

great lawyers, who have had great experience, who will bring great distinction to the Court, and who will, without telling us how they are going to vote and how they are going to rule, do the job that we all count on the Supreme Court doing.

The Supreme Court, to me, is a sacred institution. We have had great Justices on both sides—on all sides, as a matter of fact. We have had great Democrat Justices. We have had great Republican Justices. No one knows how great the nominee is going to be until that nominee actually serves on the Court and does the job that is so difficult to do as a member of the U.S. Supreme Court. I have every confidence Neil Gorsuch will be one of the all-time great Justices for that Court. He deserves confirmation. He deserves overwhelming confirmation. If we weren't in such a disputative mood around here, if we didn't have so much problems with each other, he would be an easy person to support.

So I hope we can put our politics aside and look at the man, look at his experience, look at his ability, look at his genius, look at his decency, and look at the fact that he agreed with his colleagues on 99 percent of the cases tried before the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals—and most of those colleagues were Democrats. Look at these types of things, and say: My gosh, what are we about here? Has it just become a politicized exercise every time we have a Supreme Court nomination, one way or the other?

I have to admit that it looked as though Hillary Clinton was going to win. Senator MCCONNELL decided that we should not put Merrick Garland on during a Presidential election, which I think was a good decision. It was a sincere decision. It looked as though, if Hillary Clinton was going to win, she might very well put a much more liberal judge on the Court than Merrick Garland. The fact of the matter is, Senator MCCONNELL knew the odds were against Republicans winning the Presidency this last election.

To some, it was kind of miraculous for Donald Trump to win. It wasn't miraculous to me, because last May Donald Trump called me and asked me to support him. I said: You don't want me. I said: I am the kiss of death.

He laughed and he said: What do you mean the kiss of death?

Well, I supported Jeb Bush, and he went down to defeat. Then I supported MARCO RUBIO, my colleague in the Senate, and he had to withdraw. So I am the kiss of death.

He said: I want you, anyway.

So I became one of two Senators who supported this now-President of the United States and was gratified to see him win that election. I thought he could. Deep down, I knew there was a great chance because I was going all over the country and I found that people were not willing to say whom they were for. I knew darn well they were for Trump. They just didn't want to

admit it—especially Democrats. But he got an overwhelming number of blue-collar Democrats—I understand them; I learned a trade as a young man—who voted for him.

When I say I learned a trade, I was born not with the wealth of some of our colleagues. I was born in what some people would call poverty today. We didn't think we were poverty-stricken. My parents were very solid, decent, honorable people, but they were poor—frankly, poor in the sense of monetary value. But they were good, honest, decent people, and I feel very blessed to have been raised by them.

All I can say is this. To allow the selection of the Supreme Court nominee to come down to a wide vote against that nominee with the qualities of Neil Gorsuch—if that is what my colleagues on the other side, in their wisdom, decide to do, I think it is a disgrace. I think it flies in the face of years and years of people selected for the Court. Now, we all can differ. Everybody has that right. All I can say is I just wish we were more together as a body.

I have great respect for my Democratic colleagues, as well as my Republican colleagues. This is the greatest deliberative body in the world. Despite our difficulties and our differences, we do a lot of really good things for this country. And we do it at its best in a bipartisan way when we can.

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

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

SYRIA

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I would like to start briefly by mentioning the horrific chemical attack on innocent civilians in Syria earlier this week. It was nothing short of evil. I stand shoulder to shoulder with the administration in condemning this brutality. Again, we see Bashar al-Assad crossing a line—a line drawn and then ignored by the Obama administration.

The United States and the world community simply can't stand idly while Syria continues crimes against humanity, again, under Russian protection. That is why last night the administration responded quickly and proportionally. I commend the President and his national security team for acting decisively and sending a clear message to Assad and our allies. I am sure it was a message that was not missed by the leaders of the Iranian Government, the Russian Federation, and North Korea.

I agree with Ambassador Haley that Russia's obstructionism at the U.N. has enabled Assad and prevented international action, resulting in at least 400,000 Syrians dead in this civil war and millions of others displaced as ref-

ugees, not only internally but externally as well. Going forward, I stand ready to work with the President and his administration on a unified strategy to defeat Assad's barbarism and work toward greater stability in Syria and throughout the region.

Madam President, on another subject, as we all know, here in about 20 minutes, we will start the vote to confirm Neil Gorsuch as the next Justice of the Supreme Court. Over the last few weeks, our colleagues and I have—and the entire country, as a matter of fact—have gotten to know Judge Neil Gorsuch not only as a judge but as a man. He is a good man with superb qualifications and incredible integrity.

