

Ukraine, and Russia, guaranteeing that at least in principle all those nations would respect the territorial integrity of Ukraine. Within the last 2 weeks, Russia has not only reneged on that promise—it has in fact invaded Ukraine and taken over territory there.

It is important for us, when it comes to Ukraine, to not only stand by the Ukrainian people as they move toward a more democratic form of government, but it is important for us to reinforce the premise that if a country will give up its nuclear weapons, will not pursue the development of nuclear weapons, and become part of the nuclear club, we will basically say: That will not create a dangerous situation for your future. This is what the Budapest agreement was about, recently violated by Russia, one of the signatories.

If we want to make the argument in Iran, North Korea, and other countries, that they should forswear their nuclear weapons, shouldn't we also be standing by the premise that if they do, at least civilized nations will stand behind them if they and their sovereignty are threatened? This is what is happening today in Ukraine and Crimea.

It is not just a question of the survival of the Ukrainian Government but also a question as to whether civilized countries around the world trying to lessen the threat of nuclear weapons will stand with one voice and condemn the Russians for what they have done.

It is very clear Putin has ambitions far beyond the Republic of Georgia and far beyond Ukraine. He engaged in this charm offensive at the Sochi Olympics and talked about the modern Russia and what it meant in the 21st century. The very same troops who were protecting the athletes from terrorism in Sochi, as soon as the final ceremony ended, were shifted and transferred into Crimea to invade that nation. The charm offensive was clearly over. NBC may have covered the Sochi Olympics, but it didn't cover the invasion of Crimea in real-time. But it happened, and we know it happened.

Having been to Ukraine with Senator McCAIN and six other colleagues, our bipartisan delegation found a deep attachment in Ukraine to the United States. It is an attachment sometimes linked to specific families. I happen to represent the City of Chicago, where there is a prominent section known as Ukrainian Village. When I returned from Ukraine and went back to this section of Chicago, near the church where the Ukrainians worship on Sunday, we had over 500 people who gathered to hear what I had seen and heard and to talk about where we should go when it came to the future of Ukraine.

But it is worthy to note that there weren't just Ukrainian Americans in that room in Chicago when I returned a week ago. In the front row were Polish people—and we have more Poles in Chicago than almost any other city

outside of the nation of Poland—Lithuanians, Latvians, Georgians, and even Venezuelans. They had all come there to listen carefully, many of them with memories that not that long ago they were under Soviet domination and lived in fear of what would come from Moscow. These same people were standing together. They were standing in league with their Ukrainian-American neighbors, with the understanding that throughout its modern history Russia and the Soviet Union have taken over countries nearby when they could, and many times we didn't speak out.

I have heard the argument made that perhaps, if the United States showed more military force in other places in the world, we might have discouraged Vladimir Putin. That argument doesn't make sense. Look at history. We were in the midst of the Vietnam war and we had committed half a million troops. The greatest military in the world was engaged in Southeast Asia when Brezhnev, the head of the Soviet Union, invaded Czechoslovakia. We were engaged in two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, actively showing the power of our military in those countries, under President George W. Bush, when Vladimir Putin invaded the Republic of Georgia.

So I think it is an empty argument to say if we just show our muscles and start a war someplace, the rest of the world will be fearful. I don't think it is a recipe for the future. What the President is trying to do is to establish political and economic sanctions on Russia which will cost their economy and put pressure on them to stop this aggressive conduct. That, to me, is sensible.

Let's take up this measure. If Members have amendments, bring them to the floor. Let's pass it today, not later this week. Let's show that we stand with the Ukrainians and oppose Russian aggression, support sanctions when needed, and prepare to loan to the Ukrainians the money they need to sustain their economy and to build it in the future.

Ukraine is the second largest country in Europe. It is moving toward the West. Let us welcome them. As long as they are going to make certain their future is consistent with our democratic values, I think it is important we not only continue this dialogue but show we can truly be their allies and friends.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and 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. THUNE. 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.

