

Murkowski	Sasse	Thune
Murphy	Schatz	Tillis
Murray	Schumer	Udall
Perdue	Scott (FL)	Van Hollen
Peters	Scott (SC)	Warner
Portman	Shaheen	Warren
Reed	Shelby	Whitehouse
Roberts	Sinema	Wicker
Romney	Smith	Wyden
Rounds	Stabenow	Young
Rubio	Sullivan	
Sanders	Tester	

NAYS—8

Alexander	Enzi	Lee
Booker	Hoeven	Toomey
Cotton	Kennedy	

NOT VOTING—4

Inhofe	Risch
Paul	Rosen

The motion was agreed to.
 The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The majority leader.
 Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I withdraw my motion to proceed to S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, what is the pending business?

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 268, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 268) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Shelby) Amendment No. 5, of a perfecting nature.

Schumer Amendment No. 6, of a perfecting nature.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk for Senate amendment No. 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 Senate amendment No. 5 to H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Josh Hawley, John Thune, Shelley Moore Capito, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Richard Burr, James Lankford, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, David Perdue, Mike Rounds, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn, Rob Portman, Steve Daines, John Kennedy.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for Senate amendment No. 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on amendment No. 6 to H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Chuck Schumer, Patrick Leahy, Ben Cardin, Tim Kaine, Brian Schatz, Chris Van Hollen, Chris Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Kirsten Gillibrand, Jeanne Shaheen, Gary Peters, Bob Casey, Jr., Tom Udall, Angus King, Debbie Stabenow, Maria Cantwell, Martin Heinrich.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls be waived.

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

STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S SECURITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST ACT OF 2019—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 1, a bill to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 1

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, as my colleagues know, we have about 41,000 Active-Duty servicemembers in the U.S. Coast Guard. They are running vital missions right now in the South China Sea. They are protecting our airspace and ports along about 12,000 miles of coastline. They are performing search and rescue missions that include nearly 1,200 Active-Duty Coast Guard personnel in my home State of Louisiana, the Eighth Coast Guard District. For that reason, I think the members of our Coast Guard need to be paid during this shutdown until we resolve our differences. We need to resolve our differences.

There are some good Members of Congress, but right now, the American people are wondering what they are good for. It seems to me that we ought to be able to reach an agreement that secures the border—which I happen to believe can't be done without a barrier—and that also opens the government.

For that reason, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Coast Guard be paid; that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 6, H.J. Res. 1; that the Wicker amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the bill as amended be considered read a third time and

passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, President Trump is responsible not only for thousands of Coast Guard personnel not getting paid but also for hundreds of thousands of other Federal employees not getting paid.

Last week, I met with Coast Guard Commandant Schultz, and I told him to press Secretary Nielsen, who could press the President to stop holding innocent Federal employees hostage in wall negotiations.

Last month, as we all know, the Senate voted unanimously to keep the government open into February so all Federal employees would get paid and the President and Congress could separately negotiate border security.

Today, the Senate will again have a chance to vote on the same measure that we passed unanimously in December. I expect that those who care about getting our Coast Guard paid will support passing H.J. Res. 31, a continuing resolution for the Department of Homeland Security, and H.R. 648, which are the conference bills for FSGG, Interior, Environment, Agriculture, T-HUD, SFOPS, and CJS.

Will the Senator from Louisiana modify his request to include the unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 648 and H.J. Res. 31 en bloc; that the measure be considered read a third time and passed en bloc; and that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no action or debate? That will pay all Federal employees who deserve to be paid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I am smiling because of the great admiration and respect I have for the senior Senator from New York. I love to hear him talk.

Mr. SCHUMER. If the Senator would yield, it is mutual.

Mr. KENNEDY. I love to hear him talk. He can talk the ears off a jack-rabbit.

Mr. SCHUMER. If the gentleman will yield, we don't do that in Brooklyn.

Mr. KENNEDY. He has waxed eloquently many times in this Chamber.

I remember back in 2005, 2006—I was a mere lad—that we had a bill before this Chamber that was called the Secure Fence Act of 2006. Senator SCHUMER and then-Senator Obama—a rising star—and Senator Hillary Clinton talked passionately and eloquently about how it was impossible to secure a 1,900-mile piece of real estate without having barriers. They talked eloquently. I remember agreeing with them wholeheartedly that legal immigration makes our country stronger,

that illegal immigration undermines legal immigration, and that one way to stop illegal immigration—not the only way but one way—was with a border barrier. That was then. This is now.

Now, my esteemed colleague knows full well that his resolution will not accomplish either border security or the opening up of this government because President Donald Trump is going to veto it. It will be a futile, useless exercise. We can go through it if the Senator wants to. He can spend all day trying to teach a goat how to climb a tree, but he is better off hiring a squirrel in the first place. There is a measure before this Senate, and the President has put a proposal on the table that will satisfy many of the concerns of our Democratic friends and will ensure border security.

For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I object to the original request because the Senator from Louisiana has not allowed the rest of the Federal Government to get paid. I would remind him, whether it is squirrel, jackrabbit, or armadillo, that we are the article I branch of government, and because President Trump says no, we have veto override power, and we could get the workers paid even if he will not sign it. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I was going to ask the distinguished Democratic leader to have yielded under his reservation.

Might I be recognized for just a moment? The objection has already been heard, and we will not get this done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield the floor? Mr. KENNEDY. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I appreciate the Senator from Louisiana.

His unanimous consent request would have done one simple thing—gotten the uniformed servicemembers in the Coast Guard paid just like we are paying today for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. The Coast Guard members are the only servicemen out there now who, under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, are required to perform their duties under pain of penalty, and they are not being paid as the others are. It would also protect survivors' benefits for the retirees and their survivors in the Coast Guard, as is being done with the other uniformed services.

We may be getting close to a solution on this. I certainly hope so. In the meantime, I think it would be a significant gesture on the part of the Democrats and the Republicans in this Senate and in the House of Representatives to pass this one small change

that the President has said he will sign and to do the right thing by paying members of this uniformed service. I regret that the Senator has objected, and I appreciate at least having a chance to explain why this mere carve-out is different from a larger solution that may be coming soon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, once again, I would simply remind my dear friend from Mississippi that we could do a whole lot more good by funding and opening up the government for everyone. President Trump has claimed 25 times he wants to shut down the government for his wall, and he has gotten this Chamber to reverse itself when it had originally passed funding for the whole government. We could do a lot more good if my amendment to the proposal by my friend from Louisiana were adopted. That is how it is.

