

on in the House and, actually, what is going on here. But I will confer with my counterpart, Senator McCONNELL, and we will do what we can to move forward.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we move forward on this bill, S. 3689—there is a provision in that dealing with what we call FMAP—that the FMAP provision be taken out, that it be considered as separate legislation, be read three times and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and there be no intervening action or debate.

The reason that is so very important is that FMAP is something that every State—every State, all 50—is in desperate need of. No part of our country has proven immune from our economic struggles. We are all sharing the heavy burden of these difficult times. But few places are suffering, though, more than we are in Nevada.

Budget shortfalls in Nevada are causing deep cuts in bedrock programs the Government must provide, programs that help and protect children, senior citizens, and people with disabilities.

The State of Nevada has been forced to cap enrollment in Nevada Check-Up, our form of children's health insurance. The State recently had to institute cuts to provider reimbursement. What is worse, these cuts will not end here unless we act to provide fiscal relief by increasing the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage; that is, FMAP.

What are the consequences of inaction? It was reported in the media this weekend that due to the provider rate cut, University Medical Center in Las Vegas, our public hospital, is discontinuing outpatient cancer treatment. And that is not just for Medicaid patients, it is for all patients. It is not clear if all those patients will be able to afford chemotherapy elsewhere, but it is pretty clear they will not be able to.

Low-income children who need orthopedic treatment will have to leave Las Vegas altogether for services elsewhere. They will likely have to leave the State.

There is more to come. The cuts are not over. This is the way it is in many States around the country. The budget shortfalls are deep. When States have to cut provider reimbursement for some of the things I have outlined, they have real difficulties in making the safety net not be one that has big holes in it. States have found no choice but to look at cutting services such as mental health and cutting actual people from the program, adding to the ranks of the insured at the worst possible time.

We have been working in the Senate to provide help. The stimulus bill we introduced includes a temporary 8-percent FMAP increase to stave off these cuts. It will not fix the problem, but it may make a difference in ensuring that

our children are not without the care they need. I hope we can take that step.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, this is a spending measure of \$37.8 billion which has not been considered by the Finance Committee. We should be asking the States to pay it back. We should require the States to agree to not raise taxes. For all of those reasons, Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have one final consent request on which I would like to move forward. This is the matter dealing with automobiles. We know the issue before this body. There have been speeches given the last several days about where the automobile industry is. We have watched on national TV the congressional hearings that have taken place on this side of the Capitol and on the other side of the Capitol. We need to try to figure out some way to move forward.

We believe the best way to move forward is taking the money, as I have indicated, out of the so-called TARP money. I do not believe we need the legislation. I think—well, I don't know. I have talked to Secretary Paulson twice today. He knows he has authority to take money out of that; he just does not want to do it.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill I have at the desk, which is the text of title VI of S. 3689 regarding automotive industry assistance; that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and there be no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KYL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, the longer this legislation has been lying around, the more objections have been heard to it. So, yes, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, the distinguished majority leader was kind enough to mention the fact that several of us on our side have been working with leading Members on his side of the aisle to come up with a compromise proposal that would come to the aid of the auto companies which are facing a very serious situation, without mentioning specific ones or others, but to say this is a critical time to move to prevent perhaps the bankruptcy or the disappearance of a major auto company, which would cause chaos in our country. Over 3 million jobs are related to the auto industry—from the auto assembly plants, to the auto dealerships, to the parts suppliers.

So we have been working on a bipartisan basis. On my side of the aisle, Senator VOINOVICH and I have been

working with others on the Democratic side. We took the basic construct of the measure the majority leader had introduced. We took the money out of a previously passed bill, which would not cause as much concern down Pennsylvania Avenue, and we provide that the money will go back into that program as it is returned.

In my view, it is essential we work something out. I will tell the majority leader we have made great progress. We are down to the point now where wording challenges are about the only remaining things to deal with. I strongly believe it is in the interest of the country, particularly all of those families whose jobs depend upon the auto industry, and the States, the local governments, and the Federal Government to move something forward.

So I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined on Thursday, November 20, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a bill to be introduced by Senators BOND and VOINOVICH and others; I further ask that there be no amendments in order, with 2 hours of debate equally divided, and following the use or yielding back of the time, the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to a vote on passage, and that if there are not 60 votes in the affirmative, the bill be placed on the Senate calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, Madam President, we have had no hearings. We have no text. I know my friend, Senator BOND, is a man of faith. I think I am too. But this is carrying it a little too far. We do not know anything about this. I look forward to a piece of legislation we can look at. Hopefully, it can be done tonight or tomorrow, and we will be happy to look at it.

I have had many conversations today and yesterday with the senior Senator from the State of Kentucky, Mr. McCONNELL, and we understand the importance of this issue. We will try to work to move forward on it. But I want everyone to understand, no matter how hard we work, how hard we try, the House of Representatives is going home tomorrow. OK. They are leaving.

I understand the importance. But I would hope that in addition to understanding the importance, we have to face reality. The reality is, we have tried a number of different approaches.

I will be happy to look at the approach my friend from Missouri has. He is a hard-working Senator. I understand how hard he works. He is a real advocate for doing what he thinks is appropriate for his State and our country.

