

budget is anything but balanced, anything but fair. Members of the House should look at what they are being led into—or out of.

This plan, just like last year, refused to close a single tax loophole in order to reduce the deficit. Yet it guts investments in education, health care, public safety, scientific research, and job-creating clean energy technology. The Ryan budget would end the Medicare guarantee and force seniors into a voucher program. It would ax preventive health care such as cancer screenings and charge seniors more for prescriptions and further reduce the funding for food inspectors, police, and first responders generally. As if protecting the wealthy special interests is not bad enough, the Republican budget also devastates the economy, costing jobs and slowing economic growth.

Not only is this a wrong approach, it is the same old approach. To make matters worse, the Paul Ryan Budget No. 3—he has done it two other times—used the same fuzzy math and gimmickry as his previous two budgets, relies on accounting that is creative at best and fraudulent at worst to inflate its claims of deficit reduction. We believe it is critical to stabilize the deficit, but it will take more than accounting gimmicks to achieve real deficit reduction.

At a time when corporations are making record profits, the stock market is soaring, and wealthy Americans' income continues to rise, the deficit reduction should not have to be at the expense of middle-class families, senior citizens, and the poor. Americans have demanded a fair approach to deficit reduction for all Americans—Democrats, Independents, and Republicans. They want a fair approach to deficit reduction that makes sensible cuts and asks profitable corporations and the wealthiest among us to share the burden—balanced.

We have been listening. That is why this week Budget Committee Chair PATTY MURRAY will introduce a budget that reflects those balanced priorities. Her plan, the Democratic plan, will cut wasteful spending and reduce the deficit, close tax loopholes that benefit the rich, and invest where the economy needs to grow, to go really hard, to continue to build, to grow. It will create a strong middle class.

Congressman RYAN and his Republican colleagues in Congress have taken a different approach, an approach that makes it plain they missed the message in the November elections. Their budget once again will put moneyed special interests ahead of middle-class families, and no amount of rebranding will hide that.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

BUDGET PREVIEW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as we know, President Obama missed this year's legal deadline to submit a budget to Congress, just like he has nearly every year of his presidency. But this year it is even worse—we now know he does not even plan to submit a budget until after the House and the Senate have acted to pass one.

That has never happened in the more than 90 years that have gone by since the modern budgeting process was established in the 1920s. Somehow, Presidents managed to submit budgets on time in the middle of World War II, during the Great Depression—but not today? There is simply no excuse.

Rather than helping lead Congress toward a reasonable outcome, it appears the President is happy to drop a bomb on the congressional budget process instead by releasing his budget plan after the House and Senate have acted—presumably so he can campaign against Republicans if the process fails as he hopes. Let's hope he does not trot out that tired political playbook again.

The President should send over his budget now—not next week or next month, but today—so both sides can consider it at a time when it might be helpful, rather than destructive, to the process.

And speaking of serious delays, for 4 years my constituents in Kentucky and Americans across the country have been asking Senate Democrats a simple question: "Where's the budget?" Most families put one together. They want to know what Democrats who run the Senate have planned.

But for 4 years, Senate Democrats have ignored these concerns. Year after year, they have neglected one of their most important legislative responsibilities.

Evidently that is about to change. Senate Democrats are now pledging to finally—finally—produce a budget. I will be interested to see what they put forward.

I hope Senate Democrats take this exercise seriously and propose real spending reforms that can put our country on a stronger, more sustainable fiscal path, reforms that can control spending and lead to robust private-sector growth and job creation. We will see.

What about Republicans? Well, Republicans lead the House, and they have proposed budgets every year, right on schedule—budgets that would finally put our country on a path to growth and job creation, and that would put our creaky entitlement programs on a sound fiscal footing so they are around when people need them.

Today, House Republicans will unveil this year's budget blueprint. If the past is any indication, the reforms it contains would jump-start our economy, help more Americans join the middle class, and begin to tackle the debt that threatens all of our futures because Republicans understand we need to grow the economy, not the government.

What's more, it would get us back to a balanced budget within just a few short years.

Call me a skeptic, but there is little chance the budget my Senate Democrat friends put forward will balance—either today, 10 years from today, or ever. And I doubt it will contain much in the way of spending reform either. We will probably just get more of what we have come to expect from them the past few years: lots of budget gimmickry, tons of wasteful spending, and even more tax hikes. That type of budget won't grow the economy or shrink the debt.

