

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Yes, Madam President, for the reasons I have clearly laid out, I again object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, let me again say the reasons that were clearly laid out were inappropriate reasons. The very specific project my colleague described as the problem—at least one of the problems—it turns out he would know, because he has received written notice from the Corps of Engineers, that they do not have the legal authority to do that which he demands.

So I do not know. I do not know where you go from here. If facts do not matter in this place, then I guess we have a fact-free debate and one does what they want to do without regard to the consequences. The consequence in this case—the negative consequence is for a soldier, a patriot who has gone to war for this country is now, in my judgment, being treated unbelievably unfairly by at least one Senator.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

GUN SHOW LOOPHOLE

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I rise because today marks 11 years since the massacre at Columbine High School in Littleton, CO, occurred. This is a painful recall of a horrible moment in our country that should remind us all of a condition that could easily happen again.

I and millions of other Americans watched in horror as young students hung out of windows in that schoolhouse to try to save their lives, while two of their schoolmates went on a rampage and killed 12 students and a teacher. Those images will forever be burned in our memory.

But here is what a lot of people do not know: All the firearms used by the shooters were bought by an underage friend at a gun show. That purchase was able to be made because of the gun show loophole. Because of the gun show loophole, they were bought with no questions asked, no background check, no questions about who you are, where you might live. The weapons were bought “cash and carry,” without, again, any identifying questions being asked or being supplied. Those 13 people should never have died that day because those teenagers should not have had access to those guns. The young

woman who bought the guns for the shooters said she would not have done it if a background check had been required.

Our laws require a background check for all gun sales by licensed dealers. But a special exemption allows anyone—including terrorists such as bin Laden, criminals, gun traffickers, and the severely mentally ill—to buy guns without a background check from so-called private sellers, who sell hundreds of guns every year at gun shows, fully exempt from any responsibility for those sales.

In 1999, I introduced legislation to close the gun show loophole and to keep guns from falling into the wrong hands. In the aftermath of Columbine, the Senate passed my legislation, with Vice President Al Gore casting the tiebreaking vote. It was a great victory but a short-lived one. The gun lobby stripped my legislation in conference with the House, and in the decade since then we have done absolutely nothing at the national level to close the gun show loophole. No wonder domestic terrorists frequently use gun shows to sell their firearms to fund their illegal activities.

Just yesterday, we commemorated the 15th anniversary of the Oklahoma City bombing. It claimed 168 lives, including 19 children under the age of 6. Timothy McVeigh—the killer responsible for those horrific deeds—frequently set up his own booth. He sold weapons at gun shows.

We continue to see the tragic consequences of senseless gun violence fueled by gun show dealers who are not really licensed.

Just a few weeks ago, a few miles from this Chamber, John Patrick Bedell opened fire on two police officers at the Pentagon Metro station. They were wounded before they returned the fire and killed Bedell. One of his semi-automatic guns was linked directly back to a gun show sale. And it is no surprise that his gun was bought outside the normal stream of commerce because Bedell would have failed a background check. He actually tried to buy a gun from a licensed firearms dealer in California, but because of his diagnosed mental illness, he couldn't pass the check.

If that doesn't make it clear that we have to stop guns from falling into the wrong hands, just think of the Virginia Tech shootings. Last Friday, we marked the third anniversary of that horrible day. In that tragedy, a mentally deranged man killed 32 students and faculty in the worst mass shooting in American history.

Whether it is Virginia Tech, the recent shootings at the Pentagon, or Columbine, we are reminded over and over that our gun laws are not strong enough. Yet, while gunshots continue to ring out across this country, the silence from this Chamber is deafening.

I am a veteran. I served in the military in Europe during wartime, World War II, and I understand the desire to

protect one's self and family. But I know how important it is to keep terrorists, convicted criminals, and domestic abusers from having guns.

Some would argue that gun owners are against sensible gun laws, including closing the gun show loophole, but that is simply not true. Recent polling has shown that there is overwhelming support for closing the gun show loophole among gun owners. Here we have a placard that shows that gun owners themselves want the loophole closed. Sixty-nine percent of NRA members agree, and 85 percent of other gun owners agree: Shut down that gun show loophole. Republican pollster Frank Luntz recently found that 69 percent of National Rifle Association members and, as pointed out, 85 percent of other gun owners want us to close this loophole. After all, the vast majority of gun owners are law-abiding Americans who pass background checks and use their firearms responsibly. They know their lives and the lives of their children are in danger when a firearm is purchased by an unqualified buyer at a gun show, by someone who could never pass a background check at a neighborhood gun store. It is as easy as ever for criminals to buy guns—easier, in fact, than it is to get a library card.

