

other parts are from Missouri. We see that as a great American tractor.

The crews that harvest some of the Swanson's crops are folks that come in—legally, by the way—from New Zealand, Ireland, or South Africa. The wheat they produce goes to export markets all over the world. Some of it goes to Egypt, some to India, Japan, and South Korea.

Their cotton is used all over the United States, but it is also shipped to China, as well, to produce fabrics. Some of the fabrics end up being made into garments that are shipped from Vietnam. Some of them end up right back here in the United States again, having started from the cotton from Roosevelt, OK.

The milo they raise goes to feed. Most of that feed goes to Texas. If you are from Oklahoma, you may consider that international trade, but it is still domestic trade. A lot of the feed goes to China.

They raise cattle, our great American beef. We eat as much beef as we can possibly eat in Oklahoma, and the rest of it we ship all over the world. Their beef is used in Oklahoma and all across the United States, but it is also sent to Japan, Korea, and Mexico.

Understand this, just as an aside: In 2017, U.S. beef producers exported 1.2 million metric tons of beef worth \$2 billion. That is just American beef going around the world. Two leading partners in that are Canada and Mexico—\$980 million in exports. It is a big part of what they do.

Charlie Swanson drives a Ford F-150 pickup. It is a great American product; isn't it? It is a great Ford truck. That F-150, by the way, is a fantastic vehicle. It is completely assembled in the United States, but the aluminum in that great American truck comes from Canada. About 15 percent of the components in that great American truck come from Mexico. Some parts even come from China. That F-150 is not only used extensively in the United States, but it is also shipped around the world. There are a lot of F-150 trucks on the roads in Mexico, Canada, and, yes, even in China.

That F-150 rides on four good, solid American-made tires, but the steel cord in those good American tires comes from all over the world. The steel in most of our tires is not made in the United States. A lot of the chemicals that go into the production of those tires are from Europe, Asia, and Latin America. They are good American tires. A lot of them are made in Oklahoma in the Goodyear facility—a phenomenal facility—or the Michelin plant in Ardmore. They make great American tires for a lot of vehicles all across the United States, but they have parts and pieces from around the world in those American-made tires, and they are shipping them out as well. So just speaking about Charlie and what is happening in Roosevelt, OK, population 241, the products they produce are going all over the world. The products

they use, such as the John Deere tractor and the Ford F-150 with the Goodyear or Michelin tires are American-made, but are dependent on trade from all around the world.

I could talk about Dr. Brent Hancock, born and raised in Kiowa County, OK. He left Kiowa County and went to the big city of Stillwater to attend Oklahoma State University, where he received his doctor of veterinary medicine degree. He returned back to Kiowa County and opened a veterinary clinic in Hobart in 1995. For over 20 years, Dr. Hancock has been taking care of vaccinations for sheep, cattle, pigs, goats, cats, and dogs. It is also rumored that Dr. Hancock can operate on your rabbit, but that is a whole different story.

He vaccinates these animals with vaccines to provide some of the safest agricultural products in the world. Some of those vaccines come from companies like Bayer, which is an international company based in Germany. He also uses products from Merck. They have offices in 50 countries, and they produce and ship their products to 140 countries around the world.

Again, we look at him and say that he is a good American veterinarian. He must be all American, but he actually depends on products from all over the world to provide basic things.

I cannot talk about Oklahoma without talking about oil and gas. Most of the pipe that goes down the hole in most of our wells is produced from steel that is not made in America. That particular type of steel that is down holding those wells is produced around the world but not here. We are dependent upon oil and gas that goes in the F-150 pickup and the John Deere tractor, and a part of it relies on steel from around the world.

I can take you to Tulsa, OK—slightly larger than Kiowa County, I would say—to a manufacturing plant called SWEP. They employ 100 people and produce components for refrigerators and air conditioners. They import products from Europe, and they combine them with products that they are making in the United States and assemble them. That final product is sold all over the country and is also sold to Canada and Mexico—all from one company in Tulsa, OK.

Drive up the road from Tulsa to Bartlesville to a manufacturing plant operated by ABB. They create a lot of products that are in wells, pipelines, and refineries all across America. That company imports products from suppliers from Canada and Mexico, and they create a final product that is sold all over the United States, and they sell it right back to Canada and Mexico as well.

