

to extend unemployment benefits to people who are out of work.

It is the same old story, and it has been going on for decades in this country—big shots get in trouble, and you give them an aspirin, fluff up the pillow, put them to bed, and ask if there is anything else you can do for them. Ordinary folks get in trouble, lose their job through no fault of their own, and then when push comes to shove, they are told: You know what, we just cannot agree. Your unemployment insurance has run out. Get along. Tough luck. I find that unbelievable.

Let me go back. The fact is, we have budget deficits. They are serious, and they are unsustainable. We have to deal with them, there is no question about that. But it is important for us to understand how all of this happened.

Now we come to this moment, and we choose to say that unemployment insurance is where we are going to make the stand. Help for people who have lost their jobs—that is where we are going to make the stand.

It was 10 years ago on the floor of this Senate when we were told: We have the first budget surplus in 30 years, and they expect budget surpluses as far as the eye can see.

President Bush came to town and said: We are going to give large tax cuts, and we are going to give the biggest tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans. If you earn \$1 million, guess what, we are going to give you something very special. You get an \$80,000 tax cut a year.

I said: I will not support that. Let's be a little conservative. What if we do not have these budget surpluses in the outyears? What if they do not exist?

They said: Don't worry about that, it will be fine.

They drove through a tax cut that benefited the wealthiest Americans. Then we were in a recession. Then 9/11, a war in Afghanistan, a war in Iraq, and then supplemental after supplemental request to increase defense spending, none of it paid—none of it—all of it emergency.

Then at the end of that period, when the biggest financial firms ran this country into the ditch, the question was, What is going to happen to this economy? We were told: Now you have to have a \$700 billion bailout for the biggest institutions in the country. That was done. Nobody paid for that. That was all ladled right on top of the debt. But today, in this "let them eat cake" moment, we are told: No, no, let's just let unemployment insurance expire. Just let it expire. It will be fine.

It will be fine for everybody in this Chamber who wears a suit and claims it will be fine because they are not unemployed. But what about those people who are unemployed and are right at the cusp of losing their home? They have lost their job. They have lost hope. The only thing that keeps them going to pay the rent and to pay for food and to try to help their kids is the unemployment insurance while they

are looking for a job. And this Congress has people who stand up to say: We will not allow them to extend unemployment insurance, even after they voted to give \$700 billion to the biggest financial firms in America that ran the country into this big economic wreck we have had. I do not understand that at all. How do you go home and tell people that is what your priority is? How do you do that?

If there is anything that ought to represent a priority for us, it is to say to those who are the most vulnerable in our society, those who have lost their jobs with a recession they did not create, those who are looking for work in the morning and cannot find it, those who now have no income because they have lost their jobs, probably lost their homes, and many of them lost hope—we say to them: It will be fine; you do not need this money to get along.

Unemployment insurance is just that—it is insurance. That is why it is called insurance. Every one of their paychecks while they were working paid for a portion of this. I just cannot believe that this afternoon we would decide it is not a priority for us to help the most vulnerable in this country, especially during this period in which we have just ladled money out the door in terms of tens and tens of billions of dollars in emergency funding for almost everything.

I held 20 hearings on the issue of waste, fraud, and abuse in contracting in the war in Iraq. They threw money away. In fact, not just threw it away, they actually loaded \$100 bills on pallets and sent them over in C-130s and shoveled them out the back of pickup trucks, for God's sake, wasting taxpayers' money. I did not hear anybody stand up on the floor and say: Here is where we draw the line. No, you draw the line with the most vulnerable people. You won't notice you don't have the funds to buy your food, pay your rent, or for your kids.

We have more responsibility than this, in my judgment. I hope by the end of this afternoon we will decide to meet that responsibility.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

---

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—  
H.R. 4851

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, at a time to be determined by the majority leader following consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 323, H.R. 4851, and that when the bill is considered, it be under the following limitations: that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, with all time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; that the only amendments in order be the following, with no motions to commit in order, and that the amendments be subject to an

affirmative 60-vote threshold; that if the amendments achieve that threshold, then they be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that if they do not achieve that threshold, then they be withdrawn; Baucus amendment, partial offset; McConnell or designee, full offset; that debate on each amendment be limited to 60 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that upon disposition of the listed amendments, the bill, as amended, if amended, be read a third time and the Senate then proceed to vote on passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, under this scenario, we will pass this bill and add to the debt. Because of that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I regret that my Republican colleagues have once again objected to giving out-of-work Americans the unemployment and health benefits they need.

Since they have evidently forgotten, I remind them that unemployment is high in every one of our States—it is over 13 percent in Nevada—and 10 percent nationwide.

I understand that Republicans are upset they didn't get their way. I know they are disappointed that Democrats have listened to the American people, and that we succeeded in finally delivering the change our citizens have demanded and deserved for decades.