But here is the thing. The budgeting process is a great way for both parties to outline their priorities for the country, and that is something Senate Democrats have refused to do until now.

So, if they want to put forward a budget that allows Medicare to go bankrupt, that hikes up taxes on the families and small businesses that can least afford them, and that proposes a future of massive deficits without end—if that is really how they want to define themselves for the American people—then let the battle of ideas begin.

But we need to see their budget first, so it is time to end the years of delays and put those ideas on the table. And it is well past time for the President to do the same—not after Congress acts, but before.

Republicans have managed to play by the rules every year and produce serious budgets for our country. I hope Democrats are finally ready to get to work to do the same.

I yield the floor.

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 of morning business until 12:30 p.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 30 minutes and Republicans controlling the second 30 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I understand that the Democrats have the first half of morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

CONTRASTING BUDGETS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this is a historic week because we will see congressional presentations of the congressional budgets, and I believe we will see stark contrasts.

Congressman RYAN of Wisconsin—nearby my home State of Illinois—is going to prepare and present to the Republicans in the House of Representatives a budget that he says will bring our overall Federal budget into balance over 10 years. It is a daunting task, and I commend him for his effort. I also have to say that we have been there before. We have heard this budget before. We know what it contains. There are several elements in the Ryan budget—as some have announced in advance—that repeat the mistakes of his earlier budgets, and some of them are grievous.

We understand we need entitlement reform to make sure important programs such as Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid continue for years to come. We understand there will be some hard choices associated with efforts to make these programs more solvent.

The Ryan approach continues to have something called premium support. What it boils down to is this: In the outyears, Congressman RYAN and the House Republicans want to offer seniors across America less money to pay for their Medicare insurance. They want to privatize the Medicare insurance system.

Our side of the aisle—both in the House and the Senate—is dedicated to some basic principles. One of the first is to make sure men and women across America who are from working families have a fighting chance, to make sure the Tax Code is responsive to their needs, to make sure the programs they count on will be there when they need them.

Every hour of every day most American workers in States such as Massachusetts and Illinois pay into our Social Security and Medicare system with the belief that when the time comes for retirement, Social Security and Medicare will be there. Unfortunately, what Congressman RYAN is proposing is to really break that promise and to say to seniors across America: You can pay into it for a lifetime, but when the time comes and you really need Medicare and health insurance during your retirement, you probably won't be able to afford it. You won't be able to come up with the premiums.

What good is a Medicare system that a worker has paid into for a lifetime if it cannot provide the basic protections they will need during retirement? They can balance the books—at the cost of coverage and the cost of the Medicare promise that has been made for generations.

Therein lies the real crux of the difference between Democrats and Republicans when we look at these entitlement programs. We know that reform is necessary, but reform should be based on best medical practices, on reducing the obvious waste in the Medicaid Program, and not on penalizing seniors who are on a fixed income who cannot afford increasingly high Medicare premiums. That is the PAUL RYAN

approach—privatizing Medicare. It is not a good approach for America. That is the real difference.

Of course, there is this dedication on the part of Congressman RYAN to reduce the tax rates for the wealthiest people in America. Those rates, after the fiscal cliff negotiation, go as high as 39 percent on the highest income. PAUL RYAN's budget wants to bring them down to 25 percent, which is a dramatic decline in the income tax rate for the wealthiest Americans. How will he achieve this? He says he will achieve it by changing the Tax Code to bring the rate down to 25 percent. I sat through the negotiations in the Bowles-Simpson Commission and other places, and the math does not work. If they are going to try to bring down the income tax rate for the wealthiest to 25 percent, sadly, they will eliminate the most basic income tax deductions for working and middle-income families across America. That is the reality; otherwise, they cannot reach that number.

We have to look at this. If the PAUL RYAN budget means the wealthiest Americans get a tax cut while working families see a tax increase and if the PAUL RYAN budget means Medicare will be fiscally solvent but unaffordable for most working Americans, this is a budget we need to reject out of hand.

