

Trade negotiations with China are far too important to the future of American business and American workers to sacrifice just because a handful of American corporations are worried about their quarterly profits. Their quarterly profits are nothing compared to America maintaining its technological dominance, its technological superiority that China keeps trying to steal from us, in some ways legitimate, in many ways not.

Another point of emphasis for the President's team—this is one the President cares less about, but that is OK—is China's human rights record. China released a new policy outlining the use of force against Hong Kong's protest. Its military built up forces along the border. We have seen this movie before at Tiananmen. It was a horror movie—one that resulted in hundreds, if not thousands, of unarmed Chinese citizens being mercilessly slaughtered by their own Army under the direction of the Chinese Communist Party. We cannot have a sequel to this atrocity. The administration should push back against China's militarism and stand up for the autonomy and democratic rights of Hong Kong citizens.

I have read some of these columns where they say: Can't we get along? We can't get along because, first, China doesn't play fair and has stolen trillions of dollars and millions of jobs from America and seeks to keep doing it. They have been duping our Presidents, pushing them around, making agreements, and breaking them. Second, we can't get along with China because of what it does to its citizens—the Uighurs in Western China and now the citizens of Hong Kong.

What we have seen with China is that when we are tough and strong, they back off. When we show any glimmer of weakness—as we are showing in floating a deal, a lessening of the restrictions on Huawei—they take advantage.

Let me say this to all of those in this administration who are urging the President to back off on Huawei and let them buy some of our products. There is a bipartisan group here in this Senate who will work very hard to prevent that from happening legislatively. The most likely vehicle is the NDAA. I think we will get broad support from Democrats and Republicans in the House and Senate. So to those in the administration who are trying to back off, don't even try it.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Looking back on this work period, it is a shame that the Senate, once again, has made no progress—none—on the issue of election security.

Only a week ago, Special Counsel Mueller called Russia interference one of the greatest threats to democracy he has seen in his career, a threat that he said continues “as we sit here.”

Despite Mueller's warning—a warning echoed by prominent Republicans,

Trump appointees, such as FBI Director Wray, Director Coats, and our entire Senate Intelligence Committee led by RICHARD BURR, a colleague of ours—Leader MCCONNELL has not brought election security to the floor. In fact, he has blocked Democratic requests for a debate on election security, dismissing our ideas as a “partisan wish list.” That is political rhetoric to avoid a problem that shouldn't be partisan at all.

Using paper ballots is not partisan. Making sure that our election machines are safe from hacking is not partisan. Giving the States resources to better manage their elections is not partisan. That is American. Our elections are sacrosanct and these are commonsense, widely agreed-upon reforms that will make our elections safer, particularly in this dangerous new world where powers that have malice toward the United States—Russia, China, Iran, and North Korea—can use new technology to reach into our election structure.

This is not 1940 or even 2005. We need to strengthen our election security, and it should not be a partisan issue. When Leader MCCONNELL calls it a partisan issue, he is ducking to avoid it for reasons unknown to almost anybody.

Recent Republican opposition to election security has been disappointing. I say to my Republican colleagues: Where are you? Why aren't you telling the Republican leader that we ought to do something? Every one of our Republicans is complicit when Leader MCCONNELL blocks election security because they could join with us. If they began to join with us, my guess is that Leader MCCONNELL might put some legislation on the floor. We want to debate it. We want to discuss it. Leader MCCONNELL and our Republican colleagues may not exactly agree with our ideas—although many are bipartisan—but we should at least bring things to the floor, discuss them, and get something done. Unfortunately, we don't see much action.

It was precisely a year ago that the Democrats last sought to secure funding for election security when the Senate Republicans voted down our amendments. Unfortunately, it appears that Leader MCCONNELL will not take action before the August work period. Yet I assure the American people and Leader MCCONNELL that this issue is not going away. The Democrats will press for election security when we return and again when the Senate debates appropriations bills.

This is about protecting the wellspring of our democracy, the vitality of our democracy, and the sacrosanct nature of our democracy. To call it political demeans everything. Young men and young women from Bunker Hill on—for hundreds of years—have died to protect our elections. You have to protect them in a different way now with there being technology and cyber threats, but the

idea of protecting them burns just as brightly in the American heart, and Leader MCCONNELL is somehow impervious to all of that.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on climate, I am pleased to share that the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works did something amazing and groundbreaking yesterday. It passed the first ever climate title in a transportation reauthorization bill.

Thanks to the Senate Democrats on the committee and to particularly Ranking Member CARPER's hard work, the highway bill actually includes \$10 billion that will be dedicated to climate-focused programs and policies in order to reduce emissions and improve the resiliency of our transportation infrastructure to climate change and natural disasters. It includes funds for States to reduce carbon emissions, support for electric and alternative-fuel vehicles, reductions in emissions from ports and roadways, and investments in climate-resistant infrastructure.

Less than a year ago, I said, in moving forward, the Democrats would demand that climate change be addressed in any infrastructure bill. This bill, with its \$10 billion investment in climate, is a product of that demand. This will be the first time serious money has been included in an infrastructure package to fight climate change, but it certainly will not be the last.

The clock is ticking when it comes to climate change. We need to make progress whenever we can and as quickly as we can. If the Republican leader will not bring legislation to the floor, the Democrats will be prepared to take the lead and fight for climate progress at every opportunity we get. That is precisely what this \$10 billion climate investment in the highway bill represents. Again, I thank Senator CARPER for his leadership, his skill, and his persistence in getting it done.

Protecting our country and the world from the threat of climate change is no less than a moral obligation. When we return from the recess, the Democrats will continue to look for more opportunities to make progress on climate change.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally, during the debate last night, when it came to healthcare, half of the Democratic Presidential field engaged in a healthy debate, a great deal of which was focused on the No. 1 issue to American voters—healthcare.