This shouldn't be shocking to anyone. This is the same structure that we have had since the 1700s as Colonies. We produce some of our products and ship them out. We buy some to be able to use in manufacturing. This is a nation that is very interconnected to the

world, and it is exceptionally important that our trade agreements get resolved as fast as possible.

I want fair trade. We had unfair trade in 1773 that we protested in the Boston Harbor. We still want fair trade agreements right now, but those trade agreements need to be resolved as fast as possible. Farmers and ranchers in Oklahoma cannot wait a year to find out what is going to happen in our trade policy. Some of them are on the edge of the knife right now of bankruptcy. They can't get anything on the futures market to try to figure out what is happening in the now to be able to make the basic investments they need to make for this year's crops.

Predictability helps us, just like fair and free trade does. So while I understand full well that the administration is engaging in trade negotiations around the world, I encourage them to move from talking about these trade agreements to settling them—getting them resolved with Mexico and Canada and getting the best deal that we can have, resetting this agreement with NAFTA for another generation to prepare us for the future. Let's get that resolved. Those are our two largest trading partners. Resolve our trade agreement with Korea, locking that one in and finishing out all the area around Asia as well. Twelve of those nations have already resolved the trade agreements they are into, putting us behind. Those nations are forming contracts now. We need to engage as soon as we possibly can.

There are big issues with China and trade. They have not been fair in all their trade agreements. We need to resolve our issues with China, and I am pleased that this administration is leaning in to resolve a long-term issue with China trade. It is about time someone does it, but we also need to get it resolved. We don't need retaliatory tariffs moving across every industry in our Nation destabilizing what we are doing in the economy. Let's get these issues resolved.

Quite frankly, many of the trade issues that we have with the rest of the world aren't their tariffs, but they are our regulations. When our regulations and American redtape from our own government slow down our own economy, let's deal with our own house to make sure what we produce is competitive around the world, but in the meantime, let's move our trade conversations to trade agreements so we can continue to move on toward doing the same thing we have done since the 1700s as Americans; that is, trading with the entire world and leading the world with it.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Alaska.

CHINA

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, as we all know, our country is facing a lot of challenges, particularly overseas, and a lot of them are in the news—Iran, Syria, North Korea. When you

look out across the landscape of what the big, long-term, geostrategic challenges are that face our Nation, in my view, there is no doubt that the No. 1 challenge economically and from a national security standpoint is the rise of China as a great power. We need to be thinking about that a lot more because that is going to be the issue our country faces, not just this year or next year but for decades.

I come from the great State of Alaska. We are an Asia-Pacific State. We are always looking to that region—as a matter of fact, we are in that region. My hometown of Anchorage is closer to Tokyo than it is to Washington, DC. What I see as a positive on this issue—having been someone in this body for a little over 3 years, I have come down to the floor and talked a lot about this challenge, the rise of China. It is a little concerning that a couple of years ago nobody was talking about it. Very few people were talking about it, but that is changing, and I think that is positive.

It is changing. This administration is focusing, and it is changing with my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans. Certainly, this is an area where, I think, there is a lot of agreement. I was just presiding for the last hour. The majority whip and the Senator from Oklahoma both were talking about issues dealing with China and trade and strategy, and that is positive.

The administration is talking about it. If you look at the national security strategy of the Trump administration, they are starting to focus on this issue. Front and center is the return of great power rivalries, with China as the leading, pacing threat and challenge, but it is also an opportunity for this great Nation of ours.

When you look at the history of our country, particularly post-World War II, the United States set up the international system—the international trading system and security system. We have been leading them, and so many countries—hundreds of millions of people in the world—benefited from that. The irony, of course, is that the one country that benefited probably more than almost anyone is China.

The rise of China was not only helped, but it was spurred by the American international trading system, the sealanes of commerce that we have kept open for decades. So there was a moment in the last couple of decades where we reached out very much—there was a great speech by our former Deputy Secretary of State in the Bush administration, a gentleman by the name of Bob Zoellick, who went on to become head of the World Bank. He asked in a speech to the Chinese: You need to now become a responsible stakeholder in this system that we created because you have benefited so dramatically. You are big, you are powerful, and now help become a stakeholder in the international order that we set up. Here is the offer to you.

