

from OASI to DI, sometimes the other way around, sometimes with overall payroll tax rate changes and sometimes not. But there has never—let me repeat that: never—been a stand-alone reallocation from the retirement to the disability trust fund.

Most people who would dispute this talk about the reallocation of 1994, which I mentioned earlier, but if the 1994 reallocation is somehow to be considered a model of ordinary housekeeping that we should repeat today, I think it is a bad model for the reasons I just identified. Following that model, we would defer action until later, all the while claiming that real changes were on the horizon. And following that model, we would continue to do nothing to place Social Security on a more stable financial footing.

Moreover, thinking of reallocation as just a normal way of doing business raises many questions: Why was a separate DI trust fund set up to begin with? Why do we even call them trust funds if they are merely fungible accounting devices? Why not merge the OASI and DI funds and call them the singular Social Security trust fund? More generally, given the recent stimulus-inspired mingling of General Fund revenues with the OASI and DI trust funds, why have Social Security trust funds at all? And if historical reallocations are to be used to guide what we should do today, then perhaps the recent reallocations from the General Fund to both the OASI and DI trust funds, having been the most recent historical reallocation episodes, should be the most prominent precedents.

When circumstances make us focus on the solvency of any trust fund, there are two options. Option one: We can face up to the known financial challenges, examine what can be done about them in a bipartisan way, and try to enact solutions. Option two: We can kick the proverbial can further down the road by taking the most expedient route to reshuffle resources temporarily in order to get the problem out of the way in the short term.

Unfortunately, the President and his allies here in Congress seem to prefer the latter—to kick the can down the road, the kick-the-can strategy. This is especially disappointing given what the President said about Social Security when he took office in 2009. At that time, the President said about Social Security:

What we have done is kicked this can down the road. We are now at the end of the road and are not in a position to kick it any further. We have to signal seriousness in this by making sure some of the hard decisions are made under my watch, not someone else's.

Well, the President has been on his watch for 6 years now, and if we look at his administration's proposed solution to the coming DI trust fund exhaustion, he seems more than content to push any hard decisions off until his term is over. President Obama now not only wants to kick the can down the road, but he also wants to do it in a way that has never been done before.

Elementary budget arithmetic makes clear that you simply cannot strengthen the financial outlooks for our two Social Security programs and their trust funds simply by shifting resources from one to the other. Indeed, Director Elmendorf of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office recently said: “If you want to help both programs you’re not going to accomplish that by just moving money around between them.”

Rather than engaging in yet another unnecessary partisan battle, we need to take this opportunity to work together to see what can be done in a bipartisan way to address the impending exhaustion of reserves in the DI trust fund. Once again, I urge the administration and my friends on the other side of the aisle to work with me on this issue.

Mr. President, I will have more to say on this issue in coming days. For now, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

REMEMBERING KAYLA MUELLER

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to express sorrow—both mine and that of the people of Arizona—at the news that one of our own, Kayla Mueller of Prescott, has died at the hands of ISIL.

Kayla's entire adult life—cut short at the tender age of 26—had been dedicated to the service of others and the ending of suffering.

When she was taken hostage in 2013, Kayla was leaving a Doctors Without Borders hospital in Syria. She had been in the region working with Syrian refugees.

Kayla once said that what inspired her work was that she found “God in the suffering eyes reflected in mine. If this is how you are revealed to me, this is how I will forever seek you.”

Regardless of the exact circumstances surrounding Kayla's death, the fact remains that had ISIL militants not kidnapped this young woman, she would still be with us today. Her death can and should be laid squarely at their feet. It is yet another example of this group's mindless, alarming savagery.

The best action Congress can now take is to authorize a mission against ISIL and to let our allies and our adversaries know we mean business and that we are united in our resolve.

We should remember Kayla not for her death but for her life and for her devotion to the highest calling: dedication to the service of others.

Our deepest, heartfelt condolences go out to Kayla's family and her loved ones in Prescott and elsewhere around the State and the country.

BARRY GOLDWATER STATUE DEDICATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise to speak about an Arizona original—former Senator and Presidential candidate Barry Goldwater.

