

backed, and there is no clear dividing line between the Communist Party and what might otherwise be described as the private sector. There is no distinction. This makes a real difference when it comes to Chinese investments in U.S. companies that are at the cutting edge of developing military dual-use technologies. It means there is a real potential of industrial espionage because you can't separate private, profit-making motives from the government's secret-stealing capacities and proclivities, and this means that our national security is vulnerable.

In its Made in China 2025 plan, the Chinese Government made clear its intent to dominate technologies that will be essential down the road in maintaining our economic and military prowess globally. I have a chart here that I would like to display. It is an unclassified slide from one of our intelligence agencies. They provided us an unclassified version so that we could talk about it in public. Many of us on the Armed Services Committee or the Intelligence Committee are privy to classified briefings, but I believe it is important—and I am glad they do too—that we talk about what we can in an open, transparent way so that people can be alerted to what is at risk and what is actually going on.

These are China's strategic goals. Comprehensive national power—they see themselves as a rival to the United States, and they would ultimately like to surpass us when it comes to national power. We know that they believe their economic growth model must be innovation-driven; hence, their vacuuming up and relentless search for new, cutting-edge technology, including their activities in places like Silicon Valley, where they gobble up startup companies that have long-term potential to advance their economic and national power goals. Obviously, they are also modernizing their military and becoming increasingly belligerent in places like the South China Sea in the process.

How does China achieve these strategic goals? Well, it has an elaborate and sophisticated plan. The truth is, they are really not being clandestine or secretive about this. They are pretty much telling us what they are doing, and they are doing it quite well.

So their strategic goals include, obviously, their security services, their intelligence community, their talent recruitment programs at American academic institutions, where they hire talent back to China to help them in this process. They create front companies that claim to be non-Chinese related in order to transact business so that they don't raise suspicion. They engage in an active program of mergers and acquisitions of companies in the United States. They make significant investments in science and technology, including some of the most cutting-edge technologies, like quantum computing and artificial intelligence. They are probably the worst offender in the

world when it comes to stealing through the cyber domain—cyber theft. They are very creative in engaging in research partnerships. Joint ventures, one of the gaps that the CFIUS legislation intends to plug, where they realize that this is a gap in our current review process for foreign investment and national security implications—they have done so through joint ventures that aren't currently subject to that review, where they can get access not only to the intellectual property but also to the know-how. In other words, they could steal blueprints and other intellectual property, but they don't necessarily know how to make it all work—where the secret sauce is—until they can get access to the know-how through these joint ventures.

Then there are their nontraditional collectors. In other words, civilians are used by their intelligence services to get information to vacuum up data—scientific data, our data—that they may think are important to their pursuit of national power, innovation, and economic growth model, so they use a wide variety of nontraditional collectors as well.

Of course, in the legal and regulatory environment, an American company can't do business in China without basically turning over the keys to the government. Again, there is no delineation between the government and the private sector in China. All businesses have to cooperate with the Chinese Government, and the Chinese Government intermingles that information not only in pursuit of their economic goals but also in pursuit of their military goals.

As I said, these technologies that they are acquiring and seeking to acquire include artificial intelligence, robotics, quantum computing, and 3D printing. The Chinese Government is spending \$300 billion in subsidies to supplant foreign technology suppliers like ours with homegrown alternatives, and a core part of this 2025 plan is acquiring intellectual property from the United States. China is not even trying to hide it. They are advertising it, and they are doing it in plain sight.

Those and related concerns are what prompted a bipartisan group of 27 Senators recently to write a letter to Secretary Mnuchin, Secretary Ross, as well as Ambassador Lighthizer—the U.S. trade Representative. They are all involved in the ongoing trade negotiations with China. In that letter, we expressed concerns regarding China's targeting of our technology.

As a report issued by the Pentagon recently pointed out, if left unchecked, this targeting could degrade core technological advantages of the U.S. military. Clearly, the Chinese Communist Party regards these sensitive technologies as essential for China's military modernization and is accelerating its efforts to acquire them by any means necessary—stealing them, engaging in strategic investments, any way they can do it—whether it is cyber

theft, civil-military integration policies, coercion through joint ventures with foreign companies, targeted investment, or Chinese nationals exploiting access to such technologies here in the United States.

