

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Jones	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Harris	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 47.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

NOMINATION OF CHERYL MARIE STANTON

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I come to the floor tonight to oppose the nomination of Cheryl Stanton to serve as Administrator of the Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division.

The Wage and Hour Division enforces some of our Nation's most important workplace laws, including the Federal minimum wage, overtime pay, child labor laws, and family and medical leave. Yet, Ms. Stanton has a very long history of siding with employers when they have violated workers' rights. So I will be voting against this nomination, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I also want to object to the Senate moving on Republican labor nominees without approving nominations for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the National Labor Relations Board.

Last Congress, in an unprecedented display of obstruction, my colleagues across the aisle blocked the confirmation of Chai Feldblum and Mark Pearce for terms on the EEOC and NLRB, respectively.

Even though both of these nominees were highly qualified, respected by their peers, Senate Republicans refused to give them a vote.

These are critical Agencies that are responsible for protecting workers' rights. Yet my colleagues across the aisle were more interested in tilting the playing field even more in favor of corporations than providing the Commission and the Board with balanced voices.

Despite longstanding practice to confirm majority and minority members to independent Agencies, my colleagues across the aisle jammed through Republican nominees only to the Board without Mr. Pearce, the Democratic nominee.

Republican leaders allowed one Senator to block the nomination of Ms. Feldblum to the EEOC, meaning that important civil rights agency is unable to do some of its most critical work.

In this moment, as our Nation is grappling with how to address the epidemic of sexual assault and harassment in the workplace, hamstringing the Agency that is responsible for protecting women's rights and safety is absolutely the wrong message to send to women, to workers, and to businesses.

So I am going to keep fighting to make sure the nominees to the National Labor Relations Board and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission represent all voices, as they are supposed to, not just corporations.

I urge every man, woman, and worker who believes workers should have a voice to join me in that.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

CHINA

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I am on the Senate floor to talk about the importance of trade and specifically our country's economic relationship with China.

As a trade lawyer, as a former U.S. Trade Representative, as a member of the Finance Committee now that handles trade issues, I have been involved in these issues over the years.

Most importantly, I am from Ohio, which is a huge trade State. We are concerned about trade because we have a lot of manufacturing and a lot of agriculture, where jobs depend on trade back and forth. In fact, in Ohio, about 25 percent of our manufacturing workers make products that get exported, and one out of every three acres planted by Ohio farmers is now being exported.

These are good jobs. These are jobs that pay, on average, about 16 percent more than other jobs and have better benefits. We want more of them.

With only 5 percent of the world's population and about 25 percent of the world's economy, America wants access to the 95 percent of the consumers living outside of our borders. It is always in our interest to open up overseas markets for our workers, our farmers, and our service providers.

While promoting exports, we also have to be sure we protect American jobs from unfair trade, from imports that would unfairly undercut our farmers and our workers, our service providers. Simply put, we want a level playing field, where there is fair and reciprocal treatment. If it is fair, if we have a level playing field, I believe American workers and businesses can compete and win.

The sweet spot for America is this balanced approach: opening up new markets for U.S. products, while being tougher on trade enforcement so American workers have the opportunity to compete.

In that context, I want to talk a little about the inequities in our relation-

ship with China. We don't have a level playing field with China, and it is one of the most important policy issues that faces our country today.

It is certainly really important to Ohio. Ohio sells a lot of products—auto parts, aerospace parts, and other things—to China. We also sell a lot of oilseeds and grains, particularly soybeans—about \$700 million worth every year. China is actually our third biggest trading partner in Ohio after Canada and Mexico.

Yet, despite these exports, we have a trade deficit with China because they send a lot more to us than we send to them, and it is not always fair trade.

As an example, Ohio has been ground zero for steel imports coming in because of government-directed overcapacity in China. Our steel mills have been hit hard because, to put it bluntly, China has not been playing by the rules.

In 2000, China produced about 15 percent of the world's steel. Today, thanks to massive subsidies and other forms of state intervention, they now produce about 50 percent. So, again, about 19 years ago, they produced 15 percent of the world's steel; now they produce 50 percent of the world's steel, and they do it, again, through the government subsidizing them.

They often sell that steel at below its cost. They don't need it in China so they are trying to push it out to other countries. They transship it to try to avoid our anti-dumping duties or our countervailing duties, which were put in place because China wasn't playing by the rules. So we find out they are selling below their cost, which is dumping, or we find out they are subsidizing, we win a trade case, but then China sends that product to a third country that then sends it to us, therefore, evading the tariffs we put in place to deal with the unfairness.

It hits our plants hard in Ohio, but it also reduces the cost of steel around the world.

When it comes to our bilateral economic relationship, there is little or no transparency from China when it comes to their regulations, their approvals for inbound foreign direct investment into China, and the required notification of subsidies that is required by the World Trade Organization.

This lack of transparency, of course, frustrates American businesses, and it violates China's international obligations.

China also exhibits a lack of reciprocity. Its market is substantially more closed to American companies than our market is to their companies. We have Chinese companies in Ohio. They don't have to be in a joint venture with a 51-percent Ohio partner, American partner; they can own the whole thing. They don't have to go through this process of approvals that American companies have to go through, where often their intellectual property is taken.