

like any industry, needs stability to grow and thrive. Internet innovators need to know what the rules of the game are now, and they need to know what the rules of the game are going to be in the future. We can't have a situation where internet regulations vary from administration to administration or, worse yet, from year to year. Imagine a basketball game where the rules changed every quarter or after every timeout. Well, it is pretty safe to say that players would quickly get fed up and start quitting the game, and that is exactly what will happen if we don't have stable rules for the internet.

Too many Americans are not going to be interested in taking risks or investing in innovation if they can't predict what the rules will look like a year down the road. So internet regulation is a serious issue that will affect our Nation for decades to come. This is too important of an issue for partisanship. Yet here we are with just more political theater with a partisan resolution that everybody acknowledges isn't going anywhere.

So, in the wake of the FCC's decision—which gives Congress the perfect opportunity to step in to provide clear guidance and clear rules of the road for the future regarding how the internet is going to be regulated—we have Democrats in the Senate who are in the midst of a political stunt, instead of sitting down and having a serious conversation about net neutrality legislation.

It is time to put together a bipartisan bill and establish long-term stability on internet regulation so the internet can continue to grow and thrive long into the future and not be subject to the whims of one administration or the next administration and rules and regulations that are going to go back and forth with the winds of whatever political party is in the White House or, worse yet, end up spending all the time in court and spending millions of dollars on litigation that could be spent investing in infrastructure that could deliver better services to people all across this country, including those in rural areas like South Dakota.

#### NOMINATION OF GINA HASPEL

Mr. President, we have been getting some great judicial nominees in the Senate, including several this week.

I am also looking forward to confirming another important nomination in the near future, and that is Gina Haspel's nomination to be the Director of the CIA.

Acting Director Haspel is one of the most qualified candidates for the CIA we have ever had. She spent 33 years in the Agency. She served overseas and here at home during the Cold War and Global War on Terrorism. She served in the trenches, and she has held important leadership positions in the Agency. She has won several awards for her work, including the Intelligence Medal of Merit, the George H.W. Bush Award, and the Donovan Award.

Her nomination has been endorsed by six former CIA Directors, including Leon Panetta and John Brennan, who served as CIA Directors under President Obama.

Our Nation and our world are facing a range of conventional and unconventional threats from the possibility of a nuclear-armed Iran to an increasingly aggressive Russia and China, to the ever-present threat of terrorism. We need a leader like Gina Haspel at the head of the CIA—someone who knows intelligence inside and out and who can provide the President with the information he needs to make decisions affecting our Nation's security.

I look forward to confirming Ms. Haspel as CIA Director in the very near future. I hope my colleagues in the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, will join in that endeavor and make sure this important position, at this critical time in our Nation's history, is filled with a very qualified nominee—the right person to serve as the head of that Agency.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

#### CHINA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I want to begin by reading an excerpt of an article that ran on October 8, 2012. It was in the New York Times. The article opened with the following quote:

A House committee issued a blistering bipartisan report on Monday that accused two of China's largest telecommunications companies of being arms of the government that had stolen intellectual property from American companies and could potentially spy on Americans. The House Intelligence Committee said that after a yearlong investigation it had come to the conclusion that Chinese businesses, Huawei Technologies and ZTE Inc., were a national threat because of their attempts to extract sensitive information from American companies and because of their loyalties to the Chinese government.

The story continued by saying:

Allowing the Chinese companies to do business in the United States . . . would give the Chinese government the ability to easily intercept communications and could allow it to start online attacks on critical infrastructure, like dams and power grids.

This was from a bipartisan report in the year 2012, in the month of October, by the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Intelligence. Since then, over and over again, we have heard the intelligence community in this country clearly define this threat. In virtually every one of the open hearings that we had on the Intelligence Committee, I or one of my colleagues have had an opportunity to ask every member of the intelligence community—Director of National Intelligence, Director of the CIA, Director of the FBI, the Director of Counterintelligence, Mr. Evanina, or the nominee before us today—and every time one of us would ask: Would you use a ZTE phone? We are still waiting for one of them to say yes. Every single one of them said no, which is why I was pleased a couple of weeks ago when the Commerce Department brought sanctions against ZTE.

It was not a Congressional issue. Although it could be, it wasn't. It was because, on top of the spying and everything else, ZTE had helped Iran and North Korea evade international sanctions. So the penalty was, American companies could no longer sell component pieces to ZTE, which has led them to being on the brink of being out of business.

No one should feel sorry for ZTE. This is a company heavily subsidized by the Chinese Government that protects them at home, protects them in China, subsidizes them in China but exports them abroad with the hopes that they can help them steal secrets, monitor, and be an arm and tool of intelligence for them. No one should feel sorry for them.

