

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 NEFFENGER 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	Markey	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	Hoeben	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.