## SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MARCH 2016, AS ''NATIONAL COLORECTAL CANCER AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 395, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 395) supporting the designation of March 2016, as ''National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 395) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

## ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 2016

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 10; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 11:15 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 524; further, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all postcloture time on S. 524 expire at 11:30 a.m.; finally, that the time following morning business until 11:30 a.m. be equally divided between the two managers or their designees.

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

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators INHOFE and SULLIVAN.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am rising now to respond to a statement that was made by our good friend from Illinois a few minutes ago, to clarify. It is kind of interesting that we look back and we find that when the Republicans had someone in the White House and the Democrats were trying to block a nomination, it was just the opposite as it is today. In fact, at that time, the Senators in the leadership of the Democrats—Obama, Biden, Clinton, Schumer, and Reid—all made the statement, a joint statement that the Senate does not have to confirm Presidential nominations and urged that the Senate refuse to do so, especially in an election year.

Now, it is just the opposite of what the Senator said, but I don't blame them. I don't blame any Democrat for trying their best to get a nominee from this President because, as a Democrat, they are more liberal than Republicans are, and they would like very much to have a chance to change the balance of the U.S. Supreme Court, which has been consistent in recent years in objecting to some of the extremist left programs. So I can't blame them for trying, but nonetheless that is not going to work.

I applaud the leader. At the time the death—the sad death—of Scalia took place, he was in a position where we were in recess and so he had to make a decision and the decision was the right decision.

Anyway, I wish to share a couple of letters with you that came from my State of Oklahoma.

I will give the names and addresses, if anyone wants to check. This is what real people—you get outside the beltway, get out of Washington, DC, and get back to States such as Oklahoma, these are the concerns they have.

I want to read the first one. This is from a guy named Robert from Tulsa, OK. It came right after the sad death of Justice Scalia. He said:

Dear Senator Inhofe,

I have just learned of the death of Justice Scalia. I should only be feeling sadness at the death of this great patriot and man of the law. I am terrified of what I am sure is now already in the works, his replacement by President Barack Obama.

The person who replaces Justice Scalia will have the potential to change the balance of power on the bench for decades and may have the possibility to reshape the political landscape immediately and unalterably.

I, therefore, beg you and all of your fellow Senators to not vote to affirm any candidate put forward by President Obama. This is an election year and the people should be given a chance to choose which direction this country will go and not have it decided by President Obama as he leaves the White House.

Please, do not vote for any candidate offered by this administration.

Another letter just came from Chickasha, OK, from Donald. He says:

Dear Senator Inhofe,

I have just received word of the death of Supreme Court Justice Scalia. His death is a loss for the conservative movement, but I fear it also puts our country in peril.

With Scalia gone, President Obama will certainly present a nominee for his seat. If it is a justice that holds to Obama's progressive ideals and agenda, it could mean grave danger for our Constitution.

I urge you to hold fast and refuse to confirm ANY Obama appointee to the Court. Hold out until he is out of office. I feel the future of our nation depends on it.

That is from Donald of Chickasha, OK.

Next is a letter from Matthew of Claremore, OK. Claremore is one of the towns where our famous Will Rogers spent his childhood. Everyone has heard of Will Rogers—a great guy. Matthew said:

Senator Inhofe,

I am contacting you in regards to the loss of Justice Scalia and his replacement. Justice Scalia was a brilliant man and a true patriot. Unfortunately, I do not feel any appointee by the President would follow the Constitution and serve with the same virtue as Justice Scalia. I am asking that you and the other members of the Senate do not confirm a new Justice until after the election, when the newly elected President can make the appointment. We have sent you to Washington to stop the agenda of the President that runs contrary to the wishes of the country. Please stand on your principles and do not allow the President to appoint another Justice that may be detrimental to our freedoms for decades to come. Thank you.

That is Matthew from Claremore, OK. Let me assure you, of the hundreds of letters we have received, I have read them. I have no intention of changing the pattern that has been in existence since 1888 and allow a President, during an election year, to make such a nomination.

So I think we did the right thing. I think it would have been inappropriate to say we are going to have hearings, knowing that we were not going to confirm a nominee. I don't think that would be fair to the nominee.

So these are just a few examples of the hundreds of letters and calls from constituents that I have received, asking that the Senate wait to confirm the next Supreme Court nominee until we have a new President.

We have heard from our colleagues and pundits on the other side—the Democrats, the other side of the aisle—that it is our constitutional duty to confirm President Obama's nominations.

The Constitution says, and it says very clearly, that the President ''. . . shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint . . . Judges of the supreme Court.''

The Senate clearly has a role in this process, and the Senate can either give its consent or it can withhold its consent and completely fulfill its constitutional duties. So it doesn't make any difference. We have the latitude of making a determination, and we are