The main point of our letter was not to criticize but to alert our colleagues in the executive branch that there is no question that China is actively seeking to surpass the United States both economically and militarily and become the world's foremost superpower. It is pretty obvious.

It is imperative, though, that neither the Federal Government nor private U.S. companies aid or abet that effort either advertently or inadvertently.

Let me conclude by saying that we should all support a peaceful, balanced, and constructive relationship with China, but it has to be realistic when it comes to China's aims and intentions, and it needs to be informed, as well, by China's record of deception in the past.

When it comes to China, national security isn't just a pretext for economic protectionism. I think "national security" is an abuse of that label if it is used just as a pretext for protectionism. Like many of our colleagues, I believe strongly in free trade, as I started out saying in these remarks, but when national security and economic concerns overlap—which they do—there should be no question but that our national security comes first.

For those of us who serve on committees of jurisdiction involving intelligence or national security, I assure you that the Chinese threat is real, and certain dangers are already taking effect. We need to make sure that not just the committees of jurisdiction understand this and that we are working together with the executive branch when it comes to maintaining this distinction—economic and military—and understand that it is not just about trade; it is about our national security as well. We need to be smart, well informed, and clear-eyed when it comes to engaging with an aggressive China. Our inaction has had many negative consequences, and we must aim to prevent any future ones.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Delaware.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, good morning. I looked down, and the Presiding Officers have changed. It is nice to be here with you this morning.

Our Presiding Officer is tied to the military—Army colonel, highly distinguished. She comes from Iowa and travels home every weekend. She covers every county in Iowa. In a year, I cover every county in Delaware, sometimes in a day. We only have 3; she has probably 100 or so. But we have the opportunity to go home frequently to our respective States and to be with our families and the folks we work for. I love doing it, and I know our Presiding Officer does as well.

People come up to me—I go back and forth on the train just about every

night and will do that tonight, as I did last night. I feel very fortunate to be able to be that close to my constituents. I serve in the Senate with my colleagues and actually live in my home State. It is a blessing.

I think I am approachable. I know our Presiding Officer is. Senator CORNYN is approachable. People come up and talk to us all the time, which is good—which is good. Sometimes I just want to say hello. Sometimes I will ask them how they are doing. More often than not, lately, people say: I wouldn't want your job for anything. You have the worst job in the world.

I say: No, no. I feel really lucky.

Throughout the 200-and-some years we have been a country, only about 1,800 people have been privileged to serve in this body, and we are fortunate that we are able to serve here today, especially during these challenging times.

Since the 2016 election, however, a broad number of Delawareans and American citizens have approached me, whether in the Rite Supermarket or on the Amtrak train, to share with me their sense of uncertainty and their fears regarding the trajectory of our country. Specifically, they have expressed their uncertainty about the future of the special counsel's investigation and their fears that the President may put his own personal interests above the interests of all Americans and the Constitution of our country.

As we pass the 1-year mark following Deputy Attorney General Rob Rosenstein's appointment of former FBI Director Bob Mueller to become special counsel, I think it is worth remembering why the investigation began, what it has uncovered, where it is headed, and how we can uphold the rule of law and protect the investigation from political interference as we seek to ascertain the truth.

During the 2016 Presidential campaign, our democracy was attacked by a foreign adversary. No shots were fired. No bombs were dropped. But let me be as clear as I can be. Russia attacked the United States of America. Using sophisticated cyber warfare, Russia interfered in our electoral process. As they have in other Western democracies, Russia borrowed from their tried-and-true playbook. Russian internet trolls posed as American citizens on Facebook and on Twitter. Russian shell companies funded political propaganda online, all with the intent of pitting us against one another and spreading this information among the American electorate.

We also know that our Nation's election infrastructure was targeted by the Kremlin and that Russian cyber attacks penetrated voting machines in some of our States—not all of our States but a number of them.