Senator Goldwater was no stranger to this Senate floor, having served five terms in this body and having been his party's Presidential nominee in 1964. By the end of his time here, Goldwater was an elder statesman and the go-to guy on national security, having chaired the Committee on Armed Services and the Select Committee on Intelligence and having reorganized the Pentagon structure with the Goldwater-Nichols Act. He was also respected for his unapologetic fiscal conservatism. Goldwater was probably best known for his staunch defense of personal liberty and for reviving and redefining what it means to be conservative.

While he may have lost the election in 1964 to Lyndon Johnson, he laid the groundwork for the Republican Party's future and the eventual resurgence under Ronald Reagan.

As columnist George Will once noted, it took 16 years to count the votes from 1964, and Goldwater won.

For many of us, he was a role model. Before I came to Congress, I was honored to serve as the executive director of the Goldwater Institute, an Arizona organization that bears his name and his philosophy.

Born before Arizona was even a State, Goldwater, as did so many great men, honed his passionate interests in the nonpolitical world around him. He was an avid, published photographer. In fact, Goldwater's estate contained some 15,000 photographs, many of them of Arizona landscapes and the people he loved so much.

He also occasionally took his camera to social events, once even snapping President Kennedy at the White House. Kennedy inscribed the photo, “For Barry Goldwater, whom I urge to follow the career for which he has shown such talent—photography.”

In addition to being a conservative warrior, Goldwater was an actual warrior, having flown supply missions over “the hump” in World War II and retiring as a major general in the U.S. Air Force Reserve. He believed in peace through strength.

Barry Goldwater was plainspoken. He was stubborn. He was patriotic. He was independent. In short, Goldwater embodied the very spirit of Arizona.

Tomorrow—at long last—Barry Goldwater will be honored with a statue in the Capitol, representing his beloved Arizona. Goldwater may have once described himself as “the most underdog underdog there is,” but I can't think of a more deserving recipient nor of a more fitting representative of our State.

Well done, Barry Goldwater.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UKRAINE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is ironic that the Senator from Ohio is presiding because I am going to speak about the situation in Ukraine.

For the record, the Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN, the current Presiding Officer, and I have now initiated a bipartisan caucus in the Senate concerned with the future of Ukraine, and my remarks will address that during the next minute or two.

We are approaching the 1-year anniversary of a dark chapter in modern history, the forcible Russian seizure of sovereign territory in Ukraine. Perhaps the world shouldn't have been surprised by Russian President Putin's brazen attack on well-established international norms. We have seen this movie before when it comes to Mr. Putin, in Georgia in 2008, using military force to seize the territories of South Ossetia and Abkhazia.

What we are facing in Ukraine is a threat to the foundation of European security agreements and norms of the last several decades. We are facing the use of military force by Putin to undermine a democratic sovereign nation's aspirations to join the international democratic community. These ugly threats and actions by Putin must not go unchallenged.

That is why this week I wrote a bipartisan letter, along with the Presiding Officer, Senator PORTMAN, as well as Senators BROWN, BARRASSO, BLUMENTHAL, and others to President Obama urging the United States and NATO to work together to ensure Ukraine has the defensive capabilities and equipment to halt and reverse further Russian aggression.

Thousands have been killed, thousands more displaced. A civilian airliner was shot down, murdering hundreds of innocent people, and nationalistic fervor and Soviet-style propaganda have been used to further rob the Russian and Ukrainian people of their own political freedoms.

Let's recall how we got to this awful situation. In March of last year, Russian President Putin used manipulation and military might to annex the sovereign region of Crimea—not because Ukraine was about to join NATO, not because Ukraine was about to join the European Union, not because Ukraine was about to cut economic or historical ties to Russia, even if it did sign an association agreement with the European Union, and not because Russian-speaking Ukrainians were in any danger.

No, Putin took this brazen and destabilizing action because he needed to rally nationalist sentiment in his own country for his own political survival—to protect his own kleptocracy. He did so because he needed a war to distract Russians from the frustrations they had over a weak national economy, do-

mestic political repression, the elimination of Russia's free press and civic organizations, and increasing Russian exasperation with the heavyhanded rule of Mr. Putin.

