

and the importance of the second amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. How much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 15 minutes 13 seconds.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Chair.

BIODIESEL TAX CREDIT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request but I will wait until a Member from the other side is here to make it. As a predicate to that, I will make a statement on my reason for doing so.

As the majority continues to struggle in an attempt to pass another massive deficit spending bill through Congress, biodiesel plants in Iowa and throughout the country continue to lay off workers because the Democratic-controlled Congress has not extended the biodiesel tax credit. This is a simple and noncontroversial tax extension that will likely reinstate 20,000 jobs nationwide and about 2,000 jobs in my State of Iowa all by itself. These jobs have fallen victim to a tactic used by the Democratic leadership to hold this popular and noncontroversial tax provision hostage to out-of-control deficit spending in Washington.

This past February, I worked out a bipartisan deal with Chairman BAUCUS to extend the expired tax provision, including the biodiesel tax credit. However, the Senate Democratic leadership decided to put partisanship ahead of job security for thousands of workers in the biodiesel industry. I am here again to try to put thousands of workers back to work, American workers, in the process of producing a clean and renewable fuel. We already stripped out and passed the so-called doctor fix from the larger extenders bill last week. We should do the same with the biodiesel tax credit right now.

Also there is a difference between the biodiesel tax credit and the other tax provisions in the tax extenders bill. The failure to extend the biodiesel tax credit before it expires has ground the industry to a halt, because biodiesel is now more expensive than gasoline and gas stations know they can't sell it. So, of course, naturally, they don't buy it. Therefore, biodiesel producers have stopped producing it because they have nobody to sell it to. While the other tax provisions are important, they are not as time sensitive as biodiesel, because they are not transactional tax incentives like the biodiesel tax credit but instead are based on the taxable year.

I am going to reserve my unanimous consent request until the Senator from Michigan returns. I will go to other remarks I want to make at this point.

I see the Senator has returned so I will make my unanimous consent request at this point.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4853

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate con-

sideration of H.R. 4853, that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 3440, to extend the biodiesel fuel tax credit, be inserted; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I thank my colleague for his courtesy in allowing me to return to the Chamber and also indicate that this particular provision on biodiesel, which I strongly support, is in the underlying jobs bill. We hope to have this passed in a couple of days. We will have another opportunity to vote on this shortly. As a result of that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4853

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have a further unanimous consent request. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4853; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and that an amendment at the desk, which is the text of S. 3421, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. STABENOW. Reserving the right to object, I again say to my colleague, we will have an opportunity to address this. We had two opportunities last week to address it and did not get the votes. Hopefully, in the next couple days, we will be able to resolve these issues. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, may I ask how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 10 minutes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, this morning we saw yet another replay of a dialog between some of my friends on the other side and some on my side of the aisle. It kind of goes like this. Republicans make a proposal to make a pending Democratic leadership proposal such as the extenders bill deficit neutral. The Democratic leadership marshals the votes and defeats the deficit-neutral proposal on a largely party-line basis. After the vote, debate ensues. My friends on the other side define the proposal that they defeat in an incorrect way. They define it as a proposal to carry out the policy of a fiscally responsible manner as opposition to the underlying policy in the proposal. Republicans counter that the Republican deficit-neutral proposal carries most, if not all, of the policy contained in the Democratic leadership's proposal.

When the smoke clears, the true differences between the two sides' approaches become very clear. My friends on the other side want to add to the deficit to carry out the underlying ini-

tiative—be it an extension of unemployment benefits or a lot of other things in the bill. On this side, we want deficit neutrality at a minimum by rolling back future bloated spending. The Democratic leadership wants to keep in place the future bloated spending. Tax increases are OK, if they are offset. Bring on hundreds of billions of dollars of tax increase, whether they hit individuals, small businesses, or what have you. As an example, the latest tax is due to hit next week. Next Tuesday, July 1, users of tanning bed services will face a new 10-percent tanning bed excise tax. God help us if someone proposes to make the government even a little bit leaner. That proposal will be met with a brick wall of resistance, even if it is a proposal to roll back future unobligated, unallocated stimulus spending, which stimulus spending has not accomplished what it was intended to accomplish, keeping unemployment under 8 percent.