Thomas Jefferson often wrote about the truth, including a famous description of a few truths that we still consider self-evident; namely, that all men—I would add all women—are cre-

ated equal and entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Later in life, Jefferson remarked that “we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate any error so long as reason is left free to combat it.” Those words really ring true today, don't they?

Jefferson also used to say something to this effect, and I am paraphrasing: The people—that is, the people of the United States—know the truth. We won't make a mistake. If people know the truth, they won't make a mistake.

Since the attack by Russia on our democracy, many patriotic Americans within Federal law enforcement and our intelligence agencies have been heeding Jefferson's advice and seeking to follow the truth. Here is what we have learned.

In a declassified report released in January of 2017, our own intelligence agencies told us that “Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at . . . undermin[ing] public faith in the U.S. democratic process.”

Further, our own intelligence agencies told us that “Russian efforts to influence the 2016 U.S. presidential election represent the most recent expression of Moscow's longstanding desire to undermine the U.S.-led liberal democratic order.”

Those same agencies, our own intelligence agencies—I think there are 17 in all that combined to provide this report—told us that it will happen again: “Moscow will apply lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the U.S. presidential election to future influence efforts worldwide, including against U.S. allies and their election processes.”

During recent testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee, the Director of National Intelligence and our former Senate colleague Dan Coats—a good friend of many of us from Indiana—said these words: “There should be no doubt that Russia perceives that its past efforts have been successful and views the 2018 midterm U.S. elections as a potential target for Russian influence operations.”

I will read those words again. Our colleague Dan Coats, who sat over there and served with us for many years—he and I served together in the House before that, and he was an Ambassador to Germany, but now he is the Director of our National Intelligence—said: “There should be no doubt that Russia perceives that its past efforts have been successful and views the 2018 midterm U.S. elections as a potential target for Russian influence operations.” Then he added: “Frankly, the United States is under attack.”

I approve that message. I don't welcome that message, but we need to hear that message, and we need to take it to heart.

In response, we have a responsibility—not to any political party but to our Constitution and to the American people—to band together as we

would following any attack on our country. We have a responsibility to fight back, to protect and safeguard our democracy, and to ensure that it never happens again.

We also have a responsibility—again one that rises above political party—to determine whether the Trump campaign may have had inappropriate contact with Russia during that campaign.

This responsibility is shared between Congress and the executive branch, including the different committees in the House and Senate, as well as the Department of Justice, the FBI, and our intelligence agencies. Unfortunately, our President has rejected this responsibility from the start.

Let's not forget that President Trump fired former FBI Director James Comey and publicly stated it was because of the Russia investigation. President Trump told NBC News: “When I decided to [fire Comey] I said to myself, I said, ‘You know, this Russia thing with Trump and Russia is a made-up story, it's an excuse by the Democrats for having lost an election that they should've won.’” Those are President Trump's words to NBC News.

Because Attorney General Sessions has recused himself from matters involving Russia and the 2016 election, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein, a lifelong Republican appointed by President Trump to his current position, made the decision to appoint a special counsel to continue the Russia investigation.

Let me take a moment to remind the American people about the background and the character of this special counsel. Bob Mueller has spent his life serving our country with distinction.

Our Presiding Officer: Army, highly decorated.

Yours truly: Navy, 23 years, all in Active Duty and Reserve.

Here is what Bob Mueller received in some of his decorations as an officer in the Marine Corps during the Vietnam war—a war in which I served as well. He received the Bronze Star, and he earned two Navy Commendation Medals and the Purple Heart—all as an officer in the Marine Corps during the Vietnam war.

After a career in Federal law enforcement and private law practice, President George W. Bush nominated him to serve as our FBI Director, and Bob Mueller guided the FBI in the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks. A steady hand during uncertain times, Director Mueller gained the respect and the admiration of the men and women of the FBI, as well as those of us here on Capitol Hill.

During my tenure as chairman and ranking member of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, I had the opportunity to meet with Director Mueller on a range of issues, including protecting our Nation from cyber security threats. Let me just say that I think that maybe in the 17 years I have been here, the best briefing I have ever received on cyber security was from Bob

Mueller. The very best briefing I ever received was from Bob Mueller.

