

across the country of all political persuasions stood up to fight. This week, the fight goes on. Once again, far too many people are in the crosshairs. I believe strongly that so long as we continue to stand together, we can win this one too. A huge tax cut for the wealthy cannot be funded by increasing the cost of groceries.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF JUDGE NEIL GORSUCH

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, earlier today in the Senate Judiciary Committee, we considered the nomination of Judge Neil Gorsuch to serve as the next Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court. According to Judiciary Committee practice, that nomination was held over for a week, which means that Judge Gorsuch will be voted out of the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 3, and it will be available for floor action thereafter.

As the Nation—and perhaps even the world—knows, we held lengthy hearings last week to review his qualifications, his experience, and his approach to judging. I have to say that he really impressed everybody who approached this whole issue with an open mind about whether he was qualified to serve on the High Court. But unfortunately, as those of us who work in the Senate know, there has already been a threat by the Democratic leader to filibuster his nomination.

It is really important for the country to recall that there has never been a successful partisan filibuster of a nominee to the U.S. Supreme Court. Sometimes people want to talk about Abe Fortas in 1968, but ultimately Abe Fortas, who was nominated to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court by his friend and mentor, Lyndon Johnson, asked to withdraw his nomination after one failed cloture vote and ultimately ended up resigning from the Supreme Court of the United States in disgrace. It is hardly a precedent for what Democrats have said they are going to do with regard to this good man and this good judge, Neil Gorsuch.

I understand my friend the Democratic leader has a tough job. He has a split caucus—those who want to take Democrats over the ledge and those who would like to try to find some way to work out a reasonable accommodation. Unfortunately, he is under a lot of pressure from the radical groups on the left to do whatever he can to tank this superb nominee. Again, this would be unprecedented in American history.

It is true that Democrats in 2013 did the so-called nuclear option, which has established a new precedent in the Sen-

ate with regard to lower court judges—circuit court judges and district court judges—along with Cabinet nominees. Ironically, the so-called Reid precedent of 2013 has kind of come back to bite them a little bit, as President Trump now has been able to see all of his Cabinet members confirmed with 51 votes, or, in the case of one, 50 plus the Vice President.

I was glad to see a quote from a report in a Vermont publication from our friend the senior Senator from Vermont, the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, in which he said he wasn't inclined to filibuster the nomination of Judge Gorsuch and that he deserves a minimum of an up-or-down vote. So I hope others will follow the lead of Senator LEAHY, who has been in the Senate a long time in the majority and in the minority. He realizes it is important to maintain a certain level of tradition and decorum here in the Senate, because usually what goes around comes around. Unfortunately, this new precedent of filibustering Supreme Court Justices, if allowed to happen, is going to continue to be very damaging to the Senate and even to the country.

I hope he is still of that same mind—that he is not inclined to filibuster the nomination of Judge Gorsuch. If he takes that position, I know he will influence a lot of colleagues on the other side of the aisle because of his distinguished record of service in the Senate and in the Judiciary Committee.

I look forward to the committee approving Judge Gorsuch's nomination next week and then taking that nomination up on the Senate floor and confirming the nomination of Neil Gorsuch to serve as the next Associate Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court.

OBAMACARE

Mr. President, last week, a lot of attention was focused on the House of Representatives and their efforts to fix our Nation's healthcare system.

We have said for a long time that ObamaCare needs to be repealed and replaced. I stand by that comment, and I know many of our colleagues do as well. But I want to make something else clear. The failure of ObamaCare isn't a problem for Democrats or Republicans alone. It is a problem for the entire country, and particularly those who find their premiums going up by double digits every year, their deductibles unaffordable, or even choices drying up because insurance companies simply have withdrawn from the individual market. Our colleagues on the Democratic side have repeatedly recognized the problems with ObamaCare, even though they pushed it through on a partisan vote 7 years ago.

The fact of the matter is that the President promised: If you like your healthcare policy, you can keep it; if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor; and, premiums for a family of four will go down by an average of \$2,500. None of that has proven to be

true. People were misled into believing that ObamaCare would somehow be the gold standard for healthcare in the country, and people are being hurt now by high premiums, high deductibles, and fewer choices. Indeed, 30 million people remain uninsured in this country because of the cost or the fact that they just decide that they don't want to buy government-mandated healthcare. They either pay a penalty through the IRS or they simply get a hardship exemption. There are 30 million people currently uninsured, more or less, under ObamaCare.

