

and pay extra, get a rider to cover something that is a basic part of our healthcare.

Thanks to these junk plans that don't cover maternity care, and other sabotage, it is estimated that right now comprehensive health insurance costs 16.6 percent more than it otherwise would because of these efforts to undermine, sabotage, and take away healthcare. Does that sound like the Republican majority cares about moms and babies?

Now the Department of Justice has announced that it agrees with the Federal judge in Texas who said the entire Affordable Care Act must be struck down. This is something the President has enthusiastically embraced.

The entire Affordable Care Act is at stake, including Medicaid expansion for low-income workers who want to work but now have to choose between working and having healthcare coverage, children staying on their parents' plans until age 26, and protections for people with preexisting conditions.

In other words, if a baby is born with spina bifida, a heart defect, a genetic condition, or any other health problem, insurance companies would once again, under these plans, be able to deny them coverage or subject them to lifetime limits like we used to have. Does that sound like policies that care about moms and babies?

By the way, to emphasize that they support President Trump 100 percent, 2 weeks ago Senate Republicans passed a budget resolution out of committee on a party-line vote that once again has language to repeal the Affordable Care Act with no replacement. Sorry, moms and babies, you are on your own. And don't go looking to Medicaid for health coverage either. The Trump budget would cut \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid over 10 years—trillion. That is the same Medicaid that covers half of all babies born in America. When you gut Medicaid, you are keeping moms and babies from getting the healthcare they need. Does that sound as though Republicans care about moms and babies?

If our Republican colleagues really care about the health of moms and babies, here is what they should be doing and joining us to do: They would pass a bill to guarantee that every insurance plan covers prenatal and maternity care, like what is available under the Affordable Care Act. They would reaffirm the Affordable Care Act's protections for people with preexisting conditions, not just saying the words but actually making sure people with preexisting conditions are covered. And they would strengthen healthcare for moms and babies through the Children's Health Insurance Program and Medicaid.

A few years ago, the Finance Committee reported out a bill that I led with Senator GRASSLEY called the Quality Care for Moms and Babies Act. This bill would create a set of maternal

and infant quality care measures under CHIP and Medicaid—the Children's Health Insurance Program and Medicaid. The goal is simple: improving maternal and infant health outcomes. We need quality standards across the country.

Right now, half the births are through Medicaid. There are not consistent quality standards across the country to make sure there are healthy opportunities for prenatal care and maternity care.

The Quality Care for Moms and Babies Act would help make sure that every mom gets the best pregnancy care possible and every baby gets a healthy start. If our Republican colleagues care so much about the health of moms and babies, instead of politicizing issues around reproductive health and women's ability to make their own choices—instead of politicizing what is happening around reproductive health, they would join us in making the Quality Care for Moms and Baby Act a reality.

It is time to stop the cynical, political stunts. It is time to trust women to make the best reproductive healthcare decisions for themselves, their families, and their futures. It is time to take action to resolve the maternal and infant health crisis in this country. It is also time to ensure that every mom and every baby has the healthcare they need for a healthy life.

This is the United States of America; we can do better for our moms and babies than is currently being done. Democrats are ready to take real action to join with our Republican colleagues. It is time they join us in protecting the health of moms and babies.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

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

Ms. STABENOW. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeben	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	

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	Markley	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Harris	Reed	

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 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 Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

John Thune, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, James Lankford, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, John Hoeven, Pat Roberts, Richard Burr, David Perdue, Roger F. Wicker, Lindsey Graham, James E. Risch, Mitch McConnell.

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 Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 69 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeben	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	

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.