

the Republicans vote for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution that says the budget will balance within 5 years. Then, when given the opportunity to vote for spending cuts, we lose half of the Republicans. The Democrats don't care, as they will not vote for spending cuts, but the Republicans at least profess to be for spending cuts. Yet, when we offer a modest proposal like this, we lose half of the Republicans.

There is a problem with debts, and both parties share some guilt. What I have put forward today, though, is an opportunity for the Senators who truly believe the debt is a problem to try to restrain spending with a 2-percent cut across the board. I hope Senators will consider voting for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 942

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Paul amendment No. 942.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, 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 senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 73, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 310 Leg.]

YEAS—24

Barrasso	Ernst	Risch
Blackburn	Fischer	Rubio
Braun	Grassley	Sasse
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	Paul	Young

NAYS—73

Alexander	Harris	Peters
Baldwin	Hassan	Portman
Bennet	Hawley	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Roberts
Blunt	Hirono	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rosen
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Schatz
Cantwell	Isakson	Schumer
Capito	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Shelby
Casey	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cassidy	Leahy	Smith
Collins	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Thune
Cotton	McSally	Udall
Cramer	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Moran	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wicker
Gardner	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Graham	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Sanders	Warren
--------	---------	--------

The amendment (No. 942) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the third time.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. CRAMER. 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.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 311 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Alexander	Gardner	Murphy
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Barrasso	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blumenthal	Harris	Reed
Blunt	Hassan	Roberts
Boozman	Heinrich	Romney
Brown	Hirono	Rosen
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Capito	Isakson	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson	Shaheen
Carper	Jones	Shelby
Casey	Kaine	Sinema
Cassidy	Kennedy	Smith
Collins	King	Stabenow
Coons	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Tester
Cotton	Leahy	Thune
Cramer	Manchin	Tillis
Duckworth	Markley	Udall
Durbin	McConnell	Van Hollen
Feinstein	McSally	Warner
Gardner	Menendez	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Merkley	Wicker
Graham	Moran	Wyden
Grassley	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—16

Blackburn	Inhofe	Sasse
Braun	Lee	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Paul	Scott (SC)
Daines	Perdue	Toomey
Ernst	Risch	
Hawley	Rounds	

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Sanders	Warren
--------	---------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 81, the nays are 16.

The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill is passed.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, on roll-call vote No. 311, I voted yea. It was my intention to vote nay. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome.

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

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read nomination of General John E. Hyten for appointment as Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility in accordance with title 10, U.S.C., sections 154 and 601: to be General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 1:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Texas.

TRIBUTE TO SHEA WOODARD HALL

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to give tribute to a great American, a great Texan, a dear friend, and a 26-year veteran of this institution who has dedicated her career to serving the needs of her fellow citizens. Her name is Shea Woodard Hall. Shea has worked as the West Texas regional director on my team for 7 years. She is now retiring. Shea started working in the Senate in 1993, when she was hired by my predecessor, Senator Kay Bailey Hutchinson.

As West Texas regional director, Shea started with 89 counties in her region. By land area, that is bigger than some States. She could leave her office in Abilene, drive 7 hours north, and still be in her region. That is how much territory she was responsible for.

Shea has always been willing to go the extra mile, literally. In her first 3 years working in the Senate, Shea put 75,000 miles on her car. In fact, she has put so many miles on her vehicles throughout the last 26 years that it is probably for the best that she married a local car dealer in Abilene.

After 26 years serving 89 counties in West Texas, everyone knows Shea, and Shea knows everyone. From every mayor, to every county judge and sheriff, to every State elected official, Shea made it a point to know them all. In fact, when I traveled with Shea in West Texas, we would arrive at an event, and there was no doubt who folks were happy to see—me or Shea, and it sure wasn't me.

Shea is also known in West Texas for her rural tours. They are legendary. You see, Shea's region is diverse. It spans from Amarillo, to Lubbock, to Abilene, to San Angelo, to Big Spring, to Midland-Odessa.

On the last tour she planned, an ag tour, we started in Lubbock, with stops in Muleshoe, Fredonia, Dalhart, and Amarillo. If you know Texas, that is one heck of a big loop. On one of the stops, I asked Shea what we would be seeing that day, and she answered: "Strippers." I was fairly puzzled with

that response, and she quickly clarified: "Cotton strippers." I was relieved.

There are too many stories of Shea helping people in West Texas, but one of my favorite stories is about how Shea helped to bring the B-1 bomber to Texas. When the city of Abilene and Dyess Air Force Base were working to secure low-level training routes for the B-1 bomber, Shea received some questions and some concerns from local ranchers who were afraid that the noise would upset their cattle. Always the steady hand, Shea responded with some West Texas wisdom. She would tell them that the low-level training routes were good for our national security; that they would enhance Dyess Air Force Base as the premier B-1 base in the country; and finally, she would tell them that she hadn't received a single phone call from a cow protesting the noise. I am proud to say that because of her efforts and many others, those training routes remain, and today Texas is one of the homes of the B-1 bomber.