I want to remind our colleagues on the other side that they understand ObamaCare needs some work, and many of them have made repeated calls to fix it. Last year, for example, the junior Senator from Wisconsin said of ObamaCare:

There were things obviously that need perfecting, need revisiting. Even if it were perfect, over time we would have to make adaptations, and so I think we would absolutely want to strengthen it.

Not even our colleague, the junior Senator from Wisconsin, is saying ObamaCare is delivering 100 percent on the promise. She is saying it needs some work.

The senior Senator from Indiana has echoed this sentiment. He said:

I supported the Affordable Care Act because I wanted to help working- and middle-class families to have access to healthcare. That doesn't mean the law is perfect, and it doesn't mean that we don't still have work to do. That's why I'm working with my colleagues to make this bill stronger.

We haven't seen any proposals from our friends across the aisle on how to fix the law, which they concede is far from perfect. Instead, what we have seen is their standing back, watching Republicans trying to do this by ourselves and coming up short last week in the House of Representatives. To my mind, that is not commendable behavior on their part. I thought we all came here to the U.S. Senate to try to do things and fix problems for the constituents we represent. It is purely partisan to say: We know ObamaCare is falling apart, and it is not delivering as we promised. And, oh yes, you Republicans can try to fix it, but if you don't have the votes to do it, we are just going to sit back and applaud or react with glee from a partisan perspective because our political opponents somehow came up short when it came to the votes in the House.

The truth is, ObamaCare didn't bring massive relief for working- and middle-class Americans. For many, it made life more difficult with skyrocketing premiums, losing their plans and the doctors they wanted, and having fewer options to choose from.

I will quote one of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the junior Senator from North Dakota. Her website says: "With any major legislation, there are improvements that need to be made so that it works as well as possible, and that holds true for the

healthcare reform law," speaking of ObamaCare.

She goes on to say that she is committed to "correcting the parts of the healthcare reform law that do not make sense, improve on others, and implement new ideas to improve on healthcare costs and improve quality."

I am grateful to our colleague from North Dakota for her honesty and open take on where things stand with respect to ObamaCare, but that is just a start. What we need to do now is work together to try to address the failings of ObamaCare where it is not delivering as promised and where even our colleagues across the aisle have said that it needs to be fixed in order to make sure that people have access to affordable, accessible quality healthcare. They don't have that now.

My point is that ObamaCare was a bill sold to the American people under false pretenses by the previous administration, and it has proved to be a disaster for many people. I was reading an article—I think it was either in the Washington Post or the New York Times today—about a woman in Texas who runs a hair care salon and who has intentionally kept her number of employees under the threshold under which ObamaCare's employer mandate would be invoked. So rather than spending time focusing on growing her business and improving her business, she has consciously kept it smaller, with fewer employees, because she knows that the burden of complying with the ObamaCare employer mandate will ultimately make her business less profitable. And when her business is less profitable, it means she can hire fewer people and perhaps can't pay the wages or the benefits she would like to pay her employees.

So I would just say to our colleagues across the aisle that I understand you think you had a pretty good day last week when the Republicans couldn't pass the healthcare plan on their own in the House, but I don't think this is a time for people to enjoy other people's failed efforts to try to improve the status quo. It is a mandate, I believe, for all of us to work together to address the flaws that we know exist—that they admitted exist—to try to do better when it comes to affordable, accessible healthcare for the American people.

This law will fail. Insurance companies will withdraw from the market, and the individual market serving roughly 18 million people will literally dry up and go away. Imagine how those families are going to be impacted.

I wouldn't want to be somebody who said: Well, I had an opportunity to fix it; yes, I had an opportunity to address your concerns when it came to affordable healthcare, but for partisan political reasons, I simply stood down and did nothing and literally washed my hands of it.

So before this law collapses—and it will—I hope our colleagues across the aisle will start offering their ideas and

their solutions to bring better healthcare to families across the country. That is what I think our constituents expect of us. That is in the finest tradition of the U.S. Senate, and our constituents deserve no less.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I am pleased that in the Senate we are about to take a vote on ratifying the protocol of the accession of Montenegro to NATO.

What I wanted to do was to take a few moments to explain to people why I think this is an important vote and an important moment for our security as a nation but also to protect our interests abroad and that of our allies.

We all know that NATO—the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—was started right after World War II. It was primarily designed in the Cold War to confront the threats posed by the Soviet Union and its allies in the Warsaw Pact. Of course those threats have changed since the end of that Cold War.