Now, on a different issue, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to proceed to S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, let me explain a little bit about what we witnessed on the Senate floor. Actually, it may be a little bit confusing, but it is an important issue.

With regard to the Coast Guard, my colleagues from Louisiana and Mississippi have been working on this issue for a while. It is not going to solve the whole partial government shutdown, but we have been working with a number of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Right now, this bill for which my friend from Louisiana asked to have unanimous consent has 23 cosponsors, and there might be more. Actually, almost one-quarter of the whole Senate—more Democratic cosponsors than Republican cosponsors—is cosponsoring this bill to pay the Coast Guard.

Again, we are working on the broader issue of getting our government back to the work of paying Federal workers, but as my colleagues mentioned, the Coast Guard is in a rather unique situation because it is the only military service right now that is not getting paid. Those in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines are all getting paid. Right now, as we speak, the Coast Guard's men and women are out in my great State of Alaska and are risking their lives for Americans, as they always do. They are also out in other places like the Middle East and in the Persian Gulf. They are literally running patrols in the gulf, side by side, with marines and sailors. The marines and sailors are getting paid. The members of the Coast Guard are not getting paid.

By the way, if the members of the Coast Guard say: "Do you know what? I don't want to deploy to the Middle

East right now. I am not getting paid" or "I don't want to get on that ship to save an Alaskan crabber whose life is at risk," they get court-martialed. So the Coast Guard is in a very unique situation right now.

Here is the process we just witnessed. A number of us—again, it was very bipartisan—went to the President and said: Mr. President, we know it takes the Senate and the House and the White House to pass a bill. People are working on the broader issue. We are all working on the broader issue and on the compromises we need. Hopefully, we can get there this afternoon. In the meantime, let's try to get something to pass as we have almost one-quarter of the Senate in agreement—more Democrats than Republicans—on this bill that Senator KENNEDY just mentioned. Would you support this?

A number of us have had ongoing conversations with the President of the United States. I have raised this a number of times with him and his administration over the last 2 weeks. In a meeting I had with him on Wednesday, he said: I am 100 percent behind that bill.

This is really important because, as to some of what the minority leader has said we should be bringing up, the White House has said: We are not going to support. OK. It is difficult to pass a bill when you are not going to get the President to sign it. Yet the President will sign this bill, and almost 25 percent of the Senate has said it is already a cosponsor of it.

So what just happened for everybody watching, particularly the Coast Guard members?

When I learned that the President was supportive last Thursday, we brought this bill to the Senate floor, and we hotlined it, which means we were trying to move it through the Senate very quickly. Every Republican cleared that hotline. Essentially, it means we all voted yes. When we took it to our colleagues on the other side—look, I know my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, care a lot about the Coast Guard—it was stalled.

We kept asking: Come on. Don't you want to support this? You have a bunch of cosponsors. Right now, the men and women of the Coast Guard are very unique in terms of the military's not getting paid, but there was just a delay.

Senator KENNEDY said: I am going to ask for a live unanimous consent. Let's just bring it up and pass it. The White House would sign it. We could fix this issue today. I bet most of the House would certainly vote for it.

So he brought it up for unanimous consent, and the minority leader objected.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to talk a lot about hostage-taking with regard to Federal employees. I think they need to think a bit harder about what just happened with the men and women of the Coast Guard. You heard it from the minority

leader. He said he is not going to do anything about the Coast Guard right now even though the President said he would sign it. We could fix this tonight.

Here is the point. We are all working on the broader issue, and we are going to vote on some things. If they fail this afternoon, there are numbers of us who are working on compromises to fix this whole problem. In the meantime, why shouldn't we all be working on the important issue—it might not be with regard to the whole government—of taking care of the men and women of the Coast Guard? People are literally risking their lives right now for Americans, not just in Alaska or in Texas but all over the world, and they are the only members of the military who are not getting paid. We could fix it tonight—the President will sign it—as we are working on the broader issue.

I don't understand why that is not an acceptable path forward. In talking to the men and women of the Coast Guard—certainly, in my State—they don't understand either. Yes, we have to come to a compromise on this broader issue that ends the partial government shutdown—that gets all of our Federal workers back and that secures our border. We are all working on that. In the meantime, had the minority leader of the U.S. Senate not objected, everybody here—I guarantee you it would have included my Democratic colleagues—would have voted for this bill to pay the Coast Guard. It just doesn't make sense.

I certainly hope my colleagues and my good friend from New York will reconsider their blocking of this bill, because we could fix at least one element of this. We need to fix it all, but in my view this is a very unique element. The men and women who raised their hands to support and defend the Constitution and possibly die for this country are not getting paid. Yet those in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines are. Let's fix it tonight. We can fix it tonight. Unfortunately, we just had an objection to doing that. I think it is a mistake, and I am hopeful my colleagues will reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise to strongly support the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Mississippi.

We should pay our Coast Guard. It is not right that we aren't paying the Coast Guard. Right now, every other military branch is being paid. The Army is being paid. The Navy is being paid. The Air Force is being paid. The Marines are being paid. Those in the Coast Guard are not being paid even as they are risking their lives.

Many of us in Texas and along the gulf coast saw the incredible heroism of the Coast Guard in the wake of Hurricane Harvey, during which so many brave men and women risked their lives to save thousands upon thousands of innocents. They should be paid. I

think it is important for the American people to understand what just happened here because it is highly consequential. It is easy for things to get lost in procedural gobbledygook and to assume: Well, this is some back and forth about the shutdown and about the wall. It has nothing to do with any of that.

What Senator KENNEDY did was to bring forward a bill to pay the Coast Guard. The bill did nothing else. It didn't address any aspect of the shutdown. It didn't address any aspect of the wall. It simply said: Let's pay the men and women in the Coast Guard—yes or no. That means you can be a yes on that, whether you think we need to secure the border and have a steel barrier or whether you support open borders. It doesn't say anything either way. It just says that the men and women in the Coast Guard deserve paychecks.

We could have passed that right here today. There is one reason and one reason only that we didn't. It is because the Democratic leader stood up and said: I object.

I note that if there are Democrats on the Democratic side of the aisle who are not comfortable with that, who agree that the Coast Guard should be paid, let me encourage my Democratic colleagues to say so because it is their party's leader who has lodged an objection on behalf of, effectively, every Democratic Senator.