We have an opportunity to save lives, and that is why I call on my colleagues to please join me and pass my bill to close the gun show loophole once and for all. Eleven years ago, we lost 12 students and a teacher to gun violence in Littleton, CO. One of the best ways to honor those who perished and those who have suffered is to make sure a tragedy like Columbine never happens again. We owe that and nothing less to the young people who died 11 years ago and the young people who count on us today. We have to step up to our responsibilities and ask all gun dealers to step up to their responsibilities.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, earlier today I came to the floor to talk about transparency and the bright sunshine of public service and how foundational it is to that service being open. It is impossible to do the people's business if we do not allow the people to see what we are doing.

I remember sound and fury coming from some of my friends on the other side of the aisle when they believed there were decisions being made about the health care bill behind closed doors, sound and fury that somehow someone wasn't telling the public everything that was going on. Meanwhile, dozens and dozens of nominees to do the work of our government have piled up under the heading of a “secret hold.”

I don't really understand how the secret hold came about. I don't really understand why one would ever need a

hold to be secret. Why does it need to be a secret? Is there something going on that you are not proud of? Is there a problem you don't want people to find out about?

I have to tell my colleagues, I kind of admire the Senator from Louisiana, who boldly spoke out that he is holding a general and not allowing this general to get another star, after a unanimous vote of the Armed Services Committee, because he wants a special project for his State that hasn't been authorized and hasn't been appropriated—bold but not unheard of, unfortunately, around here. People are constantly making deals for pork. Pork is an important part of the dealmaking around this place. Way too much of it goes on behind closed doors. But at least the Senator from Louisiana and I think earlier the Senator from Alabama—at least they were willing to publicly say they were holding a nominee because they wanted some pork for their States.

What I am most worried about is how many people out there are holding these nominees for secret reasons, and there are secret negotiations going on about what they want to get in order to release the hold. That is what everyone should be uncomfortable with.

Because we were uncomfortable with it, the Senate passed a bill. We passed a bill that was signed into law by President Bush, and I think this bill was passed 90-something to 4. In that bill, in section 512, it lays out what we thought was going to be an end to the secret hold. In the bill, it says that once someone makes a unanimous-consent request for a nomination to proceed, then that is the starting gun. The clock begins ticking. In that law, it says that when the motion is made, the Member of the Senate who has a secret hold must notify their party leader of the reasons why the nomination is being held; further, that the hold must be published, and the reasons for it, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 6 days.

Well, this morning I began the process of making that clock tick so that secret holds come out in the open where we can all identify them. Keep in mind that all of the names I am trying to begin the clock ticking for under secret holds came out of committee without an objection. In fact, we even went so far as to go back in the record and see if there was a voice vote, and even if there was a voice vote against the nominee, we didn't include them in this list. So these literally are people who have been nominated to do important things in our government, such as putting criminals in jail, sitting on the bench, moving prisoners around the country, an ambassador to a country that is incredibly important to the stability of the Middle East and our national security. All of these people have not had anyone speaking out in opposition to them. Yet they are held in secret.

So it is important to begin this process so that Senators can proudly ex-

plain what exactly—I think there are many examples, probably, of what the Senator from Louisiana was trying to do. The man he is holding has nothing to do with the project he wants. The man he is holding can't even deliver the project he wants. He is just telling that agency: You are not going to get what you want until I get what I want. I have to tell my colleagues that is not the way the American people want this place run.

While the vast majority of these are secret holds by our friends from across the aisle, there are also a handful that are being held by Democrats, and that is just as wrong. This is a bipartisan issue. It is about good government, transparency, and doing the people's business in public instead of in secret.

I wish to clarify a point made earlier today in an exchange I had with the Senator from Arizona. The Senator asked why I did not include Calendar No. 208, John Sullivan, a member of the FEC, on my list. As I stated earlier, my list consists of those nominees who have secret holds. It is my understanding that the Democratic Senator from Wisconsin raised his objection to Mr. Sullivan publicly and put out a public statement on his opposition to Mr. Sullivan on June 30, 2009.

If any of these names I am going to proceed to try to get unanimous consent on—if any Member has, in fact, put out a public statement on their opposition, then obviously they just need to speak up. That is what we are looking for here. We are looking for people to speak and own up to their objection. There is nothing wrong with holding a nominee if you have an objection. There is something wrong if it is secret. There is nothing wrong with debating a nominee. There is if it is secret. There is nothing wrong with voting no on a nominee. That is public. It is the secrecy we have to get at here.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 652, the nomination of Michael Mundaca, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; that the nomination be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, no further motions be in order, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that any statements relating to the nominee be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Reserving the right to object, and I will simply make a couple of comments at this point because, as my colleague has said, it is her intention to make further unanimous-consent requests, and much of what I say will be linked to them as well. So with her indulgence, let me just make a couple of points.

