.

The \$300-a-week amount offered last Thursday is generous compared to regular unemployment insurance. In Ohio, with the supplement, you go from \$360 a week State benefit to \$660 per week. It is a big change. It makes a big difference in people's lives. It would cover 90 percent of the lost wages for the median worker nationwide. The \$300 per week covers 90 percent of the lost wages, helping particularly low- and middle-income wage earners get by without creating, again, this \$600 disincentive to work.

Even if \$300 wasn't the perfect solution, it was certainly a starting point. It was a policy point that could have been debated and amended on the floor had we gone to the legislation. Again, we were blocked even to go to the bill to talk about it. Democrats blocked us from debating it, and so people got nothing. They don't get the \$300, which, again, 90 percent of lost wages for the median-wage worker would have been replaced by that. But they get zero. All people are left with is the State benefit now.

Again, unfortunately, in this place, politics was put ahead of the interest of struggling families who need extra help. It is stunning to me that this is the point we have reached in Congress's work to address this coronavirus pandemic.

Early on, there were so many bipartisan victories we achieved because Republicans and Democrats alike said: This is a crisis. We have to address this not as our party might want to do but as Americans—recognizing the severity of the challenge we were facing. It was encouraging to see us come together to craft the CARES Act, which passed 96 to 0 and made a big difference.

I had hoped we would be able to recognize from that victory the importance of hashing out our disagreements and coming up with a solution, finding common ground to be able to help those we represent. Unfortunately, the opposite has happened. Politics seem to have taken over. On the other side of the aisle, the Speaker of the House and others may think this is good politics for them not to move forward with something. Maybe they are right. Maybe it is good politics somehow, but it is not what is best for the American people.

By opposing a reasonable compromise on unemployment insurance, as an example, what this Congress is doing is leaving the American people high and dry at the exact time that funding for these benefits has run out.

Again, the short-term bridge that the administration provided, \$300 a week, is running out. It doesn't need to happen. Let's come to the negotiating table this week and next week. We are going to be here next week. We are supposed to vote on a continuing resolution, the funding program. We will be here. We know what the differences are. We know what the similarities are. We know how to put together a package. We know what it has to be and

what the compromise is. For Republicans and Democrats alike, it is now on us to come up with that bipartisan solution on unemployment insurance and the other pressing issues we face as the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Valderrama nomination; that if cloture is invoked on the Valderrama nomination, the postcloture time be expired and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination; I further ask that following the disposition of the Valderrama nomination, the Senate resume consideration of the Johnston nomination; finally, I ask that the postcloture time on the Johnston nomination expire at 1:30 p.m. tomorrow and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination; that if any of the nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RUSSIA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, earlier today, my colleagues, Senator SCHUMER and Senator WYDEN violated the Senate rules by attempting to offer a resolution disparaging oversight work being done by me and Senator JOHNSON. My colleague, Ranking Member WYDEN, said that the investigation Senator JOHNSON and I are engaged in is advancing a Russian disinformation campaign. To be clear, that investigation is focused on potential conflicts of interest and other wrongdoing regarding the time Vice President Biden was lead on the Obama administration's Ukraine policy. At that same time, his son, Hunter Biden, was on the board of a corrupt Ukrainian gas firm called Burisma. This investigation is a good-government investigation to better understand the effect these potential conflicts had on policy execution. This investigation is based on Federal Government records from the Obama adminis-

tration and records from a Democratic lobby shop, Blue Star Strategies. If those records are Russian disinformation, then that says more about the Obama administration than the purpose of this investigation.

I have also addressed the claim that this investigation is somehow connected to Andriy Derkach. I have said publicly on many occasions that I have never received information or material from him. I have never solicited information from him. The same is true for my staff. In fact, the only two times that I am aware of that my staff have come in contact with his information are, No. 1, when the Democrats introduced his records into a transcribed interview, and No. 2, when Minority Leader SCHUMER, Speaker PELOSI, Senator WARNER, and Representative SCHIFF used it in their July 13, 2020, letter.

They also attempted to link Andriy Telizhenko to Andriy Derkach, apparently to cast him as a nefarious foreign agent, but they neglected to mention his many connections to the Obama-Biden administration, including White House meetings and outings with White House staff. They also omitted his work for Blue Star Strategies, which was working on behalf of the corrupt Ukrainian firm that hired Hunter Biden while his father was the face of U.S. policy toward Ukraine. Democratic connections to Mr. Telizhenko are many and well documented. If they are so concerned that he is a conduit for disinformation, why did they work with him for so long?

Maybe the Democrats should take a pause and realize that they are the only ones pushing Russian disinformation. Let's not forget about the Steele Dossier. Thanks to now-declassified information, we know the dossier was filled with Russian disinformation. The Democrats bought-and-paid-for crown jewel ironically was an example of the very disinformation and collusion that it falsely accused the Trump campaign of. The Democrats pushed it for years. Now that it is a failed document, they have tried to run the same baseless smear tactic on this investigation. The facts simply aren't on their side. If my colleagues on the other side are as concerned about foreign disinformation as they claim to be, they would stop relying on it to falsely attack us. Let's stop playing these games and get back to business for the American people.

CONGRATULATING LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO ON 150 YEARS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this year, Loyola University Chicago celebrates the 150th anniversary of its founding, which occurred on September 5, 1870. Loyola Chicago is a world-class institution with a storied history as a Roman Catholic Jesuit university, a strong track record of academic excellence, and the proud home of the Loyola Ramblers.

Loyola University Chicago was founded under the name of St. Ignatius College by Arnold Damen, S.J., to serve Chicago's Catholic immigrants. In 1909, the school was granted a new charter by the State of Illinois and renamed "Loyola University Chicago". That same year, the newly-named Loyola Chicago granted its first professional graduate degrees and organized its first football, basketball, and indoor baseball teams. Today, Loyola Chicago is the only Jesuit Catholic university in Illinois.

Throughout its history, Loyola Chicago has upheld its Jesuit values—being an institution of rigorous liberal arts education and academic excellence, while also being a place of inclusion and acceptance for marginalized communities, including immigrants. Loyola Chicago's Stritch School of Medicine led the country as the first medical school to accept DACA recipients, many of whom have committed to working in a medically-underserved community in Illinois after graduation.

In addition, under its previous president, Father Michael Garanzini, Loyola Chicago created Arrupe College. Arrupe is a 2-year degree program that brings Loyola Chicago's academic quality together with a focus on affordability and care for the whole person. Arrupe's low-cost and wrap-around services—including meals, childcare, and transportation—bring a high-quality Loyola Chicago education to low-income and students of color in the Chicagoland area who otherwise may not have a chance to succeed in college.

Loyola Chicago's focus on service is part of the fabric of the institution and its community. Loyola Chicago supports more than 300 community partner organizations in Chicago and the Chicagoland suburbs through student, staff, and faculty service and volunteer work. Loyola Chicago's impact can be found almost anywhere in the Chicagoland area.

Illinois has been served well and enriched by the many contributions of Loyola University Chicago. I look forward to the school's many contributions in the years ahead and several more successful runs at the NCAA basketball tournament being led by their team chaplain, the now world famous Jean Dolores Schmidt, known to all as simply Sister Jean.

I thank Loyola for its many contributions to our State and country. It is my distinct honor to congratulate President Jo Anne Rooney—the school's first female president—and the entire Loyola community of staff, faculty, students, and alumni on your 150th anniversary.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I was unable to attend the rollcall vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Brett H. Ludwig, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. district judge for the