A Colorado native, Judge Gorsuch has served on the Denver-based Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals for about 10 years. He is known for his sharp intellect, his brilliant writing, and his faithful interpretation of the Constitution and laws passed by Congress. He is, in short, a distinguished jurist with an impeccable legal and academic record.

In addition to his decade on the bench, his professional experience includes years practicing in a private law firm, prestigious clerkships, including the Supreme Court of the United States under two separate Justices, and service in the Department of Justice.

It is simply undeniable that Judge Gorsuch is a qualified, high-caliber nominee. I have no doubt that he will serve our Nation well on the Supreme Court. But of course, in spite of all of this—his sterling background, his proven character, his broad bipartisan support—we have seen an unprecedented attack on this good judge and this good man in the form of a partisan political filibuster, the first ever lodged against a Supreme Court nominee. Yesterday, our Democratic colleagues would have prevented the up-or-down vote we are getting ready to have here starting at 11:30. For what? Well, it certainly was not because of the judge, his character, his qualifications, or his background and experience; it was merely because so many of our colleagues across the aisle simply have not gotten over the fact that Donald Trump won the Presidential election and Hillary Clinton did not.

Before Judge Gorsuch was nominated, the minority leader, our colleague Senator SCHUMER, said they needed a "mainstream nominee." After President Trump nominated a mainstream nominee, Democrats then looked for other ways to make him out to be some sort of extremist or radical. But they failed because there is simply no evidence to justify those kinds of characterizations.

For one, judicial experts spanning the political spectrum, including President Obama's former Solicitor General, voiced their support.

Second, they had to deal with the facts of his record. During his time on the Tenth Circuit, Judge Gorsuch was

involved in thousands of decisions—2,700 to be exact. The vast majority of those panel decisions made by at least three judges—sometimes more on the panel—97 percent of them were unanimous. So you would basically have to slander the reputations of all of those other judges with whom the judge agreed to claim that he is some sort of out-of-the-mainstream extremist. That is truly an impressive record for a judge in a multi-judge court like the Denver-based Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals. It simply rebuts any picture our friends across the aisle have attempted to paint of him as some kind of extremist or radical.

I would ask our friends this question: If Judge Gorsuch does not fit the bill for a qualified, mainstream nominee, then is there any nominee from this President or any other Republican President who will meet the Democrat's arbitrary, flimsy standard?

Time and time again, our friends across the aisle failed to make any intellectually honest argument against this nominee. Still, they are determined to block him. That brought us to the cloture vote yesterday and the last-ditch effort to block Judge Gorsuch. They did not want to even give him the up-or-down vote we are getting ready to have here in a few minutes. Instead, they wanted to kill his nomination by simply refusing an up-or-down vote and moving his nomination forward.

In our Nation's entire history, before yesterday there had only been four cloture votes for Supreme Court nominees—only four. None of them had been cast as a partisan filibuster determined to try to block the nomination—until yesterday.

Still, the minority leader, cheered on by the extreme groups on the left, barreled this Chamber to the first-ever partisan filibuster of a Supreme Court nominee, following a regrettable and recent tradition of Democratic obstructionism when it came to Republican judicial nominees.

Now that there is a Republican White House, that is what they want to do again—obstruct. This is a wholly concocted method the Democrats started back when George W. Bush was President to deny a Republican President an opportunity to nominate the person of his choice, confirmed by a majority vote in the Senate.

Before 2000, before Senator SCHUMER and a number of liberal legal activists decided they wanted to raise the threshold for confirmation to 60 votes, instead of what the Constitution requires, which is a majority vote. No one would ever have dreamed that the Constitution would have allowed for a 60-vote requirement, rather than an up-or-down vote.

It is not that our friends across the aisle truly oppose Judge Gorsuch. The fact is, they oppose President Trump. That is what this is all about.

This vote isn't actually about President Trump. It is about the man we

have all learned so much about, Judge Neil Gorsuch, who has a record of faithfully interpreting the law, a man who has proved himself to possess an independent judicial mind, who simply follows the law wherever it may lead. He is someone who has won bipartisan approval.

This vote is about delivering our promise. The Republicans have promised to let the American people's voice be heard in deciding who they would choose as President to select the next Supreme Court Justice. The American people did that. They chose President Trump, and he chose Judge Gorsuch.

If Hillary Clinton had been elected President today, I have no doubt that her choice for the Supreme Court would be confirmed by a majority vote in the same U.S. Senate.