Well, unfortunately, whether it is a Democrat or Republican, in the national security and foreign policy realm, most people are sensing that China has rejected that notion. No, we are not going to be a responsible stakeholder in your system. We are going to set up our own system. As a matter of fact, we might even try to undermine your system—the global system set up by the United States of America by Democrats and Republicans over decades.

You see it everywhere, whether it is decades-long theft of intellectual property, whether it is high tariffs, whether it is any American company coming into China and being forced to transfer their technology. No other countries do this to China, but they are doing it to our companies and have been doing that for decades.

So there is a rethinking right now. Clearly, the Trump administration is thinking about what the new strategy should be. The national security strategy of this administration, which I commend people to read—it is quite a good document, written by the outgoing National Security Advisor, H.R. McMaster—focuses a lot on this issue of reciprocity and great power rivalry again.

So as we are thinking about it, I would like to briefly touch on three principles I think will be key as we debate this. As we help formulate this—hopefully, in a bipartisan manner—this issue is going to be with us for decades. There are three key principles.

The first key principle is reciprocity—true reciprocity. The majority whip was just talking about this. The national security strategy of the Trump administration talks a lot about it. The President talks a lot about this. This is just a fairness issue. As I mentioned, there is IPR theft; high tariffs; the forced tech transfer from American companies to China; giant, subsidized, state-owned enterprises and state-backed investment funds buying up companies all over the world. No other country does that to China.

So when you look at the issue of reciprocity, I would like to break it down into a positive and negative. You have negative reciprocity. If we can't do that in your country, you shouldn't be able to do it in our country. It is pretty simple, pretty fair, and everybody understands that.

Then there is positive reciprocity. One thing I have been encouraging the Chinese to do for many years—and I have been over there a lot and spent a lot of time with senior leaders in that country. The United States has been going over and investing in China for decades. Factories have been rebuilt from the ground up and we have employed tens of thousands of Chinese with American capital. Well, you know what, China is getting big enough. They can do that in America. The Japanese did that in the 1980s. We had major trade disputes with them. What

did they do? They started coming to our country and investing in our States with their capital, greenfield investments—auto factories, for example—and employing tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of Americans. We would welcome that. As a matter of fact, in Alaska, the Chinese are talking about helping us develop a large-scale Alaska natural gas project. Greenfield investment, employing Alaskans would be positive if that is going to happen. So that is the way we need to think about reciprocity.

The second key principle is allies—*allies, allies, allies*. The United States is an ally-rich nation. Our adversaries and potential adversaries—think about whom that might be: Russia, North Korea, Iran, potentially China. They are ally-poor. No one wants to join the North Korea team or the Iran team—well, maybe Syria—but the United States for decades has had allies because they trust us. We are not a perfect nation, but they trust us. Look all over the world.

So what we need to do with regard to our strategy on China is make sure we remember not only our allies and deepen current relationships with Japan, with Korea, with Australia, but expand them—Vietnam. The Presiding Officer and I went to Vietnam with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, a war hero who spent time in prison in Vietnam, Senator MCCAIN. The Vietnamese are very interested in doing more with us. India, there are incredible opportunities to have a deeper alliance between the oldest democracy in the world, us, and the biggest democracy in the world, them. So allies have to be a key part of our strategy as we look at how we deal with the rise of China for the next two or three or four or five decades because all of these countries—all of our allies—are having the same challenges.

Finally, the third principle we cannot lose sight of—and for too long this body lost sight of it—is robust American economic growth. Since the founding of our Nation, we have been growing at about 3 or 4 percent GDP growth. I have a chart, and I talk about it all the time down here. Yet, over the last decade, because of policies we inflicted on the American people, we were barely growing at 1-percent GDP growth. What does that mean? Everybody talks about numbers, wonky. That is a proxy for the American dream, and we were not growing. We weren't growing. In Asia, the coin of the realm of power more than anything—more than military power—is the power of your economy, and we have not had that. We have not shown up, and that matters.

