

one supports the lower court's ruling, but that is both shortsighted and contrary to role of the courts in our constitutional system. A deadlocked decision postpones an actual decision from the final arbiter of law under our Constitution. This results in less certainty for all of us.

I hope that Republicans will soon reverse course and put aside their obstruction to move forward on Chief Judge Garland's nomination to be the next Supreme Court Justice. Their failure to act is having a real impact on the American people. It is up to the Republican majority to allow this body to fulfill one of its most solemn duties and ensure that justice is not delayed for another year. Judge Garland deserves fairness. He should be given a public hearing and a vote without further delay.

OBAMACARE

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I would like to get into the numbers on something that folks in Wyoming are having to deal with. The number I would like to highlight is one. As an accountant, I am sure you thought I was going to get much more complicated, but it is important for my colleagues to hear that there is one health insurer in Wyoming offering exchange plans this year—one.

In October last year, people around Wyoming read the news that WINHealth, one of two major medical insurers operating in the State, would close down. That was bad news, and I had constituents who were in a tough spot.

They say that misery loves company, and, unfortunately, we have company now. This year, Alaska and Alabama join us—one insurer on the State exchanges, thousands of people losing their plans.

Blue Cross Blue Shield of Wyoming has been working to provide options, but the fact remains that we have fewer choices now.

If I think back to the ObamaCare debate, President Obama and my colleagues across the aisle promised that ObamaCare would bring more options, security, lower costs.

The majority leader at the time, HARRY REID, said: [W]e are bringing security and stability to millions who have health insurance . . . What we will do is ensure consumers have more choices and insurance companies face more competition.

I think it is safe to say that that hasn't quite materialized.

What we are witnessing is another broken promise, the failure of ObamaCare to deliver again.

Some of my colleagues have been on the Senate floor talking about insurance premiums going up, and they are going up, at shocking rates. ObamaCare has been quite a comprehensive reform of health care. Now your costs are higher, and you may have no choice in your insurer or the structure of your insurance plan—sounds like a great deal.

ObamaCare has weighed down health insurance with unworkable plans, high costs, and a risk pool that is significantly sicker than expected; and now, somehow, people seem surprised to find that we have insurers leaving the market, either by choice or because they have gone bankrupt.

Look at the national carriers that have left the exchanges: UnitedHealth, Humana, and Aetna in some States. These folks have looked at the exchanges and said, We can't anymore.

We could look at the co-ops that have closed. Twelve have closed—more than half.

Look at the States that may have some counties with only one insurance option. According to the Kaiser Family Foundation's tracking, more than 650 counties may have just one insurer for the exchanges in 2017 in Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Arizona, and Oklahoma.

What answer do my Democratic colleagues have for this absolutely unacceptable situation? I have mostly heard silence.

The people we represent deserve more than silence or rhetorical finger pointing. They need relief, and they need real, meaningful changes that will let people buy health insurance in a free market without a government chokepoint at every turn.

Let's be clear: This is not a failure of the free market. These are not open marketplaces that have failed. They are government-run exchanges selling government-mandated and government-approved health insurance.

I encourage my colleagues to consider what the option is if we fail to roll back this damaging law. What will we be left with?

I extend an open hand to work with any of my colleagues who want to make reforms to our health care system that will truly deliver on the promises of more options, security, and lower costs.

Thank you.

CONGRATULATING MONTENEGRO ON 10 YEARS OF INDEPENDENCE AND SUPPORTING MONTENEGRO'S NATO MEMBERSHIP

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, 10 years ago this month, voters in Montenegro went to the polls to determine the future of their country. These voters were faced with a single question: "Do you want the Republic of Montenegro to be an independent state with full international and legal subjectivity?" When the dust settled on the evening of May 21, 2006, the referendum passed with 55.5 percent of voters choosing to peacefully dissolve their union with Serbia. Shortly thereafter, the international community recognized the newest country in the world. In a region riddled with bullets and bombs, this moment marked the beginning of a praiseworthy chapter in regional and transatlantic history.

As a number of global security challenges occupy the top of our foreign policy agenda—not least the threat posed by ISIS and the most significant refugee crisis since World War II—it is easy to overlook Montenegro's tenth anniversary. But we would be remiss if we did not use this occasion to reflect on the importance of U.S.-Montenegro relations and the role this country of 600,000 can play to advance regional and transatlantic security moving forward.

Early on, the country's leaders made a clear decision to align with the United States and pursue membership in Euro-Atlantic institutions. Montenegrin troops sacrificed their lives supporting the U.S.- and NATO-led mission in Afghanistan. Montenegro has demonstrated its commitment to deterring Russian aggression by voluntarily joining the EU sanctions regime against Russia and rebuffing Moscow's offers for military cooperation. And since the beginning, the United States has been there supporting Montenegro's progress, with direct assistance to help the country fight organized crime and corruption, strengthen its civil society and democratic structures, and provide stability in the still-fragile Balkans region.

In October 2014, I had the privilege to visit Montenegro as then-chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on European Affairs. I met with our Ambassador and Montenegrin Government officials and opposition leaders to discuss the challenges of the region and the country's progress. I also sat down with U.S. investors to hear why Montenegro is currently an attractive country for foreign investment.

Above all else, I came away from this visit convinced that Montenegro should be granted NATO membership. The opportunity to join the world's foremost military alliance has been a powerful incentive for reform. Montenegro has come a long way, but if the prospect of joining NATO is no longer on the table, we can expect to see an erosion of Montenegro's commitment to democratic governance and arguments that Montenegro is better served by an alliance with Russia.

Last week, NATO Foreign Ministers gathered in Brussels to sign Montenegro's Accession Protocol, paving the way to Montenegro's formal membership. Each member country must now ratify the agreement. This important decision will help counter Russian aggression in the region, eliminate a strategic NATO gap along the Mediterranean, and ensure that Montenegro's young democracy continues to develop under the alliance's umbrella.

At the same time, no country should receive an invitation until it is prepared to meet the highest standards of NATO membership. Montenegro has