Now it is time that we deliver on the promise we made to the American people and confirm Judge Neil Gorsuch to the Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I hadn't planned to speak this morning, but when my friend from Texas decided to give his version of history, I thought: Well, I ought to give my version. It is slightly different.

Justice Antonin Scalia passed away in February of last year. President Barack Obama, the President of the United States of America, had a constitutional responsibility under article II, section 2 to nominate a person to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court, as every other President had. And he did.

He came up with the name Merrick Garland, the Chief Judge on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, a man who is widely respected, judged unanimously "well qualified" by the American Bar Association. President Obama submitted his name to this Congress, to the Senate, a Senate that has a Republican majority, led by Senator MITCH MCCONNELL of Kentucky.

Senator MCCONNELL and the Republican Senators did something that had never happened in the history of this Chamber—not once. They denied President Obama's nominee the opportunity for a hearing and a vote. In fact, Senator MCCONNELL went further and said: I won't even meet with the man.

It had never happened before.

You say to yourself: Well, come on. This isn't beanbag. You are in Washington. This is major league politics. This sort of thing must happen all the time. Never.

In fact, if you go back not that far in history, to 1988, in the last year of President Ronald Reagan's Presidency—his fourth year of his second term, some call it the lameduck year—there was a vacancy on the Supreme Court.

Republican President Ronald Reagan sent the name Anthony Kennedy to a Democratically controlled Senate, which had the power to do the same

thing Senator MCCONNELL did: Deny a hearing, deny a vote.

Well, what did the Democrats do? We gave Justice Kennedy a hearing, a vote, and sent him to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court.

Under Senator MCCONNELL, the Republicans refused Merrick Garland the same opportunity, and they said to President Obama: You are in your fourth year. You are a lameduck. Your choice for the Supreme Court really doesn't count.

But there was more to it. Really, the strategy was based on the premise and possibility that a Republican would be elected in this last November election, and if so, that Republican President could fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court.

Well, that is exactly what happened. The election of Donald Trump gave him the opportunity to fill the vacancy of Antonin Scalia, a vacancy that should have been filled, I believe, by Merrick Garland, President Obama's nominee.

That is what led up to the vote yesterday, but there was more.

Where did the name Neil Gorsuch come from? It is true that he served on the Tenth Circuit for 10 years. He had been approved by the Senate. He certainly had a strong resume. But how did he get on the finalist list?

Well, most of the time you never know. Presidents don't always disclose how they come up with names. In this case, it was very open because, during the course of his campaign, Donald Trump, the candidate, listed 21 names of people whom he would appoint to the U.S. Supreme Court. On that list of names, Neil Gorsuch of Colorado.

How did that name make the list? Well, we know because President Trump told us. He was the choice of the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation. If you know these two organizations, you know they are Republican advocacy groups, very conservative groups, and they were going to pick the nominees who were approved by them and submit them to Donald Trump, which he then publicized. We know that because, at the end of the day, Donald Trump thanked the Federalist Society for nominating Judge Gorsuch. That is how the name came to us.

I sat through the hearings as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and I will tell you that most Supreme Court nominees don't go out of their way to volunteer information. They try to be respectful, but they don't try to say much of anything. They don't want to get in trouble either as judges or as candidates to be a Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court. So there were gaps in his testimony and troubling questions raised about him.

I don't want to dwell on him so much as I want to dwell on this process. What happened yesterday on the floor of the Senate was unfortunate. Since I have been in the Senate, the last four Justices on the Supreme Court—two

nominated by President Obama, Sonia Sotomayor and Elena Kagan, and two nominated by George W. Bush, John Roberts as well as Justice Alito—all received 60 votes during the course of their consideration. That is not, as the Senator from Texas alluded, written in the law per se, but it was written—until yesterday—in the rules of the Senate. You needed 60 votes to overcome the possibility of a filibuster and to file cloture.

Well, that rule was changed yesterday to a simple majority. That is an unfortunate occurrence. A lifetime appointment to the highest Court in the land should be more than just a bare majority vote, as far as I am concerned, and, historically, with very few exceptions, that has been the case.

That is not the case here. We found yesterday that the Republicans voted for a change in rules, which was under the power of the majority to do—a change in the rules, which lowered the standard for this judge for the first time officially in at least a century to a mere majority vote. That is what he received, and that is what brings his nomination to the floor today to be considered for the Supreme Court.

At the end of yesterday's session, when the rule was changed, some Senators were engaged in high fives on the other side of the aisle. I am not sure why. I don't think it was a time for any winning celebration. I think it was an unfortunate moment.