The Democrats are fond of using the phrase "hostage-taking." They are, quite literally, holding the men and women of the Coast Guard hostage because they want to win a political victory against the President. Their objective here is to have the President back down and to have not a single mile of border wall built—never mind that the Democratic leader and every Democrat in this Chamber voted in 2013 to build and fund 350 miles of border wall. That was 350 miles that every Democrat in this Chamber voted for.

We are in a shutdown today because they are now unwilling to fund 234 miles of border wall, which is less than they voted for in 2013.

We understand that politics rears its head in this business, and the Democrats want to defeat the President politically, and so the substance is secondary to trying to get the partisan victory over the President. Let me suggest that this ought to be an issue. We keep fighting back and forth on whether securing the border or having open borders is a good idea, but this ought to be an issue that should be real simple.

Senator KENNEDY brought forward a clean bill that does one thing and one thing only. It pays the salaries of the men and women in the Coast Guard. If the Democratic leader hadn't objected, that would have passed right now. The President could have signed it tonight. The paychecks could have gone out right now for every man and woman in the Coast Guard.

If you are serving in the Coast Guard in any of our 50 States, let me say: No. 1, thank you for your service. Thank you for your heroism. Thank you for the amazing difference you make. You deserve to be paid. You will be paid. But if you want to know why you aren't being paid right now, it is because the Democratic leader objected to your getting a paycheck.

It is my hope that the Democratic Senators will go to their leader and say: This is a bad idea for Democratic Senators to hold hostage the paychecks of the men and women of the Coast Guard.

We should pay the Coast Guard, and that ought to be something that commands unanimous, bipartisan support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I want to make one other point after the eloquent comments of my good friend from Texas.

We have already done something similar here. We are all breaking for lunch right now. My Democratic colleagues are going to go do their strategy sessions, and we are going to do the same. I implore my Democratic colleagues to go back to their leader and say: Hey, come on. Let's rethink this. Here is why. We have already done something similar.

I was on the floor when two of my Democratic colleagues from Virginia asked for unanimous consent on a bill. Remember, the whole government was partially shut down. There was a partial government shutdown. They asked for unanimous consent on a bill to make sure that when the partial government shutdown was over, everybody would receive backpay. We are actually doing work on smaller but very important issues. I was on the floor when they did that. I certainly voted yes.

By the way, that went to the President. He said he was going to sign it, and he signed it. That became a law just about 2 weeks ago, as we have been debating and trying to find a compromise.

So the notion that we are not doing any work and that we are not passing any laws that are impacting Federal workers until the whole thing is over is actually not true. We have already done it.

This would be analogous to what we did 2 weeks ago, and that was led by the Democrats. The thing about this Coast Guard bill right now is that it is very, very bipartisan.

Mr. CRUZ. Would the Senator from Alaska yield for a question?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. CRUZ. Did the bill that Senator KENNEDY brought forward do anything—anything else—beyond simply paying the men and women of the Coast Guard?

Mr. SULLIVAN. No, it just made it so there was parity between the brave men and women of the Coast Guard and the brave men and women of the Army,

Navy, Air Force, and Marines—all of whom are risking their lives for our country and our citizens.

Right now, the men and women of the Coast Guard are the only ones who are not getting paid.

Mr. CRUZ. So if the Democrats had not objected and it had passed and the House had passed it and sent it to the President, could we get the men and women of the Coast Guard paid right now, today, and get that passed into law?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I think as soon as possible we could get it passed.

I talked to the President on Wednesday. He said he was 100 percent behind this bill, the way he was behind that other bill to provide backpay to everybody else who has been affected by the partial government shutdown.

Mr. CRUZ. So the only thing that is necessary to pass a clean bill, paying the salaries of every man and woman in the Coast Guard, is for the Democratic Senators to withdraw their objection; is that correct?

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is correct.

Mr. CRUZ. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, as you know, I seldom rise on this floor to contradict somebody on the other side. Over the years, I have worked very hard to work in a bipartisan way with the Presiding Officer and with my Republican colleagues, but these crocodile tears that the Senator from Texas is crying for the first responders are too hard for me to take.

They are too hard for me to take because when the Senator from Texas shut this government down in 2013, my State was flooded. It was under water. People were killed. People's houses were destroyed. Their small businesses were ruined forever. Because of the Senator from Texas, this government was shut down for politics.

He surfed to a second-place finish in the Iowa caucuses but was of no help to the first responders, to the teachers, and to the students whose schools were closed with a Federal Government that was shut down because of the junior Senator from Texas.

It is his business—not my business—why he supports a President who wants to erect a medieval barrier on the border of Texas, who wants to use eminent domain to build that wall, and who wants to declare an unconstitutional emergency to build that wall. That is the business of the Senator from Texas.

I can assure you that in Colorado if a President said that he was going to use eminent domain to erect a barrier across the State of Colorado, across the Rocky Mountains of Colorado, and he was going to steal the property of our farmers and ranchers to build his medieval wall, there wouldn't be an elected leader from our State who would support that idea.

That comes to my final point—how ludicrous it is that this government is shut down over a promise the President

of the United States couldn't keep and that America is not interested in having him keep. This idea that he was going to build a medieval wall across the southern border of Texas, taking it from the farmers and ranchers who were there, and have the Mexicans pay for it isn't true. That is why we are here, because he is now saying the taxpayers have to pay for it. That is not what he said during his campaign.

Over and over he said that Mexico would pay for the wall—over and over again.

I was going to talk about what he said about the junior Senator's father, but I am going to let that alone. It was after that.

Now we are here with the government shut down over his broken promise, while the Chinese are landing spacecraft on the dark side of the moon. That is what they are doing, not to mention what they are doing in Latin America and with their One Belt, One Road Initiative in Asia. That is what they are doing while we are shut down over a promise he never thought he could keep and didn't keep.

Finally, this idea that my colleague from Texas—and I am sorry to say this because I respect him. He is obviously a very intelligent person, but this idea that Democrats are for open borders is gibberish, and it is proven by what the Senator from Louisiana said, which is that time after time, we have supported real border security, not a wall that Mexico pays for that gets you attention at campaign rallies from some people in America and that gets talked about on FOX News at night.