Despite different policy proposals, the debate shows that the Democratic Party is completely united on the idea of universal healthcare coverage as well as on the need to lower the costs and improve the quality of healthcare for every American. Yet one point that should have been made during the debate but unfortunately wasn't should

have been the fact that the Republicans are actively sabotaging our current healthcare system.

Whether you are one of the more moderate Members on healthcare or are one of the ones who have a more broad, more sweeping proposal, it is the difference between the parties. Yet those differences almost pale compared to the differences between every Democrat on that platform and the Republicans, because the Republicans are seeking to undo healthcare, to sabotage healthcare, and to have fewer people covered. As a result of their ideas, thoughts, and lawsuits, costs are going up.

There is a huge gap between the parties on healthcare, and I am glad we are having an active debate on how to move forward to cover more people and have it cost less. While we are doing that, the Trump administration is doing the opposite. It is expanding junk insurance plans, reducing funds to help Americans locate and sign up for the right insurance, and ending cost-sharing payments that help low-income families afford care.

The congressional Republicans have tried and have, thankfully, failed to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The coup de grace, of course, is the fact that now the Trump administration—with the support of many Republican attorneys general and the complicity of just about every Member of the Senate on the Republican side—is supporting a lawsuit that would invalidate the Affordable Care Act entirely, which would kick tens of millions off of their insurance and eliminate the protections for preexisting conditions for the over 100 million Americans who have those preexisting conditions, and just about every Republican is going along with that.

The difference in the 2020 elections between the Democrats and the Republicans on healthcare will be apparent and glaring, and it will far and away subsume any differences we may have on policy.

I yield the floor.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark T. Pittman, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

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

BLM HEADQUARTERS RELOCATION

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, several years back, at a committee hearing of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Director Neil Kornze of the Bureau of Land Management under the Obama administration was testifying before our committee on a regulation that was coming out of the BLM that most, if not all, of the county commissioners and various organizations in Colorado were opposed to. In fact, the opposition was so uniform in Colorado and throughout the West that I couldn't understand why the BLM was going forward with that regulation.

Out of frustration, at one point during the committee hearing, I said: Director Kornze, if you were just located in the West, if you were just out west, you would understand why this rule is a bad idea.

The response at the time, several years ago, was kind of a chuckle and a laugh, and, yes, well, we should talk about that.

It planted the seeds of an idea that actually was made into reality just last week with the announcement that the headquarters of the Bureau of Land Management will be moving out west and, indeed, to Grand Junction, CO.

This announcement was made on July 16, and I commend the efforts of Secretary Bernhardt and the Department of the Interior for listening to the people of the West.

This isn't a Republican issue. This isn't a partisan issue. In fact, this idea to move the BLM headquarters out to the land that it regulates and oversees has been embraced by Democrats and Republicans across Colorado and throughout the West.

They also talked about their intention in this announcement to reorganize the Bureau of Land Management and to relocate a significant number of headquarters jobs throughout the West, not just in Grand Junction but in Lakewood, CO, in Montana, in Utah, and beyond.

I think it is important to talk about the reasons why it makes so much sense to have this particular Agency located in Colorado, in the West.

Look at this map here. The red on this map is a combination of both mineral rights and surface lands. You can see the red. Forty-seven percent of all the land out west is where 93 percent of all Federal land is located. The Federal Government owns roughly 47 percent of this land out west. It is where 93 percent of the Federal land is located. Think about that. Ninety-three percent of all Federal land, here in the red, makes up 47 percent of the land ownership in the West.

Nationwide, the Bureau of Land Management is responsible for managing

approximately 700 million acres of Federal mineral estates located underground. That is the entire country, of course, but 245 million acres are surface acres, or Federal surface lands. All but 100,000 acres of those surface acres—all but 100,000 of those acres—are west of the Mississippi River, and located predominantly in the 11 westernmost States and Alaska.

One of the frustrations I hear from local and county officials and environmental activists and farmers and ranchers is that when they deal with their BLM local field office, they seem to have a very good experience that people are working together to solve problems, and they like the conversations they have and the cooperation they are getting from the local and regional offices. But something happens when that decision-making process then moves to Washington, DC. Something happens, and all of a sudden the conversation and communication can stop. It changes. All of a sudden, the outcomes aren't what they thought they would be based on those local, productive conversations.

We have seen directives and management decisions coming more from Washington, DC, lately, instead of from the local field offices, where people know their communities best and understand the land best. So what happens is that the deep pockets and special interests in Washington often carry the day, make the convincing arguments, thousands of miles removed from where the Federal and the public land actually is.

That is why it is important to have this BLM move. It changes that. Instead of having special interests in Washington, in a community that has none of these public lands located in it, you are able to make that decision right here, in Colorado, surrounded by public lands, in a community that is defined by the public lands that they oversee.

I believe government is going to work better when it is local, when local decision makers are closest to the land that the decisions they are making affect the most. That is why this decision is so important—whether it is issues of withdrawal of locatable minerals or the reduction of grazing permits; the concept of multiple use over time; the idea that we can use this land for preservation, conservation, or that we can use it for energy development, or that we can use it for grazing. That has somehow fallen out of favor.

My friend Greg Walcher, who is a former Senate staffer for Senator Armstrong, who used to head the Colorado Department of Natural Resources, wrote an op-ed about this point, pointing out that the multiple-use mandate includes managing 18,000 grazing permits, 220 wilderness areas, 27 national monuments, 600 national conservation areas, 200,000 miles of streams, 2,000 miles of wild and scenic rivers, 6,000 miles of national scenic trails, 63,000 oil and gas wells, 25,000 mines, and 50 million acres of forests.