should never allow these special qualities to be eroded and lost; they are what define Vermont. But we have a history of addressing these issues in an objective and collaborative manner—that also is what defines Vermont.

NOTICE OF OBJECTION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I, along with Senator MARK KIRK, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Richard Berner to head the Office of Financial Research within the Department of the Treasury.

We will object to proceeding to the nomination because the Department of the Treasury has refused to respond to a letter Senator KIRK and I sent on October 2, over 6 weeks ago, regarding the Treasury Secretary's actions when he became aware of the manipulation of the London Interbank Overnight Rate, or LIBOR. The Department has also refused to provide the documents we requested.

In addition, my staff has, on several occasions, attempted to schedule briefing times that are convenient for the Department. The Treasury Department has cancelled each of these briefings and failed to cooperate in rescheduling at a mutually agreeable time.

Because everything from home mortgages to credit cards was pegged to LIBOR, its manipulation affects almost every American. Given the widespread effects of this manipulation, it is disturbing to see that the Treasury Department has thus far refused to answer basic questions and provide essential documents.

It is critical for Congress to be able to ask questions and to have access to administration documents in order to conduct vigorous and independent oversight. It is unfortunate that this administration, which has pledged to be the most transparent in history, consistently falls short of that goal.

CONGRATULATING THE SAN FRANCISCO GIANTS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2012 World Series champion San Francisco Giants. This season the Giants earned their second World Series title in 3 years by sweeping the Detroit Tigers in 4 games.

All season, the Giants truly exemplified what it means to be a team. Even though this season saw historic accomplishments from individuals, including Matt Cain's perfect game and Pablo Sandoval's three home runs in game one of the World Series, no one player carried the Giants. Contributions from all players on an outstanding roster of perennial all-stars, reliable veterans and promising young players led the Giants to win the National League Western Division.

On their road to the World Series, the Giants showed true grit and determination. They won a record-tying six consecutive games when facing elimination, fighting their way to a historic championship. In the division series, the team made history by battling back from a two games to nothing deficit to beat the Cincinnati Reds—the first come-from-behind win of its kind in National League history.

When the Giants made it to the National League Championship Series against the defending World Series Champion St. Louis Cardinals, they once again found themselves on the brink of elimination. The team banded together and roared back, winning three hard-fought games in a row to capture their second National League pennant in 3 years. With a powerful combination of great pitching, excellent defense, and clutch hitting, this Giant team always found a way to win.

All 25 players on the playoff roster should be congratulated for their contributions to this true team effort: Jeremy Affeldt, Joaquin Arias, Brandon Belt, Gregor Blanco, Madison Bumgarner, Matt Cain, Santiago Casilla, Brandon Crawford, Aubrey Huff, George Kontos, Tim Lincecum, Javier Lopez, Jose Mijares, Guillermo Mota, Xavier Nady, Angel Pagan, Hunter Pence, Buster Posey, Sergio Romo, Hector Sanchez, Pablo Sandoval, Marco Scutaro, Ryan Theriot, Ryan Vogelsong, and Barry Zito.

In addition to the players, I also congratulate Chief Executive Officer Larry Baer, General Manager Brian Sabean, and Manager Bruce Bochy for the tremendous job they did in assembling and guiding this team to the 2012 World Series.

As Giants fans in the Bay Area and around the world celebrate, I congratulate their team on a remarkable season, a seventh World Series title, and a place in the history books.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Senate is being asked today to approve the intelligence authorization bill for 2013 by unanimous consent. I believe that significant changes need to be made to this bill before it is passed, so I object to this unanimous consent request.

When the Senate Intelligence Committee approved this bill in July, I was the only member of the committee to vote against it, and I would like to take a few minutes to explain my concerns, so that my colleagues who are not on that committee can get a better sense of what this debate is about.

This bill contains a number of worthwhile provisions, and I wish that I had been able to support it. Unfortunately, it also contains several provisions that I find very troubling, all of them located in Title V of the bill. These provisions are all intended to reduce unauthorized disclosures of classified information, but I am concerned that they will lead to less-informed public debate about national security issues, and also undermine the due process rights of intelligence agency employees, without actually enhancing national security.

I agree with my colleagues that unauthorized disclosures of national security information, which are also known as "leaks," can be a serious problem. Unauthorized disclosures of sensitive information can jeopardize legitimate military and intelligence operations, and even put lives at risk. So I think it can be entirely appropriate for Congress to look for ways to help the executive branch protect information that intelligence agencies want to keep secret, as long as Congress is careful not to do more harm than good. I myself spent 4 years working on legislation to increase the criminal penalty for people who are convicted of deliberately exposing covert agents, and I am proud to say that with help from a number of my Republican and Democratic colleagues, this legislation was finally signed into law in 2010.

So I am all for Congress recognizing that leaks can be a serious problem, and for doing things to show the men and women of the U.S. intelligence community that we recognize the seriousness of this issue. The problem, though, is that Congress can't actually legislate this problem away, and attempts to do so can have serious negative consequences.

One of the best analyses I have seen of the problem of unauthorized disclosures was a report published last year by the National Intelligence University. The report observed that this problem has been around for several decades, and noted specifically that "The relative consistency in the number of unauthorized disclosures over the past 30 years demonstrates their persistent nature, independent of which political party controls the White House or Congress." This report, like a number of previous reports on the subject, also suggested that because it is very difficult to identify government employees responsible for disclosing classified information to the media, unauthorized disclosures are not a problem that can be solved with legislation.

Again, this doesn't mean that Congress shouldn't try to find ways to help the executive branch when it can. But it does mean that Congress and the public should be generally skeptical of anti-leaks bills, and remember that not everything that is done in the name of stopping leaks is necessarily wise policy.

In particular, I think Congress should be extremely skeptical of any anti-leaks bills that threaten to encroach upon the freedom of the press, or that would reduce access to information that the public has a right to know.

As most of my colleagues are aware, my father was a journalist who reported on national security issues. Among other things, he wrote what many consider to be the definitive account of the Bay of Pigs invasion, as well as an authoritative account of how the U.S. came to build and use the first atomic bomb. Accounts like these