In 2013, the Senator from Texas didn't support it. I did. In 2013, we passed a bill here in a bipartisan way. It got 68 votes. It had \$46 billion for border security in it—\$46 billion, not \$5 billion for his rinky-dink wall that he is talking about building. There was \$46 billion for border security. To be precise about it, it had 350 miles of what the President now refers to as steel slats.

By the way, America, do you hear him not calling it a wall anymore?

Now it is steel slats. Now it is a border barrier. There were 350 miles of so-called steel slats in that bill.

Do you know what else was in that bill? I think the Presiding Officer voted for that bill. In that bill, we doubled the number of border security agents on the border. They could practically hold hands on that border. There were so many border security agents in that bill. We had billions of dollars of drone technology so that we could learn what we have learned in Afghanistan and in other places, to see every single inch of that border—every inch.

We had internal security in that bill so that small businesses, farmers, and ranchers don't have to be the immigration police, and so that, finally, in America we could actually know who came here legally on a visa but overstayed their visa.

Forty percent of the people in this country who are undocumented are

here because they came legally and overstayed. We still can't do that in America because that bill passed the Senate, but it couldn't get a vote in the House because of the stupidest rule ever created, called the Hastert rule, named after somebody who is in prison. That rule has allowed a minority of tyrants in the Congress to bring a Democratic President low—President Obama, whom they didn't let do anything—to ruin the speakership of John Boehner, and to allow Paul Ryan to almost accomplish nothing while he was Speaker, except leaving this place in a government shutdown.

The so-called Freedom Caucus has had a veto around this place for 10 years and completely distorted the Republican Party here, if I do say so myself. That may sound presumptuous, but I know a lot of Republicans in Colorado who don't agree with almost anything or anything that the Freedom Caucus has stood for. Yet they have had a veto on good, bipartisan legislation passed by the U.S. Senate.

So I am not going to stand here and take it from somebody who has shut down the government while my State was flooded or from a President who says that he wants \$5 billion to build some antiquated, medieval wall, which he said Mexico would pay for, when I helped write and voted for a bill that actually would have secured the border of the United States of America, that would have secured our internal defenses as well.

This is a joke, and the fact that it consumes the cable networks all night, every night, and all the rest of it—this government should be open. We can debate whatever it is we want to debate.

Do you think the Chinese don't know that we can't land a spaceship on the dark side of the moon? Do you think the Russians don't know that for the first time since John Glenn was sent up to orbit this planet, America cannot put a person into space without asking the Russians to do it? Do you think the rest of the world doesn't know that we are not investing in our infrastructure; that we are not investing in the young generation of Americans; that we are willing to lose the race for artificial intelligence to the Chinese; that we are going to break all of our longstanding alliances since World War II at a moment when China is rising; that China's GDP has quadrupled since 2001, tripled since 2003, doubled since 2009? Do we think that no one in the rest of the world knows all of that about us?

We should reopen this government today. We should reopen it today. Then, what I hope much more than that is that we actually come together to figure out how we are going to govern this country again and stop playing petty, partisan politics, which is going to do nothing to educate the next generation of Americans, which is going to do nothing to fix the fiscal condition of this country.

For 10 years—for 10 years, I have heard the junior Senator from Texas

and I have heard the Freedom Caucus in the House of Representatives talk about how important it is to get the fiscal condition of our government fixed. In fact, that has been the pretext for shutdowns and for fiscal cliffs and for all of this stuff that does nothing but denigrate our democratic Republic.

Now, for the first time almost in history—it happened once before during the Vietnam war—we are actually having our deficit shooting through the roof while unemployment has fallen. It has never happened before. These are the people who called Barack Obama a Bolshevik and a socialist at the depths of the recession, when we had a 10-percent unemployment rate, and didn't lift a finger to do anything. They have now given us a fiscal condition where our deficit is going up while our unemployment rate is falling. Do you know how hard it is to accomplish that? Do you know how irresponsible you would have to be to accomplish that? Yet that is what has been accomplished.

When I was first here—it was actually a little after I was first here—I used to walk through Denver International Airport, which we are very proud of in Colorado. By the way, it is the most recent airport that has been constructed in America. While we have been closed, other airports around the world—new airports have been opened just while we have been closed.

Denver International Airport is the most recent airport in the country to be opened. It was opened 25 years ago—a quarter of a century ago—and during moments like those when the Senator from Texas shut down the government while Colorado was underneath floods and people had lost all of the things I talked about earlier—their houses, their jobs, and their lives—I used to want to walk through that airport with a paper bag over my head because I was so embarrassed to be part of this.

I often wondered why anyone in their right mind would want to work in a place that has a 9-percent approval rating. In fact, I brought a chart—two charts—one day to the floor, one that showed we hadn't always had a 9-percent approval rating, to remind people how far we had fallen in the public's estimation over the time that the Senator from Texas and I have been here. Then I brought out another chart that looked at who else has a 9-percent approval rating. I can't remember all—it has sort of been lost in the mist of time—but I do remember that the IRS had a 40-percent approval rating; there was an actress who had a 13-percent approval rating; more people wanted America to be a Communist country—11 percent—than approved of this Congress; and Fidel Castro had a 5-percent approval rating, which was lower than our 9-percent approval rating. He was the only one who had a lower rating than that.

So my question, often, was this: Why would anybody want to work in a place that has such a low approval rating, and why would they want to behave in a way that only made matters worse?

I am sorry to say this, but there is an answer. If you think you have been sent here to dismantle the Federal Government—and I have lots of problems with this Federal Government. I think it does a lot of things very well, and, as a westerner, I certainly believe we need to not be in the business of defending bad government. We need to be improving the government. But if you think your job is to dismantle it—as the Freedom Caucus does, in my view—then a 9-percent approval rating suits you just fine because you get to go home and say “See how terrible all of those guys are? See what idiots all of those guys are?” while you are taking your pay while the Federal workers are not getting paid, while you are keeping your job while they are losing their job.

There has been an effort not just to dismantle the Federal Government but to separate it from the American people, to claim that it is someone else's or that it is corrupt. In many ways, I think it is; I believe it is. I believe this place is one of the most corrupt parts of the whole thing. But because it is corrupt or because it can't get its act together or because it is too far away from the people or, I think I would say, because it is populated by a bunch of self-interested politicians who don't care about the priorities of the American people—whatever the reason is, it is not separate. It is not separate. The reason that is important is that we live in a democratic Republic, and the Founders of this country did two things that had never happened in human history: They led a successful armed insurrection against a colonial power in one generation, and they formed a democratic Republic whose Constitution was ratified by the people who would live under it.