But Republicans should not take out their anger on the least fortunate, which is exactly what they are doing by objecting to these extensions. They should not kick the unemployed while they are down.

Several Republicans said this week that after health reform became law, they would retaliate by not cooperating with Democrats for the rest of this year. I will trust the American people to judge whether that threat was made in their best interests or in the interests of a political party.

So far, Republicans have made good on that promise by refusing to let committees meet—including, inexplicably and inexcusably, a committee hearing yesterday on police training in Afghanistan.

Republicans then offered amendments to the final health bill on such irrelevant topics as gay marriage and foreign embassies.

And now they are using the unemployed as political pawns. They even objected to holding a vote on their own proposal for this extension.

That is such an unfortunate posture, and such an irresponsible response.

Let us put the other side's newfound principles in perspective:

They refuse to pay the bill for two ongoing wars.

They refuse to pay the bill for entitlement expansions, like their prescription drug program.

They refuse to pay for the bill for the tax giveaways they gave to multimillionaires who don't need them and didn't ask for them.

But while one out of 10 Americans struggles to pay his or her own bills while trying to find a full-time job, Republicans have suddenly found religion.

These objections are not only disingenuous. They are dangerous.

I hope they can muster the compassion to help families in every one of our States make ends meet for just a few weeks.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). The clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 1 Leg.]

Coburn	McConnell	Stabenow
Durbin	Menedez	Thune
Johanns	Reid	Udall (CO)
Kyl	Risch	Vitter
Leahy	Sanders	
Levin	Sessions	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURRIS). A quorum is not present.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. 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 is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

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

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 107 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Akaka	Cantwell	Franken
Baucus	Cardin	Gillibrand
Bayh	Carper	Hagan
Begich	Casey	Harkin
Bennet	Conrad	Inouye
Bingaman	Dodd	Johanns
Boxer	Dorgan	Johnson
Brown (MA)	Durbin	Kaufman
Brown (OH)	Feingold	Kerry
Burr	Feinstein	Klobuchar

Kohl	Mikulski	Stabenow
Landrieu	Nelson (NE)	Tester
Lautenberg	Nelson (FL)	Udall (CO)
Leahy	Pryor	Udall (NM)
Levin	Reed	Warner
Lieberman	Reid	Webb
Lincoln	Sanders	Whitehouse
McCaskill	Schumer	Wyden
Menendez	Shaheen	
Merkley	Specter	

NAYS—35

Alexander	Crapo	McCain
Barrasso	DeMint	McConnell
Bennett	Ensign	Murkowski
Bond	Enzi	Risch
Brownback	Graham	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Sessions
Chambliss	Gregg	Shelby
Coburn	Hatch	Snowe
Cochran	Inhofe	Thune
Collins	Kyl	Vitter
Corker	LeMieux	Voinovich
Cornyn	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—7

Bunning	Isakson	Wicker
Byrd	Murray	
Hutchison	Rockefeller	

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

The majority leader is recognized.

CONTINUING EXTENSION ACT OF 2010—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 323, H.R. 4851, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 323, H.R. 4851, an act to provide a temporary extension of certain programs, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Richard Durbin, Patty Murray, Patrick J. Leahy, Jack Reed, Christopher J. Dodd, Mark Udall, Debbie Stabenow, Amy Klobuchar, Sheldon Whitehouse, Max Baucus, Dianne Feinstein, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Kent Conrad, Byron L. Dorgan, John D. Rockefeller, IV, Jeff Bingaman, Robert Menendez.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am soon going to call up an adjournment resolution. But there has always been a misunderstanding as to what an adjournment resolution is. The mere fact we are going to adopt an adjournment resolution tonight does not mean we are going to run to the airports tonight. We have, under this adjournment resolution, the ability to work past tonight, and we are going to do that. We are going to be in a period of morning business tomorrow from 9:30 to 12:30. We are going to be talking about the unemployment compensation extension. That time is going to be equally divided. There is going to be some time spent tonight after this adjournment resolution is adopted, until about 9 or 9:30, talking about unemployment compensation.

So I want everyone to understand, the fact that this adjournment resolution is adopted does not mean we are all leaving here tonight. In fact, we have until Wednesday under the adjournment resolution.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND A CONDITIONAL RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now call up the adjournment resolution and ask for the yeas and nays on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 257) providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, very briefly prior to the vote, Senator COBURN and other Republicans will be here tonight and tomorrow to discuss the importance of passing the unemployment insurance package, but also the importance of paying for it. So we will be here and engaged in a vigorous discussion about the appropriateness of the measure as well as about the importance of paying for it.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask, has this matter been seconded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "nay."

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

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 39, as follows: