

body is that we vote or agree to get onto a bill, and then we discuss, debate, and amend it until at least 60 Senators are satisfied, or it goes nowhere. It goes nowhere at the end until 60 Senators are satisfied.

So what are they giving up? Nothing. They don't want an outcome. The vote we will take in a few hours is just the first step. We aren't passing a bill. We aren't making policy decisions. It is just a procedural vote to say that police reform is the subject the Senate will tackle next. That is all it says—that police reform is the subject the Senate will tackle next.

Alas, our Democratic colleagues have suddenly begun to signal they are not willing to even begin the discussion on police reform. They are threatening to block the subject from even reaching the Senate floor.

Yesterday, in a letter to me and on the floor, the Democratic leader and the junior Senators from New Jersey and California put forward an argument that was almost nonsensical. First, they explained a number of policy differences they have with Senator SCOTT's proposal. No problem there. The Senate has a handy tool for settling such differences; it is called legislating. We take up bills. We debate them. We consider amendments from both sides. And only if and when 60 Senators are satisfied can we even vote on passage.

But this time, Senate Democrats say the legislative process should not happen. This time, the Democratic leader is saying he will not let the Senate take up the subject of police reform at all—at all—unless I pre-negotiate with him in private and rewrite our starting point until he is satisfied.

This last-minute ultimatum is particularly ironic given the weeks of rhetoric from leading Democrats about how very urgent—how very urgent—it was that Congress address police reform and racial justice. For weeks, the Democratic leader has blustered that the Senate simply had to address this issue before July 4. Well, that is what the vote this morning is about.

Last week, Speaker PELOSI said: "I hope there's a compromise to be reached in the Congress. . . ." because "How many more people have to die from police brutality?" So, as recently as last week, leading Democrats called it a life-or-death issue for the Senate to take up the subject this month. Well, here we are. Here we are. We are ready to address it. But now, in the last 48 hours, this bizarre, new ultimatum. Now they don't want to take up the issue. They don't want to debate. They don't want amendments. They will filibuster police reform from even reaching the floor of the Senate unless the majority lets the minority rewrite the bill behind closed doors in advance. Let me say that again. They will filibuster police reform from even reaching the floor unless the majority lets the minority rewrite the bill behind closed doors in advance.

Yesterday, the Speaker of the House told CBS News that because Senate Republicans do support Senator TIM SCOTT's reform bill, we are all—listen to this jaw-dropping comment—"trying to get away with murder . . . the murder of George Floyd." That is the Speaker of the House accusing Senate Republicans of trying to get away with murder.

Are you beginning to see how this game works? Two weeks ago, it was implied the Senate would have blood on our hands if we didn't take up police reform. Now Democrats say Senator SCOTT and 48 other Senators have blood on our hands because we are trying to take up police reform.

What fascinating times we live in. Armies of elites and Twitter mobs stand ready to pounce on any speech they deem problematic. Yet unhinged comments like these get a complete free pass—a complete free pass.

When our country needs unity, they are trying to keep us apart. When our Nation needs bipartisan solutions, they are staging partisan theater. This is political nonsense elevated to an art form.

In a body that has amendments and substitute amendments, it is nonsense to say a police reform bill cannot be the starting point for a police reform bill. It is nonsense for Democrats to say that, because they want to change Senator SCOTT's bill, they are going to block the Senate from taking it up and amending it. If they are confident in their positions, they should embrace the amendment process. If they aren't confident their views will persuade others, that just underscores why they don't get to insert these views in advance—in advance—behind closed doors.

No final legislation can pass without 60 votes. If Democrats do not like the final product, it will not pass. The only way there is any downside for Democrats to come to the table is that they would rather preserve this urgent subject as a live campaign issue than pass a bipartisan answer.

The majority has done everything we can to proceed to this issue in good faith. I have fast-tracked this issue to the floor this month, as our Democratic colleagues said they wanted until 48 hours ago. I have expressed my support for a robust amendment process, as our Democratic colleagues said they wanted until 48 hours ago.

So make no mistake about it: Senate Republicans are ready to make a law. We are ready to discuss and amend our way to a bipartisan product, pass it, and take it to conference with the House. The American people deserve an outcome, and we cannot get an outcome if Democrats will not even let us begin—not even let us begin.

I hope our colleagues reconsider and let the Senate consider police reform later today. If they do not, the next time another appalling incident makes our Nation sick to its stomach with grief and anger yet again, Senate

Democrats can explain to the Nation why they made sure the Senate did nothing.

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 resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:30 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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. SCHUMER. Madam 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 Democratic leader is recognized.

JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the names of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and Ahmaud Arbery continue to ring in the Nation's ears, a searing reminder of the desperate need to reform policing and truly address injustice in America. Their memory is a national call to action.

Democrats answered that call by proposing a broad, strong, comprehensive policing reform bill that would bring deep and lasting change to police departments across America. House Democrats will pass that bill, the Justice in Policing Act, as early as tomorrow.

However, here in the Senate, the Republican majority proposed the legislative equivalent of a fig leaf, something that provides a little cover but no real change. In less than an hour, Leader MCCONNELL will ask the Senate to proceed to the so-called policing reform bill.

We have all gone over the bill's deficiencies over and over. There are no good answers. Some on the other side have said the bills are similar. They are like night and day.

In response to the brutal killing of George Floyd—his wind pipe crushed by a police officer—my Republican friends drafted a bill that does not even fully ban the type of brutal tactics that led to his death.

In response to the death of Breonna Taylor, killed by police executing a no-knock warrant, my Republican friends have drafted a bill that doesn't even ban that type of tactic—what weak tea. For Leader McCONNELL to come on the floor with this bill and say he is solving the problem—no one believes that, except maybe a few ideologues who really don't want to solve the problem to begin with.

The bill doesn't ban choke holds. It doesn't back no-knock warrants. It does nothing to stop profiling, the militarization of police or reform, use of force standards, and qualified immunity—all of the things that need to be done, almost none of which are in this bill.

The last piece is particularly surprising. So much of the anger in the country right now is directed at the lack of accountability for police officers who violate Americans' rights. As far as I can tell, the Republican bill does not even attempt one significant reform—not one—to bring more accountability to police officers who are guilty of misconduct.

If you present a bill, as Republicans have here in the Senate, that does nothing on accountability and say they are solving or dealing with the problem in even close to an adequate way, they are sadly mistaken. No one—no one—believes that.

I could spend more time in describing what the Republican bill doesn't do than what it does do. The harsh fact of the matter is the bill is so deeply, fundamentally, and irrevocably flawed, it cannot serve as a useful starting point for real reform.

Don't ask me. Don't ask the Democrats here. Ask the leading civil rights organizations, which have declared their strong opposition not only to this bill but have urged us not to move forward because they know this bill is a sham, a cul-de-sac, which will lead to no reform whatsoever.