I also got to know him personally. I know his wife. My wife and I know his wife. We believe that he is guided by very strong core values: Figure out the right thing to do, and just do it—not when it is easy, not when it is expedient, but when it is right. Treat other people the way we want to be treated. Focus on excellence in everything we do. If it isn't perfect, make it better. And when you know you are right, be sure you are right. Never give up. Those are his values. I suspect those are the values of many of us who serve here.

Bob Mueller is a man of unimpeachable integrity. There may be no person better suited to this task of special counsel. I have every confidence that he will follow the truth wherever it may lead him and those he leads. But don't just take my word for it. When the Deputy Attorney General appointed him to the position of special counsel a little more than a year ago, his selection drew a particularly resounding endorsement from those of us who serve here in the Senate—not just on this side but, in particular, on the other side of the aisle.

Here is what JOHN MCCAIN said about Bob Mueller: “Robert Mueller is a great choice for special counsel.” JOHN went on to add that he is “confident that Mr. Mueller will fully investigate all aspects of Russia's interference in our election.”

Senator BURR said: “By having someone like Bob Mueller head [the] investigation assures the American people that there's no undue influence, be it here or be it at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue or within the Justice Department or FBI.” Those are the words of Senator RICHARD BURR of North Carolina, a Republican.

Even former House Speaker Newt Gingrich, with whom I served in the House, said this about Bob Mueller: “Robert Mueller is a superb choice to be special counsel. His reputation is impeccable for honesty and integrity.”

I have not known Robert Mueller for as long as some who serve here, but I have known him for a while. I have had a chance to work with him on some important issues and matters for our country and for the security of our country. He is as fine as any public servant I have ever known and served with.

Unfortunately, President Trump has not been as praiseworthy of our special counsel as the Senators I just quoted and the former House Speaker I just quoted. President Trump has repeatedly used his Twitter account to call Special Counsel Mueller's investigation a “witch hunt.” A witch hunt? In February, 13 Russian individuals and 3 Russian companies were charged with breaking U.S. law and interfering in the 2016 election—13. The indictment details an elaborate, coordinated scheme to disrupt our election. Moreover, three Trump campaign officials

have pled guilty to crimes that include lying to the FBI about contacts with Russia during the campaign and a conspiracy to defraud the United States, and the former Trump campaign manager is currently facing similar charges.

Despite the progress of the investigation, we know from news reports that President Trump repeatedly has considered firing Director Mueller and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein. That would be a grave mistake. That would be a very grave mistake.

Instead of exercising Presidential leadership and holding Russia accountable and safeguarding our upcoming election, President Trump continues to use dangerous rhetoric directed toward the special counsel's investigation, as well as at the people who work for us, who serve at the FBI and the Department of Justice, and who deserve our thanks, not our scorn.

Instead of exercising Presidential leadership and holding Russia accountable and safeguarding our upcoming election, President Trump is now demanding a counterinvestigation.

Instead of exercising Presidential leadership and holding Russia accountable in safeguarding our elections, President Trump is now undermining the special counsel's investigation while risking the identity of American intelligence sources.

Despite this failure of Presidential leadership, the special counsel's investigation must go on.

A Methodist minister in Seaford, in Southern Delaware, Pastor Reynolds—a wonderful man, now deceased—gave me advice during my career, particularly when I was Governor. One day, he said: Governor, the main thing is to keep the main thing the main thing.

I said: Would you say that again, Pastor?

He said: The main thing is to keep the main thing the main thing.

In this case, I think the main thing is for us to find out and ascertain the truth. Special Counsel Mueller must be allowed to follow the truth, no matter where it leads, no matter how uncomfortable that makes President Trump or other people, no matter how uncomfortable that makes Vladimir Putin. We must continue to ensure Special Counsel Mueller has the time and resources he needs to follow the truth and bring this investigation to a conclusion.

We must also protect the special counsel from undue political influence, and send a strong signal to President Trump that firing Robert Mueller or Rod Rosenstein, without clear legal justification, would pose a grave threat to our constitutional system of checks and balances.