The question is, Where will we go from here? We know what the outcome of the vote will be on Judge Gorsuch this afternoon. That is preordained by the rule struggles we went through yesterday. But where does the Senate go? Where should we go? Well, I hope we will have the good sense to restore the 60-vote margin when it comes to future Supreme Court nominees.

It may be that Justice Gorsuch has an asterisk by his name as the only one to have been officially approved with cloture set at a majority vote, but I am hoping, even if he reaches the Supreme Court, that will not hold him back from serving this Nation well. I know he has told us over and over again that is exactly what he wants to do.

But I hope the Senate will restore the standard of 60 votes necessary for the Supreme Court. I really believe serving as a Supreme Court Justice is an extraordinary opportunity for a person to serve this Nation, an extraordinary responsibility, and we should take it very seriously. It shouldn't be a majority decision; it should be a 60-vote decision. I hope we get back to that very soon.

Secondly, I hope the Senate will not be derailed by this Supreme Court nomination having happened so early in the session. This is a great institution. I have given a big part of my life to it and look forward to serving more in the Senate—not as long as the Senator from Iowa, who I think has retired the trophy in his State for his service in the Senate—but I do believe this is a great institution.

An example is that the Senator from Iowa and I are of opposite political faiths. He and I have worked together on some important issues in the past, and we want to work together in the future. I think we can. If we can restore what you and I remember as the glory days of this body, it is in the best interest of this Nation.

So beyond this Supreme Court nomination, let's hope we can all come together to make that happen.

I see my colleagues filing in. I know they are anxious to vote. I am not going to hold the Chamber. I am just going to say that I thank the Presiding Officer and my friend, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I look forward to the vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, we are about to vote on the nomination of Judge Gorsuch, so I would like to say to my colleagues why I am so pleased that we will soon be referring to him as "Justice Gorsuch."

I opened our Judiciary Committee hearing with this:

One of Justice Scalia's best opinions begins with this declaration: it is the "proud boast of our democracy that we have a government of laws and not of men. . . . Without a secure structure of separated powers, our Bill of Rights would be worthless."

The separation of powers in our Constitution is a guardian of our liberty. Judge Gorsuch understands that. His deep understanding of the separation of powers enlivens his opinions.

By faithfully enforcing the boundaries among the branches of government and the power of the Federal Government in our lives, this Justice will ensure that the law protects our liberties.

Here is the other thing that is important about a judge who respects the separation of powers: We know he will be independent. He told us that he is his own man, that no person speaks for him. He is not beholden to the President who appointed him. His testimony shows that he is not beholden to us in the Congress either. He wouldn't compromise his independence to win confirmation votes. He passed the test.

This is a man of integrity, and his qualifications for the bench are exceptional. You know the story: bachelor's from Columbia University, Harvard Law School, doctorate from Oxford University, partnership at a prestigious law firm, and high-level Justice Department service for the people of our country, but most importantly, a decade-long record of faithfully applying the law on the Federal bench in 2,700 cases as a member of the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Let me sum up this way: This brilliant, honest, humble man is a judge's judge, and he will make a superb Justice.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield back the remainder of our time.

I withhold that request until the arrival of the leader.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of time on this side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gorsuch nomination?

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) would have voted "yea."

The VICE PRESIDENT. As a reminder, expressions of approval or disapproval are not permitted from the gallery.

Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 111 Ex.]

YEAS—54

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Alexander | Fischer | Murkowski |
| Barrasso | Flake | Paul |
| Blunt | Gardner | Perdue |
| Boozman | Graham | Portman |
| Burr | Grassley | Risch |
| Capito | Hatch | Roberts |
| Cassidy | Heitkamp | Rounds |
| Cochran | Heller | Rubio |
| Collins | Hoeven | Sasse |
| Corker | Inhofe | Scott |
| Cornyn | Johnson | Shelby |
| Cotton | Kennedy | Strange |
| Crapo | Lankford | Sullivan |
| Cruz | Lee | Thune |
| Daines | Manchin | Tillis |
| Donnelly | McCain | Toomey |
| Enzi | McConnell | Wicker |
| Ernst | Moran | Young |

NAYS—45

| | | |
|------------|--------------|-----------|
| Baldwin | Casey | Harris |
| Bennet | Coons | Hassan |
| Blumenthal | Cortez Masto | Heinrich |
| Booker | Duckworth | Hirono |
| Brown | Durbin | Kaine |
| Cantwell | Feinstein | King |
| Cardin | Franken | Klobuchar |
| Carper | Gillibrand | Leahy |

Markey
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Nelson

Peters
Reed
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shahen
Stabenow

Tester
Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Isakson

The nomination was confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to table the motion to reconsider.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 34, Rod Rosenstein to be Deputy Attorney General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Rod J. Rosenstein, of Maryland, to be Deputy Attorney General.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Rod J. Rosenstein, of Maryland, to be Deputy Attorney General.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Jeff Flake, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, John Barrasso, Chuck Grassley, Mike Rounds, John Kennedy, John Thune, Pat Roberts, James E. Risch, Orrin G. Hatch, Shelley Moore Capito, Lindsey Graham, John Cornyn.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived and that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture vote on the nomination occur following disposition of the Perdue nomination on Monday, April 24.

