

Franchise Association, International Sign Association, Interwest Energy Alliance, ISSA—the Worldwide Cleaning Industry Association.

ITTA—the Voice of Mid-Size Telecommunications Carriers, KcNext—The Technology Council of Greater Kansas City, Land Trust Alliance, LIHTC Working Group, Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), Massachusetts Housing Investment Corporation, Massachusetts Technology Leadership Council (MassTLC), Metals Service Center Institute, Metroplex Technology Business Council, Minnesota High Tech Association (MHTA), Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, National Air Transportation Association, National Association of Electrical Distributors, National Association of Home Builders, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of State and Local Equity Funds (NASLEF), National Association of State Energy Officials, National Automatic Merchandising Association (NAMA).

National Automobile Dealers Association, National Biodiesel Board, National Business Aviation Association, National Cable & Telecommunication Association, National Council of State Housing Agencies, National Development Council, National Employment Opportunity Network, National Farmers Union, National Foreign Trade Council, National Housing and Rehabilitation Association.

National Housing Conference, National Housing Trust, National Hydropower Association, National Lime Association (NLA), National Marine Manufacturers Association, National Multi Housing Council, National Propane Gas Association, National Restaurant Association, National Retail Federation, National Rural Housing Coalition, National School Transportation Association, National Shooting Sports Foundation, National Tooling and Machining Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, New Jersey Technology Council, New Markets Tax Credit Coalition, New Mexico Technology Council, NMTC Working Group, North American Die Casting Association, North Carolina Technology Association, Northeast Ohio Software Association, Northeast Pennsylvania Manufacturers and Employers Association, Northern Virginia Technology Council (NVTC), NPES The Association for Suppliers of Printing, Publishing and Converting Technologies, Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, Pittsburgh Technology Council, Precision Machined Products Association.

Precision Metalforming Association, R&D Credit Coalition, Renewable Northwest, Research!America, Rhode Island Manufacturers Association, Roof Coatings Manufacturers Association (RCMA), Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (SIFMA), Semiconductor Equipment & Materials International (SEMI), Semiconductor Industry Association, Silicon Valley Leadership Group, Silicon Valley Tax Directors Group, Software and Information Industry Association, Software Finance and Tax Executives Council, SPI: The Plastics Industry Trade Association, Tech Council of Maryland, TechAmerica, powered by CompTIA, TechMaine, TechNet, Technology Association of Georgia, Technology Association of Iowa.

Technology Association of Louisville Kentucky, Technology Association of Oregon, Telecommunications Industry Association, The National Pasta Association, The Plastic Pipe and Fittings Association, The State Chamber of Oklahoma, The Wind Coalition, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Union of Concerned Scientists, United Motorcoach Association, United States Council for Inter-

national Business, United States Telecom Association, United Way Worldwide, Utah Technology Council, Volunteers of America, Washington Technology Industry Association (WTIA), West Virginia Manufacturers Association, Wisconsin Technology Council, Work Opportunity Tax Credit Coalition.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12:15 p.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

#### HEALTH CARE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, yesterday I was visited by several hospitals from Chicago. Mount Sinai is an amazing hospital. It originally—you can tell by its name—was founded by Jewish families living in a section of Chicago. The families have moved on. The remaining population is largely African American and Hispanic. It is a very poor neighborhood. It is a violence-ridden neighborhood. But in an amazing show of magnanimity and charity, many of the Jewish families whose ancestors and predecessors predated them and founded this hospital continue to support Mount Sinai. It is a beacon of quality medical care in one of the toughest, meanest neighborhoods in that great city.

They came to speak yesterday, to meet with me. They just merged with another extraordinary hospital, Holy Cross Hospital in Marquette Park. I have a special affection for this hospital because for decades it was run by the Sisters of St. Casimir, a Lithuanian Catholic order of nuns who devoted their lives first to the Lithuanian population that lived in that neighborhood and then, after that population left, to those who came after them, many of them very poor people.

Mount Sinai and Holy Cross merged, and between the two of them, I can't think of better examples of hospitals with a mission to help the poorest people and to make certain they have care that all of us would like to have for our families. They came yesterday to talk to me about the Affordable Care Act.