To be clear, we can't pass a bill to end President Trump's erratic threats on Twitter, though I know there are a few people—some here—who would support such a proposal. However, here is what we can do: We can pass a bipartisan bill, introduced by Senators

COONS, TILLIS, BOOKER, and GRAHAM, to protect the special counsel's investigation. The legislation, called the Special Counsel Independence and Integrity Act, would ensure that the special counsel can only be fired for good cause by a senior Justice Department official, and the reason must be provided in writing. It will ensure that in the event of his firing, the special counsel can seek expedited judicial review of his removal, and it will also preserve all the documents and materials related to this investigation.

I thank our four colleagues—two Democrats, two Republicans—for introducing this bipartisan bill. I support it and urge its swift passage. Passing this bill will demonstrate to the American people that despite the uncertainties and maybe the fears at this moment, we still have a system of checks and balances which still works, as it has been working for 240 years.

There are more constitutions in this world modeled after the U.S. Constitution than any other constitution ever. Ours is the most emulated and longest living Constitution on the face of the Earth. It has an intricate system of checks and balances. Our Founding Fathers—who convened in Philadelphia 240 years ago—developed the Constitution we know of today and sent it out to the Thirteen Colonies to debate and consider whether they wanted to ratify it. The first State to ratify the Constitution was the State of Delaware, and the Constitution is something we especially revere in the First State, but if we allow the system of checks and balances as called for in the Constitution to work, it will eventually lead us to the truth—which is what we should all seek, not just in this Senate, not just in the Congress, not just in one party or the other, not just any one State or the other but all of us.

If the unthinkable were to happen and the special counsel were fired on a whim, I believe the legislation I just talked about would help us preserve the Russia investigation and the rule of law.

Like Special Counsel Mueller, Congress must not be afraid to follow the truth. We must not be distracted by the President's tweets and other attempts to undermine this important investigation. We must keep the main thing the main thing. Special Counsel Mueller and his team must be allowed to finish this investigation, and Congress—especially our Republican colleagues—must do our part to protect the investigation and insist the President stop the political interference and gamesmanship.

Taken together, I believe these actions will allow us to emerge from this especially challenging moment in our country, as we often have following other crises throughout our history. We will emerge stronger and more resilient, and we will emerge deeply proud that we upheld our responsibility to the Constitution and to the American people.

In closing, I want to mention that a lot of times people come up to me—maybe not every day but several times a week. Some are Democrat, some are Republican, some are Independent, some are probably not even registered to vote. They say: I fear for the future of our country. I don't think it has ever been this bad before. We have never seen it this bad before.

I remind them of the words from Harry Truman, who once served in this body as a Senator from Missouri, later as Vice President, and then as President of our country. Harry Truman used to say: "The only thing new in the world is the history you do not know." Think about that, the only thing new in the world is the history we forgot or never learned.

My sister and I grew up in the town of Danville, VA, right on the North Carolina border, the last capital of the confederacy. A lot of people think the last capital of the confederacy was Richmond, VA, but it wasn't. Jefferson Davis and those closest to him got out of Richmond, headed south, and ended up in Danville. That is where my sister and I grew up, and we saw prejudice and discrimination as little kids up close and personal. I will never forget it. There are some people in Danville still fighting the Civil War 150 years afterwards, at least in their minds.

During the Civil War, 800,000 men were killed on both sides, and hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children were wounded, crippled. When the war was over, what happened? When the war was over, our President was assassinated. His successor, Andrew Johnson, the Senator from Tennessee, who also served here, was impeached.

Somehow, we got through the Civil War, with the assassination of a President and the impeachment of a President, and we made it to the 20th century—just in time to fight not one but two World Wars. We won them, led the world and our allies to victory in the Cold War, and led the world out of the Great Depression.

Then, when the Sun came up on the 21st century, on January 1, 2001, here is where America was as a nation: We had the strongest economy on Earth, and we had the most productive workforce on Earth. For the first time since 1968, we actually had a balanced budget—not just one, not two, not three but four balanced budgets—the last 4 years of the Clinton Presidency. While we had a Democratic President and administration, we had a Republican Congress. If I am not mistaken, the chairman of the House Budget Committee was very much involved in the balanced budgets, a Republican from Ohio, our friend John Kasich, former Congressman, now Governor of Ohio.