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

The Senator from Iowa.

THANKING STAFF

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, there are some people who need to have a thank-you for what we just completed here—people who hardly ever get any attention. So I will take a couple of minutes to express my appreciation to some of the staff who worked on this Supreme Court nomination.

The staff for both the majority and minority put in a lot of hours and reviewed a lot of material. Their work ensured that the hearing we held for Judge Gorsuch went smoothly and was fair to all of the Members. Our staff reviewed all of the 2,700 cases Judge Gorsuch participated in as well as 180,000 pages of documents that were produced by the Department of Justice and the George W. Bush Presidential Library and Museum that were related to that nomination.

First, on my staff, I would like to recognize my Judiciary Committee staff director, Kolan Davis. Mr. Davis has been with me for 31 years, and I always value his wise counsel.

I thank, as well, my personal office chief of staff, Jill Kozeny, who has been with me for 27 years.

My deputy staff director is Rita Lari, and my chief nominations counsel is right here at my side, Ted Lehman.

I would also like to thank counsels Megan Lacy, Lauren Mehler, Kasey O'Connor, and Katharine Willey. Each of them worked incredibly hard.

Also on the team were several special counsels who joined the staff to work on this important nomination. They are Dan Guarnera, Bill Lane, Katie Roholt, and Carol Szurkowski.

Every one of these talented lawyers played a very important role, and I think every member of the Senate Judiciary Committee benefited from their wise counsel throughout this confirmation process.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank Ranking Member FEINSTEIN, the Senator from California. The ranking member and her staff approached this process seriously from the very beginning. So I want to thank her staff for all the work they have put into preparing for the hearing and the debate, both in committee and here on the floor.

Thank you to her staff director, Jennifer Duck, and several of the other lawyers on her staff who, I know, put a lot of time into ensuring that the hearing was a success. They include Paige Herwig, Nazneen Mehta, and Chan Park.

I am also thankful for my very talented press team, Beth Levine and Taylor Foy, and for Jen Heins for keeping me on schedule, as well as for my personal office staff and the rest of the Judiciary Committee staff who took care of things while I was on the floor and during the long hours in the hearing.

I also deeply appreciate the work of Senator MCCONNELL's staff who was constantly in contact with my staff—most importantly John Abegg.

The people I mentioned bore the bulk of the workload and labored tirelessly night after night, day after day, and nonstop through the weekends. They deserve our recognition as a tribute to their hard work, professionalism, and dedication to public service.

Finally, my thanks to the Judiciary Committee's chief clerk, Roslyne Turner, and her team, Michelle Heller and Jason Covey.

All of these staff members contributed to this process, and we would not have been able to conduct such a fair and thorough hearing without their hard work and their professionalism. To each of them, I extend a heartfelt thanks, and if I left anybody out, I will buy them a Dairy Queen.

Mr. President, finally, my wife Barbara is in the Capitol today. As always, I thank her for her support and partnership for more than 62 years.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

CONFIRMATION OF NEIL GORSUCH

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee for the work he carried out over the past several months as this nomination proceeded.

Mostly, I want to congratulate Judge Neil Gorsuch on his confirmation to the U.S. Supreme Court.

While people in this Chamber voted yea or nay—some voted yes and some voted no—we all recognize the heavy obligation that now falls on the shoulders of Judge Gorsuch as a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

We will lean on Judge Gorsuch to make sure our Constitution is enforced. The American people will lean on Judge Gorsuch to make sure justice is dispensed impartially, with equality—that justice is indeed blind.

To Judge Gorsuch and his family, congratulations.

To the people of this Chamber who worked so hard over the past several weeks and months to assure this moment happened, thank you.

To the great State of Colorado, it is an honor to have a fourth-generation Coloradan—a man of the West, with grit and determination—join the Nation's High Court.

I yield the floor.

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

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

COMMENDING THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, I would like to add my voice to yours in commending the chairman of the Judiciary