The upshot is this: For my friends in the Democratic leadership, keeping the spending spigot all the way open trumps deficit reduction. Keep the spending going, in other words. Worry about our deficit sometime down the road. Let our grandchildren worry about it.

On the Republican side, we want to trim the spending and save some taxpayers money by managing priorities. That is a worthwhile debate. It is an intellectually honest debate. It is the kind of debate that can inform fiscal policy judgments. But my friends in the Democratic leadership are not content to have the debate on that basis. Instead, we have seen a pattern where they want to change the subject. Instead of focusing on the present and the future, my friends on the other side want to revisit the past. In veering away from current choices and future fiscal consequences, my friends on the other side take the discussion in a whole different direction. My friends on the other side claim they cannot deal with these problems in a fiscally responsible manner because of Republicans. Republicans only left them with fiscal problems.

People watching C-SPAN witnessed this back and forth last Thursday, and around lunchtime the Senate voted on Senator THUNE's alternative to the Democratic leadership's extender bill. The Thune amendment took the exact opposite approach to the Democratic leadership's substitute. It cut taxes by \$26 billion by extending current law. It cut spending by over \$100 billion and reduced the deficit by \$68 billion. Those are not this Senator's numbers. They come from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, the last version of the Democratic leadership's extender substitute would have increased direct spending by about \$105 billion through the year 2020, and raised revenues by about \$50

billion over that period, resulting in a net deficit increase of about \$55 billion. As an aside, last Friday Chairman BAUCUS and I prevailed on the leadership to clear the deficit-neutral bill that extended the so-called Medicare doctor fix. That action will cut those numbers a little bit.

On the larger bill, however, the contrast could not be clearer. The Republican Conference, along with one member of the Democratic caucus, voted to change the bottom line fiscal effects of the Democratic leadership's extender substitute. If Senator THUNE had prevailed, his amendment would have reduced the deficit by \$13 billion more than the amount the Democratic leadership's extender substitute would have added to the deficit. The Thune amendment reached this better fiscal result by simple common sense of restraining Federal spending. All but one Member of the Democratic caucus then in attendance, 57 Senators, voted against the Thune amendment. One of the Senators who voted for the Thune amendment came to the Senate floor to highlight the differences between the Democratic caucus and the Republican Conference in the approach to this extenders bill.

A Member of the Democratic leadership also made some comments on the current fiscal problems. Instead of focusing on the question of whether to offset the policy or not, that Member decided to change the subject. As we saw this morning, that Member of the Democratic leadership wanted to go back several years and talk about fiscal history.

This morning, like last week, there was a lot of revision or perhaps editing of the recent budget history. I expect more of it from some on the other side.

The President signaled as much in an interview with George Stephanopoulos a few months ago. I agree with the President that there is a lot of revisionism in the debate.

The revisionist history basically boils down to two conclusions: One, that all of the "good" fiscal history of the 1990s was derived from a partisan tax increase bill of 1993; and, two, that all of the "bad" fiscal history of this decade to date is attributable to the bipartisan tax relief plans.

Not surprisingly, nearly all of the revisionists who spoke generally oppose tax relief and—do you know what—support tax increases. The same crew generally supports spending increases and opposes spending cuts.

In the debate so far, many on this side have pointed out some key undeniable facts. The stimulus bill passed by the Senate, with interest included, increases the deficit by over \$1 trillion. The stimulus bill was a heavy stew of spending increases and refundable tax credits, seasoned with small pieces of tax relief.

The bill passed by the Senate had new temporary spending that, if made permanent, will burden future budget deficits by over \$2.5 trillion. That is

not Senate Republicans adding that up. It is the official congressional scorekeeper, the Congressional Budget Office, nonpartisan as they are. In fact, the deficit effects of the stimulus bill passed a year ago March—passed within a short time after the Democrats assumed full control of the Federal Government—roughly exceeded the deficit impact of the 8 years of bipartisan tax relief.

All of this occurred in an environment where the automatic economic stabilizers, thankfully, kicked in to help the most unfortunate in America with unemployment insurance, food stamps, and other benefits.

That antirecessionary spending, together with lower tax receipts, and the TARP activities, has set a fiscal table of a deficit of \$1.4 trillion for the fiscal year that ended several months ago. That is the highest deficit, as a percentage of the economy, in post-World War II history.