Yesterday, 138 civil rights groups sent an open letter to Senators demanding that we vote no on moving to proceed today. I have the letter here.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON
CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
June 23, 2020.

VOTE NO ON THE MOTION TO PROCEED—S. 3985
THE JUSTICE ACT

DEAR SENATORS: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (The Leadership Conference), a coalition charged by its diverse membership of more than 220 national organizations to promote and protect civil and human rights in the United States, and the undersigned 138 orga-

nizations, we write to express our strong opposition to S. 3985, the Just and Unifying Solutions to Invigorate Communities Everywhere (JUSTICE) Act. The JUSTICE Act is an inadequate response to the decades of pain, hardship, and devastation that Black people have and continue to endure as a result of systemic racism and lax policies that fail to hold police accountable for misconduct. This bill falls woefully short of the comprehensive reform needed to address the current policing crisis and achieve meaningful law enforcement accountability. It is deeply problematic to meet this moment with a menial incremental approach that offers more funding to police, and few policies to effectively address the constant loss of Black lives at the hands of police. We therefore urge you to oppose the JUSTICE Act and vote no on the motion to proceed when this legislation is brought to the floor. The Leadership Conference will score this vote in our voting record for the 116th Congress.

Abusive policing practices, coupled with devastating state-sanctioned violence, have exacted systemic brutality and fatality upon Black people since our nation's founding. Police have shot and killed more than 1,000 people in the United States over the past year, and Black people are disproportionately more likely than white people to be killed by police. The chronic structural issue of police killings and lawlessness against Black people have escalated to a boiling point in recent weeks following the deaths of individuals like Breonna Taylor, Dreasjon "Sean" Reed, George Floyd, Tony McDade, and others. The current protests in our cities are a response not only to the unjust policing of Black people, but also a call for action to public officials to enact bold, comprehensive, and structural change.

That is why, on June 1, 2020, The Leadership Conference sent Congress a letter outlining accountability principles that must be adopted as a baseline to address rampant, systemic, white supremacy in law enforcement across America. In less than 12 hours, more than 450 of this country's most diverse civil rights, civil liberties, and racial justice organizations signed onto that letter because what was asked of Congress aligned with what advocates, policing experts, and other stakeholders agree is needed. The priorities highlighted are not only reasonable but reflect a bare minimum of what must be included in any policing legislation Congress adopts in order for systemic reform to occur.

These priorities are: (1) the creation of a use of force standard that allows force only when necessary and as a last resort; (2) a ban on chokeholds; (3) a ban on racial profiling; (4) the establishment of a police misconduct registry; (5) the inclusion of a "reckless" standard in 18 U.S.C. Section 242 that enables federal prosecutors to hold law enforcement accountable for criminal civil rights violations; (6) a prohibition on no-knock warrants, especially in drug cases; (7) the elimination of the judge-made doctrine of qualified immunity, which allows officers and other government actors to evade accountability when they violate individuals' rights; and (8) the demilitarization of law enforcement agencies. This accountability framework is reflected in S. 3912, the Justice in Policing Act of 2020.

Unfortunately, Senate majority leadership ignored these critical policies and introduced the JUSTICE Act, a bill that fails to align with our framework principles and will therefore not bring about the fundamental shift in policing our country needs. The bill does nothing to address current barriers to holding law enforcement accountable, such as abolishing qualified immunity or criminalizing the reckless use of force. It does not address, let alone prohibit, the perverse

yet pervasive practice of racial profiling, nor does it include explicit bans on dangerous practices like chokeholds or no-knock warrants. It fails to address the militarization of police or the need for a national standard restricting the use of force, and lacks the national, robust, and publicly available misconduct registry required for true transparency.

Further, the JUSTICE Act provides more than \$7 billion of additional federal dollars for law enforcement over the next five years, directly contradicting our coalition's call and that of those marching in the streets to redefine public safety by reducing the footprint of our criminal legal system. Many of the crises that currently involve police responses, and which too often lead to mistreatment and increased mistrust, would be better handled through the addition of health providers, social workers, and others who can meet the needs of communities in a non-punitive manner. Pouring additional funding into a broken system is bad policy. Furthermore, considering the limited financial resources prompted by the COVID-19 pandemic, all policing reform models must reprioritize how limited dollars are spent. The programs authorized by the JUSTICE Act will necessarily mean fewer funds to tackle other issues critical to longlasting safety, such as housing, education, and health care. Millions of people in the United States are calling for these kinds of direct investments into communities, and Congress should heed that call.

Now is the time for Congress to be bold and pass meaningful police accountability reform legislation. A vast and diverse collection of people from coast to coast are calling on lawmakers to prioritize Black communities and protect them from the systemic perils of over-policing, police brutality, misconduct, and harassment. It is your moral and ethical duty to ensure Black people and communities are free from the harm and threats from law enforcement and militarized police responses. It is also your responsibility to ensure that any legislation passed does not just provide lip service to these problems, but fully meets the critical needs of this moment and beyond. Passing watered-down legislation that fails to remedy the actual harms resulting in the loss of life is a moral statement that is inconsistent with a genuine belief that black lives matter. Anything less than full support for comprehensive legislation that holds police accountable is inexcusable. Further, any attempt to amend or salvage the JUSTICE Act will only serve to "check the box" and claim reform when, in actuality, no reform has occurred to combat police misconduct and to protect Black lives. For these reasons, we urge you to oppose the JUSTICE Act and vote no on the motion to proceed on this legislation.

Thank you for your leadership in advancing these important policy recommendations. If you have any questions about the issues raised in this letter, please contact Sakira Cook of The Leadership Conference at cook@civilrights.org or The Leadership Conference Justice Task Force co-chairs, Kenya Bennett of the ACLU, kbennett@aclu.org and Hilary Shelton of the NAACP at hoshleton@naacpnet.org.

Sincerely,

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, A Little Piece Of Light, ActionAid USA, AFGE Local 3354, African American Ministers In Action, Alabama State Association of Cooperatives, Alianza Americas, Alianza Nacional de Campesinas, American Association for Justice, American Atheists, American Civil Liberties Union, American Family Voices, American Federation of Teachers, American Federation of

Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), American Humanist Association, American Indian Mothers Inc., American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC), Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), Amnesty International USA, Arkansas United.

Asian Americans Advancing Justice | AAJC, Atrisco Community, Autistic Self Advocacy Network, Autistic Women and Non-binary Network, Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, Bend the Arc: Jewish Action, Black Farmers and Agriculturalists Association, Inc.; Bread for the World, Center for Disability Rights, Center for Law and Social Policy, Center for Responsible Lending, Center for the Study of Hate & Extremism-California State University, San Bernardino; Chi-Town GVP Summit, Church of Scientology National Affairs Office, Clearinghouse on Women's Issues, Climate Reality Project, Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, Coalition on Human Needs, Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, Common Cause.

