

Then there are the taxes imposed by the law. Because the administration did its best to hide the true cost of ObamaCare, many Americans don't realize that the law hiked taxes by \$1 trillion. In fact, the law imposed almost a dozen new taxes, including an annual tax on health insurance that is passed on to consumers in the form of higher premiums, a tax increase on flexible spending accounts and health savings accounts, and a tax on wages and self-employment income. President Obama promised not to raise taxes on those making less than \$250,000, but, as we all know, he broke that promise many times over when ObamaCare was signed into law. Many of these taxes directly impact low- and middle-income families.

Additionally, the law's tax on the makers of lifesaving medical devices, such as pacemakers and insulin pumps, which went into effect in 2013, has already eliminated jobs in the medical device industry and driven up the price of essential medical equipment.

The medical device industry is not the only industry in which ObamaCare is costing jobs. ObamaCare's requirement that employers provide their workers with government-approved insurance or pay a tax has made employing full-time workers more costly, which has discouraged employers from hiring. Workers in the retail and restaurant industries, many of them younger, less skilled workers, have been hit particularly hard. In all, the Congressional Budget Office has predicted that ObamaCare will result in the equivalent of 2 million fewer full-time jobs in 2017 and 2.5 million fewer full-time jobs by 2024. That is not good news for our already sluggish economy.

All Americans remember the President's claim that under ObamaCare, "If you like your plan, you can keep it"—a claim that was named, interestingly enough, PolitiFact's "Lie of the Year" in 2013 after ObamaCare eliminated the health care plans of 4 million Americans. Now hundreds of thousands of Americans will be losing their ObamaCare health care plan after a number of the health insurance co-ops established under the law proved unsustainable. In all, 12 of the 23 health care co-ops established by the President's health care law have collapsed, resulting in the loss of billions in taxpayer dollars, in addition to the loss of Americans' health plans. Taxpayers have also lost more than \$1 billion spent on failed or failing State exchanges, such as the failed exchanges in the States of Oregon, Hawaii, Vermont, Maryland, and Massachusetts.

Four years after telling "Meet the Press" that ObamaCare would become "more and more popular," the senior Senator from New York admitted that the Democrats had made a strategic error by focusing on ObamaCare. Americans, he admitted, were "crying out for an end to the recession, for better wages and more jobs; not for changes

in their health care." The senior Senator from New York is right.

Americans didn't want ObamaCare then, and they certainly don't want it now. ObamaCare is broken, and Americans know it. It is time to repeal this law and start moving toward the kind of health care reform Americans are actually looking for: an affordable, accountable, patient-focused system that gives individuals control of their health care decisions.

This week the Senate will take up a repeal bill that will begin the process of lifting the burdens ObamaCare has placed on Americans. I look forward to debating the bill and working with my colleagues to begin building a bridge to a better health care system for hard-working families across the country. It is time to give the American people the real health care reform they deserve.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

AMERICAN SECURITY AGAINST FOREIGN ENEMIES ACT

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the American Security Against Foreign Enemies Act of 2015. This act was passed by the House shortly before we recessed for Thanksgiving—an act dealing with the refugee crisis from Syria and Iraq. It is an act that is sort of pending before the body now as we try to decide whether to take up the House bill or take up the topic of the House bill as part of the deliberations in which we are engaged.

First, I think everyone in this body and everyone in the House acknowledges the security needs of America in this challenging time as we are engaged in a battle against ISIL. As we have seen in recent weeks, the reach of ISIL—whether it is a passenger aircraft in Sinai, a neighborhood in southern Beirut, or multiple neighborhoods in Paris, ISIL's strength is expanding and mutating, and we have to take those concerns seriously.

I applaud the work that has already been done to try to make sure the vetting process for refugees who entered the United States is pretty intense. Four million refugees left Syria during the course of the Syrian civil war. Of those 4 million who have left and registered with the U.N., after a fairly extensive review process, the U.N. has referred 20,000 to the United States for possible consideration to be refugees. Of those 20,000, after an 18-month vetting process, we have allowed approximately 2,000 into the United States. So the vetting process for refugees is pretty intense. If we can make it better, we need to do that, but it is already fairly significant. I also applaud efforts the administration announced yesterday and that other colleagues, including the Presiding Officer, are working on to ensure that the visa waiver program we currently have, which allows citizens from 38 countries to come to the United States without visas, is tight.

We have to do our best in a careful and deliberate way to make sure our security in the midst of this battle against ISIL is strong.

I rise today to speak particularly about this act because I think it is problematic, and I think it is problematic from the very title of the act. I think it raises some questions we have to be very careful about.