What they knew because they were enlightened thinkers—or I should say not what they knew but what they believed because they had only bad examples from which to draw when they sat there in Philadelphia writing that Constitution—but what they knew was that in a Republic, we would have disagreements. That was their expectation, and their belief was that out of those disagreements we would—and, by the way, they knew we would have disagreements because they had disagreements, and they had failed on some very important things. It has to be said. They perpetuated human slavery because they couldn't come to an agreement about that, and other people, whom I think of as Founders—just as important, just as significant as those Founders—ended the enslavement of human beings in America and did other important things, such as make sure my daughters had the right to vote. Those people also are Founders. But what they believed at their core was that through our disagreements, we would forge more imaginative and more durable solutions than any King or tyrant could come up with on their own. That was their belief. That was their expectation.

I would say that our country, in many ways, has eclipsed any expectation they ever had of what America would become. For the moment, we are the richest country in the world. We have the greatest capacity for self-defense of any human population in the history of the world. We are far more democratic and far more free, with all of our imperfections, than they would have ever imagined and probably than most of them would have ever wanted. We are the longest lived democracy in human history. But, for some reason, there is a generation of politicians in America today who don't think it is necessary to live up to the standard that they set and the standard lots of other people have set from the founding of our country 230 years ago until today.

I don't even know what day it is anymore of this record-long shutdown, but the pretext for it is an invention. It is a creation of something in the President's mind. It was something we have learned from reading the press that was a mnemonic device used during the campaign to remind him to talk about immigration in an effort to divide Americans from one another instead of an effort to bring us together, in an effort to turn what just 3 years ago was a bipartisan issue in the Senate—securing our southern border with \$46 billion—into a cudgel to be wielded at campaign rallies.

In any case, the least we could do while we have these shabby disagreements that are not worthy of our predecessors, that are not worthy of the State I represent—which is one-third Democratic, one-third Republican, and one-third Independent—that are threatening to make our generation the first generation of Americans to leave less opportunity, not more, to the people coming after us, a generation of politicians who are openly suggesting that America's role in the world should be diminished—the least we could do is reopen our government and stop pursuing this self-inflicted harm that it creates in having hundreds of thousands of Federal workers out of work and not being paid, not able to support their families while we continue to stand on this floor, having mindless arguments that are going to do nothing to advance the future of our country.

We shouldn't shut the government down, as it has been in this case, for a campaign promise the President, I am sure, knew he could never keep.

With that, I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, there is an old saying in Texas among Texas trial lawyers. If you have the facts, you bang the facts. If you have the law, you bang the law. If you don't have either one, you bang the table. We have seen a whole lot of table banging right here on this floor.

The Senator from Colorado spent a great deal of time yelling, spent a

great deal of time attacking me personally. He did at one point briefly rise to the defense of my father. I appreciate that gesture, but he spent a lot of time yelling.

I will say, in my time in the Senate, I don't believe I have ever bellored or yelled at one of my colleagues on the Senate floor, and I hope in my time before me, I never do that. I think we should discuss issues and substance and facts and not simply scream and yell at each other.

Let's go over some of the facts. In the angry speech of the Senator from Colorado, he did not dispute, No. 1, that he and every other Senate Democrat in 2013 voted for 350 miles of border wall. That is a fact. He has voted for 350 miles of border wall, as did every other Democrat in this Chamber at that time.

No. 2, he did not dispute that in December of last year, the then-Republican House of Representatives voted to fund the government—to fund the entirety of the government—and to secure the border, and the Senator from Colorado, and I believe every other Democrat, filibustered that bill and caused the shutdown.

I voted to take up that bill. You voted to take up that bill. Had we taken up the bill, had we simply passed the bill the House of Representatives had passed funding the government and securing the border, the government would never have shut down.

It takes some degree of chutzpah to stand up, after filibustering funding for the government, as the Democrats did, and blame the shutdown on the opposing party.

The Senator from Colorado did not dispute the Republican House voted to fund the government, and he and his Democratic colleagues filibustered that, which caused the shutdown.

No. 3, the Senator from Colorado did not dispute that the stated reason the Democrats filibustered that bill is because it authorized the funding of 234 miles of wall.

I have to say, I find it amusing that a new adjective has crept in. It is now not 234 miles of wall; it is medieval wall. I don't know if there is something in there that has a moat and has catapults that are throwing burning tar—medieval wall now.

It is kind of an odd thing. It does raise the question: Well, if walls are medieval, why did the Senator from Colorado and every other Democrat in 2013 vote for 350 miles of medieval wall? To the extent walls are medieval, they presumably were medieval in 2013, just as much as they are now.

The President has a good observation. He said: I will tell you something else that is medieval, the wheel. There is a reason the wheel is medieval—because it rolls things, and it works. Walls are effective.

Unlike the Senator from Colorado, I live in a border State. We have 1,200 miles of border. I have spent a great deal of time down at the border with

Border Patrol agents. We have miles and miles of wall right now that are working. I have been to those walls—not once, not twice but over and over again.

One of the rich things about this Chamber is, Senators from States nowhere near the border presume to lecture border States about what it is like on the border and what works securing the border. Walls are effective. I will tell you, every single Border Patrol agent I have asked—and I have asked dozens, probably hundreds of Border Patrol agents—are walls effective, unquestionably, they say yes.

Let's not destruct the straw man. Walls are not the only thing. You need technology. You need boots on the ground. You need all sorts of other tools. The critical point in intercepting someone crossing over illegally is the time between detection and interception, and what a wall does is slows down the traffickers to give the Border Patrol time to intercept them.

By the way, we have seen it over and over again in San Diego. When they built the wall, the illegal traffic plummeted. In El Paso, when they built the wall, the illegal traffic plummeted. Now the Democrats' position is not substantive. They voted for 350 miles of wall. So why are they shutting the government down over 234 miles of wall? It is not substantive; it is political.

We get that they hate Donald Trump. If anyone in America had missed that point—that they really don't like this man—their yelling and screaming and bellowing has made that abundantly clear. Just because you hate somebody doesn't mean you should shut down the government. I voted to keep this government open, right now, today. The Democrats are filibustering funding for the government.

Let me tell you something else the Senator from Colorado didn't dispute. We had a whole colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Alaska about funding the Coast Guard. Did you notice, in that entire bellowing speech, the words "Coast Guard" were never uttered? Not once.

