

I have to say, it is ironic. I hear people call this law either ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act. I am fascinated with that because the law's name is the "Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act." Over the last 5 years, the words "patient protection" seem to have disappeared from every part of everyone's vernacular in this. I would only have to say, I agree.

When did we stop saying to the patient: You have no ability to make your own choices. I will tell you when. When ObamaCare passed and everything became about affordable rather than about patient. We have seen the consequences of this.

In the days ahead, the Supreme Court will rule on this, and I believe strongly they are going to rule for the plain text of the law, not just about ObamaCare but because they have to make the decision as the Supreme Court: Does the law mean what the law says or can any administration on any law in the future reinterpret it based on their preferences?

If there is one area that would be a great path for us to follow, it is in the days ahead that we get back to the government is about the law, and we follow the law because we are a nation of laws, not just a nation of leaders. The law is to be king in our Nation.

So let's interpret it the way it is written and let's give people back the freedom they want and need. Let's put the patient back in health care. That is the next step I think we should take in this U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

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

All time is yielded back.

VOTE ON NEFFINGER NOMINATION

The question occurs on the Neffenger nomination.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Illinois

(Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 217 Ex.]

YEAS—81

Alexander	Feinstein	Murphy
Ayotte	Fischer	Murray
Baldwin	Flake	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Gillibrand	Perdue
Blumenthal	Grassley	Peters
Booker	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heinrich	Reed
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reid
Brown	Heller	Risch
Burr	Hirono	Roberts
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sanders
Capito	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Sessions
Casey	King	Shaheen
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cochran	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Manchin	Tillis
Cornyn	Markay	Udall
Cotton	McCain	Vitter
Daines	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	McConnell	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Enzi	Mikulski	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Wyden

NAYS—1

Sasse

NOT VOTING—18

Blunt	Graham	Rounds
Coats	Hoeven	Rubio
Corker	Kirk	Scott
Crapo	Lee	Tester
Cruz	Menendez	Thune
Franken	Murkowski	Toomey

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON ELLIOTT NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Daniel R. Elliott III, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board for a term expiring December 31, 2018?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE EXPLANATION

- Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 217 and the voice vote that followed. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall vote No. 217, the confirmation of Peter V. Neffenger to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, I would have voted yea; on the voice vote, the confirmation of Daniel R. Elliott III to be a member of the Surface Transportation Board, I would have voted yea.●

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid

upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Arizona.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Ohio.

KING V. BURWELL DECISION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, nearly 12 million Americans, including 500,000 Iowans—more than that, actually—now have access to affordable health coverage because of the Affordable Care Act, and many for the first time in their lives.

We know what the health care law has meant in Ohio and across the country. Patients can't be dropped from coverage or charged higher rates just because they got sick. Also, 97,000 young Ohioans have been able to stay on their parents' health insurance until their 26th birthday, giving them the chance to focus on careers, education, and future plans. Lifetime insurance caps are no longer bankrupting people with chronic conditions. Those with preexisting conditions, such as children with diabetes and asthma, will no longer be denied coverage or charged higher premiums.

But despite all of these successes, the Supreme Court of the United States is currently considering a case that can take affordable health care away from hundreds of thousands of Ohioans, tens of thousands in the State of Oklahoma, and millions of Americans.

In Ohio alone, 161,000 people are at risk of losing access to affordable health coverage in the King v. Burwell decision that the Court will soon hand down. These Ohioans receive an annual subsidy of about \$240 a month to help them purchase private insurance plans. That is an average of nearly \$3,000 per person per year. Hard-working families stand to lose even more.

Taking away those subsidies—as many of my Republican colleagues have pushed the Court to do—would amount to a massive tax increase on Ohioans already struggling to get by. These same Republican colleagues have not come up with a workable solution if the Court rules their way. They have pushed this case all the way to the Supreme Court only to leave 161,000 Ohioans and nearly 12 million Americans without access to affordable coverage.

We know what this new access to health insurance has meant for families in my State. Let me read from a couple of letters.

This spring I met with Jumaane Cook from Parma Heights and his 5-year-old son James. Jumaane is 34 years old and has lived in Ohio for most of his life. He became insured for the first time in his adult life just last year when he purchased insurance for himself and his son on the Federal exchange.

Jumaane was a college athlete but he tore his ACL in 2007. His injury left him unable to play sports, and his lack of insurance left him unable to afford treatment. Jumaane came to Washington to tell us how important the Affordable Care Act and his subsidy are to him and to his son. Because his employer doesn't offer health insurance, without the Federal subsidy Jumaane would be forced to go without insurance again and his son would have to go on public assistance.

Jumaane is not alone.

Rachael in Cincinnati wrote to me when the Supreme Court decided to hear the Burwell case. She and her husband "have insured ourselves through individual insurance since 2008. It has been difficult and, at times, we have had to go without insurance simply due to the incredibly high cost of insurance in our area. We have paid our premiums every month. I will be fit-to-be-tied if I have to look for health insurance again. I was disappointed with what I could afford on the Federal exchange. And, I fear I will not be able to afford any insurance if I lose my subsidy."