It is not a pretty fiscal picture, and it is going to get a lot uglier with the budget put forward by the President this year. It is the same result under the budget crafted last year by the Democratic leadership.

So for the folks who see this bill as an opportunity to "recover" America with government taking a larger share of the economy over the long term, I say congratulations. America has been recovered with a vast expansion of government and the American People have a lot of red ink to look forward to.

Members who voted for the budget and the fiscal policy envisioned in it put us on the path to a bigger role for the government. But supporters of that fiscal policy need to own up to the fiscal course they are charting.

That is where the revisionist history comes from. From the perspective of those on our side, it seems to be a strategy to divert, through a twisted blame game, from the facts before us. How is the history revised? Let's take each conclusion one by one.

The first conclusion is that all of the "good" fiscal history was derived from the 1993 tax increase. To test that assertion, all you have to do is take a look at data from the Clinton administration.

The much-ballyhooed 1993 partisan tax increase accounts for 13 percent of the deficit reduction in the 1990s—13 percent. That 13 percent figure was calculated by the Clinton administration's Office of Management and Budget.

The biggest source of deficit reduction, 35 percent, came from a reduction in defense spending. Of course, that fiscal benefit originated from President Reagan's stare-down of the Communist regime in Russia. The same folks on that side who opposed President Reagan's defense buildup take credit for the fiscal benefit of the "peace dividend."

The next biggest source of deficit reduction, 32 percent, came from other revenue.

Basically, this was the fiscal benefit from pro-growth policies, like the bipartisan capital gains tax cut in 1997, and the freetrade agreements President Clinton, with Republican votes, established.

The savings from the policies I have pointed out translated to interest savings. Interest savings account for 15 percent of the deficit reduction.

Now, for all the chest-thumping about the 1990s, the chest-thumpers, who push for big social spending, didn't bring much to the deficit reduction table in the 1990s. Their contribution was 5 percent.

What is more, the fiscal revisionist historians in this body tend to forget who the players were. They are correct that there was a Democratic President in the White House. But they conveniently forget that Republicans controlled the Congress for the period where the deficit came down and turned to surplus.

They tend to forget they fought the principle of a balanced budget that was the centerpiece of Republican fiscal policy.

Remember the government shutdown of late 1995, my friends on the Democratic side? Remember what that was about? It was about a plan to balance the budget. We are constantly reminded of the political price paid by the other side for the record tax increase they put in the law in 1993. Republicans paid a political price for forcing the balanced budget issue in 1996. But, in 1997, President Clinton agreed. Recall as well all through the 1990s what the year-end battles were about.

On one side, congressional Democrats and the Clinton administration pushed for more spending. On the other side, congressional Republicans were pushing for tax relief.

In the end, both sides compromised. That is the real fiscal history of the 1990s.

Let's turn to the other conclusion of the revisionist fiscal historians. That conclusion is that, in this decade, all fiscal problems are attributable to the widespread tax relief enacted in 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2006.

In 2001, President Bush came into office. He inherited an economy that was careening downhill. Investment started to go flat in 2000. The tech-fueled stock market bubble was bursting. After that came the economic shocks of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Add in the corporate scandals to that economic environment.

And it is true, as fiscal year 2001 came to close, the projected surplus turned to a deficit. But it is wrong to attribute the entire deficit occurring during this period to the bipartisan tax relief. According to CBO, the bipartisan tax relief is responsible for only 25 percent of the deficit change, while 44 percent is attributable to higher spending, and 31 percent is attributable to economic and technical changes.

At just the right time, the 2001 tax relief plan started to kick in. As the

tax relief hit its full force in 2003, the deficits grew smaller. This pattern continued up through 2007.

If my comments were meant to be partisan shots, I could say this favorable fiscal path from 2003 to 2007 was the only period, aside from 6 months in 2001, where Republicans controlled the White House and the Congress. But, unlike the fiscal history revisionists, I am not trying to make any partisan points, I am just trying to get to the fiscal facts.

There is also data that compares the tax receipts for 4 years after the much-ballyhooed 1993 tax increase and the 4-year period after the 2003 tax cuts. I have a chart that tracks those trends.

