do, we should keep in mind the counsel of his former Tenth Circuit colleagues—both as to their experience with Judge Gorsuch on the bench and their view of our role in questioning him now that he is before the Senate. Judges Deanell Reece Tacha and Robert Henry both served with Judge Gorsuch on the Tenth Circuit. Both were chief judges of that court, in fact, and both have gone on to careers in academia: Judge Tacha as dean of the Pepperdine University School of Law and Judge Henry as president and chief executive of Oklahoma City University. Judge Tacha was appointed to the circuit court by President Reagan while Judge Henry was appointed to the circuit court by President Clinton. They describe themselves as a lifelong Republican and Democrat, respectively.

They write that "predictions abound as to how Judge Neil Gorsuch—if confirmed—would lean or even vote on this or that case. . . . But these essentially political discussions tend to distort the role of judges in our government." They remind us that the " 'independence of the judges' is a most sacred tradition in U.S. constitutional law, requiring all judges to have no obligations to those who nominated or confirmed them." Let me repeat that. They note that the principle of judicial independence requires judges not to have obligations to those who nominate them or those who confirm them.

In that regard, Judges Tacha and Henry remind us that "[d]etailed discussions during the confirmation process on issues that might come before a judge are not proper; in fact, they would in all likelihood require recusals from the cases discussed." They point out how the judicial process is different from the confirmation process. They observe that "controversies that go before the court often bring unique and complicated facts that could completely change a judge's sincerely espoused view." Legal research is "[a]nother critically important input into judicial decisions." Legal research might reveal precedent that overrides a judge's "previously held views or even logical interpretations of legal text." They emphasize that the judicial process is the collection of "[t]hese factors—tradition, independence, precedent and unique facts," and that these factors "often combine to lead judicial nominees to change their views when confronted with specific cases."

By contrast, these factors are not present in the confirmation process. So it is not realistic or fair to expect a judicial nominee to state or imply under oath how he or she might rule as a judge. That is why Justice Ginsburg could not give any hints, forecasts, or previews of her possible rulings during her Supreme Court nomination hearing.

But we don't have to guess how Judge Gorsuch would conduct himself as a Justice. We have a 10-year record of his judicial decisions, and we have the professional experience of those who practiced before him and those who have served with him. As for the latter, Judges Tacha and Henry give him the highest marks.

Judge Gorsuch was, they say, "like most good judges, assiduously attentive to the facts and the law in each case." If he were confirmed to the Supreme Court, they say that "other important traits of Gorsuch that are not likely to change" are things like "his fair consideration of opposing views, his remarkable intelligence, his wonderful judicial temperament expressed to litigants and his collegiality toward colleagues."

They conclude by saying that "[i]f we seek to confirm to the Supreme Court a noted intellect, a collegial colleague, and a gifted and eloquent writer—as well as a person of exhibited judicial temperament—Gorsuch fits that bill. He represents the best of the judicial tradition in our country."

Their endorsement tracks with so many others we have heard, and I am confident Judge Gorsuch will show the country today and tomorrow why so many people are so proud to support him to be our next Supreme Court Justice.

NOMINATION OF DANNY REEVES

Mr. McCONNELL. As to another well-qualified judge whose nomination is currently being considered by the Senate, today, we will consider the nomination of U.S. District Court Judge Danny Reeves to serve on the U.S. Sentencing Commission. He is a great choice to serve on the Commission, and I look forward to the Senate confirming him.

Among its responsibilities, the Commission is tasked with setting sentencing policy in our Federal judicial system. While I don't always agree with the policy outcomes, I appreciate the important role it plays in trying to ensure fairness in our Federal courts. Judge Reeves is well prepared for the task ahead. I am confident he will do great work on the Commission.

His legal career began in Northern Kentucky University's Salmon P. Chase College of Law, where he graduated with honors in 1981. After graduation, he clerked with Judge Eugene Siler, then a district court judge in the Eastern and Western Districts of Kentucky. Upon finishing his clerkship, Judge Reeves entered private practice at what was then known as Greenebaum Doll & McDonald. He became a partner there in 1988.

In 2001, I had the first of many in-depth discussions with Judge Reeves. I was so impressed by him that I recommended him to then-President George W. Bush and that I appoint Judge Reeves as a Federal district court judge in Kentucky. The Senate confirmed him without a dissenting vote, and he served with distinction on the Federal bench.

Judge Reeves has been lauded for his steady devotion to the rule of law, for his commitment to fair rulings predicated on the facts and law—rather than his own political beliefs—and for his evenhanded approach to all who enter his courtroom. Because of his demonstrated appreciation for these precepts, Judge Reeves will be a significant asset to the Commission and an advocate for sound and sober decision-making.

As many of you know, the Commission has been operating, to the extent it can, without a quorum. Not only does Judge Reeves' appointment stand as validation of his distinguished career as a respected jurist, but, along with the reappointment of U.S. District Court Judge Charles Breyer, it represents a return to an operational agency. Now the Commission can get back to the business for which it was designed, establishing uniform sentencing practices and policies that will be utilized in Federal courts all across the country.

So I look forward to supporting and congratulating Judge Danny Reeves, as well as his wife Cindy and their sons Adam and Joe and their families, on his confirmation to the U.S. Sentencing Commission.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT RESOLUTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on one final matter, over the past several weeks, the Senate has been working to bring much needed relief from the regulatory onslaught of the last 8 years. Using the Congressional Review Act, or CRA, we have already taken action to end regulations that threaten jobs, weaken our economy, and undermine States' authority. Today we will continue to move forward with our efforts to block more unnecessary regulations that hold our country back in a number of ways. The CRA resolution that we will consider today will end regulation that undercuts Alaska's ability to manage its fish and wildlife resources. As a coalition of hunters, fishing enthusiasts, and conservationists recently wrote me, "Congress promised that the citizens of Alaska, working through their Department of Fish and Game would be able to manage their own fish and wildlife, as do the other 49 states."

Passing this CRA resolution will roll back the administration's overreach and restore the State-Federal balance that Congress originally intended. Our colleagues from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator SULLIVAN, are the sponsors of this resolution we will consider today. They know the damage this regulation would do to their home State. They have been working to do something about it.

They have also been quick to point out the concerning precedent this rule would mean for the rest of the States. I appreciate their leadership on this issue and look forward to joining them in overturning this harmful Obama administration regulation as soon as possible.