So I was surprised to see, a couple days ago—as the President tweeted and then there have been articles about how perhaps maybe these sanctions might be going away in exchange for a deal on agriculture. I want to tell you, if that is what happens, the President has gotten terrible advice, and it would be a terrible thing for him to do. I think it would be deeply problematic for the national security of the United States and ultimately for his hopes of rebalancing America's relationship with China, geopolitically, economically, commercially, and certainly on security.

The most important thing to understand is, China is carrying out a plan. They put it out there. It is not a conspiracy. It is there for the world to see: Made in China 2025. Made in China 2025 is a plan to dominate the 10 most important technologies of the 21st century. You may ask: Why is that a big deal? Countries would want to do that. They have every right to aspire to that, and I agree. If they want to dominate these 10 fields, they have every right to invest in research and innovation. They have every right to do all of that.

The problem is, that is not how they intend to dominate these fields. The way they intend to dominate the 10 top technologies of the 21st century is to steal the intellectual property, basically the protected, secret ideas our companies are innovating, that American researchers are innovating—to steal that and use it for themselves.

Furthermore, they insist that all of their companies be allowed to sell whatever they want to the United States without any restriction. On the other hand, our companies are restricted—some prohibited—from selling to China's 1.2 billion, 1.3 billion-person market, soon to be the largest economy in the world.

So, in essence, they intend to dominate these 10 fields by cheating their way into a position of dominance, and that alone is not just an economic issue. This is a national security issue. If you dominate the field of artificial intelligence, if you dominate the field of telecommunications, if you dominate the field of aerospace technology,

you will dominate the field of national defense and national security, and you will pose a threat to other countries that do not.

We are giving it to them. We are literally allowing them to steal it from us, and they play our system against us. American companies go to China to do business, and here is what they tell them: You can only do business here if you partner up with a Chinese company. You have to give them all the secrets to how you do business. By the way, time and again, as soon as the Chinese company can do what the American company can do, the American company gets kicked out. Suddenly, you have a competitor all over the world that you helped build by giving it to them for free.

Sadly, a lot of American companies play the game because all they care about is being able to sell to China in the short term and have profits, without any thought about the long term or national security of the United States.

I imagine many of these are the same voices that are trekking down to the White House to tell the President to do this deal on ZTE. The ZTE thing is not just a commercial and trade issue—although it is and it could be. It is much more than just that. It needs to be taken with the seriousness it deserves. It is not just about telecommunications.

If you have a ZTE phone—and they are widespread in the United States. These things are hitting up against our towers. They will not just use that to pull American phone companies out of business; they can use that to spy on American companies to steal the intellectual property of the United States. It is exactly what they have done. It is what the report said they do: spying on Americans and stealing intellectual property from American companies. This trade dispute with China is about a lot more than trade. It is about geopolitical balance. It is about fairness.

This is our last chance to get it right. It is almost too late. I am telling you, if we get this wrong—if we back down, when historians write about this period of time in our history, they are going to say the Americans literally gave it over to the Chinese; allowed them to steal from them because they were more interested in short-term gain and were willing to turn over the future.

We will live in a world where China dominates many of the top fields, including many that are critical to our national security and the defense of our interests and of our Nation.

I would argue to you that ZTE should not be allowed to sell anything in the United States. I would argue to you that if a technology company from another country is being used by that country not just to spy on government secrets but to steal the intellectual property of our businesses, they should be out of business in the United States. Some people would say: Well, China is very powerful. They are going to come

back and use other means to punish us for this. Let me tell you something. We have extraordinary leverage over their technology industry. For example, one of the things ZTE can do is they can buy from a company named Tsinghua Unigroup, which is a government-owned company. They can buy components from them, but then we can cut them off as well. In fact, every major telecom in China—Huawei, BBK, Yiomi, Lenovo—every single one of these depends on component parts from the United States.

Ultimately, what I would hope to arrive at is a balanced trade situation, a balanced commercial arrangement, and a balanced geopolitical situation between the United States and China, but right now it is way out of balance, and when you allow imbalances to exist and persist in international relations, it leads to conflict. It leads to wars. It leads to showdowns. That is what imbalances lead to. An imbalance leads to the country that becomes dominant to try to take advantage of the countries that are not, unless you agree to surrender to them.

This issue of China and ZTE is a terrible mistake. If the President cuts a deal with ZTE that says: Pay a couple of hundred million dollars in fines and you are back in business in exchange—and they violated the law. This is a law enforcement function on top of everything else. These sanctions against them are punishment for evading and breaking sanctions. If you basically wave that off in exchange for a deal on agriculture—these farmers didn't do anything wrong. These farmers are not being punished for evading sanctions. They are victims of retribution.

