

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

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 94 Ex.]

#### YEAS—87

Alexander	Franken	Moran
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Baldwin	Graham	Murphy
Baucus	Grassley	Murray
Begich	Hagan	Nelson
Bennet	Harkin	Paul
Blumenthal	Hatch	Portman
Blunt	Heinrich	Pryor
Boozman	Heitkamp	Reed
Boxer	Heller	Reid
Brown	Hirono	Risch
Burr	Hoehn	Roberts
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sanders
Cardin	Isakson	Schatz
Carpenter	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Sessions
Coats	Kaine	Shaheen
Cochran	King	Shelby
Collins	Kirk	Stabenow
Coons	Klobuchar	Tester
Corker	Landrieu	Thune
Cornyn	Leahy	Toomey
Cowan	Levin	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cruz	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskey	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Flake	Mikulski	Wyden

#### NAYS—11

Barrasso	Fischer	Rubio
Chambliss	Johanns	Scott
Coburn	Lee	Vitter
Enzi	McConnell	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Lautenberg	Rockefeller
------------	-------------

The nomination was confirmed.

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

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

#### SAFE COMMUNITIES, SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, tomorrow at 11 o'clock we are going to vote on cloture on the motion to proceed to the gun legislation that is now before this body.

This morning and throughout the day, our friend from Connecticut spoke, a freshman Senator who was brought to the Senate with this tragedy having taken place shortly after he arrived. My friend the Presiding Officer, a longtime attorney general, the chief law enforcement officer of the State of Connecticut, has lived with this tragedy that happened at Sandy Hook like nothing that ever happened in his career. And, of course, for Senator HEINRICH, a new Senator, this was something he never appreciated he would be faced with.

I saw the pictures today of those little babies who were murdered, some of

them shot multiple times—little tiny kids shot multiple times. The shooting was on December 14, about 4 months ago—120 days. So the time has come—it has arrived—when we have to debate this issue. We have to have a response to this tragedy.

When this incident took place on December 14, it struck me, as it did everyone in America—virtually everyone in America; we had been through Aurora, CO—that vicious, brutal machine-gunning of people going to watch a movie, and then little kids getting killed in an elementary school, kindergartners, first-graders—so we need to respond, this great deliberative body, to what the American people want. So we are going to vote. It is time to vote. I hope we get cloture on this matter. We certainly should. After that, there is no reason not to start legislating immediately. I hope we do not have to go through this procedural mishmash—30 hours; somebody on the floor all the time; if people are not, there are dilatory tactics; only one quorum call—and all this. Let's get past that. If somebody has something to say, come and say it. But this week we are going to start legislating. We are going to start legislating whether there is cloture or not. One will be a little longer process. But we are going to start legislating on this bill this week. I hope we can get to it tomorrow.

I do not think it is any secret, if we are on this bill, I am going to—the first amendment in order will be the amendment to change the background checks that has been worked on for weeks by Senator MANCHIN, Senator KIRK, and Senator TOOMEY, and then we will decide where we go from there.

To all my friends, we are going to have amendments. Some of them are going to take a little bit of time. We are not going to finish the bill this week. I do not know if we will finish it next week. But that really does not matter. Are we going to legislate the right way? Are we going to legislate? I have in my mind these little children who were murdered. What we do here is not going to prevent all gun violence in America, but if we stop a few, isn't that remarkably important for us to do? I think we can do a lot more than saving the lives of just a few people.

But let's work on this bill. We are going to start. If we have to use up the 30 hours, we will use up the 30 hours. I think there are ways around that procedurally. I hope we do not have to test that. There are a number of amendments. We all know. We have been reading about them. There are lots of amendments; people have been waiting a long time for this legislation.

One of my Republican colleagues yesterday said: I have a number of germane amendments I want to offer.

I said: Fine. Good. Do it.

We know we have to do background checks, assault weapons, the ammunition capacity of clips or magazines, mental health. That is just to name a few of the things. And I repeat, we are

going to begin this process before we leave here this week.

I so appreciate the work done by Senators MANCHIN, TOOMEY, KIRK, and many others. My friend Senator SCHUMER has been working on this issue. My friend DICK DURBIN, who has been involved in guns for a long time, has been involved. I appreciate the work of everyone. As the press has indicated, we are likely going to get cloture on this tomorrow. I hope so. But, as I have told individual Senators, if we do not get cloture, we are going to have a vote in the Senate on capacity clips, assault weapons, background checks, and some mental health items or item. That we are going to do. I hope we can do it in the regular process.

We have had people for a long time now—my friends on the other side of the aisle—saying: We want regular order. We want to be able to offer amendments. Well, I do too. And I hope people will not see how many amendments they can offer, not see if they can set a record for how many amendments can be laid down, because we should have this as a civil process and culminating in a better set of laws for our people in this great country in which we live.