There are so many speeches on the floor about the Affordable Care Act. Most of them from the other side of the aisle are entirely negative. But there are some things about the Affordable Care Act which were brought to my attention from these two intercity hospitals which I think we should all look at carefully.

First, they are telling me that at these hospitals more people are showing up and paying. In days gone by, many of those who came in for services

were charity cases. The cost of their service was passed on to everyone else. Now, under the Affordable Care Act, many of these lower-income families have health insurance for the first time in their lives.

I have met some of these families, and I know what it means to them. It was several years ago when I was approached by the chairman of the Cook County board, Toni Preckwinkle, the president, and we asked for a waiver from the Obama administration to enroll families in Cook County in the Medicaid portion of the Affordable Care Act before it actually went into effect.

We were given that waiver. We now have 100,000 individuals in Cook County—low-income individuals—who have Medicaid protection.

This Medicaid protection has allowed them to have quality health insurance for the first time in their lives, in many cases, and also it means when they present themselves for care in hospitals, they are paying. They are paying through the Medicaid program rather than coming in as charity cases.

What we are finding as well is that as more and more Americans have the option of health insurance through the Affordable Care Act, the percentage of Americans who are uninsured has gone down. The share of adults without health insurance declined to 13.4 percent last month from 15.6 percent just a few months before. It is an indication of more and more people in America having the peace of mind that comes with health insurance coverage.

I see the Senator from Kentucky is here, and I know he reserved the floor this morning, and I don't want to take his time.

I also want to make the point as well that as we are bringing in more cost savings in health care through the Affordable Care Act, we are seeing the overall increase in health care costs starting to decline and slow down. That is what we were shooting for—more and more accessibility in coverage, more affordability for those who have that coverage and the overall cost in health care systems starting to come down. It is an experiment which is starting to show good results.

Let me add that as proud as I am to have supported this law, it is not perfect. There are things we need to do to improve it and to refine it. We should do those on a bipartisan basis. That is what we are waiting for.

The House of Representatives has now voted—I believe the number is 50 times—to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I hope they have gotten it out of their system and now will sit down with us and work on a bipartisan basis to make it a better law. We can do that and we should do it together.

So I commend this effort to both sides of the aisle—in the Senate as well as in the House—and I hope that we can achieve something that will make a difference.

I would like to close by mentioning two of my constituents in Illinois before I turn the floor over to the Senator from Kentucky.

Philosophy Walker is a 28-year-old graduate student in biblical studies at the University of Chicago. Her husband Adam is 31 years old and a part-time youth minister. Philosophy's school provides health insurance, but it is \$900 per month for her and her husband. That would require them to take out additional student loans to pay their health insurance while they are in school.

Before moving to Chicago, they were paying \$700 per month for health insurance through COBRA, which is an option for those who have lost health insurance—but an expensive one. The \$700 payment depleted their savings because her husband struggled to find a full-time job. Going without health insurance wasn't an option because Philosophy Walker has some severe allergy problems.

Last November they signed up through the Affordable Care Act exchange and purchased a plan comparable to the COBRA coverage that had cost them \$700 a month, but the plan also included dental insurance, which they never had before.

Philosophy and her husband Adam, under this Affordable Care Act plan, pay \$200 a month. It went from \$700 to \$200. Philosophy also receives her monthly allergy medication for free, rather than the previous \$10 monthly copay.

If we listen to some of the stories on the floor of the Senate, you would never believe this story, but it is true.

I wish also to talk about Laurel Tyler, who runs a small business with her husband in Illinois. Because they have two employees and one of the children of one of their employees has asthma, the policies they were sold in the past were extremely expensive.

Because of the Affordable Care Act and the Illinois marketplace, Laurel's business is going to save 20 percent on health care costs, and the 22-year-old son with asthma can stay on the employee's plan. That, to me, is a success story.

Let's build on that success. Let's work together to make this law even stronger.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky.

#### BARRON NOMINATION

Mr. PAUL. I rise today in opposition to the killing of American citizens without trials. I rise today to oppose the nomination of anyone who would argue that the President has the power to kill an American citizen not involved in combat and without a trial.