We have other angles. In fact, what we should be saying is: If you don't lift the tariff on our farmers, we will do the same thing we did to ZTE, to Huawei, BBK, Yiomi, Lenovo or any other company. That is what we should be saying, instead of being tricked into this apparent deal that someone is cooking up over there and giving the President terrible advice—which, by the way, I know that is not where his instincts are, but someone is getting to him. I don't know if it is from Treasury or where it is, but someone is basically telling him now is the time to cut a deal. It is the wrong time to cut a deal. This would be a terrible deal.

Let me close by telling you this. This is not just about technology. If you don't believe that China uses its leverage, the leverage of economics, to reach into your life here in America—people will ask: What does that have to do with me? What does it have to do with us? Yes, it is a bad thing. We are worried about China in the long term. What does that have to do with me here at home?

China has no problem using its long arm and its economic leverage to interfere in the lives of Americans. I will tell you how.

About 2 weeks ago, two American airlines, United and American Airlines,

got a letter in the mail from the Chinese Government telling them: We notice that your website says "Taiwan." It doesn't say "Taiwan-China." Unless you change your website, we are going to punish you. We may even take away your routes.

They haven't made a decision yet. We have reached out to both companies. Let me clue everyone in right now. If they are anything like the other American companies that have been threatened, they are going to cave. They are going to cave, especially United, which has all of these routes over there. This is an American company, headquartered in the United States, that is going to have to change their website because China has threatened them.

If you think that is not bad, I will tell you something crazy. Yesterday, the Gap clothing store came out with a T-shirt. It had a map of China, but it didn't have Taiwan on the T-shirt. China threatened them. Within hours, the Gap put out a tweet: We are so sorry. We apologize. We didn't mean to offend you. We respect your sovereignty.

This is over a T-shirt, for God's sake. This is the leverage they have.

Do you know there are Hollywood movies that are written in a way to avoid certain topics because, otherwise, they will not be allowed to play the movie in China? Do you know there are actors—such as Richard Gere—who are not allowed to be in certain movies or who can't get a Hollywood blockbuster movie because they can't distribute it in China? They will not let them. They can't have Richard Gere in movies in China because he is pro-Tibet. This is crazy stuff.

Here is perhaps the most egregious one. Marriott, a great American company, a hotel—everybody has stayed at one. Marriott had an employee, a guy who lives in America; he is not even an executive—just a good guy, a hard-working guy. He accidentally went online and accidentally—it wasn't even on purpose—liked a tweet about Tibet, and China went crazy. They threatened Marriott. Marriott didn't just apologize; they fired him. This is an American. He didn't live in China. He lives in the United States of America. He lost his job for accidentally liking a tweet that China didn't like.

This happens over and over again, and it isn't noticed. This is how they use economic leverage. This is how they get Panama to tell Taiwan: We no longer recognize you diplomatically; we now recognize China. This is how they got the Dominican Republic to do the same thing last week or a couple of weeks ago, and they are not going to stop. I hear Paraguay might be next. This has to stop.

We don't want to contain China. We welcome a prosperous China. We want a global partner. Imagine the United States and China working together against nuclear proliferation, against radical terrorism, and against all the

threats in the world. But this is not leading to a partnership. This is leading to a world in which China dominates every key industry, remakes every institution, and America becomes a junior partner the way Vladimir Putin and Russia already are to China, and that we cannot accept. But that is where we are headed because administrations—both Republican and Democrat—have taken this threat too lightly. They thought that when China got rich, they would start playing by the rules. Guess what. They not only have not played by the rules, but they assume all the benefits of the rules and live by none of the responsibilities.

This is our last chance. This administration has been given the historic opportunity—the last chance—to get the balance of this relationship right. One misstep could blow the whole thing apart and doom generations of Americans to living in a world—not one with a powerful China, one with a dominant China and a declining America.

That may sound like hyperbole, but if they win this battle on ZTE, the world will notice, and the message it will send is that when push comes to shove, this administration is no different from the others. When they come under pressure, you can get to the right people with the right friends in corporate America, and they will back down. Once that happens, every country in the world will govern themselves accordingly. They will not join us in confronting China's aggression and China's unfairness because in the back of their minds, they will be saying to themselves: When push comes to shove, America is going to back down the way they did for ZTE.

The issue itself is problematic. We can't be selling phones in America that they use to spy on us in our companies. But on a broader scale, it sends a message that demoralizes this effort and I think has dramatic consequences.

