

important step forward to address this national epidemic.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2016.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JONI ERNST, a Senator from the State of Iowa, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. ERNST thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING NANCY REAGAN

Mr. REID. Madam President, I join the Republican leader in extending my sympathies to the entire Reagan family. Nancy Reagan was a wonderful First Lady. She was also an incredible individual in her own right. She was always gracious and charming.

The last time I saw Nancy Reagan, she was here in the Rotunda of the Capitol dedicating a statue of her husband, President Ronald Reagan. At that time, she was already well into her late eighties, but there she was, standing next to his statue with a big smile on her face. Her very presence brightened the entire Hall—she and Ronald Reagan standing together, he in the form of a statue, she standing next to him, together. It really was a fantastic picture.

Nancy, of course, will be missed. I say, though, my mind returns to a different time. It reminds me of the years Ronald Reagan was in the White House—a card-carrying conservative, yet a very pragmatic Republican.

The Nation will miss First Lady Nancy Reagan and miss her partner, the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan.

FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. REID. Madam President, from the Des Moines Register. Two former Lieutenant Governors of the State of Iowa—and I am sure the Acting President pro tempore knows both of them, one a Democrat and one a Republican—here is what they said, among other things: “This isn’t the CHUCK GRASSLEY we thought we knew.” Again, I re-

peat, this is two Iowans, former Lieutenant Governors Joy Corning, a Republican, and Sally Pederson, a Democrat.

Last week former Lieutenant Governors Corning and Pederson coauthored an op-ed in the Des Moines Register criticizing the senior Senator from Iowa for abdicating his constitutional duties by blocking consideration of President Obama’s Supreme Court nomination. The op-ed reads, among other things:

Iowans are known for being hard workers, and we appreciate that quality in our elected officials. We wake up every day, ready to do our part, and get the job done. We are also politically astute, understand the U.S. Constitution, and know when an elected official is more eager to find excuses than create solutions. Unfortunately, Sen. CHUCK GRASSLEY is refusing to do his job as described in Article 2 of our Constitution, giving “advice and consent” on the president’s upcoming nomination to the Supreme Court.

GRASSLEY is threatening to use his powerful post as chairman of the Judiciary Committee to block a hearing on any nominee, regardless of how well qualified he or she is. His recent column and public statements regarding the vacancy on the Supreme Court are troubling and harmful to our courts. Moreover, this isn’t the CHUCK GRASSLEY we thought we knew.

“This isn’t the CHUCK GRASSLEY we thought we knew.” I agree with these Iowans. This isn’t the Senator I have come to know over the last three decades. The Senator I knew would not cede the independence of the powerful Judiciary Committee he has served on for many decades to the Republican leader. The Senator I knew would not ignore his constitutional duties for the sake of election-year politics, but for whatever reason the Senator from Iowa made a fateful decision in the hours after Justice Antonin Scalia’s death. He is allowing himself and his committee to be manipulated by the Republican leader for narrow, partisan warfare. He is taking his orders from the Republican leader and, sadly, Donald Trump. When asked about this issue, Donald Trump’s words were three: delay, delay, delay. Senator GRASSLEY must have been listening.

The people of Iowa, without question, are displeased with their Senator. The Des Moines Register quoted one of Senator GRASSLEY’s disappointed supporters as follows:

He seems to be doing what other people are saying, not what he thinks is best. That has really colored my opinion of him in the past week.

Another Iowan who supports the Senator told the newspaper:

I think he’s making a bad mistake. . . . It’s purely a political party play, and there isn’t any space for that in this situation.

Now, as each day passes, the senior Senator from Iowa is trying desperately to justify his blind loyalty to the Republican leader and to Donald Trump. Senator GRASSLEY is grasping for a rationale—any rationale—that will excuse him for not doing his job. That desperation is now taking Senator GRASSLEY down a very dark path.

Last Thursday, the senior Senator from Iowa addressed the Conservative Political Action Conference, CPAC, which took place here in Washington. In his speech to them, here is what Senator GRASSLEY said: “I feel it’s about time that we have a national debate on the Supreme Court and how it fits in with our constitutional system of government.”

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee is suggesting that we reevaluate the Founding Fathers’ work, reevaluate the Constitution of the United States, and change the Constitution of the United States. Why is Senator GRASSLEY debating what the Constitution makes clear? The Senate must provide its advice and consent on nominees appointed by the President to the Supreme Court. Think of the irony. Justice Scalia was a strict constitutionalist. Yet now, in the weeks following his death, Senator GRASSLEY wants to throw out the Constitution just because President Obama gets to pick Scalia’s replacement.

The former Senator from Iowa Tom Harkin said it best yesterday. This appeared in the Des Moines Register: “The position taken now by the majority leader and majority members of the Senate Judiciary Committee is simply astounding, and not in keeping with a ‘strict,’ or even ‘loose,’ construction of the Constitution.”

The Constitution isn’t some ball you pick up and take home just because you are still mad that Barack Obama is the President. If Senator GRASSLEY and Republicans find themselves on the wrong side of the Constitution, it is their policies that should change, not our Nation’s founding document, the Constitution of the United States. If Republicans are uncomfortable with not performing their duties, the answer isn’t to take an eraser to the Constitution. No, we don’t need to take an eraser to the Constitution. The answer is to do your job.

If the Senator from Iowa wants to extricate himself from the situation he created, there is a way. All he needs to do is wrest back his chairmanship from the Republican leader and give President Obama’s nominee a meeting, a hearing, and a vote. In short, he needs to do his job. It is that easy. No changes to the Constitution are required. If he does his job, the people in Iowa will not have reason to say: “This isn’t the CHUCK GRASSLEY we thought we knew.”