I rise today to say that there is no legal precedent for killing American citizens not involved in combat, and that any nominee who rubber stamps and grants such power to a President is

not worthy of being placed one step away from the Supreme Court.

It isn't about just seeing the Barron memos. Some seem to be placated by the fact that: Oh, they can read these memos.

I believe it is about what the memos themselves say. I believe the Barron memos, at their very core, disrespect the Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights isn't so much for the American Idol winner, the Bill of Rights isn't so much for the prom queen or the high school football quarterback. The Bill of Rights is especially for the least popular among us. The Bill of Rights is especially for minorities, whether you are a minority by virtue of the color of your skin or the shade of your ideology. The Bill of Rights is especially for unpopular people, unpopular ideas, and unpopular religions.

It is easy to argue for trials for prom queens. It is easy to argue for trials for the high school quarterback or the American Idol winner. It is hard to argue for trials for traitors and for people who would wish to harm our fellow Americans. But a mature freedom defends the defenseless, allows trials for the guilty, and protects even speech of the most despicable nature.

After 9/11, we all recoiled in horror at the massacre of thousands of innocent Americans. We fought a war to tell other countries we would not put up with this and we would not allow this to happen again.

As our soldiers began to return from Afghanistan, I asked them to explain in their own words what they had fought for. To a soldier, they would tell me they fought for the American way. They fought to defend the Constitution, and they fought for our Bill of Rights.

It is a disservice to their sacrifice not to have an open and full-throated public debate about whether an American citizen should get a trial before they are killed.

Let me be perfectly clear. I am not referring to anybody involved in a battlefield, anybody shooting against our soldiers. Anybody involved in combat gets no due process.

What we are talking about is the extraordinary concept of killing American citizens who are overseas but not involved in combat. It doesn't mean that they are not potentially—and probably are—bad people, but we are talking about doing it with no accusation, no trial, no charge, and no jury. The nomination before us is about killing Americans not involved in combat.

The nominee, David Barron, has written a defense of executions of American citizens not involved in combat. Make no mistake, these memos do not limit drone executions to one man. These memos become historic precedent for killing Americans abroad.

Some have argued that releasing these memos is sufficient for his nomination. This is not a debate about transparency. This is a debate about

whether or not American citizens not involved in combat are guaranteed due process.

Realize that during the Bush years, most of President Obama's party—including the President himself—argued against the detention—not the killing—of American citizens without a trial. Yet now the President and the vast majority of his party will vote for a nominee who advocates the killing of American citizens without trial. How far have we come? How far have we gone? We were once talking about detaining American citizens and objecting that they would get no accusation and no trial. Now we are condoning killing American citizens without a trial.

During President Obama's first election, he told the Boston Globe:

No. I reject the Bush administration's claim that the President has plenary authority under the Constitution to detain U.S. citizens without charges as unlawful combatants.

As President, not only has he signed legislation to detain American citizens without trial, but he has now approved of killing American citizens without a trial. Where has candidate Obama gone?

President Obama now puts forward David Barron, whose memos justify killing Americans without a trial. I can't tell you what he wrote in the memos; the President forbids it. I can tell you what Barron did not write. He did not write or cite any legal case to justify killing an American without a trial because no such legal precedent exists. It has never been adjudicated. No court has ever looked at this. There has been no public debate because it has been held secret from the American people.

Barron creates out of whole cloth a defense for executing American citizens without trial. The cases he cites—which I am forbidden from talking about, which I am forbidden from citing today—are unrelated to the issues of killing American citizens because no such cases have ever occurred. We have never debated this in public. We are going to allow this to be decided by one branch of government in secret.

Yet the argument against the Barron memo, the argument against what Barron proposes should be no secret and should be obvious to anyone who looks at this issue. No court has ever decided such a case. So Barron's secret defense of drone executions relies on cases which, upon critical analysis, have no pertinence to the case at hand.

Am I the only one who thinks that something so unprecedented as an assassination of an American citizen should not be discussed, that we should discuss this in the light of day. Am I the only one who thinks that a question of such magnitude should be decided in the open by the Supreme Court?

Barron's arguments for the extrajudicial killing of American citizens challenges over 1,000 years of jurisprudence. Trials based on the presumption of innocence are an ancient