

brought freedom to hundreds of millions and saved the world a few times for good measure.

Yet, a crazy fringe is treating their monuments like vanity statues of tin-horn tyrants. Our Founding Fathers are being roped to the ground like they were Saddam Hussein.

The list goes on: Saint Junipero Serra, the missionary settler whom Pope Francis celebrated here in Washington a few years ago to bipartisan applause, sided with native people over soldiers; Ulysses S. Grant, the general who crushed the Confederacy, the President who used Federal force to fight the Klan. They, too, have been placed on the historical hit list for this new Red Guard that nobody elected. There are more monuments toppled up and down the west coast.

There could be no clearer sign that these far-left radicals have severed any connection to the righteous cause of racial justice. They have literally tried to succeed where Robert E. Lee failed and bring General Grant to the ground.

Like any cultural revolution, this far-left anger is sparing some heroes of their own. I understand that in Seattle, a large statue of Vladimir Lenin stands quite untouched. Apparently, people claim with a straight face that this Communist statue has survived because it is located—wait for it—on private property. So the Founding Father of the mass-murdering Soviet Union watches over Seattle streets, but our own Founding Fathers are dragged in the dirt.

A small slice of our national elite has spent years cooking up highfalutin theories to justify the cheapest, basest forms of anti-Americanism. The absurd claim that America's deepest founding principle is bigotry has escaped the ivory tower and begun seeping into society.

The United States of America can and should have nuanced conversations about our complex past. We can and should have discussions about our future. We can and should have peaceful protests. But this lawlessness serves none of that. It is just an alliance of convenience between angry criminals who think it is fun to wreak havoc and a slice of elite society that profits off saying that our country is evil and deserves the abuse. Enough. Enough.

The vast majority of Americans know full well that imperfect heroes are still heroes, that our imperfect Union is still the greatest Nation in world history. Americans know that our imperfect Framers built our Nation on moral truths that fueled improvement beyond anything their generation could have built themselves. The American people know this. They also know that we cannot let angry mobs carrying ropes act outside the rule of law.

It was central to the 14th Amendment and the civil rights movement that law enforcement and local authorities may not do their jobs selectively. If "equal protection of the

laws" means anything, it means mayors and Governors cannot selectively stand down because they would rather not pay the political price for confronting a particular mob. But that is precisely what we are seeing in Democratic-governed cities all across our country.

In Seattle, for weeks now, a mayor has let bands of people ban police from several square blocks. People have been shot. A teenager has died. But, apparently, stopping this insanity has been deemed less politically correct than letting it continue. Night after night, Governors and mayors have stood down and watched criminals spray paint churches and topple statues. Public order is now totally optional and depends on the lawbreaker's politics.

Here in Washington, last night, local police protected one monument from a memorial-hunting mob over near the White House. It is past time for that courage to be replicated in every city, every night, until Americans have the peace and the rule of law that all of our citizens deserve.

It is no surprise that people who want to say our country is intrinsically evil are so frantic to erase history that they will break the law to do it. Erasing history is the only way their claims could carry any water.

Americans know that an imperfect nation built by imperfect heroes is still the most perfect Union the world has ever seen. We are proud to build statues of the geniuses who fought to found this country. We are proud to build statues to the leaders who have preserved it. We are proud to build statues of prophetic civil rights leaders who made the country confront gross injustice. We thank God that all kinds of imperfect people have made us a more perfect Union.

When the dust settles, it is never—never—the mobs or bullies whom we honor. It is the brave leaders who confront them.

THE JUSTICE ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on a totally different matter, last week, Senator SCOTT of South Carolina and a group of our colleagues rolled out the JUSTICE Act—a serious set of proposals to move the ball for police reform across the country.

This legislation identifies a number of smart levers that Congress can pull to advance and encourage smart reforms of law enforcement without steamrolling States' and localities' constitutional powers.

It would step up transparency in reporting and recordkeeping. It would expand accountability and disciplinary measures needed to establish and restore community trust. It would directly address issues, such as choke holds and no-knock warrants, which have been in the news lately for reasons that nobody believes are acceptable.

These are the subjects that the country needs us to address. Accordingly, these are the subjects Senator SCOTT's proposal does address.

The American people expect us to do our jobs, discuss, debate, and legislate on this subject that has captured the Nation's attention—discussion, debate, and votes on amendments.

Tomorrow, we will find out whether even these modest steps are a bridge too far for our colleagues on the Democratic side.

Earlier this month, Senate Democrats were telling everyone who would listen that we would be derelict in our duty if we did not have police reform legislation on the floor of the Senate this month. But then, as soon as the junior Senator from South Carolina actually published something concrete, their tune changed rather sharply.

Now, suddenly, our Democratic colleagues are reportedly agonizing and debating whether to let the Senate have this discussion at all or whether to kill any chance of reform legislation before it can even taxi onto the runway.

The American people deserve better than a partisan stalemate. The American people deserve for the Senate to take up this issue at this time.

Senate Republicans want to have this discussion. We are ready to make a law, not just make a point.

Tomorrow, we will find out whether our Democratic colleagues share our ambition or whether they choose to duck the issue and leave the country in the lurch.

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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, 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.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I speak for 10 minutes, the Senator from New Jersey for 10 minutes, and then the Senator from California for 10 minutes.

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

JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the past few months have been amongst the most wrenching and tumultuous in recent memory. The deaths of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, as well as from the COVID-19 pandemic, have forced our country to reckon with not only the decades of long failure to reform our police departments and prevent unwarranted brutality against Black Americans but also the centuries-long struggle against racial injustice.