#### HEALTH CARE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to discuss the fourth anniver-

sary of ObamaCare. Four years ago this past Sunday the President signed his health care legislation into law. The measure was jammed through Congress on a party-line vote against the strong objections of Republicans and the American people. Democrats and the President assured everyone this opposition was temporary. When people find out what is in the law, they will like it, Democrats and the President promised.

Four years later, however, that isn't the case. The majority of the American people still disapprove of the law. Why do they still disapprove? Because the President's health care law has failed in every possible way. We have canceled health care plans. We have seen people who have lost their doctors and lost their hospitals. We have seen soaring premiums, higher out-of-pocket costs, lower pay, disastrous Web sites that have left thousands in limbo, confusion in the health insurance market, and widespread damage to the economy.

The President's law has failed so badly that some of the President's strongest supporters are rejecting it. Young people whose support of the President was so successful in his election and reelection are turning their backs on the President's law. Unions which pushed for the law's passage and the President's reelection are now protesting that the law will destroy their health care plans and damage workers' livelihoods. Democrats running for reelection are running from the health care law as fast as they can for fear that association with ObamaCare will doom their chances of reelection. People are finding out what the law truly means for them and they don't like it.

When the President was trying to pass his health care law, he made a few promises. I think a lot of people remember when the President said: If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan. He said: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. The reality of the law has proven to be quite different.

Six million Americans so far have lost their health care plans as a direct result of ObamaCare, and far too many of them found their only alternative was a plan that offered less coverage for more money. Millions of other Americans have lost their doctors and hospitals. ObamaCare placed a number of new taxes and regulations on insurance companies that left them facing huge cost increases. In an effort to manage their costs without raising health care premiums even further, many companies have narrowed their network of doctors and hospitals, especially in exchange plans. As a result, many Americans have lost doctors they have been seeing literally for years. Cancer patients in the middle of treatment have found their doctors are not covered by the new health care plans. Patients are also discovering their hospital options are now far more limited, as many plans exclude top hospitals.

A recent article in the Associated Press reported:

Some of America's best cancer hospitals are off-limits to many of the people now signing up for coverage under the Nation's new health care program.

Practically speaking, the AP reports:

Those patients may not be able to get the most advanced treatment including clinical trials of new medications.

In a particularly cruel twist, many of the patients who lost access to doctors and hospitals didn't know they would lose access when they signed up for their plans as provider information on the health care exchange Web sites is often, to quote a Business Week article, "missing, wrong, or difficult to navigate."

In addition to promising that patients would be able to keep their health care plans and their doctors, the President promised his health care law would reduce health care costs, but in fact health care costs have only risen since the Affordable Care Act passed. Families and individuals who were effectively dumped into the exchanges have frequently found that their only health care options cost far more than their previous health care plans and offer far less.

Family shopping for so-called silver plans now can face deductibles up to \$12,700, a staggering amount of money that very few families are able to afford. For many families that number represents a full quarter of their income before taxes.

Last week news emerged that already-high premiums on the exchanges are set to increase substantially next year. This was the headline in *The Hill* newspaper: O-Care premiums about to skyrocket. The *Fiscal Times* reported that Americans should "expect premium prices to soar." In fact, *The Hill* reported that "health industry officials say that ObamaCare-related premiums will double in some parts of the country." The *Wall Street Journal* reports that "one recent analysis finds that 80% of firms offering employee coverage have raised deductibles or other cost-sharing provisions, or are considering doing so . . . to avoid a new tax that's set to hit more lavish plans in 2018 and to counter health-cost increases. Thus, employee out-of-pocket costs could rise." Perhaps a more accurate name for the law would have been the "Unaffordable Care Act."

The havoc ObamaCare has wreaked on our health care system would be ample reason to dislike the law. ObamaCare's damage isn't limited to our health care system; it is also damaging our economy.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office reports that ObamaCare will result in 2½ million fewer full-time workers over the next 10 years and reduce wages by more than \$1 trillion. Those are real-world economic impacts.

