

side want to step up and work with us to secure the border—fine.

I will also point out that securing the border for the last four Presidents has meant building barriers, and every time that happened, those barriers worked.

When President George H.W. Bush built a barrier south of San Diego, the detentions of people coming across the border decreased by 95 percent. That is really the only way we have of measuring whether this was better before the barrier or after the barrier. When you have 95 percent fewer people coming across and being detained, something must be working.

President Clinton built a barrier at El Paso, and detentions went down 95 percent. President George W. Bush built a barrier at Yuma, and detentions went down 90 percent. When you have a 90- or 95-percent solution, you should be able to make that solution a part of moving forward to solve the problem.

The President has come, in my view, quite a way. He has gone from a big wall all along the border to a barrier only where a barrier makes sense. The President would like to add 10 or 20 percent to the barriers already built by all four of his predecessors. I don't see why some movement in that direction can't be part of what we get done.

The shutdown has gone on too long. It has been played out way too much in the public and way too little with Members of Congress trying to get together and work this out. People who need government services aren't getting those services. In many cases, people providing the services that are essential are providing those services and not getting paid. People who would like to be at work are at home.

Unlike any other time when the government has been shut down, Congress has said in advance that everybody will get paid, eventually. So the traditional worry about whether you will get paid, whether your income is there, is gone. But the pay is not there at the time it is expected to be. Normally, if you went to work for government at any level, you didn't go to work for government to get wealthy; you went to work for government because that was a secure job. So we have eliminated for too many people the security of one of the reasons they took a government job rather than a job that might lead to some more financially satisfactory destination—or might not. The whole reason they did this, in many cases, is they knew that check was going to come. It is not coming.

The bill the President proposed keeps the government open with new priorities—largely agreed to already by the House and the Senate—until September 30. So 2 weeks from now, we wouldn't face this exact same problem again. It does things I think need to be done to create more security for kids who were brought here as children and grew up here. I think this is a 70- or 80-percent issue in the country that all of us understand—that if you were

brought to this country as a young child, if you grew up here, if you haven't gotten in serious trouble, not only should you be able to stay, but we should want you to stay.

We need that kind of vitality in our country. The President said he would like to see a final appropriate solution on that. This bill creates a 3-year opportunity, much like—I think it was the BRIDGE Act that was sponsored by people on both sides of the aisle who would have said let's settle this for a while as we try to come to a further conclusion; the same kind of 3-year structure for people who were here because we decided we needed to give them asylum. We need to figure out how to deal with that on a long-term basis, but 3 years not only puts it through this Congress, it puts it a year into the next Congress and the next Presidential administration.

Some of us need to be focused on getting this job done. I think this bill does that. It is not perfect. I never voted for a perfect bill. I introduced two or three perfect bills, but I have never gotten to vote for a perfect bill and don't expect to. This is not our job. Perfect is not our job. Our job is the possible. I think the President has actually shown more flexibility than our friends on the other side.

If you don't like some of the things the President has proposed, the response is not this is a nonstarter. The response is to make it a starter. The response is, if you don't like something about what we are doing for deferred action on kids who were brought here, what would you do to make that better?

The President's proposal goes a long way toward solving these problems. Most importantly, it opens the government immediately. It assures that will be the case until we get to the beginning of the new spending year on October 1, and it meets the government's obligation to secure the border.

Nobody expects it to be impossible for anybody to ever get over the border in any way, but people do expect to have the kind of border security we can afford. I think the proposals the President makes does that.

We need to be more concerned about our ports of entry. We need to be more concerned about things and people coming across the border who shouldn't come across the border or people being brought across the border for purposes they do not want to be part of.

This is an important moment. We need to get this job done. The two votes today will indicate whether we want to get this done on a long-term basis and get back into the regular basis of government or whether we want to get this done for a couple of weeks, assuming somehow there are going to be dramatically new facts on the table in the next 2 weeks that are not there now. I don't believe that is the case. I am going to vote for the bill that gets the government open again

and lets us get started with the work of how to fund the government on October 1 of this year, not how to fund the government right now. I think the other bill does not get us anywhere but right back to where we are 2 weeks from now.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

I have a couple of things I need to point out; one is, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the filing deadline for second-degree amendments for the cloture motion specified in the order of January 22 occur at 2:20 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### QUORUM CALL

Mr. BLUNT. With that, Mr. 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, and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 2]

Blunt	Kaine	Thune
Cardin	Manchin	Van Hollen
Coons	McConnell	Whitehouse
Ernst	Sasse	
Isakson	Schatz	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

The majority leader.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the presence of absent Senators, and 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.

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 8 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Baldwin	Cornyn	Heinrich
Barrasso	Cortez Masto	Hirono
Bennet	Cramer	Hyde-Smith
Blackburn	Crapo	Isakson
Blumenthal	Cruz	Johnson
Blunt	Daines	Jones
Boozman	Duckworth	Kaine
Braun	Durbin	King
Brown	Ernst	Klobuchar
Burr	Feinstein	Lankford
Cantwell	Fischer	Leahy
Capito	Gardner	Manchin
Cardin	Gillibrand	Markey
Carper	Graham	McConnell
Casey	Grassley	McSally
Cassidy	Harris	Menendez
Collins	Hassan	Merkley
Coons	Hawley	Moran

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,