I don't know whether there are, in fact, holds on all of the individuals for whom there will be a unanimous-consent request made or whether in some cases there was just a failure to clear

on what we call around here a hotline; that is to say, a request made by the clerks on both the Republican and Democratic side.

I don't know who has holds on these individuals. If there are, I haven't looked it up. There are some, clearly, who are not objectionable who are on the Executive Calendar. I think, for example, of U.S. Marshals and, as far as I know, there will be no objection on our side. Those are simply to be worked out, in terms of when the votes will occur, between the two leaders. There is a process for that to occur. We just voted for a judge, and that process was done.

I understand there is an agreement for a Department of Justice Assistant Counsel who will be voted on tomorrow and two judges—I think both circuit court judges—which has been worked out by the leaders.

I only say, if my colleague from Missouri intends to ask unanimous-consent requests that each of the individuals she names be approved by unanimous consent, I will have to object to that because I think it is more appropriate for our leaders to determine a time for debate, if there needs to be debate, and a vote, if there needs to be a vote. Short of that, I will have to object to the unanimous-consent request. Therefore, with respect to the specific request just made, respectfully, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. McCASKILL. Madam President, when someone fails to clear someone they are holding—and they have a right to do that—this is not a debate over whether people have a right to hold. I assure the Senator from Arizona that the leader is very aware these motions are being made. These motions are being made simply for the purpose to allow the rule to operate the way we wrote the law. We have a bad habit. I can just whisper into somebody's ear and hold a nomination. That is why we put these provisions in the law—to stop the bad habit of somebody saying: If you give me that bill, I will let that guy go or, if you give me that levee, I will let that guy go or, if you give me something I want, I will let the guy go. That is why this law was written—to stop the bad habit of somebody being able to stop a nomination without having to say why or even who.

So this is only an attempt—this is not to say all of these nominees will go through. I am not naive. I know they all will not move through this afternoon by unanimous consent, but this is notice to the American people that we are going to try to begin to enforce the law we wrote.

It has been pointed out to me: Well, you didn't put an enforcement mechanism in there. Do we have to make it a misdemeanor for a Senator to claim a hold? Do we have to say you can go to jail if you don't identify your hold? You would think that Senators passing

by a large margin and signed by a Republican President of 90-some to something, that that alone would be enough that people would, in fact—I would hope the people I named this morning—the people holding them have already notified the Senator from Arizona or the Senator from Kentucky that they are, in fact, the ones holding these nominations and why. This is the only purpose of this exercise—to make the law work that we voted for, that I am confident the Senator from Arizona voted for, and that the leader from Kentucky voted for and the entire Republican leadership voted for.

Mr. KYL. If the Senator will yield, I appreciate my colleague's comments, which I consider well taken. It is my practice if I have a hold on someone, it is for a very specific purpose that I consider to be legitimate, and I will notify whoever may be involved in it. When I talked about clearing the so-called hotline, I meant this: Sometimes either a piece of legislation or a nominee will be hotlined—usually in the evening after all business has expired and most of us have gone home—and I have on occasion, because my staff will then be informed of that, and sometimes they will respond to that hotline by saying Senator KYL does not approve of that bill or nominee because I know nothing about it. The next morning we will take a look at it, and 9 times out of 10 say: OK, no problem. Let it go.

Technically, I think that could be deemed a hold under the legislation to which we referred. I don't think any of us are getting to that objection. About 1 time out of 10, there is usually something you say: I don't like X in the bill. And frequently that gets cleared up. I think sometimes the practice of hotlining can be a good practice, but it means everybody needs to look at what is being hotlined and have an opportunity to register an objection or get it worked out or maybe the objection would stand.

To the point of my colleague about the so-called secret holds, I totally agree. The fact is, there are different reasons some people might be on the calendar my colleague is reading, but I don't know those reasons. I need to object on behalf of the minority tonight, and I will do that.

To the extent they are secret and being used for some of the purposes my colleague described, I agree those are improper, and that happens around here.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. I appreciate my friend's comments. I understand he is not someone making secret holds, and he is objecting on behalf of others. There is not a problem with that. I want to make the point that, under the law, it is technically not a hold until this unanimous-consent request is made. So there is no obligation under the law for someone to identify their hold until this request is made. I would think that after these requests are made, everybody will be on notice to

follow the law and stop with the secret hold business because it is going to slow us down to have to constantly come to the floor and make these unanimous-consent requests.

