

had already concluded. I asked him if we'd be allowed to participate in the Fall 2005 on-campus interview program and he said he did not know.

Mr. Weber, asked me what our current position on the Solomon Amendment was, and I explained that since the 3rd Circuit had issued a stay of the injunction, the Solomon Amendment was current law and that we were in the process of following the procedures outlined in 32 CPR 216. He asked me when they could expect a letter and I stated that I did not know. We then briefly discussed the utility of on-campus interviews.

I asked him what generated the phone call and he responded that he "felt bad they had left us with no answer but still had no answer."

I asked him if I could at least post a job posting via their office and he said no. He stressed that I could contact interested students via the Harvard Veterans Student Group but that his office could not provide any support to us.

Sir, would you like me to forward the above to Mr. Reed and LCDR Syring as well as to my fellow Service recruiters (i.e., Maj. Jackson, LCDR Passarello, and Capt. Houtz?) Also, should I contact the Harvard Veterans Student Group's president. There's danger there, since in the past they were the de facto "replacement" for the CSO office's service.

Interesting timing of the phone call.

v/r

... that a decision has been made to allow military recruiting, they have engaged in a "practice" that in effect denied the Air Force an opportunity to recruit in a manner that is at least equal in quality and scope with other prospective employers who participated in the HLS recruiting program. By delaying until the last minute (or never providing an answer) to the AF request to recruit, the AF is unable to organize and schedule the recruiting effort in time to participate in the HLS program which ends on March 4, 2005. We shouldn't allow HLS to "play this game."

Please review and provide comments before I go back to ... in P&R.

*Subject FW: Harvard Phase I Pushups*

Good Afternoon—Mr. Carr requested that I draft an info paper to DSD as outlined below. Attached is draft of info paper. Would you like me to provide a package for formal coordination on the paper or will informal e-mail review be okay?

Thanks, V/R

*Subject: Harvard Phase I Pushups*

... before sending Harvard Phase I letter, we must do following pushups per agreement Koffsky/Carr:

1. (AP) Info paper to DSD outlining what we're about to do and why (since DSD has had personal involvement), once done (and absent immediate objections);

2. (OGC) Mr. Koffsky will then alert Jeff Smith, out of house counsel for Harvard on Solomon, who has generally worked faithfully with us, then;

3. (AP) Notify AF that it is clear to launch. Over to you for step 1 Tks' Bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Goldsmith nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mark A. Goldsmith, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan?

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

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

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 195 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Akaka	Enzi	McConnell
Alexander	Feingold	Menendez
Barrasso	Feinstein	Merkley
Baucus	Franken	Mikulski
Begich	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Bennet	Graham	Murray
Bingaman	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Hagan	Pryor
Brown (MA)	Harkin	Reed
Brown (OH)	Hatch	Reid
Brownback	Inhofe	Risch
Bunning	Inouye	Roberts
Burr	Isakson	Rockefeller
Burr	Johanns	Sanders
Cantwell	Johnson	Schumer
Cardin	Kaufman	Sessions
Carper	Kerry	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Shelby
Chambliss	Kohl	Snowe
Coburn	Kyl	Snowe
Cochran	Landrieu	Specter
Collins	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Conrad	Leahy	Tester
Corker	LeMieux	Udall (CO)
Cornyn	Levin	Udall (NM)
Crapo	Lieberman	Voinovich
DeMint	Lincoln	Warner
Dodd	Lugar	Webb
Dorgan	McCain	Whitehouse
Ensign	McCaskill	Wicker

NOT VOTING—11

Bayh	Durbin	Thune
Bennett	Gregg	Vitter
Bond	Hutchison	Wyden
Byrd	Nelson (FL)	

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON NOMINATION OF MARC T. TREADWELL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate evenly divided before the vote on the next nominee.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Marc T. Treadwell, of Georgia, to be U.S. District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia?

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

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

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 196 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Akaka	Ensign	McConnell
Alexander	Enzi	Menendez
Barrasso	Feingold	Merkley
Baucus	Feinstein	Mikulski
Begich	Franken	Murkowski
Bennet	Gillibrand	Murray
Bingaman	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Grassley	Pryor
Brown (MA)	Hagan	Reed
Brown (OH)	Harkin	Reid
Brownback	Hatch	Risch
Bunning	Inhofe	Roberts
Burr	Inouye	Rockefeller
Burr	Isakson	Sanders
Cantwell	Johanns	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson	Sessions
Carper	Kaufman	Shaheen
Casey	Kerry	Shelby
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Snowe
Coburn	Kohl	Specter
Cochran	Landrieu	Stabenow
Collins	Lautenberg	Tester
Conrad	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Corker	LeMieux	Udall (NM)
Cornyn	Levin	Voinovich
Crapo	Lieberman	Warner
DeMint	Lincoln	Webb
Dodd	Lugar	Whitehouse
Dorgan	McCain	Wicker
Durbin	McCaskill	

NOT VOTING—11

Bayh	Gregg	Thune
Bennett	Hutchison	Vitter
Bond	Kyl	Wyden
Byrd	Nelson (FL)	

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, due to travel delays, I was not present for vote No. 195, the vote on the nomination of Mr. Mark Goldsmith to serve as a U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Michigan. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

VOTE ON NOMINATION OF JOSEPHINE S. TUCKER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back on the next nomination?