CommonSpirit Health, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, U.S. Provinces; Constitutional Accountability Center, Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), CURE (Citizens United for Rehabilitation of Errants), Daniet Initiative Set Project, Defending Rights & Dissent, Demand Progress, DemCast USA, Democracy 21, Drug Policy Alliance, Earthjustice, End Citizens United // Let America Vote Action Fund, Equal Rights Advocates, Equality California, Farmworker Association of Florida, Feminist Majority Foundation, Government Information Watch, Hindu American Foundation, Hispanic Federation.

Human Rights Campaign, Human Rights First, Immigration Hub, IndivisAbility, Innocence Project, Japanese American Citizens League, Jewish Council for Public Affairs, Joint Action Committee, Justice in Aging, Justice Roundtable, Juvenile Law Center, Kansas Black Farmers Association Inc, Lambda Legal, Landowners Association of Texas, Leadership Conference on Civil & Human Rights, League of Women Voters of the United States, Mennonite Central Committee U.S. Washington Office, Mommieactivist and Sons, MomsRising, MoveOn.

Muslim Advocates, NAACP, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.; National Action Network, National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, National Association of Human Rights Workers, National Association of Social Workers, National Center for Transgender Equality, National Council of Churches, National Council on Independent Living, National Domestic Workers Alliance, National Down Syndrome Congress, National Education Association, National Employment Law Project, National Equality Action Team (NEAT), National Housing Law Project, National Latino Farmers & Ranchers Trade Association, National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund, National Organization for Women, National Partnership for Women & Families.

Natural Resources Defense Council, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, New America's Open Technology Institute, Oklahoma Black Historical Research Project, Inc.; Open Society Policy Center, Oxfam America, People For the American Way, People's Action, Pesticide Action Network, PFLAG National, Prison Policy Initiative, Public Citizen, Public Justice, Rabbinical Assembly, RAICES, Restore The Fourth, Rural Advancement Fund of the National Sharecroppers Fund, Rural Coalition, Silver State Equality-Nevada.

Southern Border Communities Coalition, SPLC Action Fund, Stand for Children, Stand Up America, Students for Sensible Drug Policy, T'ruah, Texas Progressive Action Network, Texas Watch, The Agenda

Project, The Black Alliance for Just Immigration (BAJI), The Daniel Initiative, The Sikh Coalition, The Workers Circle, Union for Reform Judaism, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries; UNITED SIKHS, United We Dream Action, Voices for Progress, Win Without War, Woman's National Democratic Club (WNDC).

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I want to ask the American people, I want to ask Republican Senators: Who is a better guardian of the civil rights of African Americans when it comes to police reform—the NAACP or MITCH MCCONNELL?

If this bill were such a good path to reform, why wouldn't civil rights organizations from one end of America to another say: Go forward; maybe we will get something done. Because they know the bill is a ruse, and nothing will get done. That is the way it is designed. Whom do you believe when it comes to civil rights and police accountability—MITCH MCCONNELL or the lawyer for the families of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor? Whom do you believe—the lawyer of the Floyd and Taylor families or MITCH MCCONNELL, whom we have never heard speak on this issue on the floor until the last few weeks? These groups have been speaking about it for decades.

The idea—the idea—that this bill is a step forward when it will lead to nowhere? It will not be. MITCH MCCONNELL keeps saying you can cut the bill off when you don't get your 60 votes. What kind of solution is that, when it is a junky bill, when it is a bill that doesn't go far enough at all? Why don't we put a good bill on the floor that can pass?

Let me read what the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights said. They have had a hand in crafting every piece of meaningful legislation passed in Congress in the last few years.

The JUSTICE Act—

The Republican bill—

is an inadequate response to the decades of pain, hardship, and devastation that Black people have and continue to endure as a result of systemic racism and lax policies that fail to hold police accountable for misconduct. This bill falls woefully short of the comprehensive reform needed to address the current policing crisis and achieve meaningful law enforcement accountability.

Listen to this sentence, from 136 civil rights organizations about this bill that Leader MCCONNELL has put on the floor:

It is deeply problematic to meet this moment with a menial incremental approach that offers more funding to police, and few policies to effectively address the constant loss of Black lives at the hands of police.

Leader MCCONNELL, here is what the civil rights organizations say about your bill. They rip off any cloaking about what this bill really does and what it is. I want to read it again—specifically to our Republican leader, who thinks this is a good bill and a great attempt to go forward:

It is deeply problematic to meet this moment with a menial incremental approach that offers more funding to police, and few policies to effectively address the constant loss of Black lives at the hands of police.

Whom do you believe, America—the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights or MITCH MCCONNELL? Whom do you believe, America—the NAACP or the Republican caucus? Whom do you believe, America—the lawyer for the Taylor and Floyd families or Donald Trump, who has these Members quaking in their boots if they do something that he doesn't like?

That is one of the other reasons we are in such a pickle here. They are so afraid of Donald Trump, who is willing to say overtly racist statements, like “Kung Flu” several times yesterday, that they can't even bring themselves to put a bill on the floor that has a modicum of respect from the civil rights community? When you call it “menial,” you are not respecting a bill.

The NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, founded by the great Justice Thurgood Marshall—here is what it said. They have been fighting for these things for 80 years, not 8 days. “It cannot support legislation that does not embody a strong accountability framework for police officers and [other] law enforcement who engage in misconduct.”

Here is what Benjamin Crump, the lawyer, said: The Republican legislation is “in direct contrast to the demands of the people” who have been protesting; and “the Black Community is tired of lip service, and shocked that the [Republican proposal] can [even] be thought of as legislation.” That is the lawyer for the Taylor and Floyd families. Leader MCCONNELL has invoked their names—that is the right thing to do—but then deviates totally from what their lawyer says needs to be done to deal with these kinds of deaths. Again, Benjamin Crump, the lawyer for the Floyd and Taylor families: “The Black community is tired of the lip service, and shocked that the [Republican proposal] can [even] be thought of as legislation.”

Don't get on your sanctimonious horse, Leader MCCONNELL. You have none of the civil rights community behind you.

The most preeminent civil rights groups in our Nation's history are speaking. The lawyer representing the families of Americans who have lost their loved ones at the hands of those who are sworn to protect and serve are speaking. They have one simple, urgent goal, and it has nothing to do with politics.

Leader MCCONNELL accuses what we are doing as being filled with politics. Does Leader MCCONNELL accuse all 138 civil rights organizations of wanting to do this for politics? No, no, no. I think the shoe is on the other foot. I think the politics here is that Leader MCCONNELL wants to show that he is doing something and get nothing done.