We will see that budget in its entirety today, and by tomorrow the Democratic alternative here in the Senate, which has been worked on and prepared by Senator PATTY MURRAY of Washington and her colleagues in the Senate Budget Committee, will be presented as well, and it will be a stark contrast. What Senator MURRAY and the Senate Budget Committee will produce is a balanced approach that says: Yes, there will be deficit reduction, but it will be the right way. We need to make sure we have revenues coming from those who can afford to pay in the highest income categories. Yes, we need spending cuts, and they will continue. We need entitlement reform that is thoughtful and sensitive. We need reform that really makes sure these programs are here for generations to come.

I think America will applaud the efforts on the Senate side. I think they will have many questions to ask on the House side, and then the debate begins. Those of us on the Appropriations Committee wait for this to be completed because the budget resolution is basically our blueprint for what we can achieve during the remainder of the year and for the next budget year that starts October 1.

There are a couple of things that are part of the budget process that I will address very quickly.

SEQUESTRATION

I am very concerned about the impact of sequestration on health care. Reporters in Illinois asked me over the weekend: What is the big deal? Sequestration came and life didn't end. It seems as though we are going on in a normal way.

Unfortunately, they overlooked some obvious impacts. For example, community health centers are the frontline for primary health care across America. I visit them and always leave with a sense of hope and a positive feeling. The community health centers in Chicago and across Illinois are quality medical institutions. They serve people with limited insurance or no insurance, and they serve them in the most professional way. I have said with confidence that if I happen to get sick someday or someone in my family did, I would feel confident walking into these community health centers—they are that good.

Some 22 million people in more than 9,000 locations across America rely on them. As the point of care for uninsured and low-income people, community health centers provide preventive services that help avoid expensive procedures and emergency room visits.

At a time when 30 million new Americans are about to get health insurance so they can afford to get care, these across-the-board cuts are taking \$115 million out of community health centers this year alone. Nationally, almost 900,000 patients will lose access. Community health center funding in Illinois will be cut by \$6.2 million. Erie Family Health Center in Chicago is one of the best. They will do their best to protect clinical care, but the wrap-around services that make Erie so effective, not to mention cost-effective, will be reduced.

Now is not the time to cut community health center funding. Instead, we should expand the centers so hard-working and low-income families get the care they need.

Regardless of where someone lives or where they go to see the doctor, the \$1.6 billion cut to the National Institutes of Health threatens all of us. And that is what these cuts are going to do to medical research—cutting \$1.6 billion from the National Institutes of Health. I have always said that I will take this issue to any corner of America, any group—liberal or conservative, young or old—and make my case that investment in health care research is one of the most important investments our government makes. When we short-change medical research, we short-change our future.

Great medical care is only as good as the science behind it. Drugs and devices work only as well as our understanding of the medical conditions they are treating. Our country is rich with promising research. We lead the world and should be proud of it. We have the bright minds, the curious scientists, and the innovative labs. Today countless people are engaged in work that will lead to better treatments for arthritis, Alzheimer's, AIDS, diabetes, cancer, and the list goes on.

Biomedical research supported by the NIH has established America as the leader in the world, and we are right on the verge of making life-changing discoveries through this research. But sequestration—which is now in place—

will have a ripple effect that could curb medical discoveries and weaken the economies across the country.

Dr. Francis Collins, Director of the NIH, says there is no question that sequestration will slow the development of an influenza vaccine and cancer research.

Eli Zerhouni, head of NIH under President George W. Bush, said:

We are going to maim our innovation capabilities if we do these abrupt deep cuts at NIH. It will impact science for generations to come.

Right now, when so much good research is moving us forward, we should be doubling down on medical education, innovation, and infrastructure. Cutting back on NIH and biomedical research is so shortsighted. Medical research saves lives, keeps America's place as a leader in science and medicine, and it generates economic growth. Frankly, these cuts shake the confidence of people in this field. Trying to decide whether they should dedicate their lives to medical research with the uncertainty of sequestration and budget cuts is unfair.

For over a century, NIH-supported scientists have led the way for important breakthroughs to improve health and save lives through the discovery of things such as the MRI, extending the life expectancy for people with cystic fibrosis, revolutionizing our thinking about cancer, improving our understanding of stroke and heart disease, and creating new vaccines that save lives.

President Obama has called on congressional leaders to come together to create an alternative to the sequestration. A balanced mix of smarter spending cuts and revenue from closing loopholes that benefit higher income individuals will mean we can keep our commitment to medical research.