What Senator KENNEDY asked this body to do was pass a clean bill to pay the paychecks of the Coast Guard. Senator KENNEDY's bill doesn't mention a wall—whether you like one or not, it doesn't mention a medieval wall or any other kind. It simply says: Pay the Coast Guard—yes, no.

Every Republican agrees, pay the Coast Guard right now. It is not fair to treat the Coast Guard differently than we are treating the Army and Navy and Marines and Air Force.

The Senator from Colorado didn't address that because it is indisputable, it is a fact that the reason that didn't pass right now is because the Democratic leader stood up and made an objection.

By implication, every Democratic Senator presumably agrees with it. The fact that the Senator from Colorado

didn't say, yes, we should fund the Coast Guard, and, you know what, my leader was wrong when he held the paychecks of the Coast Guard's men and women hostage because he wants to win a political fight with the President.

By the way, I would note to the Senator of Colorado, it is not the end of the world to stand up to your party's leader. Some of us have a history of having done so in the past.

We are now in the longest government shutdown in history. This shutdown needs to end—the American people want it to end—but we also need to secure the border.

I have to say, the contrast between the two parties could not be clearer. The President has repeatedly said he wants to negotiate and compromise. He says he is willing to meet in the middle. He hasn't insisted on every mile of border wall he asked for. He hasn't insisted on every single dollar of border security. He said: Let's meet and compromise. Republicans on this side of the Chamber have said: Let's compromise in the middle.

The position of Senate Democrats is that they will not negotiate; they will not compromise, period. Their position, how many miles of wall can be built? Zero. They are not to 1 yet. When it comes to negotiating, their position is not an inch of wall can be built, even though we the Democrats already voted for 350 miles of it. Why? Because Donald Trump is President.

That is an extreme and radical position. Look, I understand, folks watching at home, it is hard to tell—you are reading the news. It seems like both parties are bickering. It is hard to tell what is happening, particularly because on the Senate floor, there is a lot of procedural mumbo jumbo.

If you want to understand what is going on, the exchange between Senator KENNEDY and Senator SCHUMER illustrates it all. Senator KENNEDY's bill did one thing and one thing only. It paid the salaries of the men and women of the Coast Guard. It didn't touch any other issue.

Every Republican agrees with that bill. The Democrats objected and said: We will not pay the Coast Guard.

Had they not objected, we could put that bill on the President's desk today, and they could get their paychecks right now. That is emblematic of the approach of Senate Democrats.

When the Senator from Colorado stopped screaming at me, he then engaged in a bit of historical retrospective about the great Framers of our Constitution, which I enjoyed and very much agree with. I am someone who spent a lifetime devoted to the Constitution. I am inspired by the Framers who gave us this extraordinary democratic Republic. The Senator from Colorado called for Members of this body to aspire to be more like the men and women who gave us this country, gave us this Republic, if you can keep it, as Benjamin Franklin put it. I concur with that.

What I urge the Senator from Colorado do is to reach out to his Democratic colleagues and counsel compromise. I am urging my colleagues on this side to do the same. The difference is, the Republicans are willing to compromise, have offered to compromise, and, in fact, just now sought to pay the Coast Guard, and the Democratic position is: No, no, no. We object.

That is partisan, it is extreme, and it is not behavior that would bring pride to the Framers of our Constitution. I hope this body can do better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. I thank the Senator from Texas for having this conversation. I don't think I was yelling—but I will go watch the tape—or screaming at you. I also have never called anybody on this floor a liar, as you did, in 2015. I get the theatrics of all of this.

I guess I want to say two things. One, I appreciate the fact that you, at least, seem to be accepting the fact that every Democrat who is here, on that immigration bill in 2013, voted for it—voted for the 350 miles of wall you are talking about. You didn't vote for that bill or the Senator from Texas didn't vote for that bill, and I assume you had your reasons.

By the way, I wouldn't presume to think what the Senator would think about as a person from a border State. My State is not far from the border. We see the effects for ill and for good of immigration in my State.

I do know this. There were two Senators from a border State—the border State of Arizona—who were on that Gang of 8 bill, with whom I sat, day after day, negotiating the provisions for months. They didn't have to just vote for the bill or against it, but they had to go home to Arizona—John McCain and Jeff Flake did—and explain why they supported it and why it was the right thing to do for Arizona, which, as the Senator from Texas knows, is a border State.

The idea that there is a problem to be solved here because Democrats in this Chamber are for open borders is false, as the Senator indicated. The second point is, the Senator from Texas referenced Ben Franklin.

Ben Franklin was standing outside the steps of Constitution Hall, and somebody who was passing by—this is while they were writing the Constitution—said: Mr. Franklin, what kind of government are you creating—a monarchy or a republic?

That was the question. As Senator CRUZ has said, his answer was “a Republic, if you can keep it”—if you can keep it. His answer was not “a Republic”; it was “a Republic, if you can keep it,” because he knew that the words written in the Constitution weren't going to preserve themselves, that this exercise in democratic self-government, a democratic republic, would require generations of women and men—not just in this Chamber but

as citizens and I would say as founders—to keep the Republic they created.

That is what is at stake here. That is what is at stake when the government has been shut down for politics, when we have a President who doesn't believe in the rule of law, who attacks judges whose decisions he disagrees with, who attacks the free press, who have that freedom because of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

It is that Republic which is at risk when we are not educating the next generation of Americans, when we are not investing in our infrastructure, when we have the unbelievable and unprecedented fiscal hypocrisy that has resulted in a ballooning deficit while the unemployment rate is going down. It is a farce. It is a farce.

My closing word is to say that I will work with anybody—including the Senator from Texas, if he will work with me—to put this sorry episode behind us. And I don't mean this sorry episode of this government shutdown, although that is a sorry and pathetic episode, but this episode of American political history where we have done so little for the next generation of Americans and done almost nothing to honor the legacy of our parents and grandparents and the people who came before them. That would be worth doing around this place before we all die.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, let's put this in realistic terms. I have been here through eight Presidents. I am now in my 45th year. I have never seen anything like the Trump shutdown from the day it began 34 days ago until now.

I hear from people every day about the pain and suffering this shutdown has caused. Certainly I hear from my home State of Vermont. We know that tomorrow hundreds of thousands of public servants will miss their second paycheck since this shutdown began. Many of these public servants have had to work the entire time. They are angry. They are confused about why their paychecks are being held hostage by the President in what he appears to view as a political game. Many of these people can no longer pay their bills. They are worried about what tomorrow will bring, and all of us should worry.