He may be afraid of President Trump. He may be afraid of some police organizations. I don't know what it is.

Here is what they say in their letter: “We therefore urge you”—the Senators—“to oppose the JUSTICE Act and vote no on the motion to proceed.”

I dare the leader to come out here and say they are playing politics—

come right out and say it—because it is false, and we, the Democrats, are aligned with what they believe.

This morning, we heard more predictable histrionics from the Republican leader—the accusation of mindless obstruction and outrageous hypocrisy. Leader MCCONNELL should spare us the lectures about how laws get made. He knows how. It is through bipartisanship. The leader talks about bipartisanship and introduces a totally partisan bill and introduces a process where Democrats have had no input. That is partisanship.

Do you want to be bipartisan, Leader MCCONNELL? Sit down, assemble a group—some from your side, maybe Senator SCOTT, who is greatly respected; some from our side, maybe Senators BOOKER and HARRIS, who are greatly respected; and a few others. Let them sit down and come up with a proposal. It does not have to be behind closed doors.

The leader is worried about closed doors? There is something called the Judiciary Committee. It doesn't meet in secret. Why wasn't this bill referred there, where there would be at least something of a bipartisan process? Who is he kidding? Who is he kidding?

You don't want closed doors, Leader MCCONNELL? Send it to the Judiciary Committee. Something as important as this should have gone through that to begin with.

Let me repeat: Republicans came here, dropped the bill on the floor, and said: Take it or leave it. Even if we were to get on the bill, there is no conceivable way to rectify all of its many problems. It is not realistic that we can fix this bill even with a series of amendments because they will require 60 votes, and we will not get 60 on any of them. If they believed in these ideas, as Senator HARRIS said, they would have put them in the bill to begin with. They didn't.

The Republican majority has given the Senate a bad bill and no credible way to sufficiently improve it. Senator MCCONNELL—cleverly, maybe cynically—designed a legislative cul-de-sac from which no bill—no bill at all—could emerge. And whether the bill lacks 60 votes now or 60 votes in a few days, we know the Republican leader will accuse Democrats of filibustering and claiming we are the opponents of progress, as he did this morning.

Please, does anyone believe that Democrats are the obstacles to reforming our police departments? Does anyone believe that? We announced a much bolder, stronger, better, more effective bill 3 weeks ago. And, unlike the Republican legislation, the Justice in Policing Act will actually pass a Chamber of Congress. When it passes the House, the Nation is going to say to Leader MCCONNELL: Get something moving in the Senate. And Leader MCCONNELL knows, and everyone in this body knows, that you have to do that in a bipartisan way. That is how the Senate has always worked and still does.

Senate Republicans and their President, who proclaims we should cherish the memory of Confederate traitors who fought to preserve slavery, who gleefully called the coronavirus “Kung Flu,” with hardly a word of criticism from his party, expects you to believe that Republicans are, all of a sudden, the true champions of racial justice and police reform? That is what Senate Republicans want America to believe, and America ain't buying it.

The same Republican majority that has demonstrated a complete lack of urgency to address the public health and economic crises that are devastating Black America, the same Republican majority that has refused time and again to call out President Trump's bigotry and intolerance, the same Republican majority that has run a conveyor belt of anti-civil rights votes for judicial nominees, including one today—today, the very same day we vote on policing reform—wants you to believe that all of a sudden they want to get something done. As they say in Brooklyn, forget about it.

When you hear President Trump and Senator MCCONNELL trying to cast blame for lack of progress on police reform, I have three words for you: Consider the source. Look at their history. Look at what they have done. Look at just today. Leader MCCONNELL proudly brags that he is putting someone on the Fifth Circuit who has opposed voting rights for his whole career. That is who wants to move things forward? I doubt it.

Here is the truth. Senator MCCONNELL has been around a long time and knows how to produce a workable outcome in the Senate if he really wants to. We have done it before on criminal justice reform, on annual budgets, on the national defense bill, and on the lands package we just passed.

Even on difficult issues like immigration, the Senate can function if the leadership allows it to. In 2013, a bipartisan group of Senators produced compromise immigration legislation that garnered two-thirds of this Chamber on immigration, no less. What do bills that pass have in common? Bipartisanship, sponsorship, and support. What does this bill have? Only partisan support. Not a single Democrat supports this bill, their bill.

While I certainly feel obligated to point out the contradictions and hypocrisy in the Republican leader's statements and history, I am not dismayed by the likely failure of the Republican bill today. All is not lost. There is a better path and one we should take once this bill fails to go forward.

After this bill goes down, there should be bipartisan discussions with the object of coming together around a constructive starting point for police reform. Leader MCCONNELL can pick a few of his Members as negotiators. I could designate a few from our caucus. They can sit down, talk to one another, and find a bill that we are ready to

start debating. We could send that bill to the committee and have an open process, as it would be refined. This is an important issue.

That, Leader MCCONNELL, is what successful legislating will be. I have no doubt that we could come up with a bill that is ready for the floor in a few weeks. We know how to do this. But in the rush to get this issue off their backs, to check some political box and move on, my Republican colleagues have forgotten or are simply ignoring everything they know about how the Senate works.

My hope, my prayer is that after this bill fails today, after Leader MCCONNELL's path reaches its preordained dead end, we can start down the path of bipartisanship—real bipartisanship—not a bill designed to be put on the floor by one party.

If Americans of all ages and colors and of all faiths can join together in a righteous chorus calling for change, as they have in big cities and small towns across America, then we in the Senate can at least try to come together to deliver it—Democrats and Republicans working together to solve an age-old problem that is a deep wound in America.

These past few weeks have magnified a very old wound in our country. The binding up of that wound is a project that demands more from all of us: Black Americans, White Americans, police departments, and the protesters in the streets—Democrats and Republicans.

So, please, let us not once again retreat to our partisan corners after today's vote. Let us appeal, instead, to the better angels of our nature, reach out to one another, Democrats and Republicans, and try to forge a path forward together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LOEFFLER). The majority whip.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, in just a few minutes, we will vote on whether to move forward on Senator SCOTT's policing reform bill.

We are at a turning point in our Nation's history—a moment when Americans of every background and political persuasion are united in a call for change. We have a chance to give it to them. Over the course of the next couple of weeks, we will have a chance to pass legislation that will permanently reform policing in this country—legislation that will improve training, increase accountability, and give increased security to families who worry that their sons or daughters could be the next George Floyd or Breonna Taylor. Senator SCOTT's legislation, the Just and Unifying Solutions to Invigorate Communities Everywhere Act, or the JUSTICE Act, is a product of years of serious work. It is an extensive bill that focuses on a number of areas that call for reform.