In 1993, the Clinton tax increase brought in more revenue as compared to the 2003 tax cut. That trend reversed as both policies moved along.

Over the first few years, the extra revenue went up over time relative to the flat line of the 1993 tax increase.

So, let's get the fiscal history right.

The progrowth tax and trade policies of the 1990s, along with the "peace dividend," had a lot more to do with the deficit reduction in the 1990s than the 1993 tax increase. In this decade, deficits went down after the tax relief plans were put in full effect.

No economist I am aware of would link the bursting of the housing bubble with the bipartisan tax relief plans of 2001 and 2003.

Likewise, I know of no economic research that concludes that the bipartisan tax relief of 2001 and 2003 caused the financial meltdown of September and October 2008. I have a chart that shows what the President inherited from a Democratic Congress and a Republican President.

As I said, from the period of 2003 through 2007, after the bipartisan tax relief program was in full effect, the general pattern was this: revenues went up and deficits went down.

That is the past. We need to make sure we understand it. But what is most important is the future. People in our States send us here to deal with future policy. They don't send us here to flog one another, like partisan cartoon cut-out characters, over past policies. They don't send us here to endlessly point fingers of blame.

The substitute before us takes us in the direction of more deficits and debt. The Thune amendment, which was rejected by most of the Democratic Caucus, would have put us on a path in the opposite fiscal direction. My friends on the other side fool no one if they pretend that the fiscal choices made by the Democratic leadership and the President over the last year have nothing to do with this rapidly rising debt.

President Obama rightly focused us on the future with his eloquence during the campaign. I would like to paraphrase a quote from the President's nomination acceptance speech: We need a President who can face the threats of the future, not grasping at the ideas of the past.

President Obama was right.

We need a President, and, I would add, Congressmen and Senators who can face the threats of the future. Grasping at ideas of the past or playing the partisan blame game will not deal with the threats to our fiscal future.

It is not too late to correct the excesses of the stimulus bill or the bloated appropriations bills that will come. The Senate missed an opportunity with a partisan rejection of Senator THUNE's alternative.

We took a small, bipartisan step last Friday. The Senate unanimously approved a paid-for Medicare doc fix bill, led by my friend, Chairman BAUCUS. That was the way we need to go.

There are more bipartisan fiscally responsible efforts underway. Senator MCCASKILL's and Senator SESSIONS' amendment, which calls for a timeout on the exponentially rising levels of appropriations spending, is a good start. The President called on the Democratic leadership to do something similar.

That is what the American people want and need. There is a way to reach a real bipartisan compromise. It is right in front of the Democratic leadership. Efforts to change the subject and blame Republican Congresses of many years ago won't answer the questions about what needs to be done now.

Efforts to blame every fiscal problem on a Republican President who retired a year and a half ago is no answer. It is a strategy that avoids responsibility for the trillions of new spending that the Democratic leadership and this President have muscled through with large majorities. It is time to match the power with responsibility. The American People expect no less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Republican time has now ended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Ms. STABENOW. We have 15 minutes to wrap up. Is that my understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Ms. STABENOW. First, as a courtesy to my colleagues, I will offer a unanimous consent request at the beginning of our comments, and this relates to the nearly 1 million people who have lost their jobs who have now lost their unemployment benefits because of the inability to move this forward in terms of extending unemployment benefits through the end of November.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3520

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3520, the Unemployment Extension Act of 2010, that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no inter-

vening action or debate, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Republicans have offered a bill, and it is fully paid for. We have the same concerns. We think, though, we should not be adding to the debt and the deficit. We know the President's budget doubles the national debt in 5 years, triples it in 10. The recommendation here being offered is one that would add to the burden of the debt on our children and grandchildren.

As a result, Mr. President, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I would like to now speak both in response to some of what my friends on the other side of the aisle have said and also to talk about why we are here this evening, why we started this whole discussion this evening.

I remember when we, in fact, balanced the budget. We passed a balanced budget under President Clinton. I was against deficits then when I voted, for the first time in 30 years, to balance the budget. I was against deficits when I supported a different way to go with the largest surpluses created by the policies of President Clinton, when I said just focusing on the wealthy in this country and tax benefits for the wealthy not only was not fair, but it was going to balloon the deficit; that not paying for two wars was going to balloon the deficit; that not paying for really any major policy during the 8 years of the Bush administration would balloon the deficit. I was against deficits at that time as well, and I am still against deficits.

