

the implementation of this failed law, Americans have received one broken promise after another. For Montana families, reflecting on the consequences of this law is not a happy trip down memory lane. Too many Montanans have seen their work hours cut, they have been forced off the plans they liked, and they were told they could not see the doctors whom they trusted.

The reviews have been in for quite some time, and ObamaCare is not anything close to what Montanans were promised. Five years later, insurance companies are still unable to find stable rates that do not force more uncertainty and hardship upon Montanans. It has been widely reported across the country that rates for millions of Americans are set to skyrocket again. Look no further than Montana, where it is evident that health care premiums are not as affordable as President Obama promised they would be. Policies sold through ObamaCare exchanges are becoming even more expensive. In fact, in Montana, according to filings with the Montana Commissioner of Securities and Insurance, insurers across the board are asking for double-digit increases for 2016 policies on top of more increases that occurred just last year.

Blue Cross Blue Shield, which is Montana's largest insurer that boasts 255,000 consumers in the State, is asking for an average increase of 23 percent for Montanans enrolled in individual plans. That is the start.

PacificSource filed papers with the commissioner requesting an average of a 31-percent increase for individual plans. What about Montana Health CO-OP? They have requested a 38-percent increase for individual plans. And Montanans who were insured under Time Insurance are facing a staggering 47-percent increase in 2016.

Increased premiums make it harder for Montanans to have access to affordable health care. It is money that no longer is in the pockets of Montanans, and those rate increases are not just in Montana. Across the Nation, Americans are seeing massive and debilitating rate increases. These hikes are a far cry from what Montanans—from what the American people were promised.

In 2007, President Obama said himself that by the end of his first term, ObamaCare would "cover every American and cut the cost of a typical family's premium by up to \$2,500 a year."

Montanans have not seen their premiums decreased by \$2,500 a year. It is not even close. Unfortunately, this is the predictable result of forcing a partisan piece of legislation through Congress without transparent consideration or bipartisan input. We need to ensure health care is affordable, and it needs to be accessible for all Montanans. That starts with repealing ObamaCare, repealing its costly mandates, repealing its burdensome taxes, and repealing the senseless regulations.

ObamaCare is not working and it is not popular. This law is a bureaucratic nightmare that hurts small businesses.

I just came out of a meeting with some homebuilders and small business owners from Montana. I showed them this chart before I came down to the floor. One of the builders said: This likely means I no longer will be able to provide health care insurance for my employees.

Growing up in Montana, I grew up hunting, camping, backpacking, fishing. In fact, I was fly fishing in Montana before Brad Pitt made it cool in the movie "A River Runs Through It." I know that when your fishing line gets tangled up, you have two options. I have been there many times on one of the banks of Montana's rivers. Sometimes you take a minute, sometimes you take several minutes, and you work to untangle the line. But other times the line gets so badly knotted up that the best option, instead of spending a long time untangling the line, is to simply cut the line.

After 5 failed years, the American people know ObamaCare is too badly tangled to fix. It is time to cut the line and tie on a new fly.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I wish to begin my comments on this year's National Defense Authorization Act, S. 1376, by thanking all of the members of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. I would especially like to thank the subcommittee's chairman, Senator SESSIONS, for the close working relationship we share.

I want my colleagues to note that Senator SESSIONS and his staff worked closely with me and my staff in developing the elements of the bill pertaining to the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. This bipartisan effort has proved fruitful as all of our provisions were adopted unanimously by the full committee during the markup of this bill.

The annual National Defense Authorization Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation Congress passes every year, and this year will mark what I hope will be the passing of a defense authorization act for the 54th year in a row.

I would like to give my colleagues a brief overview of the provisions in what we will call the NDAA, which we are considering today, as they relate to the Strategic Forces Subcommittee.