Senator LEVIN and I have had hours of conversation regarding this issue. Every conversation I have with him he mentions the name of the Senator from Missouri. So I understand what this is all about, but, recognizing we have had no hearings, we have no legislation, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be closed.

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

Morning business is closed.

#### ADVANCING AMERICA'S PRIORITIES ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 3297.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask permission to withdraw the motion to proceed to S. 3297.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2008—MOTION TO PROCEED

##### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 1123, H.R. 6867, an act to provide for additional emergency unemployment compensation and, with that, 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. 1123, H.R. 6867, the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2008.

Harry Reid, Max Baucus, Patrick J. Leahy, Bernard Sanders, Kent Conrad, E. Benjamin Nelson, John D. Rockefeller, IV, Dianne Feinstein, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Patty Murray, Richard Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Barbara A. Mikulski, Barbara Boxer, Carl Levin, Daniel K. Akaka, Mark L. Pryor.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I appreciate the patience of all my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I would ask my friend, the majority leader, now, if consent is not granted, this vote would be on Friday?

Mr. REID. That is right.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I say to my friend, I will be working on my side to see if it is possible to move that vote forward to tomorrow. Hopefully, he will be doing the same.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I certainly think it would be appropriate if we can do that. I will do everything I can to move this forward.

I again say, Madam President, I appreciate the patience of everyone today. A lot of times we do not spend a lot of time here, but it is hard getting here. I appreciate it very much. And we were interrupted by the President of Bolivia.

I should say—and I am sorry I did not to my friend, Senator MCCONNELL—if we do get cloture, then we could even do that, have a 60-vote threshold on that. And if that were done, we would be out of here as far as I know. So we will work together to see what we can get done. We will work to see what we can get done in the next 12 hours.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

##### AUTO MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY BAILOUT

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the pending discussion and debate in the Senate about subsidies to the auto manufacturers and whether passing a large bailout subsidy package for the auto manufacturers is a good idea. Earlier this afternoon I objected to a unanimous consent request by Senator MIKULSKI and she responded to that objection by noting that she certainly hoped that objecting to a bailout package for auto manufacturers wasn't the last thing I did in the Senate, given that my term is going to be expiring and I am going to be retiring from the Senate. Well, it won't be the last thing I do. If nothing else, the last thing I will do is to explain why her legislation was such a terrible idea to the people of New Hampshire who elected me and to the American people whom I think I have an obligation to serve in making sure that their interests are protected, that their wallets are protected, and that we act with a commitment to fiscal responsibility.

We don't need to be providing subsidies, special benefits or protection to individual businesses, whether they are auto manufacturers or any other business. This is wrong for a large number of reasons. To be sure, no one is happy about the fact that our country is in a recession, that Europe is in a recession, that we have a global slowdown that will affect hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of lives across the United States and across the world. But by providing subsidies to the auto manufacturers, we do several things that are fundamentally wrong—bad for our economy, bad for taxpayers, bad for consumers.

First, quite frankly, we reward bad decisions that have been made by these firms themselves. The problems within the auto industry are largely the mak-

ing of those in the auto industry: management choices, production of models that consumers choose not to buy, legacy costs, contracts, health care, pensions. We all understand that within the economic slowdown there has been a significant drop in the number of cars being manufactured, but these businesses were losing money well before the current downturn. By stepping forward now to provide them with \$25 billion or \$50 billion, depending on which piece of legislation we would be considering and voting on, we, quite frankly, would be taking money from taxpayers across the country and rewarding those poor decisions that have been made by the manufacturers themselves.

Second, this would set a bad precedent. There are many businesses across America that are dealing with tough times, a slowdown in their growth prospects. They have had to deal with layoffs. They have seen a significant slowdown in construction spending or consumer spending. It is affecting every corner of our economy. If we set the precedent of stepping forward with \$25 billion in subsidies for auto manufacturers, every other business and industry in America would be looking for the same kind of treatment from the Federal Government. That is simply not in the taxpayers' interests. It is certainly not fair to the average taxpayer. It is not fair to those taxpayers who work for companies that won't get that kind of special treatment. Any time the Federal Government starts putting a significant amount of resources—\$1 billion, \$10 billion, \$25 billion—into a particular firm or industry we distort the marketplace. So we would be rewarding bad decisions. We would be setting a bad precedent.

Finally, we would be placing taxpayers at even greater risk. We need to be honest about the impact of giving \$25 billion to the auto manufacturers in order to sustain their unprofitable operations. Many observers have suggested that \$25 billion isn't nearly enough, \$50 billion probably isn't enough to stave off bankruptcy. So when these firms ultimately did have to file for bankruptcy or when the losses mounted over the next 6 months or 12 months or 18 months and the firms needed additional capital, where would they turn? Back to the taxpayer. So the expectation would be—and I think the likelihood would be—that the \$25 billion or \$50 billion provided today would simply be a downpayment on even greater losses and greater exposure to the taxpayers in the future.

Now, the proponents of this legislation have said a number of things. First and foremost, they have talked about the number of jobs that would be affected. No one relishes the idea of higher unemployment and job losses that have already begun in this current recession. But there are many businesses and industries across America that employ hundreds of thousands of people, that employ even more than the auto manufacturing segment. The