

In fact, Justice Moritz should and could have been confirmed last year. She was first nominated last August, but her hearing was delayed until mid-November because of the Republican shutdown of the Federal Government. Senate Republicans then refused to vote on her nomination in committee at the end of last year and her nomination was returned to the President. As a result, the President had to renominate Justice Moritz and the Judiciary Committee had to reprocess her nomination this year. When we finally confirm Justice Moritz today, her nomination will have taken more than 9 months. It should not take this long to process noncontroversial nominees.

Justice Moritz has now served on the Kansas Supreme Court for nearly 4 years. Prior to joining the Kansas Supreme Court, she was an appellate judge on the Kansas Court of Appeals from 2004 to 2011. Before becoming a judge, she spent nearly 10 years as an assistant U.S. attorney in the Kansas City and Topeka offices. From 1989 until 1995, she was an associate at Spencer, Fane Britt & Browne, LLP in Kansas City and Overland Park. From 1987 to 1989, she served as a law clerk to the Honorable Patrick F. Kelly, U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas. Her breadth and depth of experience as both a practitioner and a jurist will make her well suited to serve on the Tenth Circuit.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote to confirm this excellent nominee.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield back time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time for debate is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Nancy L. Moritz, of Kansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth District?

Mr. BARRASSO. 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 assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 130 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Gillibrand	Moran
Baldwin	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Murphy
Begich	Hagan	Murray
Bennet	Harkin	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hatch	Paul
Blunt	Heinrich	Portman
Booker	Heitkamp	Pryor
Boxer	Heller	Reed
Brown	Hirono	Reid
Burr	Hoeben	Roberts
Cantwell	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Cardin	Isakson	Rubio
Carper	Johanns	Sanders
Casey	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Chambliss	Kaine	Scott
Coats	King	Sessions
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Collins	Landrieu	Shelby
Cooms	Leahy	Stabenow
Corker	Lee	Tester
Cornyn	Levin	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCain	Walsh
Enzi	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	McConnell	Warren
Fischer	Menendez	Whitehouse
Flake	Merkley	Wicker
Franken	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—3

Coburn Crapo Risch

NOT VOTING—7

Ayotte Kirk Vitter  
Boozman Schatz  
Johnson (WI) Toomey

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON SELFRIDGE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Selfridge nomination.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Peter A. Selfridge, of Minnesota, to be Chief of Protocol, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislation session.

The Senator from Minnesota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 149

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I rise today to urge my colleagues to pass the Stopping Tax Offenders and Prosecuting Identity Theft Act of 2013.

Before we have another year—yet another year—of criminals stealing the tax returns of millions of hardworking Americans, we need to pass this bipartisan bill.

Let me tell you from the start this is a bill that I introduced with Senator

SESSIONS of Alabama. This is a bill that made it through the Judiciary Committee 18 to 0. After a number of amendments were considered and rejected, this bill made it through the Judiciary Committee—in which there are many different people of ideological views—18 to 0.

So what is this about? We have a problem in this country, and it is a problem I think people would be very surprised about if they knew how much money it involved. Criminals are increasingly filing false tax returns using stolen identity information in order to claim victims' refunds.

What does this mean? How much money are we talking about?

In 2012 alone, identity thieves filed 1.8 million fraudulent tax returns, almost double the number confirmed in 2011. The numbers in the documents in these cases may be forged, but the dollars behind them are real.

In 2012, there were another 1.1 million fraudulent tax returns that slipped through the cracks, and our U.S. Treasury paid out—are you ready for this—\$3.6 billion in fraudulent returns, \$3.6 billion at a time when we have a debt. At a time when we are cutting programs and doing everything we can to make the government more accountable, we paid out \$3.6 billion in fraudulent returns. That is taxpayers' dollars going down the drain.

But when the criminals file these fake tax returns, it is not only the Treasury that loses out. Everyday people are the real victims, forced to wait months—sometimes even years—before receiving the refunds that are owed to them, and it can take years to fix the problems when you have your identity stolen.

In 2012, Alan Stender, a retired businessman from the 5,000-person town of Circle Pines, MN, was working to file his taxes on time, just as so many Americans did this past month. After completing all the forms and sending in his tax returns, Alan heard from the IRS that there was a major problem. Someone had stolen his identity and used his personal information to fraudulently file his return and steal his tax refund.

Last month, 25 people were arrested in Florida for using thousands of stolen identities to claim \$36 million in fraudulent tax refunds. This included the arrest of a middle-school food service worker who stole the identities of more than 400 students. Those victims are just kids. Yet criminals are stealing their identities to get fake tax returns.