Wouldn't it make more sense for everybody to own it, if they are going to stop somebody's life—a lot of these people have given up other jobs and are out there in limbo. Wouldn't it make more sense to own it and not go through these games?

At this time in the Bush administration we had five backed up. We have 80-some now.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 705, the nomination of James P. Lynch, to be Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics; that the nomination be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that any statements regarding the nomination be printed in the RECORD as if read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 722, the nomination of Judith Ann Stewart Stock, to be Assistant Secretary of State; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD, as if read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KYL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 726, the nomination of Patricia A. Hoffman, to be Assistant Secretary of Energy; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that any statements relating to the nominee be printed in the RECORD as if read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KYL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 728, the nomination of Gloria M. Navarro, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Nevada; that the motions to reconsider be con-

sidered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD as if read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KYL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I might inquire of my colleague. I gather there will be several individual unanimous-consent requests made for the purpose of getting on the record the objection as to each name on the calendar. I believe we can accomplish that purpose by an en bloc request. If my colleague were to make such a request, it would be deemed that the request was made for each of the individual names, and perhaps my colleague would read the numbers on the calendar. I can then interpose an objection. If my colleague's purpose is beginning the clock, as it were, or requiring the person with the hold on the individual having to come forward, that could be achieved. I would be happy to spare the time of my colleague and the Senate from going through each individual name. I can object en bloc and that process can then commence, if that is acceptable.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Pardon me while I consider the irony that the assistant leader of the other party wants to save time. I find that slightly ironic under the circumstances of how many of these nominations have been blocked up all these months.

Having said that, it is my understanding that this law requires the motion to be made on each individual. I don't want there to be any question as to whether each individual unanimous-consent request has been made, so that everyone understands that the clock is ticking. I think it is very important that there is a very clear signal. I don't believe this procedure has ever been undertaken before under the new law we passed in January of 2007. I want to make sure after the fact—because I am worried that perhaps somebody is going to think if we didn't make the request, they can tag team and withdraw their secret hold and put another one in. I am trying to make sure that doesn't happen.

Mr. KYL. I appreciate that concern, and I would think by a unanimous-consent agreement, which specifically stated the reason for it, as both of us have said, that it would be our intention that the process would be invoked by an en bloc request, if the Chair would rule on the matter, perhaps that would be sufficient to move forward on it, and we could know at that point that the process had been invoked for everybody.

Might I inquire whether the Chair would consider the process to be invoked for all of the names considered in the Senator's request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An en bloc unanimous-consent request will satisfy the procedural requirements.

Mr. KYL. I would be happy to have the Senator proceed whatever way she would prefer and for me to object appropriately for that purpose.

Mrs. McCASKILL. In the spirit of moving things along and getting cooperation to move things along, which I hope is something that becomes a trend, I will be happy to read off all the names and then make the motion en bloc, with one objection to be heard for the record, and we hopefully will get letters flowing into the office from the persons having secret holds. I will begin to read the names:

Calendar No. 729, Jon E. DeGuilo, to be U.S. district judge for the Northern District of Indiana;

Calendar No. 730, Audrey Goldstein Fleissig, to be U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Missouri;

Calendar No. 731, Lucy Haeran Koh, to be U.S. district judge for the Northern District of California;

Calendar No. 732, Tanya Walton Pratt, to be U.S. district judge for the Southern District of Indiana;

Calendar No. 740, Marilyn A. Brown, to be a member of the board of directors, Tennessee Valley Authority;

Calendar No. 741, William B. Sansom, to be a member of the board of directors, Tennessee Valley Authority;

Calendar No. 742, Neil G. McBride, to be a member of the board of directors, Tennessee Valley Authority;

Calendar No. 743, Barbara Short Haskew, to be a member of the board of directors, Tennessee Valley Authority;

Calendar No. 759, Jane E. Magnus-Stinson, to be U.S. district judge for the Southern District of Indiana;

Calendar No. 775, Brian Anthony Jackson, to be U.S. district judge for the Middle District of Louisiana;

Calendar No. 776, Elizabeth Erny Foote, to be U.S. district judge for the Western District of Louisiana;

Calendar No. 777, Mark A. Goldsmith, to be U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Michigan;

Calendar No. 778, Marc Treadwill, to be U.S. district judge for the Middle District of Georgia;

Calendar No. 779, Josephine Staton Tucker, to be U.S. district judge for the Central District of California;

Calendar No. 780, William N. Nettles, to be U.S. attorney for the District of South Carolina;