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. REID. Madam President, on another subject, last Thursday, the Department of Health and Human Services released updated statistics about the number of Americans who now have health insurance. This is ObamaCare. The numbers are incredible.

Since enactment of the Affordable Care Act, 20 million Americans have

gained health care coverage—20 million; 6.1 million adults, ages 19 to 25, now have health insurance.

Remember, it wasn't long ago that everyone said they wouldn't sign up. Now, 6.1 million have. Before we passed ObamaCare, some 50 million people in this Nation were without health care. Now, because of the Affordable Care Act, 91 percent of Americans are now insured. That is stunning. It is only getting better. Every day, more and more people who were previously without health insurance are now covered. That is true across racial and ethnic lines.

Listen to these stunning statistics. The uninsured rate for African Americans has dropped by more than 50 percent. That is the equivalent of 3 million newly insured people. The uninsured rate for Hispanics dropped by more than 25 percent, representing 4 million insured Americans.

The evidence is clear: The Affordable Care Act is working. From Nevada to Kentucky, our constituents are getting the quality health care they were promised when Congress passed the Affordable Care Act. It is time for Republicans to stop following Donald Trump's lead by clamoring for repeal.

It is really nervy for Republicans to come down here, as they do all the time in the Senate—they have been quiet lately—and as they do on the campaign trail. This large number of Republicans, which is narrow, still all say the same thing: The American people should listen to what we are saying; we have to get rid of the Affordable Care Act. We have to get rid of it.

How disappointing. It is time for Republicans to face the facts. ObamaCare is helping tens of millions of Americans and will continue to do so.

Madam President, I ask the Chair to announce the business of the day.

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 4 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, as my colleagues in the Senate just heard, the tantrums from the other side continue, but I guess it shouldn't surprise anybody because everyone around here knows that nothing makes the minority leader more mad than when his side is forced to play by its own rules.

The American people are divided, and the divided government the American people delivered over the last several election cycles reflects those divisions.

Our constitutional Republic was designed with a series of checks and balances. As any branch gets too powerful or exceeds its authority and tries to impose policies the American people don't want, the people express their will through the electoral process, and that is what we have witnessed during the last several election cycles.

Over the last few years, our current President has engaged in a systematic and very massive overreach of his executive power, way beyond what the Constitution has ever considered, and—thank God for checks and balances—the courts have said as much, and that is why I am here today. I am here today to tell you how the courts have interceded and curbed this massive overreach of Executive power. But as he has done so, the people have responded.

Since he was first sworn into office in 2009, nearly 70 additional Republicans have been elected to the People's House. And there are 13 more Republican Senators today than there were in January of 2009.

In January of 2014, frustrated that the people's representatives wouldn't enact his liberal policies, the President famously said that he would use “a pen and a phone” and impose his agenda anyway even though Article One of the Constitution is very clear. It states that the legislative powers of the United States shall be vested in the Congress, not with the President of the United States.

Just a few months later, in November of 2014, the people spoke and sent nine additional Republicans to the U.S. Senate.

This is the beauty of our system of checks and balances, and the Framers of our Constitution designed it that way. The Framers knew a thing or two about Executive overreach, because they had to deal with somebody called George III. They had firsthand experience with an Executive, King George III, who imposed his will on the people unilaterally.

So you wonder why our Constitution has checks and balances? The President holds the Executive power, the Congress writes the laws, and the Supreme Court interprets them. That is what we call separation of powers. That's why we have checks and balances. That's why we have separation of powers. And that is why our Constitution is designed so that no Presi-

dent can appoint a Supreme Court Justice with a pen and a phone.

As we continue to discuss what is at stake during this Presidential election and whether the American people want to elect a President who will appoint yet another liberal Justice, I wanted to take a few minutes to review some of this President's efforts to expand the reach of his power and impose his will on the American people. This President has pushed the envelope at every turn. He has sought to impose his will on the American people in ways and to a degree that this Nation has never before witnessed.

What is striking about this President's record before the Supreme Court is that even with a Court as liberal as ours, the Obama administration still has the lowest winning record of any President going back to at least the Truman administration. When presented with this undeniable fact, the President's apologists quickly grasp for the nearest bogus defense. Most notably, they claim that the Supreme Court is more ideologically hostile to this President than previous Courts were to other Presidents. Now that is a very crafty argument, but it is what Justice Scalia would have called “pure applesauce.”

Leading Supreme Court analysts declared the last term of the Supreme Court, even with Justice Scalia on that Court, as the most liberal since the 1960s. So the President's defenders can't blame the Court's makeup for its rebuke of his expansive claims of power. And of course this explanation fails to account for the fact that President Eisenhower took office and litigated in a Supreme Court with eight Justices who were appointed by Democrats or that President Nixon's administration began with an even more liberal Court than Eisenhower. No, this President hasn't lost cases because the Court is ideologically hostile to this President and his policy; the Court has rejected this President's power grabs because they are based on ideology and an unwillingness to recognize that the law constrains that power.

All too often the President's claims are supported by an Office of Legal Counsel and a Solicitor General's Office that seem unwilling to tell the President that his impulse for expanded power is flatly contrary to the law. I'd like to describe a few examples. The President's lawyers argued that he could ignore the Senate's determination—this body's determination—of when it was in session in order to make recess appointments. No President in our history ever claimed that recess appointments were permissible in that situation. But the Office of Legal Counsel—once considered the crown jewel of the Department of Justice—offered a tortured justification to sanction that assertion of power.

If this view of Presidential power were allowed to stand, the President could bypass the Senate with ease to install individuals in powerful government positions with no check from the