Gardner	McConnell	Schumer
Graham	McSally	Scott (FL)
Grassley	Menendez	Scott (SC)
Hassan	Moran	Shaheen
Hawley	Murkowski	Shelby
Heinrich	Murphy	Sinema
Hirono	Murray	Smith
Hoeven	Paul	Stabenow
Hyde-Smith	Perdue	Sullivan
Inhofe	Peters	Tester
Isakson	Portman	Thune
Johnson	Reed	Toomey
Kaine	Risch	Udall
Kennedy	Roberts	Van Hollen
King	Romney	Warner
Klobuchar	Rosen	Wicker
Lankford	Rounds	Wyden
Leahy	Rubio	Young
Lee	Sasse	
Manchin	Schatz	

NAYS—6

Brown	Gillibrand	Merkley
Casey	Markey	Warren

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Jones	Tillis
Harris	Sanders	Whitehouse

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINT RECEIVED ON AUGUST 12, 2019, BY THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY SHOULD BE TRANSMITTED IMMEDIATELY TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OF THE SENATE AND THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in August a public servant inside the intelligence community found the conduct of the President of the United States alarming enough to file an official whistleblower complaint. The inspector general of the intelligence community found this whistleblower complaint both credible and urgent. By law, the Director of National Intelligence must forward such a complaint to the congressional intelligence committees within 7 days of receiving it. Congress has been informed by the inspector general of the intelligence community in writing that the Trump administration is preventing that complaint from being sent to the relevant committees in Congress.

Those are the facts. The situation they describe is unacceptable. We know that the executive branch is blocking the legislative branch—a coequal branch of our government—from performing its constitutional oversight duties. The fact that the whistleblower complaint concerns our national security, our foreign policy, and potential misconduct by the President makes the situation even more serious.

In a short time, I will ask my colleagues' consent to pass a simple resolution. It essentially says ''that the whistleblower complaint received on August 12, 2019, by the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall be transmitted immediately to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.''

I cannot imagine any legitimate or straight-faced reason for an objection to this unanimous consent request. The only reason for any Senator to object would be to shield the President's conduct from scrutiny by the public and the representatives they elect to represent them; that is, to protect the President from accountability.

In a moment, I hope this resolution will pass without a single dissenting Senator, and it should.

The request, despite its noncontroversial nature, speaks to the issues that go back to the founding days of our Republic: checks and balances, the separation of powers, and the constitutional duty of the President and the executive branch to faithfully execute the laws of the United States. The Senate, today—right now—should speak with one unified voice to reaffirm those time-honored principles and defend the grand traditions of our democracy.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 325, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 325) expressing the sense of the Senate that the whistleblower complaint received on August 12, 2019, by the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community should be transmitted immediately to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, all of us share the concern for protecting whistleblowers who use appropriate, established channels to raise legitimate concerns. The Senate's obligation is to treat such allegations in a responsible and deliberate manner, to avoid racing to judgment based on media leaks, and to not fuel media speculation with reckless accusations.

There is much we do not know about the complaint lodged with the intelligence community's inspector general, including whether the complaint involves intelligence activities at all.

Before the Democratic leader elected to go to the media yesterday, the chairman and vice chair of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence had already been working together in a bipartisan manner—free from politicization—to get more information from both the Acting Director of National Intelligence and the intelligence community's inspector general. Given the progress the committee was making, I don't believe this made-for-TV moment was actually necessary. I would have preferred the committee be allowed to do its work in a quiet and methodical manner. It doesn't serve the committee or its goals to litigate its business here on the floor or for the television cameras.

Nevertheless, I agree that the DNI should make additional information available to the committee so it can evaluate the complaint consistent with the statute and other procedures that exist to safeguard classified and sensitive information.

I also want to express my appreciation for President Trump's announcement that the White House will release tomorrow the ''complete, fully-declassified, and unredacted transcript of [his] phone conversation with President Zelensky.'' I hope this will help to refocus the conversation away from reckless speculation and back toward the facts.

So, stipulating that our objective here is simply to conduct the kind of bipartisan oversight of intelligence matters that the committee has successfully conducted in the past, I have no objection to the Senator's request.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, three brief points. First, this resolution is not aimed at the Senate Intelligence Committees. Senators BURR and WARNER do a diligent job in trying to figure out what is going on. It is aimed at a thus far recalcitrant executive branch which has blocked the ability for the committees to see the complaint even though law requires it.

