

has been nurtured by a far-right billionaire and corporate titan, Philip Anschutz, who has gone out of his way to fund hard-right judicial causes, including the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation. President Trump outsourced his choice of a Supreme Court nominee to these organizations, and they recommended Judge Gorsuch.

Neil Gorsuch represented Mr. Anschutz's firm as a young lawyer. He has earned his favor and patronage ever since. It was Anschutz's top lawyer, someone who represented Anschutz here on the Hill, who lobbied for Gorsuch to get the spot on the Federal appeals court. Judge Gorsuch has been partners in an LLC with two of Anschutz's top advisers, building a vacation home together. Of course, there is no problem with that. Anyone can be partners. But it goes to show the long-standing intertwined ties between one of the leading advocates for a hard-right pro-corporate agenda, Mr. Anschutz, and Judge Gorsuch. The long history of ties between Judge Gorsuch and Mr. Anschutz suggests a judge whose fundamental economic and judicial philosophy is favorable to the wealthy and the powerful and the far right.

Judge Gorsuch may sometimes express sympathy for the less powerful verbally, but when it comes time to rule, when the chips are down, he has far too often sided with the powerful few over everyday Americans trying to get a fair shake. He has repeatedly sided with insurance companies that want to deny disability benefits to employees. In employment discrimination cases, Bloomberg found he sided with employers 66 percent of the time. In one of the few cases where he sided with an employee, it was a Republican woman who alleged she was fired for being a conservative.

On money in politics, the scourge, the poison of our political system—undisclosed dark money—Judge Gorsuch seems to be in the same company as Justices Thomas and Scalia, willing to restrict the most commonsense contribution limits.

Judge Gorsuch's record demonstrates he prefers CEOs over citizens, executives over employees, corporations over consumers.

Later this morning, I will be meeting with people who have personally experienced the real-life implications of Judge Gorsuch's decisions: Alphonso Maddin from Michigan, a truckdriver who was fired because he left his vehicle when freezing; Patricia Caplinger from Missouri, who sued Medtronic after being injured by a medical device implanted in a non-FDA-approved manner; David Hwang and Katherine Hwang, whose late mother, Proffer Grace Hwang, sued Kansas State University after being fired following a 6-month leave for cancer and requesting to work at home because of a flu epidemic. Their stories illuminate the real-world effects of a judge who sides with Anschutz-like interests over ev-

eryday Americans like Mr. Maddin, Ms. Caplinger, and the Hwang family.

My colleague, my friend, the Republican leader, said there is no principled reason to be opposed to Judge Gorsuch. Yes, if your principles say the law should be used time and time again to support powerful corporate interests over average Americans, maybe there is no principled objection. But for most Americans, the overwhelming majority of whom want the Court to bring justice to the people who have less power—and the Court is their last resort—there are plenty of principled reasons to vote against Judge Gorsuch.

Because of starkly unequal concentrations of wealth and ever-increasing corporate power, aided and abetted by decisions like *Citizens United*, because they have skewed the playing field even more decisively to special interests and away from the individual citizen, we need a nominee who would reverse that trend, not exacerbate it.

Donald Trump campaigned on helping average people. His nominee sides with corporate interests against average people like Mr. Maddin, Ms. Caplinger, and the Hwang family over and over again. From all indications, Judge Gorsuch is not the kind of nominee who has sympathy and helps average Americans when it comes to judging and the law.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel Coats, of Indiana, to be Director of National Intelligence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 10 a.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise today to support Senator Dan Coats, our former colleague and a friend, as the President's nominee to be the next Director of National Intelligence. Dan Coats has been asked to lead our Nation's intelligence community of over 100,000 individuals during, I think, the most profound period of threats and change. Let me say to my colleagues,

it is a job that Dan Coats is well prepared to do.

After graduating from Wheaton College, Dan served honorably in the U.S. Army before serving the State of Indiana as a House Member, as a Senator, and for not only Indiana but this country as Ambassador to Germany.

While in the Senate, Dan was engaged and was a valuable member of the Senate Intelligence Committee. He dedicated countless hours to understanding and overseeing the intelligence community—in essence, one of 15 people who certified for 85 others and for the American people that we do everything we can to keep America safe but we do it within the parameters of the rule of law. He is well versed in the operational capabilities and authorities. He understands the threat we are facing at home and abroad. He understands that we need to improve our ability to collect against our adversaries, and Dan will be a forceful advocate for intelligence collection but, again, never jeopardizing that line of what is legal and what is not.