We know that our basic government services are no longer functioning. Our Federal courts will run out of money by the end of this month. Important scientific research has been put on hold. Think of the cost to turn it back on. The fishing industry is in turmoil because they cannot get the Federal permits or inspections required to take out their boats. In the wake of a record-setting fire season, the Forest Service has curtailed thinning and fire-prevention projects. Federal law enforcement and prosecutors are sounding the alarm that the shutdown is hin-

dering important investigative work and criminal prosecutions. The Transportation Security Administration, TSA, has employees who are calling in sick in record numbers after a month of being on the job with no paycheck. Some even say they cannot pay for the gas to get to the job. These are the people charged with detecting dangerous threats at our Nation's airports. Instead, they are stressed and frustrated. Everybody knows that is not a very good combination. Long lines are forming at airports. A lack of TSA employees has forced some major airports to close screening areas, causing further delays.

I could go on and on, but we know the Trump shutdown is hurting our Nation and our citizens. Overseas, it makes the United States of America look weak and foolish. This great country is made to look weak and foolish by the Trump shutdown.

We can end it right now, today, and for the sake of the country, we should. The McConnell amendment, the so-called End the Shutdown and Reopen the Government Act, we all know is a nonstarter. I came to the floor yesterday, and I detailed why. I am not going to repeat that here today.

It is the height of irresponsibility to use the pain and suffering of the American people as leverage to force the U.S. taxpayers to fund the President's bumper-sticker, campaign slogan southern border wall—on his solemn promise that Mexico would pay for it—or to enact his hard-line, anti-immigrant agenda. That is what the bill does. It is not a compromise. It is not a deal. I hope my fellow Senators oppose it. If we give in to these tactics now, where will it stop? What is the next thing the President will shut down the government over?

H.R. 268, which is what the Schumer amendment contains, is a bipartisan bill that we should all support. It would reopen the government by extending funding for the seven remaining appropriations bills through February 8, 2019. Remember, those are appropriations bills that Chairman SHELBY and I worked very hard on and that passed through the committee virtually unanimously. We ought to applaud that. The passage of the bill will ensure that Federal employees are paid and that critical services are restored and provide time for negotiation and debate on border security without the American people being held hostage to the President's ill-considered, anti-immigrant agenda. I urge Senators to vote for it.

On December 19, in this Chamber, we passed the bill to fund the government until February 8. We did it unanimously by a voice vote. Republicans were in charge of both the House and the Senate at that time. In other words, the Senate was for keeping the government open. The President's own Republican leaders supported it. Suddenly, he changed his mind, and the Republican leaders had to back off.

H.R. 268 also provides \$14 billion in assistance to help communities and families impacted by natural disasters recover and rebuild. It provides assistance to the victims of Hurricanes Michael and Florence, the California wildfires, the volcanic eruptions in Hawaii, the recent typhoons in the Pacific, and other natural disasters. It will also continue assistance for Puerto Rico, which is still recovering from the category 5 Hurricanes Maria and Irma.

The McConnell amendment contains a disaster package nearly identical to H.R. 268, but to appease the President, it eliminates all disaster assistance for Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico is part of America. I know the President referred to it as an island surrounded by water, as though that is the only island that is surrounded by water. The McConnell amendment eliminates \$1.3 billion in funding for clean and safe drinking water grants, community redevelopment funds, and nutrition assistance that would help the American citizens of Puerto Rico continue their recovery.

Hurricanes Maria and Irma devastated Puerto Rico and destroyed the island's homes and infrastructure. Hurricane Maria caused the deaths of 2,975 Americans. It is one of the deadliest hurricanes this country has ever seen.

While Congress has provided Puerto Rico with assistance in past disaster bills, they still have unaddressed needs that have to be met. Absent supplemental assistance, it is estimated that 140,000 Puerto Ricans—and I have to re-emphasize that they are all U.S. citizens—are going to lose nutrition assistance at the end of March. This in the United States of America? Is there any wonder that the rest of the world looks at us and says: What are you doing? We are supposed to take care of all of our citizens when there is a crisis, not pick and choose based on who we are or who we are aligned with politically.

Just as I voted for disaster aid in States represented by Republicans, Republicans have voted for disaster aid in my State when it has been represented by Democrats. The President's disregard for the victims of Hurricane Maria is shameful.

I urge Senators to vote aye on the Schumer amendment. It provides much needed assistance to disaster-affected communities, and it immediately allows us to send this bill to the President to reopen the government. It has gone on long enough.

The President and the people in his Cabinet are billionaires. They do not care about the harm he has inflicted on this country, but I know Members of this body, both Democrats and Republicans, do. We know what it means to govern. We have a responsibility to do it now.

Senator SHELBY, whom I admire, is a friend of mine. He and I worked together last year in a bipartisan way. We got the appropriations process back on track. We showed that this is the way to get things done. But then the President decided to take us off course.

The Senate is an independent, co-equal branch of government. We should act like it. Let's end this national nightmare. Let's vote to open the government now for our fellow Americans. Let's do it now, today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, just a few months ago, we stood here on the Senate floor celebrating the progress we had made together in the appropriations process, as Senator LEAHY has just alluded to. I believe we are all tired of lurching from crisis to crisis amid partisan bickering. Both sides resolved then to put aside partisan differences and work together for the good of the American people, and it worked.

Together, we funded 75 percent of the government on time. While we would have preferred to have funded 100 percent, it was considerably more progress than we had made in decades. Yet we find ourselves here today more than 1 month into the longest partial shutdown of the government in American history. It is enough to give you whiplash.

Funding the remaining 25 percent of government is a task before us here today. Homeland security, border security, is the linchpin. We know that. Are our differences really as insurmountable as they seem? They should not be, and I want to discuss why.

Last May, the Appropriations Committee considered the fiscal year 2019 Homeland Security bill. That bill included money for a physical barrier at the southern border. In fact, it included an increase in funding over the 2018 level for a physical barrier.

Our Democratic colleagues made no attempt to strike this funding, just as Republicans made no effort to strike funding for Democratic priorities in the bill. The bill passed with overwhelming bipartisan support in the committee—a vote of 26 to 5. There were no fireworks or histrionics in the hearing room that day. There was no demand to delay the Homeland Security bill until the rest of the Federal Government was funded. Rather, the committee simply decided together, on a bipartisan basis, to increase funding for a project that Congress funded the previous year. The fireworks and demands for delayed consideration came later.