Syrian and Iraqi refugees are not foreign enemies. Refugees are not the enemies of the United States. We have an enemy. The enemy is ISIL. We are coming up on the start of a 17-month war against ISIL that Congress has been unwilling to debate, vote on, and declare. ISIL is an enemy, and we would all acknowledge that, but the refugees who are leaving Syria and Iraq are not our enemies. They are victims. They are victims. I think before we go down the path of quickly—and this bill was passed in the House in just a couple of days—painting with a broad brush as our enemies these poor people who have suffered so much, we really need to reflect on what they have been through.

This refugee crisis in Syria has been called by most NGOs and other organizations like the U.N. the greatest humanitarian crisis since World War II.

In a country of between 25 and 30 million people, 4 million have had to flee because of the atrocities of the Assad regime and the atrocities of the civil war carried out by ISIL and other terrorist organizations.

Four million had to leave their homes and 8 million more had to leave their homes and move to other places in their country where they would prefer not to live because their homes are unsafe because of the civil war.

Nearly 300,000 Syrians have been killed in this civil war, and the atrocities are horrible. The Assad regime uses barrel bombs in civilian neighborhoods to kill innocents without any rhyme or reason as to where or when they are going to fall, creating psychological terror as well as physical danger. ISIL in Syria is carrying out beheadings and the forced subjugation of people and selling them into sexual slavery. It is the oppression of religious minorities, virtually any religion other than that of the Sunni extremists who would fit within ISIL's narrow definition of who they think true believers are. This is what people are fleeing from.

This Senator emphasizes this point: Refugees are not our enemies. They are not foreign enemies. They are victims who deserve compassion.

This is a fairly famous photograph from a suburb of Damascus, Yarmouk, that is filled with Palestinian refugees who have been waiting for food. The Assad regime had cordoned them off and would not allow humanitarian aid because they thought there were opponents to the regime in this neighborhood.

This was a photo that was taken in January of 2014 when the U.N. could finally come in to try to deliver humanitarian food aid to these folks. You can see the tens of thousands of people who are waiting in the midst of their bombed-out neighborhood for a delivery of basic food aid, which has been very episodic during the course of this war. This neighborhood has gone back under blockade, and it has been extremely difficult to get them the food they need.

These are not enemies; these are people who are worthy of the compassion of any person and especially of a nation as compassionate as the United States.

More recently, we were all stunned to see this horrible photograph of a 3-year-old Syrian boy who, with his family and a group of 12 Syrians, tried to make it across water to Greece, fleeing atrocities in the battle between Kurds and ISIL in northern Syria. Twelve members of this family in a boat were killed and drowned, including this 3-year-old and his 5-year-old brother. These are not enemies.

To have an act that purports to deal with this refugee crisis and to call this an act that is an act about foreign enemies—they are not enemies. There is no way we should allow the kind of tar brush approach that would paint these poor unfortunates who are victims of the worst humanitarian crisis since World War II as if they are somehow enemies. We should have a compassionate response that protects American security but is nevertheless compassionate.

These photographs really grab me, and the rhetoric surrounding these refugees—that they are enemies—when this act passed really grabbed me. I found myself thinking about it not so much even in just a policy way—what is the right policy, what is the right mixture of things to keep the country safe? That is very important, but these pictures make one think about something more fundamental: Why does this happen?

Since the beginning of time, human beings have asked: Why is there suffering of this kind? Why must hundreds of thousands be huddled into a bombed-out neighborhood and be nearly starved to death to wait for a delivery episodically from the United Nations? Why would a family have to flee from their home, with their children killed, to try to get away from atrocities? If you are a student from California State University, on a semester-abroad program in Paris, sitting in a cafe, why are you gunned down by ISIL terrorists? If you are a tourist coming back from a vacation in the Sinai with your family, why is your plane suddenly bombed out of the sky?

Humans have asked this question since the beginning of time. Why do these things happen? There are two conventional answers to the question of why these things occur, and there is a nonconventional answer that is a challenging one that we as a body and

as a country really have to grapple with. The two conventional answers as to why there is horrible suffering such as this is obviously there is evil in the world and there is evil within. There is evil out in the world and there is evil within and we make mistakes. Clearly there is evil in the world. ISIL is evil. Refugees are not evil.

I think it is interesting that one of the bodies here could come up with a piece of legislation, draft it, debate it, and vote on it in a couple of days to label refugees as “foreign enemies” when we have been at war for 17 months against ISIL and we haven’t been able to have a debate in this body to authorize military force and declare that they are an enemy. There is evil in the world, and part of what we must do is call it out and be willing to stand against it.

The great Irish poet Yeats talked about a situation where the best lack all conviction and the worst are filled with passionate intensity. I worry that this legislative body has not shown the conviction to call out evil in the way that we should call it out, and mistakenly we are calling people evil who aren’t evil but who are deserving of compassionate help from us and from other nations. That is the first explanation of why evil occurs. There is evil out in the world, and ISIL is evil, the atrocities of Assad are evil, and we ought to call it out.