Make no mistake about it. When the Democrats vote today, if they do—and, I hope, there will be enough of them

who will not, so as to allow this legislation to move forward—they will be voting to block police reform legislation, because that is what this is. This is not Senator MCCONNELL's bill. The Democratic leader kept attacking Senator MCCONNELL and the McConnell legislation. This is a TIM SCOTT bill, crafted with input from other Senators, with input from communities of color from across this country, and with input from the law enforcement community—people who care deeply about not just talking about this issue but about actually solving this issue, people who care about action. The Democratic objection and vote to block this legislation from moving forward will prevent an open debate in front of the entire American public about an issue that has generated a tremendous amount of controversy, not only currently but throughout our Nation's history.

We cannot change our past—there are parts of it that we are not proud of—but we can change our future, and that could start today with this vote to get on this bill and then to have an open process.

The leader has promised that, if we can get on this bill, we will have an amendment process. If there are things in the bill that people on either side of the aisle think can be improved on, they will have an opportunity to offer amendments to make those improvements. Yet, by not even getting on the bill, they will be saying to the American people that we don't care about your having a voice in this process or being able to see what your elected leaders are actually doing to resolve this problem in our country.

That is what this would do. It would open it up. It would allow a piece of legislation to be brought to the floor; allow for a motion to proceed to get on it; allow us to open up the amendment process and to have a freewheeling, fulsome debate about each and every one of the issues that is involved in this legislation.

They have said that this doesn't go far enough, that it doesn't do this or that it doesn't do that. Sure, that is true. Perhaps, it doesn't, but it gets about 75 percent of the way there. If you look at the contents and the substance of this bill, it represents a lot of what both sides have been talking about. There are a lot of recommendations in it that have come forward from people across this country who have been directly impacted, none more so than Senator SCOTT. I can tell you Senator SCOTT doesn't view this as a messaging exercise. He views this as something that is deeply personal to him. Unfortunately, he has experienced the pain of racism, not only as a young boy, growing up in the South, but as an adult and as a U.S. Senator. He wants a solution, and we should all want a solution, but that starts by getting on the bill and debating it in the open, in the light of day.

The Democratic leader talks about: Why can't we go back behind closed

doors and negotiate this? Look, we have a piece of legislation that represents 75 percent of what the Democrats say they want, and we can finish the other 25 percent. Maybe we will not get to 100 percent. Nobody ever, usually, gets 100 percent of what one wants around here. Yet simply having a debate, allowing an open amendment process, and allowing the will of the U.S. Senate to be heard is all this is about. This isn't about the final bill. This isn't about the final contents. This is about whether or not this body—100 U.S. Senators—has listened enough to what is going on around this country to say: We want to have this debate. We want to get on this bill, and we want to have it in public, in the light of day, in front of the American people, not behind closed doors—an open debate, a fulsome debate, in which amendments can be offered and in which the American people can observe and see it. That is what this vote today is about.

Now, the Democrats will say that, if you allow us to get on the bill, then they will have no control over what will happen after that. Well, actually, they will, because it is not just a 60-vote threshold to get on the bill; it is a 60-vote threshold to get off the bill. So, if you want to stop this somewhere—anywhere in the process—you will have the opportunity to do that because it will take 60 votes to move it forward and to ultimately pass it, not just to get on it.

It takes 60 votes—a supermajority here in the U.S. Senate. I think it is fair to say that, historically, the way the Senate has worked on major pieces of legislation is it ends up being bipartisan because of the 60-vote threshold. There hasn't been a time since the popular election of Senators, at least on the Republican side, when we have had more than 55 votes in the U.S. Senate. The Democrats have had 60 a few times throughout history, but the Republicans have never had more than 55. So we know it is going to take a bipartisan solution, and we know that the Democrats' voice matters. We know that, in the end, if you are going to have a bipartisan product, you are going to have to have input from both sides.

That is what this is about. It is about getting on the bill that has been advanced and put forward by an individual, TIM SCOTT—it is a TIM SCOTT bill—again, with input from others. It is not a McConnell bill. It is a TIM SCOTT bill. He is someone who has personally experienced and felt the very frustration and anger that is being voiced by the American people across the country. He wants a solution. He doesn't want a messaging bill. We want a solution.

Let me just tell you quickly about a few of the things that are in this bill, which I think suggest that it would be really important to get on it and to, at least, have a debate.

One of the most important sections of the bill is the George Floyd and Wal-

ter Scott Notification Act, which would correct deficiencies in law enforcement's reporting of use-of-force incidents. Right now, the FBI's National Use-of-Force Data Collection only receives data on about 40 percent of law enforcement officers—40 percent. That needs to change. The only way we can understand the scope of the problems we are facing is to have full and accurate data—a complete data picture—that will allow us to pinpoint problems, identify troubled police departments, and develop best practices for use-of-force and deescalation training.

There are many police departments across the Nation that are doing an excellent job of policing and that are keenly interested in becoming still better. I recently met with law enforcement leaders back in my home State of South Dakota. Among other things, they have been participating in listening sessions with the community since George Floyd's death, and they are supportive of new measures that will help to ensure that every officer does his or her job in the best possible way. Yet, while there are a lot of excellent police departments out there, there are also troubled departments—departments that fail to train their officers properly and that overlook officer misbehavior. We need to identify those departments and demand their reform. Collecting full and accurate data on use-of-force incidents will help us to do just that.

Another important section of the JUSTICE Act focuses on police deescalation and duty-to-intervene training. Sometimes police end up using force in situations in which force could have been avoided simply because they lack the necessary training to deescalate a situation without the use of force. It may be understandable that well-meaning but overwhelmed police officers who are in dangerous circumstances will sometimes resort to the use of force too quickly, but that is not a situation that we can accept. Every police officer in this country should be given the kind of training that will ensure that the use of force is restricted only to those situations in which it is absolutely needed.

Another key area of the bill—one that is absolutely essential to getting bad cops off the streets—deals with law enforcement records retention. Too often, law enforcement officers with problematic records, like multiple excessive use-of-force complaints, manage to transfer to new jurisdictions because the hiring police departments never see their full records. That is a problem. Bad cops should not be able to find new homes in other jurisdictions. We can prevent that from happening by ensuring that every police department is able to access the full disciplinary record of any officer it is looking to hire.

The JUSTICE Act would help to make sure these records are readily available by requiring police departments to keep officers' records for at

least 30 years. It would also require any police department that hires a new officer to obtain a full employment and disciplinary record for that officer from all of his previous departments.

There are a lot of other important measures in the JUSTICE Act, from the funding of body cameras to expanding minority hiring, to developing best policing practices. With this legislation, we have a real chance of improving policing in this country and of ensuring that every officer is held to the highest standards.