Attorney General of the United States of America Eric Holder had his tax ID stolen. Two young adults used his name, date of birth, and Social Security number to file a fraudulent tax return. They got caught and they got prosecuted. But when our own Attorney General of the United States is a victim of tax fraud—people stealing his identity—I think it is time to admit we have a problem. From a retired man in Minnesota, to middle-school students

in Florida, to the Attorney General of the United States, it is clear identity theft can happen to anyone.

We also know this crime can victimize our most vulnerable citizens—seniors living on fixed incomes or people with disabilities depending on tax returns to make ends meet. These people cannot financially manage having their tax returns stolen. There is a lot at stake here, and bipartisan action is needed. That is why I put forward this bipartisan piece of legislation along with Republican Senator JEFF SESSIONS to take on this problem and crack down on the criminals who are committing this crime.

The critical legislation—which, by the way, has a similar version that passed in the House last year—will take important steps to streamline law enforcement resources and strengthen penalties for tax identity theft. The STOP Identity Theft Act will direct the Justice Department to dedicate resources to address tax identity theft. It directs the Department to focus on parts of the country with especially high rates of tax return identity theft and boosts protections for vulnerable citizens such as seniors and veterans. We also urge the Justice Department to cooperate fully and coordinate in investigations with State and local law enforcement agencies.

Identity thieves have become more creative and have expanded from stealing the identities of individuals to stealing that of businesses and organizations. My bill recognizes this change and broadens the definition of tax identity theft to include businesses, nonprofits, and other similar organizations. This is something that came to us from law enforcement. This is a bill that passed through the Judiciary Committee of the Senate—not an easy journey—18 to 0.

Finally, we need to crack down on the criminals committing this crime. The bill would strengthen penalties from tax identity theft by raising the jail sentence. I believe this bill would go a long way in helping law enforcement use their resources to more efficiently and effectively go after these crimes. It is time to pass it through the Senate. As I said, it passed through the House of Representatives.

In recent weeks, we have made significant progress by passing this bill out of, as I said, the Senate Judiciary Committee. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We had votes on amendments in the Judiciary Committee, which some may hear about soon, that were rejected but were heard out. We had very good discussions and arguments, and I believe that is why I got the support of the people who were putting those amendments forward. Senator HATCH himself said one of those amendments belonged in the Finance Committee. In any case, we came together in the Judiciary Committee, voted for this bill 18 to 0, and it is now time to get it through the Senate.

With an 18-to-0 vote, I should have been able to bring this bill to the full Senate, but I know my colleague from Texas has some concerns, even though he is on the record supporting this bill in committee. The time is now to pass this bipartisan piece of legislation to crack down on identity thieves and protect the hard-earned tax dollars of innocent Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 316, S. 149, the STOP Identity Theft Act, the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2066 AND S.

2067

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I commend my friend from Minnesota for her very good bill. This bill is good policy. It is supported by both Democrats and Republicans, as she noted. It passed unanimously out of the Judiciary Committee. I was proud to vote for this piece of legislation.

However, at the time the Judiciary Committee took up the bill it also considered amendments—in particular, two amendments I introduced that are both relevant and germane to this bill. This bill is addressing the IRS. We have seen in the past year abuses from the IRS that sadly this body—the Senate—has been unwilling to address.

It has been the practice under the current majority leader to prevent the minority from introducing amendments, preventing the minority from having a voice, and so the only avenue for the minority to have a voice is to use tools such as denying consent to try to raise issues that are relevant to the American people.

When it comes to the IRS targeting of individual citizens, it was roughly 10 months ago the Inspector General at the Department of the Treasury concluded the IRS had wrongfully targeted conservative groups, tea party groups, pro-Israel groups, and pro-life groups. The day that news broke, the President of the United States said he was outraged. He said he was angry, and he said the American people have a right to be angry. That same day Attorney General of the United States Eric Holder said he too was outraged and, indeed, the President pledged to work hand in hand with Congress.