Here in Congress, the Democrats have sought to turn the anger and frustration in our country—and, yes, sometimes despair—into real and meaningful action. The Democrats wish to seize the moment. Three weeks ago, the Democrats announced a bill that would finally bring strong, comprehensive, and lasting change to police departments across America—the Justice in Policing Act, led by Senators BOOKER and HARRIS. The House of Representatives will pass that bill this week, but here in the Senate, we have a much different story.

Senate Republicans have responded to our comprehensive legislation by proposing a bill that is so much weaker on nearly every single count and, worse still, is completely silent on so many issues that scream out for action. Should police officers be held to greater account if they violate Americans' constitutional rights? The Republican bill is silent. Should police departments continue to have easy access to military-grade equipment? The Republican bill is silent. Should police departments be forced to change their behavior when it comes to racial profiling? Should they develop a better use of force standard? Should the Justice Department be empowered and encouraged to investigate police departments that have bad patterns and practices? Silent. Silent. Silent.

In the place of real change and accountability for police officers and departments, the Republican bill proposes a slew of studies and commissions. We don't need to study the problem of police misconduct and violence—we need to solve it. No doubt, these issues are complex, multifaceted, and difficult, but the Republican legislation pretends as if the cancer of police brutality is, in reality, little more than a runny nose.

The national conversation about policing reform, which has been ongoing for several years, was renewed by the terrible killing of George Floyd—his windpipe crushed by an officer who

kept his knee on Floyd's neck for nearly 9 minutes. The bill my Republican friends have drafted would not even completely ban the type of brutal tactics that led to George Floyd's death. The Republican bill does not even fully prevent the kind of tactics that sparked this whole debate in the first place.

Breonna Taylor, a first responder, was asleep in her bed in Louisville, KY, when she was killed by police who were executing a no-knock warrant. The Republican bill does not ban no-knock warrants. It does not limit no-knock warrants or require police departments to provide more information before obtaining them from a court. It calls for more data on the use of no-knock warrants. After the tragic loss of Breonna Taylor, how could the Republican bill not even attempt to prevent the kind of events that led to her death?

Imagine if President Johnson, after the bus boycotts and the march in Selma and the righteous movement for civil rights in America, had proposed a bill that had called for more data on the effectiveness of poll taxes and other voter intimidation techniques. Imagine if President Johnson, instead of the Voting Rights Act, had proposed a voting rights commission to have studied the issue a little bit more.

There is no escaping the fact that the Senate Republicans have drafted a policing bill that is deeply, fundamentally, and irrevocably flawed, and the Democrats are not the only ones to say so.

In this morning's Washington Post, the Floyd family lawyer, Reverend Sharpston, and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund urged Senators to oppose the GOP reform bill. They called it a nonstarter. That is what we believe as well.

Last night, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund said that it "cannot support legislation that does not embody a strong accountability framework for police officers and other law enforcement who engage in misconduct."

The lawyer for the families of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor, Ben Crump—one of the Nation's most renowned civil rights attorneys—wrote that the Republican legislation is "in direct contrast to the demands of the people" who have been protesting, and "the Black community is tired of the lip service, and shocked that the [Republican proposal] can be thought of as legislation." That is from the lawyer for the families of Breonna Taylor and George Floyd.

Let me repeat: The attorney representing the families who are seeking justice believe the Republican bill is completely inadequate, lip service, and can hardly be thought of as legislation. How does Leader MCCONNELL respond to that charge? How does he respond when the families' lawyer says his bill is a nonstarter?

Civil rights groups—the noble guardians of these issues for generations

that want nothing more than to see meaningful legislation—are urging the Senate to reject the Republican proposal. They see this bill for the futile and, maybe, cynical ploy that it is. Their opposition speaks louder than almost any other.

Who does America believe when it comes to dealing with these issues—Leader MCCONNELL, who seems to be new to these issues, or the civil rights groups, which have been fighting for change for decades? Who does America believe?

We Democrats are certain the McConnell plan will not—indeed, cannot—result in any passing of legislation. It is clear the Republican bill, as is, will not get 60 votes. There is overwhelming opposition to the bill in our caucus, and because the bill needs such large-scale and fundamental change, there is no conceivable way that a series of amendments strong enough to cure the defects in the bill could garner 60 votes either. So no bill will pass as a result of this ploy by Senator MCCONNELL. The Republican majority has given the Senate a bad bill and proposed no credible way to sufficiently improve it.

Simply put, Leader MCCONNELL has created a cul-de-sac from which no legislation can emerge. Leader MCCONNELL's plan appears to be designed to get the burden of dealing with policing reform off the Republicans' shoulders by setting up a process which is guaranteed not to result in successful legislation.

Again, Leader MCCONNELL is leading the Senate into a cul-de-sac—a process designed to fail. Yet there is a way out of this cul-de-sac. Yes, there is a way out. It is the same process that has led to success in the Senate time and again. It is a simple word—"bipartisanship."

This morning, Senators BOOKER, HARRIS, and I are sending a letter to Leader MCCONNELL, stressing the need for bipartisan talks to get a constructive starting point on policing reform. If our two parties could get together to draft a bipartisan proposal—and even if we don't agree on everything, we can agree to invoke a real amendment process—then we might produce a bill that has a real shot of passing. If the Republican leader would acknowledge the obvious need for these talks, there is a real chance we could produce legislation that has a shot of passing.

So we are pleading with Leader MCCONNELL: Instead of pressing forward with this partisan bill that is designed to make sure no bill passes, Leader MCCONNELL, pursue a path that is designed to produce real, meaningful policing reform.

In the Senate, where 60 votes are required to achieve almost anything, a bipartisan process is the only way to move forward.

My friends, this could be a moment for the Senate to rise to the occasion. There is certainly something happening out there in America. Hundreds