He did so because his ally and former Ukrainian President Yanukovych was democratically removed from office by a unanimous vote of the Ukrainian Parliament after he squandered negotiations for closer trade ties with the European Union and then presided over the murder of more than 100 of his own citizens. Apparently Putin did so because he felt aggrieved by the West.

Instead of inspiring his own people to share the many talents and accomplishments of the Russian nation as part of the larger global community, Putin has spread a message of victimhood and the West is really still the enemy.

What a waste. What an insult to the proud and talented Russian people. Putin's tactics are from the old Soviet playbook, tired and dated tactics of propaganda, military power, and domestic repression.

The resulting destruction and human misery in Ukraine has been significant and has been increasing by the day. Thirteen innocent Ukrainian citizens, including pensioners and little children, were killed in a horrific bus attack last month in Volnovakha.

The city of Mariupol recently came under shelling, killing 30 and injuring another 100 civilians—part of a likely attempt to militarily seize another strategic coastal area.

Ukrainian Government forces and civilians have come under mounting fire in the strategic city of Debaltseve, where residents are fleeing by the busload. Russian heavy weapons and military personnel continue to brazenly flow into eastern Ukraine, despite Putin's refusal to acknowledge the obvious. Nearly 750,000 Ukrainian citizens are now living as displaced persons within their own country because of this offensive action by the Russians.

The World Health Organization estimates that 5 million Ukrainians living in areas where the fighting is fiercest are in dire need of basic health care services. People trapped in the cities of Luhansk and Donetsk are essentially without any medical assistance. The Ukrainian officials say January was one of the bloodiest months in eastern Ukraine since the conflict started. All the while, Russia and its proxies in eastern Ukraine continue to balk at peace talks and even deny their military actions.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States and Europe have worked to strengthen ties with Russia, to help it become a partner in the global community. Of course, our interests didn't always overlap, and there were disagreements. That is the nature of any international relationship. But to whip up anti-Western propaganda on state-controlled media and insult Russian people—they deserve more.

The West didn't lock up Western opposition leaders whose only so-called crime was to disagree with Putin. The West didn't shut down all the independent media in Russia to deny the Russian people a free flow of ideas. The West didn't shut down Russian groups whose sole purpose was to ensure fair elections. The West didn't conduct a Russian Presidential election in 2012 that was loaded with fraud and irregularity. The West didn't create a system of corruption around Putin that enriches a lucky few oligarchs and tarnishes Russia's economy and international reputation. The West certainly didn't focus on creating false enemies, both domestic and international, to distract from the real work of diversifying Russia's economy.

Let me be clear. The West did not cause the protests in Ukraine, in the Kiev, Maidan Square. The protesters were Ukrainians fed up with endless corruption and political malfeasance. I met with several of those leaders in Ukraine, and I can assure everyone they were Ukrainian patriots, not Western proxies.

While I have been giving the speech, my friend and colleague Senator McCAIN has come to the floor, with whom I visited Ukraine several months ago. He was there during the Maidan demonstrations and has firsthand knowledge of how this was a home-grown effort to bring real change to Ukraine. I am glad to see him on the floor at this moment.

New York Times columnist and Pulitzer Prize winner Tom Friedman called what is happening in Ukraine under Putin "the ugliest geopolitical mugging happening in the world today."

Perhaps you have seen the recent excellent episode of the PBS "Frontline" documentary entitled "Putin's Way." It meticulously laid out the web of corruption and destruction around Putin's rise to power. It showed how each contrived crisis at home has been used to consolidate Putin's grip on power, and it left little doubt the lengths Putin will go to to protect the web of corruption that is ensuring his future. What a waste.

I commend the President for working with our European allies to impose severe economic sanctions on Russia for its actions in Ukraine. These sanctions have some impact. In fact, Russia's credit rating is now reduced to junk bond status. But Putin and his proxies have only doubled down, launching new offensives in eastern Ukraine, leading to more death and human misery.

I have concluded, and I believe the Senator reached a similar conclusion because of a letter we cowrote this week, that the United States has to do more to protect the Ukrainian people. I know it is a debating point with some of our European allies as to whether we are escalating the conflict. But to leave Ukraine poorly prepared to defend its own territory—to leave the civilians in Ukraine so open to the aggression of the Russian invaders—is