So we had the strongest economy and the most productive workforce, four balanced budgets in a row, and, on January 1, 2001, we were the most admired Nation on Earth, and we had the strongest force for justice on Earth. That is where we were, after all the bad

stuff and all those challenges of 150 years, beginning with and following the Civil War.

If we can get through all that, we can get through this. In the words of Jefferson, if the American people know the truth, we will not make a mistake. That is what Bob Mueller and his folks are trying to get to, and it is important that they succeed.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHINA

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, there has been a lot of coverage over the last couple of months and years really—but certainly in the last few days—about the topic of China, ZTE, and trade. I have had a lot of questions about it, both in the hallways from the press and constituents back home and even from family and friends who have inquired what all the ruckus is about. I thought this was a good opportunity to lay out for my constituents and broadly for the American people what is at stake.

The first thing I would encourage everyone to do is to separate the two issues, the issue of trade with China and the issue of a specific company called ZTE, which is a phone company—a telecommunications company in the cell industry based in China. They were the fourth largest cell phone company in America, up until very recently when they struggled to stay in business. We will talk about that in a moment, but let's talk about those two things separately. They are not necessarily interrelated.

On the broader topic of trade and China, the United States has an enormous imbalance in trade—as we do with other countries but none like we do in China. A trade imbalance, by the way, in and of itself, is not problematic. It really depends on what has caused it, but the trade imbalance with China is problematic because of how it has happened.

China was basically poor, underdeveloped, under a Communist dictatorship, and decided it wanted to open up to the world and become more economically prosperous many years ago.

The deal the world made with China is, we are going to help you develop economically. You are going to open up. We are going to help you invest. We are going to help you create opportunity. We are going to let your companies invest in our economies.

There are rules in the world for trade. There are things that are allowed and things that are not allowed. For example, you are not allowed to steal another company's secrets. If another company has figured out how to make something, that is proprietary.

They own it, they developed it, they spent money creating it, and you are not allowed to go there and steal that from them and start making it yourself.

You can't have rules that say your companies cannot sell in my country, but our country can do whatever we want in your country. There are rules. China has never played by those rules, and everybody knew it. Nobody disputed it. Administrations from both parties, the consensus politically in America was go ahead. Let's let China cheat. Let them keep stealing things because once China becomes richer and more prosperous, they will stop doing that stuff. As soon as China's economy grows big enough, not only will they stop doing all that, but they will become a democracy.

Everyone who said that was wrong. That is not what has happened. They are less Democratic, less open today than they used to be, and they are no longer just stealing little secrets to be in the same ballpark. They are stealing \$600 billion a year of intellectual property. Six hundred billion dollars a year is equivalent to what we spend on the U.S. military. They are stealing the equivalent of that every single year.

How do they do it? First of all, just straight-out espionage. Time and again, they hack computers, they hack emails. They have spies embedded inside companies. They straight-out steal it through espionage.

The second thing they do to protect their industries and grow at our expense is, they don't allow many of our companies to do business in China—huge market. Their companies get to do business here, but they don't allow our companies to do business there—some companies.

They do allow other companies to do business in China, but here is the deal. If you do business in China, it has to be a joint venture with a Chinese company—51 percent Chinese, 49 percent American company. On top of that, there is another catch. If you want to do business in China with a Chinese company, you have to transfer your technology to them. If you want to build turbines, we will let you build turbines in China, but you have to transfer to us the technology of how you do it.

Do you know why they do that? Because once they figure out how to do it themselves, they don't need their American partner anymore. They kick you out, and now they are your competitor and may even put you out of business. That has happened many times. If they don't achieve it by forcing you to transfer, then they straight-out steal it from you.

They also buy up small companies. We have a law here that is called CFIUS process. When a foreign company, especially from a country like China, is buying in a key industry, it undergoes this review to make sure it is not a deal where they could be taking secrets that are tied to national security.