Shea has become a living legend in West Texas because no problem is too big and no problem is too small. She wants to help anyone and everyone who calls her with an issue. She often helps people in stressful situations, navigating the leviathan of Big Government on behalf of fellow Texans in their time of need. Shea also doesn't take no for an answer. If she didn't get the answer she needed to help a fellow Texan, she didn't give up.

She has been a tireless and effective member of our team. That is her legacy, and I know it will endure.

Shea is retiring next month. While we will miss her greatly, she will remain a friend, and she will remain family. We wish her well as she begins her well-earned retirement. The Senate, the people of Texas, and the thousands of people and families whom she has helped over the course of 26 years of service will miss her too.

Thank you, Shea, for your work, your determination, your passion, your patriotism, and your love for Texas. Texas says thank you.

God bless you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

NOMINATION OF EUGENE SCALIA

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to speak on the nomination, which will occur before the Senate shortly, of Eugene Scalia as Secretary of Labor.

I think it is important to say that as President Trump continues relentlessly pursuing his anti-worker agenda, now, more than ever, we need a Secretary of Labor who will stand up to the President and stand with working families, not someone like Scalia, who is an elite corporate lawyer, who has made his career fighting for the biggest cor-

porations and against workers. We need someone who will fight for strong health and safety protections, not someone who has crusaded to strike them down. We need someone who will hold companies accountable, not someone who used his last position in the Department of Labor to undermine whistleblower protections and fought to get his corporate clients off the hook for workplace harassment and discrimination against workers with disabilities.

We need someone who will fight for workers' economic security, not someone who helped companies get away with stealing their workers' wages and denying overtime pay. We don't need someone who avoids committing to support our efforts to raise the minimum wage to \$15 an hour and close the pay gap and, certainly, not someone who costs working families billions of dollars by fighting to strike down a crucial rule that made sure they could get retirement advice that was in their best interest.

We need a Secretary of Labor, not a secretary of corporate interests. Yet at our confirmation hearing last week, Scalia made very clear that is exactly what he would be by dodging taking a stand for workers and deferring to President Trump's anti-worker agenda.

I have been deeply concerned about his awful record since day one. I strongly oppose his nomination. I urge my colleagues to do the same. Everyone needs to take a long, hard look at who Mr. Scalia fights for and who he does not and think carefully about the message their vote will send to working families in our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I guess I shouldn't be surprised. I have seen 2½ years of a betrayal of American workers from this White House, this government, this Senate, and the President of the United States. The White House looks like a retreat for Wall Street executives, except on the days it looks like a retreat for insurance executives, except for the days it looks like a retreat for drug company executives.

I guess I shouldn't be surprised, but a few weeks ago, when we saw the nomination of Eugene Scalia to be Secretary of Labor, it just underscored again the betrayal of American workers by this government and by this President.

Eugene Scalia is the President's nominee to serve as Secretary of Labor. His job as Secretary of Labor is to represent workers, to advocate for workers, and to fight for workers—not to advocate for corporations, not to sell out to special interests, but to side with American workers. Yet all you have to do is look at his job. The President has sent us a corporate lawyer who has fought over and over to stop workplace protections, to undermine worker safety, and to cut and depress workers' wages over and over again.

Mr. Scalia, as an elitist, multi-million-dollar corporate lawyer, has repeatedly defended companies against whistleblowers. He defended Walmart against its workers. And he is nominated to be Secretary of Labor?

He defended a corporation against 30 women who had been sexually harassed at assembly plants. And he is going to be the Secretary of Labor?

He defended other corporations against workers with disabilities after the companies violated the Americans with Disabilities Act. And he is going to be Secretary of Labor?

Over and over, he fought to help the most powerful corporations against workers, asking the courts to put their thumb on the scales of justice, to choose corporations over workers, to choose Wall Street over consumers, and to choose health insurance companies over patients. He has always come down on the side of corporate interests, of special interests, and in the end, always betrayed workers. And he is the President's nominee to be Secretary of Labor?

He has defended union-busting corporations. Boeing has been rabid in its anti-union coercion. Scalia worked for them, advocated for them in their never-ending quest to stop workers from having a voice in their company. And he is going to be the President's Secretary of Labor?

What Mr. Scalia doesn't understand and what President Trump doesn't understand is that you can't say—let me back up for a second. The President loves to say that he supports this, that he is for workers, that workers are his friends, and that he is a friend to workers. He loves saying that, but what he doesn't understand is that you can't support workers individually without supporting workers collectively. You can't support workers individually without supporting workers collectively. You can't support workers if you attack unions.

We know what unions have brought to this country. Ever since the generally rapid decline of trade unionism, we have seen wages flatten, we have seen benefits cut, and we have seen retirements taken away from workers. You know, when people can organize and bargain collectively, they have higher wages, they have better healthcare, and they have a retirement system.

You can't support workers if you attack unions like Mr. Scalia has done. We need a Secretary of Labor who will actually fight for labor. It is not called the secretary of corporate interests or the secretary of special interests; it is called the Secretary of Labor. You are supposed to honor work and respect work. We need a Secretary of Labor who will fight for labor, not fight for corporate interests.

It comes down to whose side you are on. Are you on the corporations' side, or are you on American workers' side? Do you fight for Wall Street wealth, or do you fight for the dignity of work?