Our ability to do that is going to depend on one thing, and that is the willingness of the Democrats to come to the table. It was disheartening to see the Democrats dismiss Senator SCOTT's bill before it had even been released, especially because, as I said, many of the proposals in the bill have been taken directly from earlier bipartisan bills. The word, of course, today, is that they are planning to block the bill without even allowing it to be considered on the floor.

The Democrats have spent a lot of time talking about police reform, but if they want to actually achieve reform and not just talk about it, they are going to have to decide to move beyond politics. Senator SCOTT's bill is a serious, wide-ranging bill. It is a common-sense bill. It is a bill that all of us, whichever our party, should be willing to agree on.

As I said, the Democrats have changes they would like to make, and the leader has made it clear there will be an opportunity for amendments. But to refuse even to allow debate on this bill suggests the Democrats are more interested in attempting to score political points on this issue rather than to actually do anything about reform. I hope that what we are hearing about the Democrats' plans to block this bill is wrong. I hope—I really, sincerely, hope—that we are going to see the Democrats—some courageous ones—come to the table and vote to move forward with debate on this legislation.

We have a chance to do something important here—a historic chance. With the JUSTICE Act, we can permanently improve policing in this country and bring real hope to those who have lost faith in law enforcement, but we are going to have to stand together to get this done. I urge my colleagues to vote, in a few minutes, to move forward on the JUSTICE Act and start the process of reform.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I come to the floor to talk about the civil rights of all Americans and ask my colleagues to vote for a process today that will lead to laws that will protect those civil rights. Unfortunately, the motion to proceed to predetermined legislation is just a predetermined outcome for a weak bill.

There is no agreement today by the majority leader and the minority lead-

er on a bipartisan bill. Everyone around here knows the way to get good bipartisan legislation. It starts with a committee process that is open and public and an amendment process. You can, and we have, done things like we did with COVID, where we get a bipartisan group of members together to discuss legislation and put something before Congress. Or you could bring up a bipartisan bill on the Senate floor. But that is not what is happening. That is not what is happening.

What is happening is a predetermined process to get a bill that is not good enough for the American people. Voting yes is just an attempt to dictate a weak outcome when what America wants more than anything else is justice. They want justice, guaranteed by a strong Federal response. Leader MCCONNELL said, in talking about the Republican efforts, "it would encourage smart reforms of law enforcement without steamrolling states and local communities' constitutional powers." Elsewhere, he said Democrats want to overreach, "Federalize all of the issues."

Well, with all due respect to the majority leader, it is called the Federal Civil Rights Act for a reason. It wasn't right to deny Rosa Parks a seat on a bus when she was fighting for her Constitutional rights. It wasn't right to deny African Americans access to hotels or lunch counters when they were fighting for their civil rights. It wasn't right to use police dogs on Black women trying to register to vote in 1964 in Mississippi when they were fighting for their voting rights. I guarantee you, it is not good enough and would not be good enough to give them 75 percent here. Rosa Parks was not looking for 75 percent; she was looking for someone to uphold her rights.

I spoke last night with one of my constituents, Stan Barer, who worked for Senator Warren Magnuson. As a staffer, he drafted the Accommodations Clause of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as one of his first jobs on the Senate Commerce Committee. Can you imagine coming to the U.S. Senate as a young lawyer and getting a job on the Commerce Committee and the first thing you have to do is draft the Accommodations Clause of the Civil Rights Act of 1964?

I can tell you what he told me. He said: Advocates then tried to minimize the Federal role. That is what we are hearing today, minimize the Federal role. Where would we be if President Kennedy had taken that approach? He fought for equal protection under the law for access to education and to end discrimination and segregation when Southern Governors wouldn't do so. There is a Federal role in protecting the civil liberties of all Americans, and we should not be abdicating it today with this vote.

Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1871 after the Civil War when Black Americans faced violence from the KKK and White supremacists in South-

ern States. It gave them the right to seek relief in Federal court when their Constitutional rights were deprived by someone acting in official capacity. It is those same civil rights that we should be upholding today, upholding those rights—making sure that there is not police brutality. That is what the U.S. Department of Justice is supposed to do. It is supposed to fight to uphold those rights. But we know we have a problem because President Trump and Attorney General Barr have repeatedly abdicated those responsibilities, have failed to uphold those civil rights. Because as the top law enforcement officer in the land, Attorney General Barr could be directing and supervising U.S. attorneys and prosecuting those Federal crimes as violations of civil rights.

Well, I know that that is what President Obama did. I know that he worked hard to make sure the U.S. DOJ Civil Rights Division oversaw pattern and practices of police abuses and entered a number of consent decrees with major cities, including in my State. Yes, the Attorney General is supposed to uphold the Fourth Amendment protections against unreasonable seizure and the civil rights laws that protect against excessive use of force. But that is not what is happening. Under the Trump administration and Attorney General Barr, the U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division police practice group has been reduced to half. It has not opened a major pattern or practice investigation, and Trump and his administration have been pulling away from this important role. It started with Jeff Sessions. Jeff Sessions made it harder to reach consent decrees with cities. So instead of playing the Federal role that we are supposed to play, we have an administration that is enabling bad practices to continue by not stopping them.

So, yes, there is a Federal role, there is a Federal role here today, just as there is with voting rights, just as there is with access to public places, just as there is with education and fighting discrimination. In fact, I think that is the central question of this debate. Are we going to have a strong Federal role in protecting the Constitutional rights of all Americans to prevent excessive force by police? It is pretty basic. We want to see a law that says that choke holds should be banned. We are not looking for 75 percent, we are not looking for study and analysis, we are looking to protect the Constitutional rights of all Americans.

So it is no surprise that the NAACP and Urban League have said that this legislation that our colleagues have proposed on the other side of the aisle does not meet the moment to end racial justice. I ask my colleagues, when are we going to? Maybe the information age has laid bare for us and all our eyes to see that this problem has to be resolved.

Are we going to uphold the Fourth Amendment rights against unreasonable seizure and the civil rights protecting against excessive use of force

by police? Are we going to uphold the rights of all Americans, or just some Americans? I would say to my colleagues, if we are not upholding all the Americans' rights, then we aren't really upholding America's civil rights. We have to ask ourselves, what moment are we living in when somebody thinks 75 percent is enough, and it is study and analysis, when we are talking about protecting the rights of all Americans?

My mom has been ill and so I've been spending a lot of time with her talking about family history, talking about this moment in our history, and she told me a story of how she was a young girl. She was born in 1932, so you can imagine the era that she lived through. But she told me when her older brother got to go to school, she got to stay home and ride his tricycle, so she thought that was the best. You know, he started kindergarten, she could ride his tricycle up and down the alley. And she met a woman, an African-American woman, who became her friend—her first real friend as a young child.

