

dollar we spend with the IRS going after people who cheat, we bring in more than \$10 to the Treasury. They are cutting the ability of the IRS to go after people who cheat on paying their taxes. That makes it more difficult for the people who pay their taxes. I hope they will get off the government bashing program they have been on and focus on job creation.

We all know we need to reduce our debt. We are engaged in that, but in a way that is smart, not a way that is, as indicated in that Washington Post article, penny-wise and very pound-foolish.

Will the Chair now announce morning business.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period for the transaction of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, last week, Senator INOUE of Hawaii, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, proposed a bill to fund the government through the end of this fiscal year. It is hard to believe we are almost halfway through this year and still haven't resolved the basic issue of our budget. Our failure to resolve it, lurching from 2 weeks to 3 weeks of funding, may serve some political purpose, but it doesn't serve the purpose of good government because many people who have to make critical decisions that involve more than a momentary glimpse or glance at our fiscal situation are held back.

I met a man last night whose business is to supply the United States with vaccine for anthrax, tuberculosis, and similar things. We have an inadequate stockpile of vaccine. The government has said to him: We want you to produce more vaccine, but we are only funded for 2 more weeks.

He said to me: How can I, as a businessman, make a commitment to produce vaccine with an uncertainty as to whether it will be paid for?

That is a pretty reasonable question, and it reflects the fact that as we move from 2 weeks to 3 weeks of funding, postponements are made in decisions which have an impact on the future of our country.

This morning, I wish to address, as well, something that goes beyond the obvious—stockpiling vaccine—and looks to some of the other aspects of the House Republican budget bill and what it will mean to America if it is adopted. This is a bill which they proudly boast will cut \$100 billion in spending. Most people across America, sensitive to our deficit crisis, say we should start by cutting spending. That is a reasonable request by voters in New Hampshire and Illinois. But there comes a moment when we have to use our best judgment about where cuts should be made and where cuts, when made, would cost us dearly for a long time to come.

Senator INOUE, in his bill, tried to balance \$51 billion in cuts below the President's original budget request in a way that would not hurt our investment in America's future and economic growth.

American innovation has always fueled economic sustainability and job creation. Senator INOUE's bill lays out a wise path toward providing more jobs and less debt—two things we desperately need to do. Under his alternative spending bill, which I supported, the budget for the National Institutes of Health—which is the premier agency for medical research in America—is frozen at \$31 billion, the same amount it received last year. This means the funds required to perform cutting edge breakthrough medical research and new clinical trials for much-needed cures and treatments will be available. It also means that nearly 12,000 jobs across the State of Illinois in hospitals, universities, and medical centers will continue to be supported under the Inouye budget.

Under the House Republican budget, the National Institutes of Health is cut by \$1.6 billion. That is a cut that is severe by any measure. It would cause new construction projects to be halted when it comes to medical research laboratories and put 351,000 U.S. jobs in danger of being lost. We can't afford these shortsighted cuts when our Nation is struggling but is determined that we will come out of this stronger than we went in.

That said, we know that freezing budgets is not going to be enough. Thoughtful and difficult cuts will have to be made. The Senate appropriations bills provide \$6.8 billion for the National Science Foundation. This is a cut of \$573 million from the President's budget, but it is still \$284 million more than was provided in the bill passed by the House. Under the Democratic Senate alternative, we can continue to

fund basic research and create jobs and programs that educate the next generation of scientists in America. That is not possible under the House bill.

As I travel to research laboratories in my State—Argonne National Research Laboratory, Northwestern University Medical Care Center—I meet some of the best and brightest young people I have ever seen in my life. They are from all over the world, and they come here because this is the place to do research and to make the breakthrough findings that will change America and change the world. Thank God for their intelligence and their idealism. But they look at me and say: Senator, am I going to have a job 6 weeks from now? If I am not, tell me now. I have to make a plan with my life.

