

No other location in the nation can offer the millions and millions of visitors who will stream into the Intrepid to view and experience the shuttle.

Housing an iconic spacecraft in New York City—the media center of the world—guarantees it will appear in countless news and entertainment programs broadcast throughout the nation and world, providing incalculable public-relations value to NASA.

Just yesterday I spoke to NASA Administrator Charles Bolden and he has informed me that the Intrepid is in good shape to be the permanent hangar for one of the shuttles.

The Intrepid is competing with museums in 25 other cities to win one of the shuttles, including Washington's Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum.

NASA has been clear that they intend to award the shuttles to the sites where the most people could view them.

With the Intrepid already drawing one million visitors a year it is clear that the Intrepid is the best possible spot for a shuttle.

NASA also requires any potential host location to raise significant funds.

I have no doubt that the Intrepid's drawing power and New York City's deep and diverse philanthropic community are more than able to compile all the resources needed.

Yet skeptics may ask why a space shuttle should be brought to New York City.

Perhaps they don't know that the Intrepid led the recovery of astronauts during the Mercury and Gemini programs in the 1960s.

The exhibit will be sure to attract heavy foot traffic too: The Intrepid will house the shuttle in a glass enclosure on Pier 86—close to Times Square and many other tourist attractions, accessible from major airports, passenger-ship terminals and highways.

Countless boys and girls, as well as adults, with boundless imaginations, will be able to stroll over to the West Side and take in the truly magnificent icon of science, exploration and innovation.

With 20 institutions across the country competing to receive one of the retired shuttles, *Discovery*, *Endeavour* and *Atlantis*, we should all join the fight to bring a space shuttle to the greatest city in the world, a no-brainer.

It is a non-brainer.

I, along with some of my New York colleagues, are working hard to land the shuttle here, and I hope we are able to convince NASA that we are ready, willing—and very able—to be the home for a shuttle.

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I object until we discuss the order of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COBURN. I assure my colleagues that—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Without objection, Madam President.

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

(Mr. SCHUMER addressed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that first the Senator from Oklahoma be recognized for 5 minutes, then the Senator from North Dakota be recognized for 10 minutes and that no motions be in order during the time of their speeches and immediately thereafter we resort back to a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, while the Senator from New York is here, I might go over 5 minutes to 6 minutes or 7 minutes. I wonder if he will object and modify his request.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that my request be modified so that the Senator from Oklahoma may have up to 10 minutes to speak.

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

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I wish to spend a short period of time, and hopefully it will not even be 5 minutes.

What we have seen on the floor this afternoon is a motion to accomplish what the chairman of the Finance Committee wanted us to accomplish, without adding to the debt. We did not reach agreement on that motion. It was tabled. Then what we saw was a motion to proceed to take care of these issues by adding \$9.2 billion to the debt. That is the real debate: are we going to pay for what we do? There is not an agreement to move forward and pay for it, and there is not an agreement to move forward and not pay for it.

There is a process here called cloture, which means that by Wednesday, if all time is consumed, this problem would be solved and it would be dealt with. It is unfortunate that the potential is that we may go home and not deal with this issue, having us vote against ta-

bling a motion to supply these needed priorities but also making sure we do not add to the debt as we do it.

I look forward to the rest of the afternoon. I will not consume any additional time but will note that I do not care how we pay for it as long as it is legitimate, as long as we do not add to our kids' debt. I am hoping and willing to negotiate on any area of waste in the Federal Government that we can eliminate to pay for it. We cannot pay for part of it; we need to pay for all of it because we violate the principle of stealing from our kids.

I advise the Senator from Alabama that we have unanimous consent and I cannot break off, and the Senator from North Dakota will be recognized after I yield the floor, so I cannot in good conscience yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I understand. I am proud of the commitment the Senator from Oklahoma has made and totally recognize it.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, this is a pretty disappointing thing to see on the floor of the Senate—a discussion about the potential of having unemployment insurance at this point in time lapse, let it lapse during one of the steepest recessions since the Great Depression.

Unemployment insurance is not some abstraction when we have 15 million, 16 million, 17 million people who got up this morning in this country and looked for work, people who lost their jobs and then searched valiantly to find a new job and could not find a new job, and so they pay their rent, they buy food, they provide for their children, they buy school clothes with unemployment insurance.

We are told: We cannot reach an agreement, so we will just let it expire. We will not extend it. It will be OK.

It will be OK for everybody here who gets up and showers in the morning and puts on a nice blue suit and comes to work. There is nobody here who is unemployed, but there are a whole lot of people in this country who are unemployed.

If ever there were a need to extend unemployment insurance, it is now. We cannot do that to the most vulnerable people in this country.

It is very interesting. It was not too many months ago that there was a proposal on the floor of the Senate: Let's give \$700 billion to the biggest financial firms in America to bail them out. They ran this country into the ditch with unbelievable greed and speculation and recklessness. Then after running this country into the economic ditch, there is a bill brought to the Congress that says: We need to bail them out, \$700 billion—a three-page bill. They said: We need to have it passed in 3 days—\$700 billion. I did not vote for it, but there are plenty of people who did who now say it is too much

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.