The jurisdiction of the subcommittee includes missile defense, strategic forces, space programs, the defense-funded portions of the Department of Energy, nonproliferation, and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

In preparing the provisions in the bill that relate to the areas of our jurisdiction, the subcommittee held six hearings and three briefings on defense programs at the Department of Energy, strategic nuclear forces, missile defense, and space programs at the Department of Defense.

As I mentioned before, our committee oversees the strategic nuclear forces based on a triad of air, sea, and land-based delivery platforms. This triad is, as Secretary Carter has called it, "the bedrock" of our national defense posture. In the wake of the Department of Defense's 2014 nuclear enterprise review, this is a significant year for reforms and investments to ensure the safety, security, and the effectiveness of our nuclear deterrent.

Among the key priorities going forward, I look forward to working with our leaders at the Department of Energy, at DOD, and my colleagues on the committee to take advantage of smart opportunities to enhance commonality across nuclear systems, sharing expertise and resources across the services—particularly the Navy and Air Force—to enhance the capabilities and cost-effectiveness of our nuclear deterrent in the future.

Critically, the bill creates a position in the Air Force responsible for nuclear command, control, and communications acquisition and policy. The Air Force is responsible for over 70 percent of this mission, which essentially connects the President to the nuclear weapon and the delivery platform. We have found that since the communications layers involve space, air, and ground systems, there is fragmentation in an overall strategy as we begin the modernization of the overall system, which must be fail-safe.

Through hearings and briefings concerning the state of other nations' nuclear programs, it was clear that we face an increasingly complex global nuclear environment. We are well past the days of the Cold War. Today, our deterrent strategy must now account for a wide range of nuclear-armed nations beyond simply Russia to now include Pakistan, India, North Korea, and even China's modernization of its strategic arsenal. Our bill contains a provision that directs the Office of Net Assessment to begin a study on what effect, if any, this multipolar nuclear environment will have on our deterrent strategy. This is an important area which will only grow as time goes on.

In the area of missile defense, this bill fully authorizes the President's budget request for the Missile Defense Agency and maintains our commitments to key allies. It includes several provisions that advance MDA's efforts to deploy additional sensors and to improve the reliability and effectiveness

of the ground-based interceptors. The bill also contains the GAO's annual review of MDA's acquisition programs.

Moving on to space programs, the bill addresses several key aspects of space system acquisition. It includes important provisions aimed at maintaining fair competition among space launch providers through fiscal year 2017. It does not, however, solve a potential 2- to 3-year gap after that, as launch providers work to develop and certify a new American-made rocket engine to replace the Russian RD-180. I hope that gap does not occur, but if it does, I am sure this committee will revisit and correct the issue so we can maintain a competitive and healthy launch industrial base that both ensures DOD's access to space and saves taxpayer dollars. The bill also makes important contributions to ensuring that we address the threats we may face in space by requiring an interagency policy and a principal DOD position to address these threats.

We have authorized the President's requested level of funding for the nuclear modernization programs at the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration, or NNSA. We also create a program that enables the scientists and engineers at the NNSA to work on new concepts and methods that shorten the time and the cost for future life extensions of our warheads.

Let me close noting that we fully fund the President's request for non-proliferation at both the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Defense. At the NNSA, these programs collect loose nuclear material around the world, which could be used as terrorist devices against us. The NNSA also maintains a network of radiation detectors at borders across the world to detect the illegal transfer of nuclear material before it can cross our borders here in America.

Finally, the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program at the Department of Defense will continue to secure weapons of mass destruction all around the world, as it did with Syria's chemical weapons and dangerous pathogens at Ebola clinics in West Africa. The relatively small sum of money in this program has made a noticeable difference in reducing dangerous threats to our country.

I take particular pride in this program as the enduring legacy of my fellow Hoosier, Senator Richard Lugar, who has done our Nation and the world a great service as a champion for nuclear nonproliferation. He and Senator Sam Nunn were extraordinary leaders, and we are proud to try to follow in their tradition.