When we talk about what happened in the last 8 years, it is not to go back, but it is to learn from what did not work for the American people. One of my friends on the other side of the aisle said they were for private-sector jobs and we were for public-sector jobs. Well, the reality is, during the last 8 years, when deficits did not matter—I will never forget the former Vice President saying deficits did not matter. When they were trying to pass their policies that affected the wealthiest in the country, at the expense of the middle class, deficits did not matter.

But we lost 6 million private-sector jobs during that time—6 million manufacturing jobs—when there was a focus on cheap products instead of American jobs. We lost jobs. Well, deficits mattered to me at that time too, as well as deficits in jobs, which is the main engine of our economy: middle class jobs.

Well, it is true. When we came into the majority and President Obama came into office, after that time of losing 750,000 jobs a month, we took a different tack. We did. We said: Do you

know what. Instead of focusing on big bailouts for Wall Street, and losing 8 million jobs because of that, or people losing their pensions or 401(k)s, we think we ought to have a different set of priorities. We think we ought to focus on the middle class in this country and working people and people who spend all their lives playing by the rules who are saying: What about us?

So we did something different. We put in an investment jobs plan that our colleagues have spent the last year and a half trying to talk down, trying to make sure it did not work. But we put in place a jobs plan to begin to turn things around. And that 750,000 jobs that were lost a month that President Obama inherited went down to zero by the end of the year.

As shown on this chart, this is where we were on jobs in the Bush administration. If their approach had worked, I would say great. If people in my State had not been hit by an economic tsunami during this time, I would say great. I would be out here promoting it. I would be promoting what they are talking about—if it had worked for the majority of Americans. The problem is it did not work.

Now, people listening I know get very confused because there are all kinds of back and forth and different versions of what happened in history. I would ask people just to think about their own lives.

As shown on this chart, it did not work here, starting in 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005. I can tell you, in my State, where we lost a million jobs, these policies did not work. So we tried something else, when we started focusing on people, investing in innovation, partnering with manufacturers—private-sector jobs.

Yesterday, I went to a facility groundbreaking for a battery manufacturing plant. We have 16 different battery manufacturing facilities in Michigan now because of the Recovery Act that are creating private-sector jobs. The manufacturing tax credit we put in for alternative energies is creating private-sector jobs. Now, they are not as fast as we want. They are not as fast as we need. But we are beginning to turn this huge economic ship around. The ship that was going down, down, down—we are beginning to turn it around. We are beginning to turn it around.

My colleagues say we should help people who are out of work by taking money away from this. Let's stop this. Let's take money away from creating jobs to help people out of work.

Well, that does not make any sense. What we have said is we want to continue this. That is why we are saying no to the proposals. That is why I objected to proposals tonight on the floor

that sound great on the surface. They sound great. Well, why not just pay for it? Well, you are talking about taking money away from jobs in order to be able to put it into something that is desperately needed as well—both are needed—helping people who are out of work.

We say no. Keep investing. Keep moving it forward, and at the same time—at the same time—let's help people who are out of work in the same way every President—Republican and Democrat—for decades has done; that is, we call it an emergency. It is an emergency in this country when over 15 million people are out of work. And the reality is, from an economic standpoint, we will never get out of a deficit with over 15 million people not working and contributing to the tax base and contributing to the economy, buying things as consumers. We will never get out of debt.

So, yes, we do have a different view. We do. We have a view that worked under President Clinton when 22 million jobs were created. We have that same view now, that same view that says we are going to move ourselves out of this by investing in the middle class of this country, working people. We are going to invest in innovation. We are going to partner with our businesses. They are competing with countries around the world right now to create good private-sector jobs.

And, yes, to support small business, we have done more in tax policies related to small business, and we intend to do even more than I think at any other time I can think of in terms of support for small business. All of that is true.

Mr. President, in order for my colleague from Pennsylvania to speak, will you please tell me when there is 5 minutes left of our time. I do not want to lose the opportunity for the Senator from Pennsylvania to be able to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a minute and a half.