Calendar No. 781, Wilfredo A. Ferrer, to be U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Florida;

Calendar No. 782, Michael Peter Huerta, to be Deputy Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration;

Calendar No. 783, David T. Matsuda, to be Administrator, Maritime Administration;

Calendar No. 784, Michael F. Tillman, to be member, Marine Mammal Commission;

Calendar No. 785, Daryl J. Boness, to be member, Marine Mammal Commission, reappointment;

Calendar No. 787, Earl F. Weener, member, National Transportation Safety Board;

Calendar No. 788, Jeffrey R. Moreland, to be director, Amtrak board of directors;

Calendar No. 789, Larry Robinson, to be Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere, Department of Commerce.

Calendar No. 790, VADM Robert J. Papp, Jr., to be Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard and to the grade of admiral;

Calendar No. 791, RADM Sally Brice-O'Hare, to be Vice Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard and to the grade of vice admiral;

Calendar No. 792, RADM Manson K. Brown, to be Commander, Pacific Area of the U.S. Coast Guard and to the grade of vice admiral;

Calendar No. 793, RADM Robert C. Parker, to be Commander, Atlantic Area of the U.S. Coast Guard and to the grade of vice admiral;

Calendar No. 794, Arthur Allen Elkins, inspector general, Environmental Protection Agency;

Calendar No. 795, David A. Capp, U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Indiana;

Calendar No. 796, Anne M. Tompkins, U.S. attorney for the Western District of North Carolina;

Calendar No. 797, Kelly McDade Nesbit, U.S. marshal for the Western District of North Carolina;

Calendar No. 798, Peter Christopher Munoz, U.S. marshal for the Western District of Michigan;

Calendar No. 799, Carolyn Hessler Radelet, Deputy Director of the Peace Corps;

Calendar No. 800, Elizabeth Littlefield, president of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation;

Calendar No. 801, Lana Pollack, to be Commissioner on the part of the United States on the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada;

Calendar No. 802, Victor H. Ashe, member, Broadcasting Board of Governors;

Calendar No. 803, Walter Isaacson to be a member and chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors;

Calendar No. 805, Michael Lynton, member, Broadcasting Board of Governors;

Calendar No. 806, Susan McCue, member, Broadcasting Board of Governors;

Calendar No. 807, Dennis Mulhaupt, member, Broadcasting Board of Governors;

Calendar No. 808, S. Enders Wimbush, member, Broadcasting Board of Governors;

Calendar No. 809, Bisa Williams, Ambassador to the Republic of Niger;

Calendar No. 810, Raul Yzaguirre, Ambassador to the Dominican Republic;

Calendar No. 811, Theodore Sedgwick, Ambassador to the Slovak Republic;

Calendar No. 812, Robert Stephen Ford, Ambassador to the Syrian Arab Republic;

Calendar No. 814, Gary Scott Feinerman, U.S. district judge for the Northern District of Illinois;

Calendar No. 815, Sharon Johnson Coleman, U.S. district judge for the Northern District of Illinois;

Calendar No. 816, Loretta E. Lynch, U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York;

Calendar No. 817, Noel Culver March, U.S. marshal for the District of Maine;

Calendar No. 818, George White, U.S. marshal for the Southern District of Mississippi;

Calendar No. 819, Brian Todd Underwood, U.S. marshal for the District of Idaho.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the calendar numbers as read; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that any statements relating to the nominees be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KYL. Madam President, for the reasons indicated, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. McCASKILL. Madam President, finishing up, hopefully, we do not have to do this again. Hopefully, we have turned a page on a new day and secret holds are going to go away.

Let me once again give kudos to Senator WYDEN and Senator GRASSLEY. They worked on this issue for years trying to clean up secret holds and thought they got it done when we passed S. 1 back in 2007. Similar to a bad habit that is hard to break, this one evidently has been very hard to break in the numbers I just went through. Those are all the people who have secret holds right now. Hopefully, by the end of the week, we will learn who it is in the Senate who does not want them to be nominated, who it is who does not want them to be confirmed, and that they are willing to speak out about their objections so we can answer them, move forward, and get these people to work for the people of this great country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BURRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of Colorado). The Senate is in morning business.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF CIVIL RIGHTS PIONEER DOROTHY HEIGHT

Mr. BURRIS. Mr. President, last week, I came before this body to speak of the loss of a great leader from Memphis, TN, by the name of Benjamin Hooks. It is with a heavy heart that I come to the floor of the Senate again for the loss of a distinguished American. Early this morning, our Nation lost a strong leader and a great civil