Ten months have passed, and in the 10 months that have passed we have discovered not a single person has been indicted. In the 10 months that have passed, many of the victims of this illegal targeting have not even been interviewed by the Department of Justice. In the 10 months that have passed, we have discovered that one of the lead lawyers leading the investigation at the Department of Justice is a major Obama donor who gave over \$6,000 per-

sonally to support President Obama and the Democrats. In the 10 months that have transpired, Attorney General Eric Holder has turned down my request that he demonstrate the same impartiality, the same fidelity to the law that has been a bipartisan tradition for Attorneys General under both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Indeed, as I pointed out to the Attorney General, when credible allegations of wrongdoing against Richard Nixon arose, his Attorney General Elliott Richardson, a Republican, appointed Archibald Cox to investigate those allegations, free of political pressure. Likewise, when credible allegations of wrongdoing against Bill Clinton arose, his Attorney General, a Democrat, Janet Reno, appointed Robert Fiske as an Independent Counsel to get to the bottom of it.

Sadly, when I asked Eric Holder if he was willing to follow that same tradition of impartiality, of independence, of fidelity to law, of insulating the Department of Justice from political pressure, the Attorney General gave a flat-out answer of no. He was perfectly content; he saw no reason why anyone should doubt the integrity of an investigation led by a major Obama donor.

As I asked the Attorney General, Would you trust John Mitchell to investigate Richard Nixon? Of course you wouldn't. So it is in the context of this abuse of power—this abuse of power of the administration—that rather than working hand in hand as the President has pledged, they have stonewalled it—that I introduced two amendments.

The first amendment was simply to make it a criminal offense for an IRS employee to target people based on their political beliefs. I will note the text of the language I introduced made it a criminal offense to willfully act with the intent to injure, oppress, threaten, intimidate, or single out for the purpose of harassment any person based solely on the political, economic, or social positions held or expressed by that person or organization.

When the IRS targeting was revealed, it was condemned in bipartisan language. If that language was real, this provision should pass this body unanimously. To make the law reflect that it is criminal for the IRS to willfully target someone based solely on their political beliefs ought to be a proposition that passes this body 100 to 0. Yet I am sorry to say that when I introduced this amendment in the Judiciary Committee it was voted down on a straight party-line vote. Every Democrat who had given speeches against the IRS targeting, when given the opportunity to actually codify a prohibition against it in committee, voted against it.

Likewise, the second amendment I introduced was an amendment to stop the IRS from its attempt at codification of this persecution of political views. The IRS promulgated new rules that would have put in place its targeting of political views. The response

from the citizenry was record-setting. Indeed, I would note what the ACLU said about the IRS's proposed rules. The ACLU—not exactly a bastion of rightwing thought—said:

The proposed rule threatens to discourage or sterilize an enormous amount of political discourse in America.

The ACLU went on to say:

Most social welfare organizations—on both the left and right—serve exactly that function as they see it—the promotion of social welfare and community good. Based on their respective visions, they advocate for the powerless and the voiceless. They promote fiscal responsibility and good government. They serve as a check on government overreach, or as a cheerleader for sound public policy.

I can say in this respect that I agree emphatically and wholeheartedly with the ACLU. So I while I am perfectly happy to assent to the bill of my friend from Minnesota, if only the same reciprocal courtesy will be so and the remainder of the body will assent to these commonsense bills that make it a criminal offense to willfully target people based on their political views, and that keep the IRS out of the business of persecuting people for their political views.

I ask this body to stand with the ACLU. I ask this body to stand with the words of President Obama, if not the actions. I ask this body to stand with the American people to protect them from being wrongfully singled out by the abuse of power in the IRS.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 311, S. 2066, and Calendar No. 312, S. 2067 en bloc; I further ask unanimous consent that the bills be read a third time and passed, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I reserve the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, the bill I put out on the floor is a bipartisan bill. It is a bipartisan bill that passed the Senate Judiciary Committee 18 to 0. It is a bill that last Congress passed under suspension in the House with the support of Republican Representative LAMAR SMITH and got through the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives, which tends to sometimes be a rather partisan place, was able to pass that bill. We cannot let this bill, when we are bleeding \$3.6 billion in fraudulent tax return payments, die on the floor because my friend from Texas is trying again to put on these amendments.

I have no problem in having this amendment come up through the Finance Committee. By the way, Senator HATCH, the ranking Republican on the Finance Committee, said on the record during the Judiciary Committee hear-

ing that S. 2067 should be considered first by the Finance Committee; that it was in the Finance Committee's jurisdiction. Yes, he voted for it in the end, but that is what he said. That is why this was problematic, and that amendment failed. We had a full discussion about this amendment.

In addition, there is a rulemaking on this issue, with 76,000 comments before the IRS. That is the issue.

As for the other amendment that my friend from Texas has put out there as 2066, also considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee, also debated in the Judiciary Committee—we didn't close off the amendment. We had an amendment, we had a discussion, and that amendment failed by 10 to 8.