And she got to know that woman so well that my grandparents, in the neighboring building, helped with an election and saw that people were lining up to vote. White people were allowed to come into the building and be warm, but the African-American people had to stay outside in the cold and wouldn't be allowed to come into the building to vote, a great discouragement. Thank God my grandfather went out and built a bonfire and then left to go to work.

But when you look at the history of our country—and we still see voter suppression issues today—that is why we have to ask ourselves the fundamental question. When it comes to the civil rights of Americans, a report, 75 percent, is not enough. A clear line ending excessive abuse and declaring choke holds illegal is where we need to be.

I ask my colleagues to turn down this measure on a weak, predetermined path and get a real bipartisan effort and uphold the civil liberties of Americans because, I guarantee you, America really is watching.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I stand before this body today with a troubled heart, as most of us do, but that is not good enough. We have to kind of put away our own biases, our own prejudice. I am not talking about racial; I am talking about political.

Today we have an opportunity to do something, to start a process. Words are cheap in this body. I hear a lot of empty words. I hope not to add to that quantity today.

When I was a kid growing up in the Deep South, Martin Luther King wrote a letter from a jail cell in Birmingham to Black preachers in that community. He encouraged them to turn away from the violence that had such a poten-

tially devastating impact and to seek reform peacefully; that in the long term, that was the better approach. My father had me read that letter. I gave a speech a couple years ago, and I quoted from that letter. It meant something to me as a young White man in the Deep South.

Almost 57 years ago, on the other end of the National Mall from where we stand today, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., I believe, changed the world—certainly impacted millions of lives.

Standing before thousands of people, he shared his dream. He dreamed of a world where justice would prevail over prejudice. He dreamed of an America where everyone would be judged not by the color of their skin but by the depth of their character.

Since that day in 1963, a lot has changed in our country for the better. Unfortunately, Dr. King's vision of racial justice, harmony, and equality is yet to be fully realized. That is unacceptable.

This year, our country is seeing devastating tragedies taking place in our communities, but what we see on TV really is the tip of the iceberg, as a lot of my friends from those communities tell me. I believe them.

We need to make sure that the fundamental issue of fairness is upheld by all law enforcement agencies so everyone gets treated equally, fairly, period. The tragedies we have seen are unacceptable by any measure, and I don't think anybody in America thinks that what we have seen is right. Those who are responsible need to be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, and we need to put a full stop to it right now. But that fight starts today, I believe, here in the U.S. Senate.

Like so many Americans, my wife Bonnie and I have spent a lot of time reflecting and praying for our country and our friends and our fellow Americans in the last many weeks. It is clear to us that we have more work to do to make justice for all become a reality for every American.

We are a nation of laws, but those laws have to be enforced fairly and equally. To truly be effective, the police need to have the confidence of the communities they serve, and in many cases today, that is just not the case. That trust and confidence must be earned, however. Clearly, there is much work to do on this front to build up mutual trust.

I had a conversation with two grandmothers last week—well-educated, successful women of color, in positions of tremendous responsibility—and we talked about how their perspective and my perspective differed and how we saw each other in this crisis. But the most telling thing in that conversation was how they told me their No. 1 concern was for their grandsons and how their grandsons would be treated by members of the police force in their communities. That is a tragedy, and we can do something about it.

This issue is personal to me. Growing up in middle Georgia in the 1960s, I

have seen the devastation of racism, discrimination, a lack of equality, prejudice. As the son of two public school teachers, I saw how it weighed on my parents during that time. All they wanted was for every child to be treated equally, regardless of where they came from, what their name was, or the color of their skin.

Understand, I grew up in a military town, and we had people there from all over the world. So this wasn't an idle conversation; this was an objective they tried to live up to every single day. They wanted every child to have the same simple opportunity.

As superintendent of schools in our county, my father successfully integrated our school system—I remember that as a young kid—one of the first counties to do that in our State. They did it there without incident. It was a military town. We had people, again, from all over the world, and it was a joint effort. My dad did not do it because it was the easy thing to do, the convenient thing to do; he did it because it was the right thing to do.

In my own life, I have been blessed to have interacted with people from all over the world in my career. My hometown of Warner Robins is a military town. I went to school there, went to church there, and played ball there with people literally from all over the world. Later on, my wife Bonnie and I had the opportunity to live around the world in different places. This challenged our perspective in many ways. It helped us develop a deeper appreciation of how America's diversity is at once our greatest asset and, yes, sometimes our greatest challenge.

However, I also recognize that as a White man, my perspective is by definition very different from those of African Americans in my own community. We have these conversations all the time. I know I could never fully appreciate the pain and adversity many African Americans have faced in my lifetime and still face today. That is wrong. We can fix that starting today or at least start down that road again.

Yes, we have made a lot of progress—I can see that in my own lifetime—but that is no reason to ignore the situation today or to sit back and not do anything. However, as Dr. King said at the Lincoln Memorial, we will “not be satisfied until justice rolls down like water and righteousness like a mighty stream.”

Right now, the Senate has the opportunity to fight for justice for all. Today we will be voting to—it is a technicality, but it is a motion to proceed. This is nothing more than to just start on the bill.

I hear my Democratic colleagues talking about, well, it is not perfect; it is only 75 percent of the solution. Well, OK. Great. Let's start there. The purpose of a motion to proceed is to put a bill on the floor and actually debate it, have amendments. This bill is not perfect. It doesn't satisfy all the things I want to do. But it is a start. I plan to

offer amendments. I am sure the Presiding Officer wants to offer amendments. We welcome amendments in this process. The majority leader has said we will have an open amendment process. What we want to do is offer up this as a starting point, not a final solution.

Today we will have the vote on whether to start actually working on the JUSTICE Act. Senator TIM SCOTT has led a small task force to come up with the starting point—a bill that we can actually put our hands on, read, and then start changing. I am proud to be a cosponsor. We have many cosponsors. I think that we will probably have a unanimous vote on that on the Republican side today. My prayer is that we will have many on the Democratic side say: Look, we understand it is not perfect. We want this. We want that.

Let's put in the work, and let's start working on this now. It should be a foregone conclusion that we get overwhelming bipartisan support to debate the bill. Let's make it a good law. If it is not to your satisfaction, fine. Let's debate it.

Some say: Well, we don't trust the majority leader.

You don't have to trust the majority leader. The rules of the Senate protect each individual Senator once we put the bill in play. But if we don't put the bill on the floor, nobody is protected—especially our constituents.

Unfortunately, many of my colleagues on the other side are attempting to shut down this debate before we even start. They say it doesn't go far enough. They call it a token. That is absurd. That is ridiculous. It is insulting, particularly to my good friend TIM SCOTT.

Look, none of us believes this bill is perfect or an end-all as it is. As I just said, we have differences on this side, but we are willing to put it on the floor. We have allowed the Democrats to do things like this where we went on the floor and tried to debate a bill to get it to where—if you don't like what we end up with, you can always vote it down at cloture. You don't have to even go to the final vote.