Second, it is welcomed that we can join together to do our job of oversight. I want to thank the majority leader for not blocking this request, because I think every one of us in this Chamber realizes the importance of oversight and the need to prevent an overreaching executive from going that far. Getting the transcript is a good step, but it is the complaint we need.

That is the gravamen of this resolution. It is the whistleblower's complaint, not the transcript, that we need and are asking for in this resolution.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion 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. 325) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the remaining votes in the series be 10 minutes in length.

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

Under the previous order, the Senate will resume the Cella nomination.

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 299 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Blackburn	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hawley	Risch
Boozman	Hoeven	Roberts
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Burr	Inhofe	Rounds
Capito	Isakson	Rubio
Cassidy	Johnson	Sasse
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	King	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sinema
Crapo	Manchin	Sullivan
Cruz	McConnell	Thune
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Murphy	

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Rosen
Bennet	Hassan	Schatz
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schumer
Brown	Hirono	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Smith
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Peters	Wyden
Feinstein	Reed	

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Jones	Tillis
Harris	Sanders	Whitehouse

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Daniel Habib Jorjani, of Kentucky, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to address a matter relating to the nomination of Daniel Jorjani to be Solicitor at the Department of Interior. In March, I joined a bipartisan, bicameral letter to Interior raising concerns about proposed updates to its Freedom of Information Act, FOIA, regulations. These changes appeared to shift the burden of identifying the location of agency hold records from the agency to the public, set limits on requests when they involve processing a ''vast quantity of material,'' and imposed a monthly limit on the processing of records for a given requester—all of which have no identifiable basis in the FOIA statute. Since then, reports indicated other concerning FOIA policies at Interior that could result in unlawful delays of FOIA responses—policies that were in place while Mr. Jorjani served as Deputy Solicitor, with key FOIA responsibilities. Over the weekend, Interior's inspector general confirmed an investigation into the FOIA process at Interior. I look forward to reading the results of this investigation and learning more about the development of these policies. If confirmed as Solicitor at Interior, Mr. Jorjani would oversee and resolve FOIA appeals, among other critically important transparency policies. As we have seen in successive administrations, FOIA requests are often viewed as the skunk at the picnic. But the government's business is the people's business. Going forward, Mr. Jorjani would do well to consult with Congress on any FOIA policy matters at Interior to ensure compliance with the law. I intend to vote for Mr. Jorjani today, but let me be clear: I will be holding him—and any others under any administration—accountable to faithful compliance with both the letter and spirit of FOIA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Jorjani nomination?

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 300 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Cornyn	Gardner
Barrasso	Cotton	Graham
Blackburn	Cramer	Grassley
Blunt	Crapo	Hawley
Boozman	Cruz	Hoeven
Braun	Daines	Hyde-Smith
Burr	Enzi	Inhofe
Capito	Ernst	Isakson
Cassidy	Fischer	Johnson
Kennedy	Perdue	Scott (FL)
Lankford	Portman	Scott (SC)
Lee	Risch	Shelby
McConnell	Roberts	Sullivan
McSally	Romney	Thune
Moran	Rounds	Toomey
Murkowski	Rubio	Wicker
Paul	Sasse	Young

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Peters	
Gillibrand	Reed	

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Jones	Tillis
Harris	Sanders	Whitehouse

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David Fabian Black, of North Dakota, to be Deputy Commissioner of Social Security for a term expiring January 19, 2025 (Reappointment).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I oppose the nomination of David Black to be Deputy Commissioner of Social Security. I have longstanding concerns about how management at the Social Security Administration has treated the unions representing their workforce, and I am concerned about the role that Mr. Black may have played in these anti-union practices.

SSA was especially hostile towards its workers when it implemented the anti-union Executive orders that President Trump issued on May 25, 2018. SSA was one of the few agencies to evict unions from office space pursuant to the Executive orders, in the brief time before a Federal district court issued an injunction blocking key parts of the Executive orders. SSA also abrogated its unexpired contract with administrative law judges who are represented by the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers, which even the Executive orders themselves expressly prohibited.

After the Executive orders were blocked in court, SSA went to the Federal Service Impasses Panel to impose a contract on workers represented by the American Federation of Government Employees, and the terms of this contract were highly similar to provisions of the Executive orders. SSA is now using similar tactics against workers represented by National Treasury Employees Union.

We need to stop a bad situation from getting worse. The Senate should demand stronger commitments to improve labor relations from President Trump's nominees for leadership positions at SSA.