Dan's legislative experience also translates to his understanding and his appreciation of the need for transparency with the appropriate oversight committees and, more importantly, with the Congress and the American people.

Dan's intellect, his judgment, his honorable service, and his commitment to the workforce make him a natural fit as Director of National Intelligence. I have absolute trust that he will lead the community with integrity, and he will ensure that the intelligence enterprise operates lawfully, ethically, and morally.

So today I rise in this austere body to urge my colleagues to support the President's nominee for Director of National Intelligence. We are now in March. We have gone from January until March with one of the most important posts of this administration unfilled. Congress must act quickly, and it is my hope that Members, before the end of this day, will make sure we have a Director of National Intelligence in place.

I urge my colleagues to support this nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

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 Daniel Coats, of Indiana, to be Director of National Intelligence.

Mitch McConnell, Michael B. Enzi, David Perdue, Bob Corker, John Hoeven, Lamar Alexander, Bill Cassidy, John Barrasso, Dan Sullivan, Tim Scott, James Lankford, Tom Cotton, Mike Rounds, James M. Inhofe, Chuck Grassley, Roy Blunt, Richard Burr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Daniel Coats, of Indiana, to be Director of National Intelligence, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 88, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 88 Ex.]

YEAS—88

Alexander	Flake	Nelson
Barrasso	Franken	Perdue
Bennet	Gardner	Peters
Blumenthal	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Reed
Boozman	Hassan	Risch
Brown	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heinrich	Rounds
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Rubio
Capito	Heller	Sasse
Cardin	Hirono	Schatz
Carper	Hoeven	Schumer
Casey	Inhofe	Scott
Cassidy	Johnson	Shaheen
Cochran	Kaine	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Stabenow
Coons	King	Strange
Corker	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Tester
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Manchin	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Udall
Daines	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Feinstein	Murphy	
Fischer	Murray	

NAYS—11

Baldwin	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Markey	Warren
Duckworth	Merkley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Isakson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 88, the nays are 11.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first of all, I thank my friend the Senator from Texas for giving me the courtesy of letting me get in my comments about the nomination of former Senator Dan Coats to serve as the fifth Director of National Intelligence, a position recommended by the 9/11 Commission and established by the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004.

Dan Coats is a friend of mine and many in this body. He represented Indiana in both the U.S. House and for separate terms in the U.S. Senate. He was also U.S. Ambassador to Germany from 2001 to 2005. As mentioned, for 6 years I served with the nominee on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. I have always found Dan to be fair-minded and know him to be an advocate for strong oversight of the intelligence community. He believes in the need for intelligence that is timely, relevant, and free of political interference.

During my private meeting with him, as well as during his confirmation hearing, Senator Coats committed to find and follow the truth, regardless of where it leads, agreeing that his primary job will be “to speak truth to power,” to the President, to policy and military leaders, and to Members of Congress. I know these are traits he will continue to employ if confirmed as the next Director of National Intelligence.

During James Clapper’s most recent tenure as the DNI, in 6 years he put in place some fundamental changes in how the Intelligence community operates. He reoriented the Office of the DNI to focus on intelligence integration with an emphasis on mission. He often was willing to roll up his sleeves and take on the hard challenges of trying to get the intel community to operate on the same IT backbone systems. If confirmed, I have encouraged Senator Coats to build upon former Director Clapper’s efforts, which are critical to ensuring that policymakers, warfighters, law enforcement, and national security officers receive intelligence products that are timely, relevant, and objective.

Of course, if confirmed, Director Coats will take on the job as the Nation’s chief intelligence officer, leading the intelligence community during a very difficult time because unfortunately this President, along with his closest advisers, has repeatedly and unfairly disparaged the professionalism and actions of the Nation’s intelligence professionals. These are men and women who maintain the highest standards of professionalism and integrity. They anonymously sacrifice for the country, often in the face of grave personal danger.

As DNI, Senator Coats is committed to defending the values and integrity of the men and women of the intelligence community, even when the White House may not like to hear it.

