

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
Barraso	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
Barraso	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.