The second explanation is our own weakness. When bad things happen, whether to yourself or to your country, you have to look in the mirror and ask: Did we do anything wrong? And I have a concern that when the chapter on the Syrian refugee crisis is written, neither the United States nor other nations are going to look that good. It is going to be like looking into the 1990s and looking at why the United States was able to intervene and stop atrocities in the Balkans and chose not to in Rwanda. The answer to why we did in one instance and not the other—I don’t think that looks good in retrospect. I worry with respect to this refugee crisis, the 4 to 8 million killed, these children and their families—we have to look in the mirror and ask ourselves whether we have done enough or whether we can do more.

Last, there is a nonconventional explanation of why suffering like this occurs that is a challenging one. It is in the Book of Job. There is a Bible on the Presiding Officer’s desk. It is there because it is a book of wisdom. I know you know the story. It is an interesting story, as we grapple with suffering like this and we have to ask why it occurs. Job was an upright and righteous man. He was a blameless person, a person of integrity.

The story was written in about 500 BC and posits this debate between God and Satan. God is talking about how great Job is. Satan says that he is great because he is wealthy and has a great family, and if he lost that, he would cease being so faithful.

God says: I think he would be faithful anyway.

Satan says: Let’s have a wager and see what happens.

That is how the Book of Job begins. This upright and blameless man who has everything proceeds to very quickly lose everything. He loses his wealth, he loses his family, he loses his health—not because of his own sin, his own weakness, or his own error, his own mistakes, and not because of evil in the world; he suffers because he is being tested. That is the reason he suffers.

As the story goes on, he is tested. He is tested. He argues with God, he fights with God, he fights with the faith, but he doesn’t let go of his faith. At the end of the story, this Book of Job—and this is a book which is not only in the Old Testament and studied by Jews and Christians alike, this is in the Koran. This is a story which all the Abrahamic faith traditions have grabbed on to because it has a fundamental piece of wisdom to it.

Sometimes when suffering such as this occurs, it is not just because there is evil in the world or because of our own sin, it is because bad things happen to test us as individuals. Bad things happen and sometimes test us as a country.

I look at this refugee crisis as a test. It is a test on whether we, like Job, will be true to our principles or whether we will abandon them. Job was true to his principles, and things came back to him multiplied. Are we going to be true to our principles?

My State of Virginia began when the English who were starving were helped out by Indians down near Jamestown Island. There was the extension of a hand to strangers in a strange land that enabled them to survive, unlike earlier parties who had been wiped out by starvation or battles with Indians.

My people came from Ireland in the 1840s. They were chased out by oppression. They were chased out by hunger. My people have the same story that virtually everybody who came to the United States has. Some came under much worse conditions, brought over in slavery and servitude.

The nation of France recognized the United States for what it was—a beacon of liberty for people from around the world—when France gave to the United States the Statue of Liberty, which we planted in New York Harbor right next to Ellis Island, where so many people came into this country. Nobody who came here had it easy. People faced signs that said “No Irish need apply” or they faced discrimination or oppression, but they didn’t face a door being shut in their face and being told they were foreign enemies when they were really refugees looking for a better situation in life.

As I think about what we are grappling with and what we may be called to vote on in the next 10 days in this body, I think about this massive scale of human suffering that is going on

with respect to Syria, and I think about that wisdom from the Book of Job, which is that sometimes suffering and adversity is to test us. Are we going to abandon our principles? Are we not going to be the Statue of Liberty nation? Are we not going to be the nation that will extend a hand of welcome or friendship for those who suffer? Are we going to be true to our principles?

Again and again in our Nation's history and in the history of nations, it has been shown that if you are true to your principles—especially true to them during times of adversity—then you are worthy of respect. You teach important lessons to your kids and to the generations that follow, and usually things work out. I think our Nation's principles are solid. They are rock solid. In the heat of the moment, we shouldn't abandon them, and we shouldn't abandon people who have suffered and are suffering with the kind of hot legislative language that would label them as "foreign enemies" when they are just refugees in the same way that people throughout history have been refugees needing a compassionate response from others.

Thank you, Mr. President.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to complete my remarks.

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

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last week families across the Nation gathered in gratitude to celebrate Thanksgiving—the holiday we commemorate in remembrance of our Pilgrim ancestors. With humble appreciation, we venerate the sacrifice of America's early settlers. We remember their fortitude in leaving family and home to colonize a new wilderness. Facing disease, starvation, and even death, these brave men and women endured tremendous hardships to secure the blessings of religious liberty.