Another challenge Senator Coats will face on his first day on the job is to effectively support the Senate Intelligence Committee’s ongoing investigation into Russian interference in the 2016 Presidential election. Last week, I went to CIA headquarters in Langley, along with a number of other Members of the committee, to review the beginnings of the raw intelligence that led the community to conclude that Russia massively interfered in our last

Presidential election. Both in public and in private, Senator Coats has promised he will support the committee’s investigation to the fullest. We will hold him to that commitment.

On this topic, I want to reiterate on the Senate floor what I have already said numerous times. This investigation is not about being a Democrat or Republican nor about relitigating the 2016 election. The investigation is about upholding the core values and sanctity of democracy that all Americans hold dear. It is also about holding Russia accountable for their improper interference in our elections and arming our allies—one of which has an election today—with information about the means employed by Russia in our elections so they can use that information to protect the integrity of their own electoral process.

We will work to ensure that this critical investigation is done right, done in a bipartisan manner, free of any political interference, and as the chairman and I have both reiterated, that it follows the facts wherever they may lead.

I have every reason to believe Senator Coats will be forthcoming in supporting this investigation. If at any point it becomes clear to me that the Senate Intelligence Committee is unable to keep up these commitments, I am prepared to support another process.

Finally, let me acknowledge two other things.

During Senator Coats’ confirmation hearing, he was asked about his role on the National Security Council, including the Principals Committee. He assured us that he will be attending these meetings and participating in them despite the confusion created by an Executive order that appeared to disinvite the DNI from these meetings. If he is not included in these meetings, I will expect to know about it and the reason why.

Senator Coats has also committed to me personally and to the committee that he will not support the return of waterboarding and other so-called enhanced interrogation practices, nor will he support reestablishing secret detention sites into the activities of the intelligence community. He reassured the committee that he will follow the law as it now stands and that he will not advocate for changes to the law or recommend a reinterpretation of the law based on any personal beliefs. The law is clear: No interrogation techniques outside the Army Field Manual are allowed.

Finally, Senator Coats has also reassured me and all of the members of the committee that if confirmed, he will always present to the President, to his Cabinet advisers, and to those of us in Congress the unvarnished facts as represented by the best judgments of the intelligence community whether or not that analysis is in agreement with the views of the President, with ours in Congress, or with anyone else’s who might receive them.

For these reasons, I support the movement. I was glad to see 88 Members of this body support Dan's movement forward. I believe he will be a great fifth Director of National Intelligence.

I thank my friend the Senator from Texas for giving me time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Virginia, who is the vice chair of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, for his remarks.

I, too, support the nomination of Dan Coats to serve as the next Director of National Intelligence and succeed James Clapper, who has been in the intelligence business for 50-plus years. He has big shoes to fill, but I have every confidence Dan Coats can do that.

One of the things I hope he looks at is that post-9/11, when the Office of the Director of National Intelligence was created, we basically created another layer in the intelligence community. As the Presiding Officer and other Members know, the DNI—the Office of the Director of National Intelligence—has grown by leaps and bounds. I just hope he takes a good, hard look at the layers we have created, perhaps at the duplicative functions that do not necessarily make our intelligence any better but that do create more problems in managing what is a very important office to our national security and certainly to the intelligence community.

SUNSHINE WEEK

Mr. President, on another matter, in spite of the snow yesterday, I recognize the fact that this is Sunshine Week. Sunshine Week is a movement that was created to highlight the need for more transparent and open government. Justice Brandeis is also often quoted when one talks about transparency in government and its importance to a functioning democracy when he said that sunlight is the best disinfectant.

As a conservative, I would much rather have people change their behavior in their knowing that their actions are going to be public rather than to pass new laws and new regulations. To me, knowing that the public is going to be aware of what one is doing causes people, typically, to be on their best behavior. I think that is the reason I support Justice Brandeis' comment that sunlight is the best disinfectant. I believe that is true.

I have done my best to keep that sentiment in mind to create legislation that presses our democracy toward more openness in the Federal Government, not less. That is because I believe our country grows stronger when operating under the principle that an open government is the basic requirement for a healthy democracy. Of course, when voters know and understand what their government is doing, they are in the best position to change its direction if they disagree with it or to reaffirm that direction by casting their votes as informed members of the electorate.