Lisa in Athens wrote:

I have been reviewing plans on Healthcare.gov. At my age—over 60, but not Medicare-eligible—the premiums are high, even for the Bronze plans. It concerns me that a court may rule that the subsidies are not available to those who access the Federal exchange.

That is why these subsidies exist—to help people such as Lisa afford coverage, regardless of where they live.

Jim from Streetsboro, near Akron, wrote, saying that he is "62, drawing a pension, on Social Security, and paying COBRA health care to the tune of \$1,200 a month." Jim is looking forward to buying cheaper insurance coverage through the Federal exchange, which he should be able to afford. He wrote: "At least that was the plan until someone decided to try and derail the ACA for the umpteenth time. If things go bad with this decision, please do all you can to remember those who have worked their entire lives"—to remember those who have worked their entire lives.

What the Supreme Court could do, and what clearly most Republican Members of this body and the House of Representatives want the Supreme Court to do, is to strike this part of this law down so that 161,000 Ohioans will either lose their insurance by losing their subsidy or pay increased fees—taxes in the years ahead.

Connie in Cincinnati wrote to me after the lower court decision came down. She said the ACA has been "a Godsend" for her. Connie wrote:

I believe strongly in the importance of having health care and have recently qualified for a catastrophic health plan with tax credits on healthcare.gov.

As you know, Ohio is one of those States that opted out of establishing its own State plans. That was not a problem until yesterday. Now, facing a plan that may be ineligible for the federal tax credit, I face a dire financial situation.

Connie says:

I have willingly paid my fair share of taxes throughout my life. My tax dollars helped bail out banks and automobile corporations. I need my government to look out for me.

The Supreme Court needs to hear from people such as Connie and Jim and Jumaane and Lisa and Rachael. These are hard-working Ohioans, most of whom have worked their entire life, but, unfortunately for them, have not worked for a company that has provided affordable health care. They have spent large chunks of their paychecks on health care, even with Federal subsidies. The Supreme Court should remember that before it takes away affordable coverage. That is a lifeline to these Ohioans and to so many millions of Americans.

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MS. SENIOR NEVADA PAGEANT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Ms. Senior Nevada, Inc., on the organization's 30th anniversary.

Since it was founded in 1985, Ms. Senior Nevada, Inc., has honored the talents and accomplishments of senior women throughout the State of Nevada. The first Ms. Senior Nevada Pageant was held in 1986 at the former Sahara Hotel and Casino. At the time, only one contestant from each county was able to compete in the pageant. Today, the Ms. Senior Nevada Pageant is open to all women in Nevada who are age 60 or older, to celebrate the "age of elegance."

The contestants in the Ms. Senior Nevada pageant must demonstrate their strengths in four areas: talent, evening gown, philosophy of life, and an interview. The winner of the pageant represents Nevada on the national stage at the Ms. Senior America pageant. During her reigning year, Ms. Senior Nevada travels throughout the State to discuss a variety of issues affecting senior citizens and promotes her platform. Past Ms. Senior Nevada platforms have included "for the good of seniors" and "responsible pet ownership."

I commend Ms. Senior Nevada, Inc., on recognizing exceptional senior women in the Silver State for 30 years,

and I applaud their service to the State of Nevada.

RECOGNIZING WENLIANG WANG

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize entrepreneur and philanthropist Wenliang Wang for his commitment and dedication to restoring one of the world's most impressive wetlands, the Dandong Yalu River Estuary Wetland in China.

Mr. Wang is well-known in his country as the founder and chairman of the China Rilin Construction Group, which is among the largest private construction companies in China. Rilin is also the owner and operator of the Port of Dandong, a vital trading hub in Liaoning Province located in northeast China. Though Mr. Wang has important business ties to this region, it is his private efforts and personal connection to the area that has influenced him to invest millions of dollars in the restoration of the Dandong Yalu River Estuary Wetland.

Not far from Dandong Port, sit the Dandong wetlands. Bird watchers, scientists, and outdoor enthusiasts travel from around the world to Liaoning to study the area and watch the native species and migratory birds, including those that fly from New Zealand to Alaska each year. Mr. Wang recognized the significance of safeguarding and enhancing these wetlands. With his support, restoration work to revitalize the fields, shrimp pond, and tidal basin has made this important migratory destination a sanctuary for all of the species that depend on the wetland.

Today, the Dandong wetlands are among the most inhabited wetlands in the world, which includes feeding and resting areas for hundreds of thousands of migrating and wading birds, such as the rare saunders' gull. It is my understanding that there are approximately 14,000 of these birds left in the world and more than 1,300 have made the wetland their home.

I applaud Mr. Wang for his commitment to protecting the internationally significant Dandong Yalu River Estuary Wetland and wish him the very best in his continued efforts to protect our environment and restore these important sites.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING ARKANSAS POWER LINEMEN

• Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I would like to recognize 12 Arkansas power linemen who recently traveled to Guatemala as volunteers with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's International Foundation to put into action cooperative principle number 6—cooperation among cooperatives. On their recent trip, Doug Evans, Kyle Metcalf, Andy Caywood, Michael Counts, Andy Ward, Brent Hufstedler, Kirk Kempson, Kris Rankin, Joey