

Secretary of Defense, Mark Esper. We also voted to advance the nomination of Ambassador Kelly Craft, a very impressive individual, to serve in the critical role of U.N. Ambassador.

Ms. Craft is a fellow product of the Bluegrass State. She has already made Kentucky and the Nation proud through significant public service, including as an alternate delegate to the United Nations and, most recently, as Ambassador to Canada.

In each of these cases, this impressive nominee earned an unopposed confirmation, and, in each case, she repaid the Senate's confidence by skillfully and effectively advocating for the interests of the United States on the international stage. During her tenure as Ambassador to Canada, America's relationship with our northern neighbor was tested. A number of challenging policy hurdles threatened to trip up progress on several important issues, including trade negotiations, but, by all accounts, Ambassador Craft's involvement led to greater cooperation.

She worked on finalizing the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement, encouraged cross-border participation in joint sanctions efforts, and helped more Americans do business in Canada. As she stands in this new role, she brings the ringing endorsements of peers and counterparts she engaged all along the way.

The Premier of Ontario and a former Canadian Ambassador to the United States has said: "She's done the job very well."

And another quote: "Every Premier I know thinks the world of her. . . . She really proved herself over some tough times."

Our partners to the north have a healthy respect for the hard work and qualifications of Ambassador Kelly Craft, and so does the Senate. Last week, even in this contentious moment, a wide bipartisan majority of our colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee voted to recommend her nomination to be U.N. Ambassador favorably here to the floor, and before we adjourn this week, we will confirm her.

#### BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, the Senate needs to pass the bipartisan budget agreement secured by the administration with Speaker PELOSI. The deal we have in front of us is a product of extensive negotiations between President Trump's team and the Democratic House. I am confident it is not exactly the legislation that either side of the aisle would have written if one party held the White House, the House, and had 60 votes in the Senate. That is what we call divided government, but I am equally confident that this is a deal that every one of my colleagues should support when we vote on it in the near future.

This government funding agreement is the right deal for our national de-

fense. It is the right deal because it ensures the United States maintains its full faith and credit. It is the right deal because it brings predictability and stability through 2020 and moves toward restoring regular appropriations. It is the right deal because it secures these priorities without partisan poison pill riders that would take us backward on the issue of protecting human life and curtail central Presidential authorities.

The Republicans' No. 1 priority was investing in our national defense. After 8 years of neglect and atrophy under the Obama administration, Congress has worked hand-in-hand with the Trump administration to begin writing a new chapter. More of the resources our Armed Forces need, more flexibility for commanders, more cutting-edge tools for U.S. servicemembers, and more investments in modernization will not only rebuild the military that we need today but set us on the trajectory we need to be on to secure our future.

All in all, I don't think any Senators are actually rooting for a destabilizing continuing resolution. I certainly don't think any Senators are rooting for a debt limit crisis that could put our full faith and credit at risk. I believe that every one of our colleagues wants this agreement to pass. That means every one of our colleagues should actually vote for it.

The House has passed this deal. The President is ready and eager to sign it. It is our turn to do our job.

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. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2019

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, over 2 weeks ago, the four congressional leaders in the White House reached an agreement to raise the budget caps and extend the debt ceiling. The House has already passed the legislation that codifies the agreement into law. The President supports it. He is even making calls—evidently, from press reports—asking Republican colleagues to support it. So the last piece of the puzzle here is the Senate.

Speaking for the minority, Democrats have no objection to voting on the budget caps deal as soon as possible. I say to my friend the majority leader: Why don't we vote on the caps deal this morning and send it to the

President's desk? There is no need to wait until later in the afternoon today, tonight, or tomorrow to get this done. Democrats are ready to pass it right now if the majority leader would call it up for a vote.

#### CHINA

Mr. SCHUMER. As trade negotiations with China continue this week, I want to press the President again to stay tough and hold out for the best possible deal. If China is unwilling to make significant reforms to its economic model, President Trump must be prepared to walk away.

I believe the President's instincts on China are right. I have not been afraid to say so, despite our vast political and moral disagreements. But if we are going to be successful in these negotiations, it will be up to President Trump—no one else—to keep the pressure on Chinese leaders this week.

There are a few things he can do. The most significant point of emphasis for the President should be Huawei, the Chinese telecom giant. China has responded to the administration's justified restrictions on Huawei, unlike any other action the President has taken. It is our greatest source of leverage.

President Trump, hold tough on Huawei. Don't let there be giant loopholes.

I am told that under the purported proposal being talked about, 80 percent of Huawei's products could still be sold to us. If we have a total boycott of Huawei, then China will beg us to come to the table and make real concessions. It is the best leverage we have—even better than the tariffs. China wants Huawei to dominate the world. They will find a way to do it unless we are tough as can be.

I say to President Trump: I know these multinational corporations are pressuring you to cut a quick deal. The President should not listen to these big corporations who want him to cut a deal quickly. Many of these same corporations are the ones that have shipped jobs overseas through the last decades. They are the ones that took jobs away from American workers and moved them to China. I understand those corporate executives. They are supposed to be totally subservient to their shareholders. Their shareholders say: Whatever you have to do to bring the price up, do it.

That hurts American workers. It hurts American security. It hurts the American economy, especially when it comes to Huawei.

President Trump, don't listen to the siren call of those same corporations that have created part of the problem with China to now get you to back off. Yes, they will have a little pain. They have made billions at large from dealing with China and letting China get away with stuff like taking jobs away from the United States into much lower paid, lower standard jobs in China.

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