This week we are going to start the debate on the continuing resolution. One of the early amendments that is likely to be offered will be by Senator HARKIN, who chairs the Labor, Health and Human Services Subcommittee in Appropriations. I have spoken to Senator HARKIN. He is determined to do everything he can to give the Senate the opportunity to continue to cut the deficit but to do it in a way that will not make dramatic negative cuts in medical research.

I hope we can get a bipartisan consensus. Diseases and the threats of ill health strike all of us regardless of party affiliation. We should come together on a bipartisan basis to support increasing medical research and maintaining America's lead in the world.

I yield the floor and 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. CORNYN. 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.

REMEMBERING BORAH VAN DORMOLEN

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to start my remarks today by remembering a great Texan who passed away just yesterday. Sandy, my wife, and I are deeply saddened by the loss of Borah Van Dormolen, a remarkable patriot, a respected leader, and a loving wife.

Borah rose through the ranks of the U.S. Army, achieving the rank of lieutenant colonel. After more than two decades serving her Nation in the uniform of the U.S. Army, she poured her energy and sense of duty into helping our State. Frequently offering frank advice in only the way Borah could, she was a leader by example and a great friend.

Borah's legacy will live in many ways, including in the young Texans she helped me select for nominations to our Nation's military academies through her service on my Military Academy Selection Committee.

Sandy joins me in sending our thoughts and prayers to Borah's husband, LTC Rich Castle, their families, and all those whom Borah touched throughout her journey in life.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would like to mark this 1,413th day that the Senate has not had a budget. We will be talking a lot about the budget this week, as we should, in a debate that has been long overdue.

Since the Budget and Accounting Act was passed in 1921, no President has missed the legal deadline for submitting a budget to Congress. Unfortunately, for the fourth time in 5 years, President Obama will miss that deadline.

Given that our gross national debt is already larger than our entire economy, and given that we are facing more than \$100 trillion in unfunded liabilities, one would think the President would make this a priority and he would feel a greater sense of urgency about America's fiscal dilemma.

In fact, not only will President Obama be late with his budget this year, he will not even be submitting it to the House and the Senate until after we have released our own budgets. So the President will not have any input whatsoever by submitting his budget—which he should have done on February 4—he will not have any input whatsoever on the deliberations of the House and Senate as we take up our proposed budgets.

As I say, since the Budget and Accounting Act was passed in 1921, no U.S. President has ever done that. The White House has always gone first. In fact, the President is the leader of our Nation not only as Commander in Chief but also as the one the Constitution looks to in the law to bear the responsibility to make at least an initial budget proposal. The White House has

always gone first, providing a blueprint that helped guide negotiations on Capitol Hill, but not under this President.

The budget process is an opportunity for the President to outline his priorities. It is an opportunity for the President to tell the American people what we can afford and how we are going to pay for it. Above all, it is an opportunity for the President to show real leadership on issues of national importance.

As ADM Mike Mullen, the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said: The greatest national security threat to the United States is our budget. What he meant by that is, unless the Federal Government gets its fiscal house in order, we are not going to be able to afford even the safety net for the most vulnerable of our people, nor are we going to be able to afford the national security that helps keep America strong and America and its allies safe.

Unfortunately, the President has failed to demonstrate the required leadership in this area. He has also ignored the recommendations of his own bipartisan fiscal commission. He submitted two consecutive budget proposals that failed to receive a single vote in this Chamber. His administration has racked up \$6 trillion in new debt since he became President, and he created a massive new entitlement funded by a trillion-dollar tax increase—something known as ObamaCare. Now he is refusing to send us a budget until after the Senate and the House vote on their own budget proposals.

If the President really wants to play a constructive role in the budget process, he will send us his proposal right away. Further delays will only complicate and hinder our negotiations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and 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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. SCHATZ) Without objection, it is so ordered.

TERRORISTS TRIALS

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an issue I am very concerned about, which involves a man who was recently captured overseas. His name is Sulaiman Abu Ghaith, and he is Osama bin Laden's son-in-law. Here is a photo of him sitting next to Osama bin Laden. In fact, he appeared with Osama bin Laden right after the 9/11 attacks on our country.

He is Osama bin Laden's son-in-law, captured overseas and brought to the United States of America. The Attorney General has made the announcement Osama bin Laden's son-in-law