There are several laws, as we know, that are already on the books that could be useful in this case, and there may be further discussion of this in the future. But this bill has nothing to do with that. Just because it has the word "tax" in it doesn't mean it has anything to do with the IRS employees and the amendments that my friend from Texas put forward.

What is this bill about? This bill is about how, in 2012, identity thieves filed 1.8 million fraudulent tax returns, almost double the number confirmed in 2011. That is 1.8 million Americans having their tax ID stolen in 2012. There were another 1.1 million that slipped through the cracks, and our own U.S. Treasury is paying out \$3.6 billion from fraudulent returns.

Our own Attorney General of the United States of America had his tax ID number stolen. If Eric Holder can have his tax ID number stolen—and they were able to catch the guy and prosecute him—what happens to the poor guy in Minnesota. That guy wasn't caught. What happens to the people that have their tax ID stolen and then they take years to be able to get back their identity.

This is why this bill went through the House of Representatives without messing around with these amendments. This is why this bill went through the Judiciary Committee, where we had the discussion and the votes on amendments.

All I am trying to do is take this 18-to-0 Judiciary vote—which I was very pleased that the Senator from Texas supported in the Judiciary Committee and said good words about this bill—all I am trying to do is to get this bill passed, instead of having a debate about an amendment that clearly should have gone through the Finance Committee, as stated by the ranking Republican on the Finance Committee.

It is time to get this bill passed. That is why I object to the amendments raised by the Senator from Texas and ask that this bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the request of the Senator from Texas.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to note very briefly to my friend from Minnesota that her bill is good policy. It is policy on which I hope this body can come together.

I will note a path forward. If my friend from Minnesota can prevail on the majority leader simply to allow a vote on the Senate floor on the two amendments I have introduced, then I will withdraw my objection. The reason I have to make this request is, under this majority leader, the minority of this Chamber is shut out of the ability even to have votes. I would note this request is less than what I asked in my unanimous consent. It is not a request to pass. It is simply a request that there be a vote, and if there is a vote, that gives an opportunity for every Member of this Chamber—Republican and Democrat—to go on record and to see if every Democrat in this Chamber is willing to do what every Democrat in the Judiciary Committee did, which is vote affirmatively against making it an offense for IRS employees to willfully target Americans based on their political views.

Any Democrat who votes that way can no longer stand and say they are upset about the IRS's abuse of power because once you voted against prohibiting, you have made clear that you are unwilling to do anything to protect the American people.

The requests from the Republican side to the majority leader to have votes scheduled fall on deaf ears. Perhaps my friend from Minnesota will have more sway with her party's leaders than we will. But in the interim, we are obliged to use whatever tools we can to press for the American people, to stop the abuse of power that is stifling their First Amendment rights. For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Ohio.

ENERGY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise this evening to urge my colleagues to support the energy legislation we hope to bring to the floor this week. We are still working through some of the possible amendments on that, as well.

This is good legislation that has been on the floor before. Actually, about 6 months ago we took this up on the Senate floor. Since that time we have actually added about 10 bipartisan amendments to the bill, making it even stronger.

But it is a bill that is good for jobs. It is good for American energy security and therefore good for our national security. It is good because it is going to save taxpayers a lot of money, and it is also good because it is a bill that actually helps to grow the economy while improving the environment.

I have been working on this bill for about 3 years now with Senator SHAHEEN from New Hampshire. We also have other cosponsors on both sides of

the aisle—6 Republicans and 6 Democrats—who have been part of this process. We hope to be able to get this legislation on the floor this week because it is a good bill and it deserves to be passed.

When we have come to the floor before and we have talked about it, we have talked about the fact that it helps manufacturers in Ohio and around the country to take advantage of energy savings techniques and the best technology, allowing them to save more money so they can invest more in plants and equipment and in people, adding more jobs. That is why, by the way, over 270 businesses and business organizations—from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the National Association of Manufacturers—and a lot of other trade groups on both sides of the political spectrum—have endorsed this legislation.

We have also come to the floor and talked about how provisions in this legislation will save the equivalent of taking 80 million homes off the grid by the year 2030—a cumulative energy savings, by the way, of up to \$100 billion. It is called the Energy Security and Industrial Competitiveness Act. Again, it makes a lot of sense.

We talk about how taxpayer dollars will be saved because we require the Federal Government to practice what it preaches; in other words, to make the Federal Government, the largest energy user in the United States, much more efficient in its own energy practices.