Ms. STABENOW. Before the 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank you very much.

Let me conclude by saying we are moving in the right direction, but we inherited a huge hole. By the way, the folks who created the hole want us to give them more shovels to go back and create another hole, a deeper hole. We are saying, do you know what. Take away the shovels. Take them away. We need to fill in the hole, not dig a deeper one.

So that is what we have been doing. But here is the reality. It was six people out of work for every one job. Now it is five. OK, it is moving in the right

direction. We have a long ways to go. But five people are looking and trying to find every one job. That is what this debate is all about.

Millions of people—most of them worked all their lives, never been out of work in their entire life and are humiliated at the idea they have to ask for help from anybody—find themselves in a position where they are going to lose their house, they are not going to be able to care for their kids, unless we give them the dignity of temporary help. That is all this is, the dignity of temporary help, and the dignity of saying, yes, this is an emergency; yes, we are not changing the rules just for you. We are not going to have a different set of rules for the wealthy in this country and separate rules for somebody who is out of work who is 55 years old who has worked all their life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. STABENOW. That is what this is about, and it is my great pleasure tonight, as we end, and as we continue to fight for these Americans, to turn our final 5 minutes over to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has been a real champion standing up for working families in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator, there are now 4½ minutes.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, first of all, I commend Senator STABENOW for her words tonight to put in perspective what this debate is all about. It really is a question of jobs—not only creating jobs, as we have been able to do, and still have a long way to go to get out of the ditch, but also preserving jobs. Also, I commend the Senator for her stamina tonight. She has spent a lot of time on the Senate floor.

I want to make two points. One is about unemployment insurance and one is about COBRA premium assistance for health care.

First, with regard to unemployment insurance—the debate we are having on the bill this week and last week, for a number of days now—one of the real points of contention is what we do about those who are out of work through no fault of their own.

I can just tell you what it means for Pennsylvania. Here is the reality in Pennsylvania—and I will ask consent that the following document be made a part of the RECORD: Estimated Exhaustions of All Available Unemployment Compensation Benefits, calendar year 2010. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that document be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTIMATED EXHAUSTIONS OF ALL AVAILABLE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS (UP TO A MAXIMUM OF 99 WEEKS) CALENDAR YEAR 2010

[These estimates reflect the total number of individuals in each month projected to exhaust all available state and federal unemployment compensation (UC) benefits under current law—Regular UC, Emergency Unemployment Compensation (EUC), and High Unemployment Period Extended Benefits (HUP EB).]

	YTD Through April	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Annual Total
EUC/EB phase-out beginning June 2 ¹	30,000	5,200	111,000	94,000	65,000	41,000	32,000	25,000	26,000	429,200
EUC/EB phase-out extended to Dec 31 ²	30,000	5,200	4,800	5,600	5,900	6,600	9,100	7,300	64,000	138,500

¹ These projected exhaustions are based on current law, whereby the phase-out of EUC begins on June 2, 2010 (last payable week of EUC is week ending November 6, 2010) and the last payable week of HUP EB is week ending June 5, 2010.

² These projections reflect the estimated number of exhaustions that would occur if the phase-out of EUC and EB was extended to December 31, 2010.

Mr. CASEY. What this says is if we don't act to extend unemployment insurance, to give people some help, to get from joblessness to a job, to get across that long bridge, 111,000 Pennsylvanians will be out of unemployment insurance by the end of June. Unfortunately, that number goes up by another 94,000 at the end of July if we do nothing. By the end of this year, 429,200 Pennsylvanians will have no unemployment insurance.

We have to act on that. It makes all the sense in the world when we are recovering—and we are in recovery, thank goodness, but we have a way to go—that we give people the opportunity to at least have the peace of mind to know they have unemployment insurance.

Secondly, with regard to COBRA, if anyone has any doubts as to what this means to real people, I would submit one part of one sentence from a single Pennsylvanian by the name of Lisa. She sent a letter to me talking about chemotherapy treatments she needs and the COBRA premium assistance. She said: "COBRA benefits have kept me alive." That is exactly what we are talking about here—about life and death. Why should a family—as they are trying to get a job, trying to find their way out of joblessness—why should they have to worry and have the additional nightmare of having no health insurance? We can help so many Americans as we did in the Recovery Act. Two million households across the country were helped by the COBRA premium assistance program in 2009. In our State, over 107,000 Pennsylvanians had the benefit of that.