I encourage the President to think very seriously and very carefully. He is in a very strong position right now. I urge him to think very carefully about the next step and to listen to the people in his administration who are talking to him about the ZTE issue for what it is—a national security threat much bigger than just one company in the telecom industry.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### NATIONAL DRUG COURT MONTH

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to highlight some of the great successes of our drug courts around the Nation. May is National Drug Court Month, and I have come to the floor today to highlight the work of these innovative courts—I think that is an understatement—which play a unique role in our justice system.

Participants in the drug court system receive treatment and support services to help these individuals recover, and the individuals are held accountable through regular drug testing and judicial supervision.

These courts are uniquely equipped for nonviolent substance abuse offenders, and they provide eligible individuals with intensive treatment, individualized consequences, and other medical services in order to help them overcome their substance use disorder—something we have heard a lot about in every State.

Participants are randomly tested for drug use and mandated to appear frequently in court so that the drug court judge can review their progress. The judge also holds drug court participants accountable for their obligations to the court and, of course, to society at large. All of these features make drug courts particularly important as we deal with the opioid crisis that has affected so many individuals, families, and communities in Pennsylvania and across the country. No neighborhood—no region of the State—is safe in this horror that we have been living through now for several years.

Given the scope and severity of the opioid epidemic, we need to invest in effective solutions. I use that word purposefully—“invest.” With their proven track record of success, drug courts should be a keystone of our efforts to deal with the opioid crisis.

Drug court systems not only save money, but they also reduce both drug use and crime itself. Recidivism rates among drug court participants are significantly lower than for those defendants undergoing traditional sentencing procedures. Around 50 to 70 percent of drug court participants complete at least a year of treatment, and 75 percent of graduates remain arrest-free for the next 2 years. Let me say that again: 75 percent of drug court graduates remain arrest-free for the next 2 years.

Additionally, studies have found that the use of drug courts save taxpayer money by lowering overall criminal justice costs. There are a lot of success stories from drug court graduates, and I want to highlight one today from Schuylkill County, PA, the Schuylkill County Drug Treatment Court.

This constituent of mine struggled with opioid and alcohol use disorder and spent time in prison before going through the drug court system. According to the probation officer, this Pennsylvanian is now “gainfully employed, has regained a positive relationship with family, is working towards maintaining sobriety and is now working towards the long-term goal of buying a home.”

That is just one story about one individual, who said:

I used to think about how much I wanted to use and what I wanted to use. Now I think about going to work and coming home to my fiancée and children.

That is one success story but a very powerful story.

As the probation officer said, that is just one of many “incredible stories of progress and redemption found in drug courts.”

As we observe National Drug Court Month, I encourage my colleagues to

continue supporting the innovative and effective work of these drug court programs. I want to thank the judges, officers, and other professionals who help make these success stories a reality every week.

#### NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. President, I also rise to talk about one other issue. It is an issue that we are hearing about today because of the ceremony at the Capitol. In addition to this being National Drug Court Month, it is also National Police Week, which we have observed as a nation since 1962.

National Police Week is an opportunity to pay respect to the men and women who have lost their lives in the line of duty, as well as their families. It is also an opportunity to express gratitude and appreciation for the work that police officers do to keep our communities safe every day. We owe a great debt of gratitude to those who have served and the families who have sacrificed alongside them.

Today I want to recognize those who have lost their lives in the line of duty in my home State of Pennsylvania, two officers who were killed in 2017. First is Brian David Shaw of the New Kensington Police Department. That is in Westmoreland County in the southwestern corner of our State. Second is Michael Paul Stewart III of the Pennsylvania State Police. These fallen heroes gave what President Lincoln once called “the last full measure of devotion” to their country.

We have a solemn obligation to pay tribute to these fallen law enforcement officers and to have their families' backs. Paying tribute is not enough, though. We must honor those in law enforcement and the families of the fallen in word and in deed.

One of our top priorities should be fighting for policies and programs that make law enforcement officers safe. That includes working to secure funding for the COPS Hiring Program, Byrne Justice Assistance Grant—known as Byrne JAG—and the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program, just to name a few. Some around here want to cut these programs or limit increases to their funding. Fortunately, in the latest spending agreement, there were increases for all three. I want to thank colleagues on both sides of the aisle for ensuring that these programs are well funded in the omnibus bill that we passed in March.

In addition to fighting for law enforcement dollars, we also have a basic obligation to ensure that our law enforcement officers are appropriately compensated and that their families receive the care and financial security they need and deserve—of course, especially for families who have lost a loved one in the line of duty.

That is why I am thankful that the omnibus legislation in March included a bill that I worked on with my colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator TOOMEY—the Children of Fallen Heroes Scholarship Act, which will help children of fallen law enforcement officers