I again thank Senator SESSIONS for the productive and bipartisan relationship we have had on the subcommittee and also all members on the subcommittee for taking part in our hearings and in crafting the provisions under this subcommittee's jurisdiction.

I look forward to working with our colleagues to pass this important legislation.

I yield back any remaining time that has been allotted.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. 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. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

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

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, we have had a number of our colleagues come to the floor to talk about the importance of the Export-Import Bank, and I want to see if I can put in context the exceptionally important work done by our colleagues Senator CANTWELL and Senator HEITKAMP on this issue.

We have been talking in this body for weeks now about the importance of trade and particularly tapping global markets, given the fact that there are going to be 1 billion middle-class people in the developing world in 2025. This is an exceptional opportunity for us to be able to sell the products we make here, whether they are computers or wine or helicopters or planes, you name it.

We had a big debate about trade promotion authority. What I want to spend just a few minutes talking about is whether a Senator was for trade promotion authority or not, they ought to support the Export-Import Bank because the Export-Import Bank provides key financing tools to promote products that are made in my home State, in the States of our colleagues, and all across the land. It has supported tens of thousands of American jobs—even hundreds of thousands—for decades. It doesn't cost American taxpayers a single dime. In fact, the Export-Import Bank covers its own costs and then some. It actually generates revenue for taxpayers—\$7 billion over the last two decades and \$675 million in fiscal year 2014 alone.

So what I would submit is the Export-Import Bank is a way to ensure that in this country we get trade done right. I happen to believe it makes sense to support the trade promotion act because that is going to ensure that we are going to have a chance to drive down some of those tariffs that are barriers to American products. Whether you are for it or not, you ought to support the Export-Import Bank because it provides key tools so we can reduce barriers to our exports, take on modern challenges that threaten American workers, and fight to create more high-wage jobs in the United

States because it provides the financing you need in order to actually secure one of these deals. The Export-Import Bank is a core part of getting trade done right.

Countries, including Germany, Japan, Mexico, and Canada, all have agencies that are up and running and do it in a fashion that make their exports more competitive. How are they doing it? They are using financing tools, including supporting their manufacturers and pushing their products into the global marketplace.

As Senators CANTWELL and HEITKAMP have said, we need this tool to make sure our country doesn't fall behind. We shouldn't let the Export-Import Bank become some kind of ideological pinata that you keep bashing on, not recognizing it will hurt our competitiveness. I think it would be legislative malpractice to let the Bank expire because it would needlessly endanger the thousands of businesses and tens of thousands of jobs supported by Ex-Im, including many in my home State.

In particular, in Oregon, one can see that Ex-Im is a very substantial help to small- and medium-sized companies. In fact, 86 percent of the funds disbursed in fiscal year 2014 went to small businesses. Thanks to the Export-Import Bank, companies in Albany could find markets abroad and hire new workers. They manufacture important things such as titanium casting.

Selmet is a perfect example, a company that got its start in my home State years ago. Today, it employs hundreds of people in Oregon and across the United States, and 40 percent of its revenue comes from overseas. They got off the ground with help from Ex-Im Bank, and it has customers in France, Germany, and Asia, and it is looking to expand further.

These kinds of success stories are ones you see in every single State because these startups got help when it was essential to have that added boost to be able to seize the opportunities around the world and create high-skilled, high-wage jobs.

To me, when we debate the future of the Export-Import Bank, colleagues, this is about red, white, and blue jobs. Keeping the Export-Import Bank up and running with the important financing tools it offers is part of getting trade done right.

I commend our colleagues Senators CANTWELL, HEITKAMP, MURRAY, and GRAHAM, who have come together in a bipartisan way to work to extend the Bank as quickly as possible, and they have my support.

NATIONAL HEMP HISTORY WEEK

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I asked for an extra few minutes. I want to spend another few minutes just talking about another part of our economy that I think can grow in the days ahead, and I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to bring a basket of Oregon products onto the floor at this time.