It boggles the mind at times how we return so quickly to a standoff mode—to a zero-sum mentality—after making so much progress together. It is particularly perplexing to me considering bipartisan support is exactly what underpinned the very thing that now divides us so bitterly.

Just a few months ago, funding for a physical barrier in the southern border was part of a bipartisan deal, and now we cannot even really discuss it. That was then. I understand that. But where do we go from here? Who is offering real solutions, comprehensive solutions to end this impasse?

The President, for his part, has proposed a serious and, I think, a reasonable compromise—a comprehensive solution. I commend him for that. He is doing what the American people expect, I think, showing a willingness to work together to find common ground.

I encourage my Democratic colleagues to reciprocate here. We have in the past. If this proposal today is unacceptable, I ask my colleagues on the other side to put something on the table that could help move us off the dime. Work with us. Propose a comprehensive solution to get us moving in the right direction. But simply saying no, demanding that we deal with border security later, is not going to cut it today.

What do we do about solving our crisis? This is a real crisis. If not now, when? When will be the time to secure the border? What good will more time or talking do?

The American people have been promised that border security will come later since the Simpson-Mazzoli amnesty in 1986. Look at where we are today—still waiting, still talking. The drug smuggling, the human trafficking, and the chaos are a real crisis. We know what must be done. It is a question of what will be done.

I say this afternoon in the Senate, let's come together. Let's put the bitterness behind us and do what is right for the American people—end the shutdown and secure the border. The real question before us today is this: Is this the beginning of the end or is it just the end of the beginning? We shall find out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in a moment, the Senate will proceed to two amendments: one on the President's proposal and one on a 2-week continuing resolution that opens up the government, with disaster assistance.

Let me be clear: The two votes are not alike. The President's proposal makes radical changes to our asylum laws and demands that American taxpayers fund a border wall in exchange for reopening the government. The second vote demands nothing—no partisan demands, no ransom. It reopens the government for 2 weeks and provides long overdue disaster aid, and then it leaves room for us to debate how to best secure our border.

My Republican friends can fall in line behind the President if they choose, but it does not have the support of the House or the Senate. Contrary to what

the Republican leader says, that there is only one bill that will become law, that is not so. His bill will not pass the Senate and will not pass the House. It is not the only way for us to make a law.

After the first vote fails, Republicans will have a chance to vote with us to reopen their government. The second vote determines whether you want to reopen the government or not. The second vote determines whether you are willing to reopen the government without taking hostages, without hurting 800,000 workers, and without hurting America but open the government with no conditions. We can send that bill to the President's desk. It has already passed the House.

The President may choose to veto it, just as we may choose to override that veto. My dear friend from Louisiana missed that point. If we act with 67 votes, even if the President doesn't like it, it can pass.

We all know it was the President who threw us into this turmoil when he changed his mind and opposed a bill to reopen the government without conditions—just like the one we offered in December and the House wouldn't go forward with, even though the Senate voted for it unanimously.

Our bill should not be controversial. Our amendment is nearly the same bill Republicans all voted for a month ago. It shows that the one cause of this shutdown is the one person who bragged he wanted it—President Donald Trump.

Last month, the Senate unanimously passed the short-term bill to keep the government open. It was Leader McConnell's idea. Everyone thought the President would support it, but President Trump buckled to the most extreme voices in his party and reversed his position at the eleventh hour. That is how the government shutdown began, sadly and unfortunately. Since then, we tried to negotiate with the administration to no avail. When the President's deputies made offers, the President almost immediately retracted them. The President even rejected an idea by Senator GRAHAM, one of his staunchest allies in the Senate, to reopen government temporarily while we debate border security.

Now the President is back with a "straw man" proposal, as the Senator from Oklahoma called it, that makes the same demand he has been making all along: \$5.7 billion taxpayer dollars for a border wall he promised Mexico would pay for, and it adds a new radical change to our asylum laws. What the President calls concessions to Democrats are the protections for DACA and TPS recipients that the President himself rescinded and have been subsequently protected by the court.

Calling this a reasonable compromise is laughable. It is a starkly partisan proposal that perfectly encapsulates the President's hostage-taking of the

American government. This is what the President could be saying in this bill: Give me everything I want in exchange for reopening the government. A vote for the President's plan is very simply an endorsement of government by extortion. Enough is enough.

I know that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree with me. They understand that holding our government workers hostage for a policy goal is no way to govern. I know they feel that way. I urge them to vote yes on the second vote.

Supporting our amendment doesn't mean you don't support stronger border security. To the contrary, it starts funding that effort once again. Voting for this amendment means you agree with the vast majority of the American people that the government should open without precondition. Voting for this amendment means you recognize that holding millions of Americans hostage is not a way to run our government. Voting for this amendment means that you believe members of the Coast Guard, the TSA, the DHS, and the FBI should be paid for their work protecting our country. Voting for this amendment means you support our air traffic controllers, food inspectors, and the men and women who work at our national parks. And yes, voting for this amendment means that you support border security. It means you support a way out of this shutdown where we can sit down and rationally hash out our differences. If we can't do that, if we can't agree today that the way to solve disagreements over policy is through debate and consideration in Congress where it belongs, then we are staring down a very long and very dark tunnel.

Our system of government was designed to allow space for disagreements, even vociferous ones, but when one side—in this case, the President—uses the basic functioning of our government as leverage to extract policy concessions, our entire system of government breaks down. It is a recipe for gridlock, dysfunction, and paralysis, not only now but on into the future.

I believe there are men and women of good faith on both sides of the aisle who want to see this senselessness come to an end today. Let the Senate come together now. Let the Senate rise to the occasion as it has done so often in the past. Vote yes on the second amendment. Open the people's government.

I yield the floor.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

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 bill 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 Senate amendment No. 5 to H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Josh Hawley, John Thune, Shelley Moore Capito, Johnny Isakson, Mike Crapo, Richard Burr, James Lankford, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, David Perdue, Mike Rounds, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn, Rob Portman, Steve Daines, John Kennedy.

AMENDMENT NO. 5

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 amendment No. 5, offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] to H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) would have voted "yea".

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—3

Paul	Risch	Rosen
------	-------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 47.