The time for talking about this legislation, however, has gone. It is now time to pass it. When we do, we can then work with the other body—the House of Representatives—because they have already passed significant parts of our legislation earlier this year. We can bring together the legislation we would pass here on the floor with the House legislation and send it to the President for signature.

At a time when people are understandably concerned about the partisan gridlock here in the Senate, and in Washington in general, this is an example of something we can actually get done. Again, it has been bipartisan from the start. It came out of the committee with a big vote—18 to 3. It is one to which we have added more bipartisan support over the last 6 months by adding more amendments.

Let's do something that will actually surprise the American people. Let's do something that will help move our country forward, create more jobs, help the environment be cleaner, also helping our energy security and therefore our national security, and saving taxpayers a lot of money.

Some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle are skeptical of any energy legislation they have seen in the past, that this Senate and the Congress have passed some proposals that are top-down proposals that impose mandates on the American people. They have also seen costly legislation that fun-

nels subsidies to preferred industries, companies, technologies, distorting the market and ending up in what have sometimes been some very expensive failures. That is not this legislation.

This legislation on energy efficiency contains no mandates. The bill is about giving people access to information they can use, not about making the American people or businesses do something.

Not only does it have no mandates, but it does not add to our deficits. Every authorization contained in this bill is fully offset by savings elsewhere in the budget. In fact, the reforms made in this legislation will save taxpayers a lot of money.

Some of it can be scored. There is a \$10 million savings, for instance, on the mandatory side by some of the legislative changes we are making. A lot of it won't get a score because it is additional savings we will see by having the Federal Government be much more energy efficient, which saves money for us all as taxpayers.

Unlike some of these previous energy initiatives which were costly and I think inappropriate, this legislation relies on the market and on the States—not the Federal Government—to drive efficiency improvements.

There is a reason this legislation received this strong vote out of the energy committee, 19 to 3. It has been improved since then with the addition of these 10 bipartisan amendments. It is going to create new jobs, it is going to save money for the taxpayers, and it is going to help with regard to the environment.

By the way, our economy is going to be helped because we rely on affordable and reliable energy in this country. It is our responsibility to do everything in our power to secure more affordable and more reliable energy by adopting what a lot of people talk about is an all-of-the-above energy strategy.

To me, that means producing more energy—yes, including oil and natural gas. In my own State of Ohio, we have a great opportunity there. It also includes being sure that we are using the coal resources we have, nuclear power, and renewables. We should be making it easier to take advantage of these resources and to bring more of these resources to market at lower costs.

But at the same time, we should be taking steps to reduce waste. This is complementary. This is not something that should be either you are for producing more energy or you are for more energy efficiency. We should be for both. We should be producing more and using less. That helps grow the economy, create jobs, and makes us more competitive in the global economy in which we find ourselves.

Energy efficiency, by the way, of all those energy sources, is the lowest-hanging fruit. Think about it. It is the least expensive form of energy—the energy we don't end up having to use.

I think this is a commonsense approach which should be able to be de-

bated on the floor in an honest way, with other energy-related amendments; and then, after that process, to pass it here in the Senate, get it over to the House, work on a compromise with the House with their legislation and our legislation, get it to the President for signature, and actually move on with an opportunity to truly begin the process of putting in place a national strategy that has this all-of-the-above approach—producing more and using less.

I look forward to working with my colleagues this week on engaging in this debate, passing this legislation, and helping the constituents whom we represent on issues that are important to them—jobs, saving taxpayer money, making the environment cleaner, ensuring that America has a secure energy future, which is important to our national security.

I thank the Presiding Officer for allowing me to speak, and 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. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent 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.

#### TRIBUTE TO TERRY GAINER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Terry Gainer, the Senate's skilled and energetic Sergeant At Arms, is leaving the Senate family, after 8 years of devoted service to the Senate and the Nation in this vital role.

Overseeing the Senate's largest administrative office, Terry Gainer has led during a difficult time of change, as the Senate has continued to adjust to a wide range of challenges, from burgeoning technology, to budget squeezes, to the shadowy threat of terrorism. I have watched the way he has handled these duties, and I have admired not only his talent and ability but also the style of his leadership. He has been a credit to this body.

Terry Gainer is a decorated veteran of the Vietnam war. He was a captain in the U.S. Navy Reserve, and he went on to serve as an accomplished law enforcement officer.

Appointed to the post of Sergeant At Arms in 2006, Mr. Gainer came to the Senate with an admirable record of public service. He cut his teeth as a homicide detective on the streets of Chicago, and while working on the Chicago force he earned both a master's and a law degree. From there, he rose