

crime. It lays out new requirements for departments to explain their policies on how, when, and why no-knock warrants are used. On behalf of the many people looking for answers in my hometown of Louisville, I am, unfortunately, especially interested in that provision.

In recent weeks, the Democratic leader and many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have insisted—insisted—over and over and over again that they wanted to consider legislation on this subject prior to the Fourth of July. My friend the Democratic leader repeatedly expressed how eager—eager he was to consider these issues here on the Senate floor, but now we read this: “Senate Democrats are agonizing over what to do about Senate Republicans’ police reform proposal.” What is there to agonize over?

And we read this: “[The] Senate Democratic leader . . . faces a tough call on whether to let a Republican-backed police reform bill advance on the Senate floor.”

“Agonizing”? “Tough call”? It seems to me that proceeding to consider Senator SCOTT’s legislation, proceeding to take up the subject on the Senate floor, would only be an agonizing prospect if Members were more interested in making a point than in actually making a law.

For anyone who actually wants to legislate, it shouldn’t be a difficult call to vote to begin considering Senator SCOTT’s legislation. It will be exactly the vote which this moment demands.

Last week, I understand the Speaker of the House herself said: “We’d like to end up in conference” on police reform legislation. The only way to do that would be if the Senate passed a bill. Even the Speaker does not seem to understand why Senate Democrats would block this Chamber from even considering the JUSTICE Act.

Senator SCOTT and Senate Republicans are interested in making a law. The President and the administration want to make a law, and even the Democratic House leadership apparently would be happy to see a conference committee. So maybe the only group left in Washington who are reportedly agonizing over whether to block discussion of police reform or to let it proceed seem to be our Senate Democratic colleagues.

I hope that whatever strange political calculations are making this difficult for our friends across the aisle will yield to common sense and to the American people’s hunger for progress. We are going to find out when we vote later this week.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### JUST AND UNIFYING SOLUTIONS TO INVIGORATE COMMUNITIES EVERYWHERE ACT OF 2020—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 480, S. 3985.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows: Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 480, S. 3985, to improve and reform policing practices, accountability and transparency.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 480, S. 3985, a bill to improve and reform policing practices, accountability, and transparency.

Mitch McConnell, Cory Gardner, Ben Sasse, Steve Daines, Rob Portman, John Cornyn, David Perdue, Joni Ernst, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Todd Young, Michael B. Enzi, John Hoeven, Tim Scott, Lindsey Graham.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cory T. Wilson, of Mississippi, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative 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.

#### JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the American people are crying out for major, significant changes in policing in this country. Being killed by the police is now the sixth leading cause of death for young men in America. Young Black men are 2.5 times more likely than White men to be killed by police, while Black women are 1.4 times more likely than White women to be killed by police.

As hundreds of thousands of Americans of all ages and colors take to the streets to demand change, we need legislation that rises to the moment. So Democrats introduced a bill 3 weeks ago that would bring strong, comprehensive, and lasting change to police departments across America: the Justice in Policing Act.

Our colleagues in the House are expected to pass that bill this week. However, here in the Senate, our Republican colleagues have responded to our comprehensive proposal with an approach that is piecemeal and halfhearted. The longer you look at the Republican policing reform effort, the more obvious are the shortcomings and deficiencies.

The Republican bill does nothing—nothing to reform the legal standards that shield police from accountability for violating Americans’ constitutional rights. The Republican bill does nothing—nothing to encourage independent investigations of police departments with patterns and practices that violate the Constitution. The Republican bill does nothing—nothing to reform the use of force standard, nothing—nothing on qualified immunity, nothing on racial profiling, and nothing on limiting the transfer of military equipment to police departments.

The Republican bill doesn’t even truly ban choke holds or no-knock warrants. It leaves major loopholes when it comes to choke holds and only requires more data on no-knock warrants. More data would not have saved Breonna Taylor’s life. Allowing police to use choke holds whenever they say that deadly force is necessary is not going to save lives.

We need a bill that achieves genuine police reform. The Republican proposal comes across like a list of suggestions.

I would repeat this important warning: If we pass a bill that is ineffective and the killings continue and police departments resist change and there is no accountability, the wound in our society will not close; it will fester. This is not about making an effort or dipping our toes in the water. It must be about solving a problem that is taking the lives of too many Black Americans.

This is not a time for studies or commissions or tinkering around the edges.