What we are trying to do in this body now—tax reform, regulatory reform, unleashing American energy—is we are going to start growing this economy again, and that is going to help the American people, that is going to reignite the American dream, but that is going to be key with any policy we deal with China.

So as we are thinking through this challenge—and I am going to talk about this a lot, and I know all my colleagues are interested in this. I know my colleague from Michigan is interested in it—we need to continue to focus on these core principles—reciprocity, our allies, and robust economic growth as we all struggle with and put together a long-term strategy to deal with the rise of China, the challenges and the opportunities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, our Nation's middle class was built by the hard work of American workers. At a time when our country has become increasingly polarized, we should all be able to agree that everybody should have a fair chance to succeed if they are willing to work hard and play by the rules.

These truly American values have inspired generations of workers who stand together and collectively bargain for basic workplace protections such as fair wages, safe workplaces, and reasonable hours. These protections allow American workers and their families to be productive members of the economy and achieve their version of the American dream, but the American dream only exists if hard work is rewarded with the opportunity to earn a good living, provide for your loved ones, and, when it is all said and done, be able to retire with dignity.

This is deeply personal to me. As a nurse's aide, my mother found opportunity and led the effort to organize her workplace. She went on to serve as an SEIU union steward.

Unfortunately, in the years since I grew up in Rochester Hills, it feels as though the American dream has moved out of the reach for too many American families. Joining or staying in the middle class can be a daily struggle.

We must fight every day to support and build the middle class, not chip away at fundamental worker rights. The laws, regulations, and administrative decisions that come out of Washington have a direct impact on American workers, unions, and the middle class.

The National Labor Relations Board plays a central role in protecting the rights of American workers. The NLRB was created to safeguard their ability to unionize and engage in collective bargaining for fair workplace conditions.

To work as intended, the NLRB must be made up of members deeply committed to representing the interests of American workers. Unfortunately, the nominee we will be considering shortly, Mr. John Ring, does not share this commitment. In fact, he is the third labor attorney President Trump has nominated to the committee with zero—let me say that again—zero track record of representing workers. He has only represented clients on the corporate and management side of labor issues.

During Mr. Ring's tenure at one of the country's largest firms, he advised corporations on how to undermine worker protections. He also posted blogs opposing commonsense reforms to modernize union election procedures, classifying the NLRB actions as "some of the biggest assaults on employer rights in recent history."

Mr. Ring would join recently confirmed Board member William Emanuel, who quickly ran into ethics trouble based on his history of representing corporations. Just 5 months after Mr. Emanuel's appointment, the NLRB was forced to vacate a major decision related to employer liability due to his conflicts of interest. Yet the administration continues full steam ahead with new nominees with extensive corporate ties and conflicts of interest.

This administration is also breaking precedent and all conception of fairness by refusing to nominate new NLRB members in bipartisan pairs. Despite a pending Democratic vacancy on the panel, the President and Senate majority leader have instead chosen a partisan approach—doubling down on the one-sided nature of a supposedly independent Federal agency. This is simply an unacceptable development, and it is an ongoing effort to silence our Nation's workers. Protecting American workers, the American middle class, and the American dream should not be a partisan issue.

I am deeply concerned with Mr. Ring's appointment to the NLRB. If confirmed to the five-member Board, the voting majority of an agency charged with protecting workers' voices will be stacked with members who are focused on undermining fundamental worker rights. I think employers should be treated fairly but not at the expense of our Nation's workers and the American middle class. We need a balanced and fair NLRB, and we need NLRB members who will stick up for American workers and the middle class. Mr. Ring will not be that kind of NLRB member. The administration and the majority are actively preventing seating someone who will stand up for workers.

I will be voting against Mr. Ring's confirmation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Ring nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 67 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeben	Rubio
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Corker	Inhofe	Scott
Cornyn	Isakson	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Sullivan
Crapo	Kennedy	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—48

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

NOT VOTING—2

Duckworth McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor.

Mitch McConnell, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, John Thune, Pat Roberts, David Perdue, Michael B. Enzi, Lamar Alexander, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Tim Scott, James M. Inhofe, John Hoeven, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Patrick Pizzella, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor, shall be brought to a close?