Maybe they will leave research and go into work for a private company and make more money. Maybe they will go back home to another country where they will be welcomed in their research capacity. So the generation of scientists affected by this decision are as important as the breakthroughs that might be found in the research itself.

The National Science Foundation will continue to provide \$8 million of innovation research to Illinois small businesses under the Inouye bill, but the funding level difference between the House and the Senate and what they want to cut and what we want to cut is dramatic.

Let me give an example: We are working on a new supercomputer at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. It is called Blue Waters. When it is completed, it will be the fastest computer in the world. Most Americans, when asked where is the fastest computer in the world today, would probably say America; we are the leaders. No, it is in China. But we are trying to devise and invent the next computer.

Now, what difference does that make? We know fast computers make quick decisions and help us find ways to solve problems we never even imagined. We are about to sacrifice many of the economic gains we can realize if we go through with the House Republican budget.

The budget for the Department of Energy's Office of Science was also examined and cut by \$388 million to \$4.7 billion for the year. Now, that is a \$200 million cut. It is difficult because the Office of Science supports seven of our National Laboratories. University research centers and private companies use their facilities to create new drugs, biofuels, and solutions to our country's toughest problems. Research done by Abbot Laboratories at the Advanced Photon Source at the Argonne National Laboratory is crucial to the development of an AIDS drug—Kaletra—which is now the world's most prescribed drug for fighting AIDS and the HIV virus. Cutting back on the funds for Argonne National Laboratory, dismissing one-third of their scientists

and engineers—as the House Republican budget calls for—cutting back their research by 40 to 50 percent for the remainder of the year, slows down the use of the Advanced Photon Source, which is utilized by virtually every major pharmaceutical company.

The question may be asked: Does it work? Here is living proof—Kaletra, the most widely prescribed drug for fighting AIDS, developed at the Argonne National Laboratory.

The House Republicans say: Slow down, stop, we will get back to you later. Can we say that in a world that demands innovation and research and that is looking for solutions to problems? If we cut \$1.1 billion from this account, as the House Republican budget suggests, facilities at the National Laboratories in my State and across the country will shut down and workers will be laid off. That is a simple reality.

I am not coming to the floor and engaging in scare tactics. This is what the Directors of the National Laboratories have told me. If these centers and Laboratories are closed, private companies—Eli Lilly, Texas Instruments, GE Research, and 3M—have a choice. If our Laboratories are closed, they will find labs overseas, outside the United States. Does that help our economy? Does that create jobs in America—to cut research?

The House Republican budget cuts this research and innovation and welcomes these companies to leave and go overseas to create jobs. Could we possibly be envisioning that at a moment when we have so much unemployment and we are facing a recession in this country?

Japan, China, and Europe are ready to receive these research projects. They are building facilities in the hopes that these companies will decide they are more reliable than the United States. That is what the House Republican budget threatens. Whether it is in medical research, energy research, or finding new drugs, unless we make a commitment that people can count on, that research is going overseas and jobs will flow with that research to other countries and not to America.

We need to cut the budget and reduce our deficit, no doubt about it. Let's not do so in a way that costs America jobs and cuts off American innovation at the knees. The spending bill before the House of Representatives is going to cripple our economy at a time when it is just starting to recover. Economists tell us the House Republican budget will cost us more than 700,000 jobs. That is not the way to move America forward.

We can find a way to eliminate tax loopholes and benefits, improve the way we spend money, and thoughtfully—thoughtfully—decrease our spending. These are elements of a sustainable plan for reaching the budget balance we are seeking and, equally important, the economic growth we need. We cannot balance the budget of

America with 15 million people out of work. We have to build an economy that creates good-paying jobs and people drawing paychecks who pay their taxes. That sustains government growth as well as economic growth.

I am going to be working with my colleagues in the Senate to come up with a better approach than the House Republican budget, and I certainly believe we can and should.

WESTWOOD COLLEGE AND THE GI BILL

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I have come to the Senate floor a number of times over the past year to speak about my concerns about the rapid growth of for-profit colleges. I believe some for-profit colleges are quality institutions, but I also believe many are taking advantage of Federal taxpayer dollars and doing more harm than good for unsuspecting students. In no area is this issue more important than when it comes to our veterans.