Here is what hasn't changed. What hasn't changed is the need for America and her allies in a strong way to remain engaged in the world. That need has not changed. What has not changed is the need for democracies to be able to come together and collectively defend not just their interests but the interests of all people around the world where freedom is threatened. The difficult, painful lesson of history is that dictators and tyrants are never pleased with what they have. They always want more. They always need more. That is why it is so important that those nations on Earth—luckily and in a blessed way, more people than ever before find themselves living in societies where the people get to choose their leaders.

These alliances we have around the world—NATO being chief among them—help advance our strategic and economic interests, but most importantly, they help to keep our country safe.

There is a lot of talk about how much countries are paying into NATO, and it is true that the United States is by far the largest contributor to NATO. I think that is a combination of two things: one, decisions that were made by some of our allies in Europe on how they want to spend their government's money, and the other is just the reality that we are the United States of America, and as the United States of America, we will always find that we are always making a disproportionate share and contribution on everything, from global aid to fight off hunger and disease, to collective security.

While we can urge our allies, encourage our allies, and ask our allies to make a greater contribution to their own defense, we should not fall into the trap of diminishing what they are doing and what they have done.

First of all, in Europe today, many of our NATO allies are increasing their defense spending. They are doing so in response to Russia's aggression in Ukraine and its increased aggression elsewhere in the region. Their soldiers are joining ours in deploying to Central and Eastern Europe to reassure our allies who are facing aggression and potential aggression from Vladimir Putin.

With all this talk about NATO and money and how much everyone is giving, I think it is important to take a moment to also understand that our NATO allies have fought beside us and have died beside Americans in Afghanistan, where more than 1,100 soldiers of the NATO-led coalition paid the ultimate price with their lives. It is important to note this because on September 11, 2001, Paris was not attacked, Berlin was not attacked, and London was not attacked on that horrible day; yet these nations and others, our partners, invoked a shared commitment that led them to stand beside us on the other side of the world in an effort to prevent another attack like September 11 from taking place again on American soil or anywhere in the world.

Montenegro is not even a member of NATO yet. Yet it sent hundreds of servicemembers to join the American-led coalition in Afghanistan.

I have always argued that when our alliances, such as NATO, are under pressure from our potential adversaries and foes, we need to continue to expand and allow countries that meet the standards set by the alliance to join. That has never been more important than it is now, given the uncertainty and security challenges we face in Europe, especially as Vladimir Putin continues his aggression and continues to threaten stability in the region.

To be frank, Putin would love nothing more than to destroy NATO. In fact, you can see him trying to do that on a regular basis. He has tried to divide these countries, turn them against each other. He supports candidates throughout Europe who would take their countries out of NATO, constantly calling into question its viability. Vladimir Putin wants countries like Montenegro to remain in his sphere of influence and what I would call his sphere of threat, as his recent attempts to deploy his asymmetrical tools to influence Montenegrin politics have shown. That is why it is so important that we are moving to ratify Montenegro's access to NATO and to strengthen our relationship with Montenegro through NATO.

As the Senate and as a country, we are sending a clear message to Vladimir Putin that we will not accept the establishment of a Russian sphere of influence over countries that desire to

ally themselves with the free and democratic community of nations.

Today, I have tried to refrain from using the term “Russian” sphere of influence or “Russia” because the fact is, as I said to someone earlier today or yesterday, there is a difference between Russia and Vladimir Putin, and the events of the last 48 hours remind us of that. We are watching as many Russians who also desire to join the community of nations have turned out in cities and in places across Moscow and in other places in the thousands. They have turned out to protest the rampant corruption that fuels the Putin regime. And the Putin regime, as all totalitarian regimes do, has cracked down. They have arrested and detained hundreds of peaceful protesters. I ask you to compare that to Montenegro, whose membership in NATO will help the United States and Montenegro deepen our already strong bilateral relationship.

The stakes here are extraordinarily high for the United States and for our European allies. The Senate needs to send a strong message of solidarity with those in Europe who are standing up to the anti-democratic tactics of Vladimir Putin and his cronies.

That is why today I will be proud to cast my vote in support of Montenegro's accession into NATO, and I hope my colleagues here in the Senate will do the same and join me in doing so as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HEALTHCARE

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, last week Republicans in Congress came within an inch of ripping health insurance away from 24 million people in order to give tax breaks to rich people. That collapsed, and it collapsed because the American people stood up and said no—no to kicking seniors out of nursing homes, no to booting kids with rare diseases off of their treatments, no to gutting funding for opioid addiction.