All we are pleading for today is a motion to proceed to allow this bill to go on the floor and be fully debated. It is simply a starting point for debate and true compromise. Isn't that what our job is? Isn't that what we are supposed to do?

I ask my Democratic colleagues this: What major bill has come before this body in perfect form at the very outset? I can't think of any. If you have issues with this bill, let's debate it and offer amendments. Don't let perfect be the enemy of the good, please.

On major issues like this, it is our duty to come together. It is our duty to find common ground. It is our duty to fight for what is right.

This bill offers meaningful solutions that will help build trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve. These are just ideas. It provides

solutions that all of us can get behind right now.

In addition to modifying the rules concerning the use of force and providing body cams, this bill does several critical things to establish that trust and provide additional funding to help improve our police forces.

First, it incentivizes police recruiting to reflect the demographics of the communities they serve. How simple is that? This is a big step. If the police live in the communities they serve, if they reflect the demographics of that community, if they identify with the people of that community, it is a lot easier to develop trust and common ground.

Second, this bill encourages deescalation training for law enforcement officers. This will help law enforcement develop the skills and techniques they need to prevent public interactions that lead to the violence we have seen of late.

Third, this bill creates a database that helps our communities root out those who do not serve the public even though they are enforcing law.

The bottom line is that the bill increases funding for law enforcement. It doesn't defend law enforcement or eliminate the police force.

These solutions we are offering up as a starting point today are meaningful. They will restore the confidence of our communities and hold accountable police officers who abuse their positions or who are poorly trained.

Most of us who truly want change also understand that eliminating police forces is not the answer, as some suggest. Our police forces are to serve and protect our communities—all of our communities—and there needs to be change before they can be successful in that.

We have proven in the past that we can come together to fight for what is right. We did when we provided permanent funding for our HBCUs, our historically Black colleges and universities. We did it when we created opportunity zones in hundreds of communities of color around the country, many of them economically challenged. In 2018, when we passed the bipartisan criminal justice reform bill—the biggest one in the last 50 years—that was true progress. We did it. We can do it again today, but first we have to put this bill on the floor. We have to start the debate. We have to pass this motion to proceed, or—guess what—no debate will happen. They will talk to their base, Republicans will talk to our base, and nothing will happen. A pox on all of us if we let that happen.

If Democrats shut down this bill today, it will demonstrate a lack of sincerity, in my opinion, to at least engage in finding solutions. This is no different from the immigration conversation we had just a couple years ago. When the President of the United States, Donald Trump, offered up a pathway to citizenship for 1.8 million DACA recipients and we couldn't even

get a debate going with the other side—they turned it down out of hand because it was President Trump's suggestion.

All of us need to remember that while we look different, we might talk differently, we certainly may think differently, we really are one Nation under God.

Our diversity is our strength. It makes us different. It makes us stronger. It makes us the leader of the world in our current time. What unites us is far greater than what divides us.

Let's work on this bill today and start building a more perfect union for every American. Let's vote yes on this motion to proceed.

I yield the floor.

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. SCOTT of South Carolina. 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 South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the roll-call vote.

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

THE JUSTICE ACT

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, we come here today with an opportunity to say to America and specifically to communities of color: We see you. We hear you. I have experienced your pain.

I have been stopped 18 times in the last two decades, and 1 year, I was stopped seven times, as an elected official in this body, trying to get into the Chamber and into the office buildings on the congressional side.

I understand some part of what too many have experienced. This police reform legislation addresses that. It provides clear opportunities for us to say: Not only do we hear you, not only do we see you, but we are responding to your pain, because we in America believe that justice should be applied equally to all of our citizens, with no exceptions, and when we see exceptions, it is our responsibility to do something about those exceptions, and this legislation helps us get there.

I say to my colleagues on the other side, we received a letter from Senator SCHUMER saying that there were five things about the JUSTICE Act that did not meet their principles. My response was a simple one: Let's have five amendments on those things. If we can get the votes on these two sides of the Chamber, we should include that in the legislation.

I met with other Senators on the other side who said that there are more than five things that we need to have a conversation about. I said: Let's include an amendment for every single

issue you have. They did not stick around for that meeting.

My concern is that 80 percent just won't do. My concern is that our friends on the other side will not take advantage of this opportunity to say to the communities that are suffering: We see you. We hear you. We are willing to respond as one body.

I implore all of us to vote for the motion to proceed so that if there are recommendations that come in the form of amendments, we have a vote up or down on those amendments. I have offered as many amendments as necessary for this bill to be seen by the public, and, in consultation with the other side, let it be their bill—not TIM SCOTT's bill, not the Republican bill, not the Democrat bill, but a bill that starts to address the issues that have plagued this Nation for decades.

This is not my first start at this legislation. I started on this bill 5 years ago, but I could not find voices that would push forward reforms brought to our attention by the Walter Scott shooting in 2013.

I will close with this: I respect people with whom I disagree. They have the right to disagree. My pastor tells me I have the right to be wrong, which means I am not right all the time. But on this bill, if you don't think we are right, make it better. Don't walk away. Vote for the motion to proceed so that we have an opportunity to deal with this very real threat to the America that is civil, that is balanced. This is an opportunity to say yes—to say yes not to us but to those folks who are waiting for our leadership to stand and be counted.

VOTE ON WILSON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Wilson nomination?

Mr. LEE. I call for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 125 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Loeffler	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Perdue	

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Harris	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Rosen
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carper	Klobuchar	Smith
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 3985, a bill to improve and reform policing practices, accountability and transparency, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Crapo	Johnson
Barrasso	Cruz	Jones
Blackburn	Daines	Kennedy
Blunt	Enzi	King
Boozman	Ernst	Lankford
Braun	Fischer	Lee
Burr	Gardner	Loeffler
Capito	Graham	Manchin
Cassidy	Grassley	McSally
Collins	Hawley	Moran
Cornyn	Hoeven	Murkowski
Cotton	Hyde-Smith	Paul
Cramer	Inhofe	Perdue

Portman	Sasse	Tillis
Risch	Scott (FL)	Toomey
Roberts	Scott (SC)	Wicker
Romney	Shelby	Young
Rounds	Sullivan	
Rubio	Thune	

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Harris	Rosen
Bennet	Hassan	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cardin	Leahy	Smith
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McConnell	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Peters	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Reed	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 45.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to explain the reason I changed to no.

I am in strong support of the bill that has been crafted by the Senator from South Carolina. In order to have an opportunity to reconsider the vote without waiting for 2 days, I changed my vote and moved to reconsider, which means that it could come back at any time should progress be made.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 483, S. 4049.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 483, S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

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