A few years ago, I proudly joined Senator JAMES WEBB of Virginia, who said to me when he came to the Senate 5 years ago: I want to pass a new GI bill. It is my No. 1 priority. And he did it. Thank goodness, he did. This is a man—a veteran of the Vietnam conflict who served in the U.S. Marines and later as Secretary of the Navy—who knows what he is talking about when it comes to veterans. He helped put together the modern GI bill, and I am proud to have voted for it, as many of us did.

When we passed that bill, we provided veterans with improved benefits to go to college. Veterans can receive up to \$17,000 a year to cover the cost of tuition, fees, housing, and supplies at the college of their choice. Veterans can also access private schools through the Yellow Ribbon Program, which allows the VA to pay a portion of private school tuition under agreements with these schools.

A lot of students are using the GI bill to attend for-profit colleges which are far more expensive than their public counterparts and even more expensive than many private not-for-profit universities. There is a rapid growth in veteran enrollment in these for-profit schools. For-profit schools cost an average of \$14,000 a year compared to \$2,500 a year at public 2-year colleges and \$7,000 at public 4-year universities.

In the first year of the post-9/11 GI bill implementation, the Veterans' Administration spent \$697 million on students attending public schools and \$640 million on students attending for-profit schools—almost the same. But we educated far more students for our money in public schools—203,000 students at public schools compared to 76,000 at for-profit schools, which charge two or three times as much for tuition and obviously educate one-half to one-third of what the public schools educated.

The top five for-profit recipients of the post-9/11 dollars received over \$320

million from the Department of Veterans Affairs last year: ITT received \$79 million; Apollo, which is the University of Phoenix, \$76.9 million; Education Management Corporation, \$60.5 million; Career Education Corporation, \$58.2 million; and DeVry, \$47.9 million.

There are reports of for-profit colleges aggressively targeting military servicemembers and veterans with expensive ad campaigns and hundreds of recruiters. One prominent for-profit college has 452 recruiters focusing on recruiting veterans out of the military. Another employs 300. Why do they want these students? Because when they bring the students in under the GI bill, they get compensated at higher levels by the Federal Government. We have a limit that says that none of these for-profit schools can take more than 90 percent of their revenue out of the Federal Treasury. That is money that comes in through Pell grants and Federal college loans. When it comes to the GI bill, we raised the 90 percent. So these schools that argue: We are just in the private sector, just little businesses, get more than 90 percent of their revenue from the Federal Government. They are the most heavily subsidized private businesses in America. It is time for us to ask, Are the taxpayers getting their money's worth? Are the veterans getting their money's worth?

It is troublesome when these schools spend so much money on recruiting students instead of educating them. I am concerned. The current system allows for-profit colleges to earn millions of dollars from taxpayer-funded programs while providing a low-quality education to students. We need to put the brakes on for-profit colleges that are targeting veterans to reap profits from taxpayers' dollars.

Last week, the Department of Veterans Affairs announced that it and the Texas Veterans Commission had disqualified three Texas campuses of Westwood College. They could no longer receive GI bill benefits. Westwood College is a for-profit college based out of Colorado, with 17 locations in 6 States—several in Illinois.

When I drive to O'Hare, I am on the Kennedy Expressway, and I look up and there is this office building and a big, huge sign, "Westwood College." Wow, the campus of Westwood College.

I know one of the students who went to Westwood College. This is a young lady who decided she needed to improve her life after high school and wanted to get into law enforcement. She enrolled at Westwood College to get a bachelor's degree in law enforcement. Five years later, they handed her a diploma at Westwood College. She went to the Chicago police department, and they said: We don't recognize that college; that is not a real college. All of the law enforcement in the region said to her: Westwood is not a real college; this is not a real diploma. She learned that to her disappointment, and she also learned to her disappointment that she had incurred