If so, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination

of Josephine Staton Tucker, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider the vote on the foregoing nominations are made and laid upon the table, and the President will be notified of the Senate's action with respect to these nominations.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume legislative session.

The Republican leader.

#### NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, the majority leader and I have been discussing, over the last few days, clearing a number of nominees, and I am prepared—although I will defer tonight—to attempt to clear a list of over 60 nominees. The President made some reference to that over the weekend. I just want to make sure everybody understands both downtown and here that we are prepared to clear over 60 nominations and have been prepared to clear them for the last week, and I am hopeful my friend, the majority leader, will be able to indicate at some point in the near future that we might be able to go forward with these nominees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, the Republican leader is correct. He has submitted a list of names. We have exchanged those with our respective staffs. I appreciate it very much. I have had one issue I have had to work through, and he has been very considerate on not moving forward on any consent request until I get this worked out. I think we will be able to do that tonight—if not, the first thing in the morning. So I appreciate very much our being able to move forward. I think we can do it as early as tomorrow morning—at least sometime tomorrow early.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I thank the majority leader.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning

business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Ohio.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND COBRA

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam President, more than 57,000 Ohioans—that is about the size of Elyria, OH, or Mansfield, OH, or twice the size of Zanesville, OH—more than 57,000 Ohioans are estimated to have lost unemployment benefits since the extension ended in May 2010, a month ago.

If the Senate does not pass an extension, that number will increase dramatically. More than 90,000 Ohioans could lose their benefits by the end of June. That is more people than live in Youngstown, more people than live in Springfield, OH, more people than live in Cleveland Heights or Lakewood, OH. Madam President, 90,000 Ohioans could lose their benefits by the end of June.

Nationwide, since the beginning of June, some 900,000 workers have run out of jobless benefits. That number will surpass 1 million by next week.

Now, those are numbers, and we can stand around here and debate back and forth, and talk about 50,000 here and 100,000 here and a million there. But later in my remarks I am going to share, as I often do, Madam President—as you and I have talked about—letters from people in Crawford County, Warren County, Pickaway County, and Hamilton County, OH, where I was earlier today—letters from people, individuals who are part of those 50,000 or 90,000 Ohioans who could lose their benefits.

Senate Republicans are denying tens of thousands of Ohioans—and thousands of people in New Hampshire and hundreds of thousands of people in California and Texas and Florida—the Republicans are denying tens of thousands of Ohioans the unemployment insurance benefits they have earned during years of hard work.

This year, this Chamber spent 9 weeks on the floor struggling to extend unemployment insurance and COBRA. Over the past week, every single Republican voted again and again to block a bill just to extend unemployment insurance. They chose to vote against extending COBRA, a critical benefit for workers who not only lose their jobs but also their health insurance.

You know how this happens, Madam President. Someone is laid off from their job. They lose their income. Then they cannot afford their insurance. They lose their insurance—unless they are enrolled in COBRA. COBRA is a bit of a cruel hoax. In order to keep your insurance, you have to pay what you were paying as an employee when you had a job and full pay and you have to pay the employer side of the insurance in order to continue your insurance. That is why a year ago, in the stimulus

package, for the first time in American history, the Federal Government helped people who had lost their insurance keep their insurance by paying about two-thirds of the COBRA premium.

If you lose your job, you get a little bit of unemployment insurance, although the Republicans have blocked that. Then you lose your insurance. Then if you get sick, you are going to lose your house. When I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk the way they do about unemployment insurance, they act as if it is a welfare program. Unemployment insurance, decidedly, is not a welfare program. We do not call it unemployment welfare. We call it unemployment insurance.

What does that mean? It means when you are working—if you are an ironworker in New Hampshire, if you are a steelworker in Ohio or you work at Burger King in Cleveland—wherever you are working, you pay into this unemployment insurance plan. When you lose your job, if you are full time, you get money back, some of the money you paid in. It is called insurance. That is why we call it insurance. Yet my Republican colleagues act as if unemployment insurance is welfare. Well, it is not. It really is insurance.

I think it is important we think about someone losing their job and not getting unemployment insurance, and then losing their health care, and then, very likely, in many cases, losing their home. We do not know many people like that because we dress like this and we make a good bit of money here and a good many of our colleagues are pretty insulated. They do not know a lot of people who have lost their job or lost their insurance or lost their home. But think about it, we should try to put ourselves in the position of someone who has lost their job, then lost their insurance, then lost their home.

You are a family in Lima, OH, or Zanesville, OH, or Gallipolis or Dayton. First the breadwinner loses her job. Then they cannot afford the insurance. Then they get not really sick but sick enough that they have bills that have piled up. Then they cannot keep up with paying for their home mortgage. Then they get 3 or 4 months behind. Then they get a notice from the bank that they are going to lose their house. Think of what that does.

Say you have two kids. You live in Dayton, OH. You have lost your job. You have lost your insurance. Now you are about to lose your house. You have to explain to your son and daughter in Huber Heights, a suburb of Dayton: Well, little Johnny and Jane, we are going to have to move, and we are going to move to a really small, little apartment, and we don't have any place to put all this stuff, and we are going to have to sell it or give it away. I don't know where you are going to go to school next fall because I am just really unsure of things.

The son or daughter says: Well, mom, what about my friends? Where are we