Democracy can only work when the public knows what government is doing and can hold it accountable, so I am glad that at this time of year, we can look back at the successful efforts we have made to promote transparency while looking ahead to do more.

Last Congress, I introduced the Freedom of Information Act Improvement Act. It is a law that strengthens the existing Freedom of Information Act, which is the country's chief open government law, by requiring Federal agencies to operate under a presumption of openness when considering whether to release government information in their custody.

We passed it last summer, and President Obama signed it into law. This important new law accomplishes some of the most sweeping and meaningful reforms in its history to the Freedom of Information Act, and it is already making a direct impact by helping the public access more information.

Because of the Freedom of Information Act Improvement Act, last October, the CIA released a portion of its official history of the Bay of Pigs invasion, which has been kept classified for decades. This is a critical part of our Nation's history that is worth knowing, and I believe it is no longer necessary to keep it under wraps in order to protect America's national security.

This serves as an example of what we are trying to accomplish with this law and others like it so as to build upon the idea the Founding Fathers recognized hundreds of years ago; that a truly democratic system depends on an informed citizenry to hold its leaders accountable. That is an idea everyone in this Chamber, on both sides of the aisle, can agree upon.

I am thankful to the senior Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY, for working with me on the Freedom of Information Act Improvement Act and making it a priority. As a matter of fact, Senator LEAHY has been my partner on a number of our efforts in this important area over the years that we have both been in the Senate.

I also appreciate Chairman GRASSLEY's leadership, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, for stewarding this bill through the committee, and I appreciate Leader MCCONNELL for making sure this was a priority for this Chamber.

In looking ahead, I will continue working with Chairman GRASSLEY to make sure the Federal agencies are implementing this law in a timely manner, and I look forward to doing more to strengthen greater government transparency measures in the future.

NOMINATION OF NEIL GORSUCH

Finally, Mr. President, next week, the Judiciary Committee will take up the nomination of Neil Gorsuch for the U.S. Supreme Court so he may fill the seat that was vacated by the death of Justice Scalia. That process, of course, begins with hearings to consider his qualifications and his credentials, but heading into next week, we already know a lot about his record.

He has been praised by people across the political spectrum—from liberals to conservatives—as a highly qualified and exceptional judge with impeccable integrity. He served with great distinction on the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, based out of Denver, for the last 10 years, after having been confirmed by this Chamber unanimously. His hometown newspaper, the Denver Post, encouraged the President to nominate Judge Gorsuch before his nomination was even announced. This, of course, was the same newspaper that endorsed Hillary Clinton for President. Clearly, Judge Gorsuch has won the respect of those across the political spectrum and on both sides of the aisle. Last week, the American Bar Association announced its unanimous decision to grant Judge Gorsuch the highest rating available; that of "well qualified" as a nominee to serve on the Supreme Court of the United States.

I should point out that both the minority leader and former chairman of the Judiciary Committee—the senior Senator from Vermont—have called the American Bar Association's rating system the "gold standard" when it comes to assessing the qualifications of judicial nominees.

Judge Gorsuch will also bring decades of experience on the bench, as I mentioned a moment ago. He has also served in private practice, as an attorney with the Justice Department, and, of course, as a Federal judge.

It is time to move forward with the President's nominee to fill the seat that was left open by the death of the late Justice Scalia, and I believe Judge Gorsuch is just the man to fill it. I look forward to hearing from him next week as we consider his nomination to this important position.

I express my gratitude to Chairman GRASSLEY and the ranking member, Senator FEINSTEIN, for their efforts thus far in putting these hearings together, and I look forward to working with the rest of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee to consider the nomination of Judge Gorsuch, starting next Monday, March 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I know both sides are working on trying to get an arrangement for the vote.

Mr. President, I also want to tell my colleague from Texas that I listened very carefully to his remarks with respect to transparency in government. He has had a long interest in the Freedom of Information Act and the like. I noted that he made a comment about the Bay of Pigs, about which information is still classified, and I know something about this because my dad wrote a book about the subject. My hope is that my friend from Texas and his interest in transparency will also extend to some other areas.

As I indicated, I am very familiar with my colleague's record with respect to Freedom of Information Act issues, which really is impressive. I