Household income has already dropped by almost \$3,700 over the course of the Obama Presidency, and

American families are already struggling. Unemployment is high and economic growth is sluggish. The last thing we need is fewer workers and lower wages.

On top of that, ObamaCare is discouraging employers from hiring and reducing employees' hours, thanks to the slew of new taxes, mandates, and regulations ObamaCare levies on businesses large and small. Chief among these, of course, is the requirement that businesses with 50 or more employees provide health insurance to all of their full-time employees, which the law defines as those working 30 hours or more. If they don't do that, they pay fines. Faced with this mandate, State and local governments, nonprofits, and businesses with small profit margins have been forced to cut employees' hours to avoid health care bills or fines they can't afford to pay. Other businesses have been forced to keep their businesses under 50 workers instead of creating new jobs and hiring new people.

Larger businesses are also deciding not to hire or even letting workers go as a result of the costly taxes and regulations the health care law imposes. According to a recent study, ObamaCare's tax on lifesaving medical devices, such as pacemakers and insulin pumps, has already affected more than 30,000 jobs in the medical device industry.

I don't care what party you are from, you cannot think this law is working. Our health care system may have needed reform, but this was not the way to do it. Instead of improving our health care system, ObamaCare is making it far worse. It is time to repeal this law and pursue real solutions to our health care challenges.

Instead of the failing government health care exchanges, we could create affordable health care plans by allowing the purchase of insurance across State lines. This would allow for interstate competition when it comes to the purchase and sale of insurance. That would increase competition among health plans, which in turn would drive prices down, not up, as is happening now.

We could allow businesses to pool together to negotiate lower rates with health insurance companies.

We could improve high-risk pools to help people with preexisting conditions and expand health savings accounts to allow families to put away money tax free to pay for future health care-related expenses.

We could end the rampant lawsuit abuse that is driving up the cost of care for all Americans.

We do need real reform of our health care system—the kind of reform that will actually drive down costs and expand access to care while allowing Americans, not the government, to make decisions about the health care plans they choose and the doctors they visit. ObamaCare is doing the opposite.

ObamaCare isn't working. We need to repeal it now and replace it with real

health care reforms so that Americans don't have to endure another 4 years like the last 4.

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.

## RUSSIA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, sometimes it takes a sudden, flagrant breach of international order to dispel a President's naivete about an adversary. The 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan had that effect on President Carter, and one can only hope that Russia's annexation of Crimea will have a similar impact on President Obama.

Only recently the President was describing his Russian reset—those were his words—as a success. In other words, he was still calling the reset a success after Moscow had done the following things—and I think it is worth recalling the litany of things Vladimir Putin and Russia have done notwithstanding President Obama's hopeful intention to reset that relationship. Here is what Moscow has done:

They brutalized domestic human rights activists.

They tortured and murdered anticorruption whistleblower Sergei Magnitsky.

They unleashed a barrage of anti-American propaganda.

They threatened to target U.S. missile defense sites with offensive weapons.

They vetoed numerous United Nations resolutions regarding Syria, where Bashar al-Assad has now killed roughly 150,000 civilians. They vetoed those resolutions. They also ignored U.S. demands to stop aiding Bashar al-Assad, period. It is well known and documented that Russia regularly sends weapons to Assad to use on his own people.

Russia has denounced U.S. sanctions against Iran as undisguised blackmail. This is a country seeking a nuclear weapon that would destabilize the entire region—and perhaps worse—in the Middle East.

Russia has expelled USAID from their country and pulled out of the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program designed to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons.

Russia has also banned American citizens from adopting Russian children and offered asylum to NSA leaker Edward Snowden.

That is quite a list. As you can see, while President Obama said he wants to reset that relationship with Russia, Vladimir Putin has basically thumbed