Freedom of religion—so precious and so prized by our Pilgrim forebears—is the legacy we enjoy as a result of their sacrifice. Today, I wish to honor the Pilgrims' legacy by speaking once again on the topic of religious liberty. Over the past several weeks, I have addressed this subject at length. In so doing, I have explained the critical importance of religious freedom and its centrality to our Nation's founding. I have also debunked the erroneous notion that religious liberty is primarily a private matter that has little place in the public domain. More recently, I have detailed the many ways freedom of conscience is under attack—both at home and abroad.

You might wonder why I devote so much time and attention to this vital subject. After all, this is the seventh in

a series of speeches I have given on the topic of religious liberty. When there are myriad other issues facing our country, why do I feel so compelled to speak out about religious freedom? Because, Mr. President, no other freedom is so essential to human flourishing and to the future of our Nation. Indeed, religion is not only beneficial to society but also indispensable to democracy.

I begin by discussing the most tangible benefits religion brings to society. History provides many examples. Indeed, many of our Nation's most significant moral and political achievements are grounded in religious teachings and influences.

First, consider the role of religion in the formation of our most basic rights. America's Framers were well versed in both religion and philosophy, and in drafting our Founding documents, they drew inspiration from both sources.

Take for example, the unalienable rights identified in the Declaration of Independence: life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. These rights are a synthesis of both religious and philosophical teachings. The rights themselves stem from the theories of the philosopher John Locke, but the concept of inalienability—the idea that these rights are inviolable because they are "endowed [to men] by their Creator"—is religious in nature.

By invoking the divine and linking our rights to a moral authority that lies above and beyond the state, America's Founders insulated our freedoms from government abuse. Philosophy helped articulate our fundamental rights, but religion made them unsailable. Thanks to the moral grounding provided by religion, we exercise these rights free of state control.

In addition to undergirding the establishment of our God-given rights, religion directly benefitted American society by catalyzing the two greatest social movements in our Nation's history: abolition and civil rights.

Abolition traces its roots to the Second Great Awakening, when preachers such as Charles Grandison Finney and Lyman Beecher rose to prominence with their revivalist teachings on social justice and equality. Many of the earliest pro-abolition organizations coalesced around Christian evangelical communities in the North. Emancipation was a religious cause first and a political movement second.

Most abolitionists were deeply religious themselves, including two of the movement's most vocal leaders, William Lloyd Garrison and John Greenleaf Whittier. The Christian doctrine of moral equality was especially crucial in generating the grassroots support that eventually made emancipation possible.

Religion was equally influential in guiding the civil rights movement. We speak today of Dr. Martin Luther King, but we sometimes forget that before he was a doctor he was a reverend. In 1967, the year before his death, Reverend King proclaimed:

Before I was a civil rights leader, I was a preacher of the Gospel. This was my first calling and it still remains my greatest commitment. . . . [A]ll that I do in civil rights I do because I consider it a part of my ministry.

Reverend King recruited other religious leaders to his cause when he convened a meeting of more than 60 black ministers in what would eventually become the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. This coalition of evangelical leaders was instrumental in organizing both the Birmingham campaign and the March on Washington. For these ministers and many other men and women who participated in the civil rights movement, religion provided the initial impetus for their advocacy.

Today, religion continues to benefit society by contributing to our Nation's robust philanthropic sector. The importance of charity and helping the poor is nearly universal across all faiths. Every year, religious organizations throughout the United States feed the hungry, clothe the naked, give shelter to the homeless, and care for the sick and afflicted.

Without these religious groups, our government welfare system would be overwhelmed.

Charitable organizations are irreplaceable because they often step in where the state cannot. Consider some of the largest, most well-respected religious charities in operation today, such as the Salvation Army, Catholic Charities, World Vision, or LDS Humanitarian Services. These organizations are motivated by more than a mere humanitarian impulse; they are driven by a sense of duty both to God and to man. Every year, they lift millions from despair, offering not only material assistance but also spiritual direction to help individuals lead more prosperous lives. This is a critical service that no government program could ever provide.

It is clear that religion has benefitted our society in several meaningful ways. First, as a result of religious teachings, we have unfettered claim to the natural rights delineated in our Nation's founding documents. Second, thanks to religious leaders from John Rankin to Martin Luther King, we freely exercise civil rights today that were once denied millions of Americans. Third, by virtue of religious teaching on charity, we have a humanitarian sector that is unparalleled in its ability to respond to crisis, bless the poor, and lift the needy.

But my purpose in speaking today is not merely to recite a list of blessings brought about by religious liberty. Religion is not simply beneficial to society; it is an indispensable feature of any free government. Without religion, liberty itself would be in danger and democracy would devolve into despotism.

The nexus between religion and democracy involves the relationship between morality and freedom. Freedom