I don't know how we could have made it any easier or better. In fact, when we took up the JUSTICE Act, he and his side were provided at least 20 amendment opportunities. We could have had the debate he seeks tonight at the appropriate time on the appropriate bill, and I am sorry that we didn't do that.

Perhaps after tonight's episode, he and his colleagues will reconsider, and perhaps before we are done this year, Senator SCOTT's JUSTICE Act could be brought to the floor and we could have an adult discussion and debate on amendments and on the bill and on all kinds of great ideas right here in the most august body in the United States. I hope that can happen.

With that, I yield the floor and wish you a good night.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. GARDNER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CORONAVIRUS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Congress, our States, and the administration talk about ways to handle the immediate consequences of COVIV–19. We must also talk about the aftermath, and Steve Case has written a provocative op-ed about the future.

Those of us in Congress should read and discuss it It has to be considered in future planning.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, July 19, 2020]

THERE'S NO GOING BACK TO THE PRE-PANDEMIC ECONOMY—CONGRESS SHOULD RESPOND ACCORDINGLY

(By Steve Case)

This week, Congress will likely take up the next steps in the economic response to the covid–19 pandemic. If the package is like previous efforts, it will focus on trying to turn back the clock to February 2020: treating the economy as if it were Sleeping Beauty, merely needing to be awakened to be fully restored. This strategy is a mistake: Congress needs to stop solely backing efforts to restore the old economic reality and focus on how to develop a new one.

Most of the $1 trillion that Congress has put into business support so far during the pandemic has been directed to preserving existing firms through the Paycheck Protection Program and the Main Street Relief Fund. Helping those businesses and their workers is vital, but that alone won't fuel the economic recovery the country needs.

The problem is that many of the businesses backed by PPP or Main Street are going to wind up shutting down. Even when they aren't facing a global pandemic or economic crisis, about 100,000 small and medium-size businesses fail in the United States every year. New businesses will be needed to replace the ones that permanently close. Moreover, the failure rate is likely to be higher, as many firms were on the wrong side of trends—such as the move to online shopping, convenient food delivery or watching streaming content at home—that the pandemic lockdown has accelerated.

Another consideration: The protests stirred by the killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis police custody have made clear how many Americans were left behind in the pre-coronavirus economy; restoring the way things were before the virus hit won't address these needs.

Here are three ways Congress can help launch a new, more equitable era of entrepreneurship.

First: Make it easier for the earliest-stage start-ups to receive PPP dollars and for all start-ups to access the Main Street Relief Fund. PPP loans go to existing businesses to maintain jobs but not to new businesses that want to create them. Main Street loans go only to companies that are already profitable; most start-ups are not. That approach is backward: Studies show that nearly all net new job creation comes from start-ups, not established businesses.

A PPP revision should allow start-ups to obtain loans based on their plans to create jobs—with loan forgiveness granted only if those jobs materialize. If they don't, the start-ups should be required to repay the loans before any other obligations. And the barrier in the Main Street lending program that makes businesses ineligible for aid if they were not profitable in 2019 should be removed.

Second, the government needs to be a counterweight to private capital that exacerbates geographic disparities in opportunity as the country responds to the crisis. The pandemic is a devastating tragedy, but adversity tends to be met by the creation of new industries and new businesses. This crisis will stir innovations in medicine, goods and services delivered at home, remote work and learning, and more. Where will these new firms grow? If the decision is left to the private sector alone, almost all of them will be in three states: New York, California and Massachusetts, which attract 75 percent of all venture capital.

Great ideas to respond to this crisis are spread widely across the country—but capital is not. Business assistance programs created by Congress should have a special focus on getting startups off the ground in places that have lacked venture capital backing in the past. Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.) and others have already proposed such legislation; members of Congress from these neglected areas should insist it is part of any Phase 4 bill.

Finally, lawmakers should step in to address unintended inequalities of opportunity for female and minority entrepreneurs caused by the earlier relief bills. Because these programs fund only existing businesses, they reinforce opportunity gaps. Communities with thriving businesses get more PPP and Main Street aid; those that have lacked capital to get businesses off the ground in the past see little help now.

The solution would be for Congress to direct unused PPP funds to start-ups led by female entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs of color, creating opportunities where they have not existed before. The Main Street Lending program could be modified to extend special debt options to community development groups and minority-focused accelerators to back a new wave of startups founded by historically underrepresented entrepreneurs.

There's no going back to the pre-pandemic U.S. economy. Too much has changed; too many new needs exist. This is a rare opportunity to break with the past and create a better future. Congress should grab it.

## VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I voted in support of S. Amdt. 1788, which would reduce defense spending by 10 percent and invest that money into healthcare, education, and poverty reduction in communities with a poverty rate of 25 percent or more. To govern is to choose, and as we face unprecedented challenges at home, this defense budget is out of step with the values, priorities, and needs of the American people.

The unchecked growth in the defense budget is unsustainable, and the Trump administration has exacerbated these challenges. We have a duty to ensure the readiness of our forces, and I have supported efforts to rebuild our Armed Forces after years of costly overseas engagements. But massive spending increases without clear strategic direction do not make us safer. We need to be thoughtful about our spending choices, recognizing that every dollar spent on defense is a dollar not spent on healthcare, education, workforce training, and other critical areas of need.

The National Defense Authorization Act as it is currently written would spend $740.5 billion on defense. This represents 53 percent of total Federal discretionary spending and exceeds the defense budgets of the next 11 nations combined, including our allies in Australia, South Korea, Germany, Japan, France, and the United Kingdom. It is more than twice the combined defense expenditures of China and Russia. Topline defense spending has risen by more than $100 billion since President Trump took office; after the $74 billion cut proposed in this amendment, defense spending would still be above the fiscal year 2017 level.

Some of my colleagues have expressed unease about the across-the-board nature of these cuts, and I agree that a targeted approach is preferable. But I have seen the consequences of delaying difficult decisions and believe we can no longer wait to have difficult conversations about our defense budget. In addition, the National Defense Authorization Act is not an appropriations bill, and this amendment simply reduces the total amount of money authorized to be spent on defense in the upcoming fiscal year. The Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, will still have the task of making thoughtful, targeted reductions in areas of lower priority, while preserving funding for high-priority items. I encourage my colleagues to confront these challenges for the good of our country and make adjustments as needed during conference negotiations with the House while remaining under the cap set by this amendment.

I am glad that this amendment protects salaries and healthcare from cuts, and would have preferred that it go further in making targeted cuts in order