So as we wrap up this debate about preserving jobs and creating jobs—and I think in a sense getting a sense of whose side you are on—are you going to be on the side of slowing things down and playing games or are you going to be on the side of helping the unemployed get a job and help them with their family's health care. As we wrap up this debate, it is about saving jobs and preserving jobs and literally, in some cases, saving lives, not only by way of health care but also by way of the additional debate we are having on Medicaid and what that means to vulnerable people as well as what it means to public safety and other priorities. We can get this right, but we need to have our colleagues on the other side of the aisle recognize that this is a high stakes game they are engaged in and that the loser here in the end is not going to be some political party. Those who will be left out are very vulnerable

people who, in addition, are without a job.

With that, I yield the floor to my colleague from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 20 seconds remaining.

Ms. STABENOW. On that note, I will simply say again that we are here and we will continue to be here fighting on behalf of people who are counting on us to do the right thing. We remember what it is like for too many families right now whose breadwinner cannot bring home any bread because there is no job. We want to remember them and we want to help them and support them as they are looking for work, as all Americans want to be able to have a job and the dignity of work, and that is what we are fighting for.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO FRED ANVIL NEWTON III

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary work of Fred Anvil Newton III, who is retiring this week. During his 28 years with the Intergovernmental Program Office, his distinguished career elevated him to the highest levels of decisionmaking in one of our government's most sensitive programs. His work greatly enhanced the safety and security of the United States Senate, staff, and visitors.

Mr. Newton dedicated his professional life to mission accomplishment, while always ensuring that the people he led were well-trained and cared for. He managed resources in the most efficient and effective manner possible. Mr. Newton cultivated and maintained partnerships with the U.S. Capitol Police, the offices of the U.S. Senate Sergeant at Arms and the U.S. House of Representatives Sergeant at Arms. Regarded as the dean of the continuity community, he has been at the forefront of strategic continuity planning and his innovative approach to problem solving has set the standard for many of today's continuity programs.

Mr. Newton has many significant accomplishments including the oversight, response, and mitigation of the effects of the public disclosure of a very sensitive national strategic continuity asset. He developed a new strategy for effective use of private sector assets in fulfilling a strategic continuity mission; the result being minimal cost to government and maximum flexibility for planners.

Mr. Newton provided advice and counsel to national level emergency managers attempting to mitigate and recover from the effects of a biological warfare attack on the United States Senate. Additionally, Mr. Newton held a great ability to identify subject matter experts, which significantly reduced recovery time and expense.

During his tenure, Mr. Newton oversaw the acquisition, staffing, and operation of multiple relocation assets in support of the strategic continuity mission. He also advocated and oversaw the development of a purpose-built tactical waterborne evacuation asset whose capabilities significantly enhance the efficient and timely movement of essential government personnel from threat zones.

He also oversaw a major chemical, biological, radiological and explosives defense effort protecting a highly symbolic national asset. This effort uniquely combines surveillance/identification technologies, defensive measures, and incident management and mitigation capabilities to form a standard by which other large-scale protective efforts are now measured.

I, along with my colleagues in the Senate, congratulate Fred on his well-deserved retirement. We wish Mr. Newton all the best in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO ANDREA ROGERS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I honor Andrea Rogers, the CEO and founding executive director of the Flynn Center for the Performing Arts. I have had the privilege to congratulate Andrea over the years on her many accomplishments within the arts community, including her most recent award from the Vermont Arts Council, the Walter Cerf Lifetime Achievement in the Arts award. Today, I once again recognize her decades of invaluable service to Vermonters and I wish her future success as she retires from her executive director position at the Flynn Center for the Performing Arts after 30 years of dedicated service.

In 1980, Andrea led a campaign to purchase an old movie house in downtown Burlington, with the hope of turning it into a home for performing arts groups. She was successful, and the old building became an independent theatre. Andrea organized many fundraising efforts to restore the antiquated space, and within the next 5 years, the Flynn succeeded in hosting over 350 performances presented by 50 different organizations. Today, 30 years