All across this country—in every corner of this country—for months people spoke up about how the Affordable Care Act and Medicaid are saving their lives and saving their families from financial ruin. They poured their hearts out, they raised their voices, and they demanded to be heard. Last week they won.

The collapse of the Republicans' cruel scheme is a huge relief to millions of people in this country, but I am not here to celebrate. I am here to warn the American people about what is coming next, because instead of listening to the American people about

what they want, the President of the United States has threatened to sabotage healthcare in America. It isn't subtle. One hour after the Republicans admitted they didn't have the votes in Congress to destroy the Affordable Care Act, President Trump sat behind his desk in the Oval Office and told the entire Nation that he wants to trigger a meltdown of our healthcare system because he thinks that would be helpful to him politically.

Just so there is no confusion, I want to quote him word for word. He said: “The best thing we can do, politically speaking, is let ObamaCare explode.”

Now let's be clear. It is deeply wrong for the President of the United States—whose one and only job is to look out for the American people—to root for the failure of our country's healthcare system. It is deeply wrong for the President of the United States to announce that he is going to drag down our entire healthcare sector—a sector that accounts for more than one-sixth of the entire U.S. economy—just so he can stand on top of the wreckage and waggle his fingers and say: I told you so.

Healthcare for millions of Americans is not a game. It is not entertainment. It is not a reality TV show. Healthcare is literally life and death, and it touches everyone in this country from elderly grandparents to tiny babies.

President Trump is responsible for making healthcare in this country work. It is his job. He is President of the United States. His party controls both Houses of Congress. A legitimate President doesn't clap and cheer when things get worse for the American people. A legitimate President doesn't pound his chest about sabotaging the health and security of the American people because it is politically expedient. A legitimate President does his job.

The President's admission that he wants our healthcare system to collapse is a dangerous sign of where things are headed. For 7 years Republicans in Congress have rooted against healthcare in this country, cheering every stumble and working at every turn to hobble the law and make it harder for people to get affordable insurance. President Trump cannot repeal the Affordable Care Act on his own, but he can strip healthcare from millions of Americans and make it too expensive for millions more. He can do that all on his own. In fact, he is already working on it.

A few days after he took office, President Trump signed an Executive order directing his agency to use every tool at their disposal to try to disrupt the Affordable Care Act. In January, he also pulled down government's efforts to get more people signed up for health insurance. Why? So fewer people would use the health exchanges, fewer would get insurance, and premiums would go up for those who did sign up—all in an effort to make ObamaCare fail.

Senator PATTY MURRAY and I asked the inspector general at the Depart-

ment of Health and Human Services to investigate this reckless move, and now an independent investigation has been launched into this despicable incident. But the President has more tools at his disposal to undercut the Affordable Care Act all by himself. The President can redefine what insurance plans have to cover, stripping out critical benefits like birth control coverage. The President can withhold payments that insurers rely on to keep private health plans affordable. The President can allow States to put new conditions on Medicaid, conditions like taking away healthcare coverage if a woman doesn't get back to work soon enough after giving birth.

If the President decides to launch an all-out effort to sabotage American healthcare so he can manufacture a crisis to score political points, he can hurt a lot of people.

But there is a better way. If Republicans want to work on ideas to actually improve healthcare in America, to expand coverage, to expand access, or to reduce premiums and out-of-pocket costs, I am eager to throw up my sleeves and go to work. For years, Massachusetts has led the Nation in bipartisan health reform. We have lots to contribute on this, and lots of other Democrats are ready to get to work, too.

The American people aren't stupid. They know the difference between a bill that kicks 24 million people off of their health insurance and a bill that actually improves care. They know the difference between a President who fights to make health care better and a President who plans to sabotage healthcare. They know the difference between a fireman and an arsonist. If this President and this Congress continue to play politics with the lives of millions of people, I promise you that the American people will see it, they will know it, and they will rise up once again to fight it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I take the floor to urge an “aye” vote on invoking cloture on the issue of Montenegro's admittance into NATO. I would point out that 25 of the 28 nations in NATO have already voted in favor of Montenegro's accession into NATO. Only the United States, Spain, and the Netherlands have yet to weigh in.

I would like to point out that Montenegro's admittance into NATO is a critical test of the alliances's open-door policy. I don't ask my colleagues to take my word for it. I would just like to point out that our Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, General Curtis Scaparrotti, last week declared that Montenegro's accession into NATO is “absolutely critical,” that they have had this desire. They have met the map, and they understand NATO's outreach and ability to bring