For those of us who have the opportunity to try to address this issue, I hope we all understand that the world is watching what we do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

#### NOMINATION OF SRI SRINIVASAN

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I had the opportunity, the honor, to chair a hearing of the Senate Judiciary Committee, on which we both serve, to consider the President's nomination of a highly qualified lawyer, Sri Srinivasan, to serve on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals.

I am encouraged by what the majority leader has just said about the very real possibility that we will get a vote on the floor of this Senate on vital and important issues affecting guns, immigration, and other issues, but what I speak to today is the absolutely essential role this Senate must fill of voting on qualified judges who have been nominated to the circuit courts of the United States.

Earlier today at this hearing, 10 of our colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, asked thoughtful questions, and Mr. Srinivasan gave thorough and thoughtful answers. I came away convinced that he has the background, the education, the skills, and, most importantly, the temperament to serve as a circuit court judge. And I was encouraged by comments of my colleagues, both Republican and Democratic, that they too were inclined to support this nomination.

Under normal historical circumstances, today's hearing would be the beginning of a deliberate, timely, orderly process—a process required of this body by article II, section 2 of our Constitution by which we advise and consent to the President's nominations.

We should, of course, carefully consider the qualifications of candidates and not serve as some rubberstamp, but neither should we be a firewall blocking qualified nominees from serving. Unfortunately, for some number of years, this Senate has, in some vital instances, served more as a firewall than as an advise and consent body. Instead of doing our due diligence with appropriate speed, we have seen delays, stalling tactics, and in some instances filibusters of highly qualified nominees.

Five years into President Obama's administration, the courts are still nearly 10 percent vacant. In my view, our courts should be above politics. When the President of either party submits a highly qualified candidate of good character and sound legal mind, absent exceptional circumstances, that candidate is entitled to a vote.

The actions or in this case inaction of the Senate with regard to the DC Circuit have consequences. The DC Circuit Court of Appeals has a series of vacancies, the result of which, in my view, are to delay and deny justice for Americans far beyond the boundaries of this District of Columbia.

The DC Circuit Court is often called the second most important in the Nation, because, like the Supreme Court, it handles cases that impact Americans all over our country. Regularly, it hears cases on issues ranging from terrorism and detention to the scope of Federal agency power. Yet it is critically understaffed. This circuit court has not seen a nominee confirmed since President George W. Bush's fourth nominee to that court was confirmed in 2006. Today, more than 1,500 days after President Obama has taken office, 4 of the 11 seats on the DC Circuit are open, making it more than one-third vacant and putting the remaining judges under undue strain to decide the complex and important cases before this court.

Contrary to the previous administration, this administration was recently recognized by the New York Times Editorial Board as putting forward nominees who are decidedly moderate. President Obama first nominated for this vacancy on this court the exceptionally qualified Caitlin Halligan, who waited more than 900 days for a simple up-or-down vote on the floor of this Chamber. She came with the American Bar Association's highest rating, glowing recommendations from bipartisan supporters, and a diverse legal career marked by distinctive service as New York's solicitor general. Nevertheless, sadly, Republican Senators successfully filibustered her nomination, and last month President Obama reluctantly withdrew Ms. Halligan from consideration.

We have today a chance for a fresh start with Mr. Srinivasan, who would serve equally well and ably on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. As he demonstrated in today's hearing, he has a sharp and capable legal mind. He has

served in the Solicitor General's office for both Republican and Democratic administrations. He has served in the private sector and the public sector and has earned bipartisan support from those who have worked with him.

In fact, he has been endorsed publicly in a letter from 12 former Solicitors General and Principal Deputy Solicitors General, six Democrats, six Republicans, for those who have served in Democratic and Republican administrations.

The letter, signed by conservative legal luminaries such as Paul Clement and Ted Olson, notes Mr. Srinivasan is "one of the best appellate lawyers in the country," with an "unsurpassed" work ethic who is "extremely well prepared to take on the intellectual rigors of serving on the D.C. Circuit."

At the same time, throughout the course of his career in private practice and as a public servant, he has represented clients with causes diverse enough that any individual policymaker or elected official is likely to disagree with some of them, including me. I disagree with a position he argued in *Rumsfeld v. Padilla* in support of the idea that the government has a right to detain U.S. citizens indefinitely, but I do not ascribe that position to him.

One of the most foundational principles of our legal system is that we do not ascribe to the attorney the position which he successfully and vigorously advocates on behalf of his client. I will not block his nomination simply because I might disagree with the position he took on behalf of a client in one case.

Sri, in my view, is a highly capable attorney, with the character and demeanor to serve on the bench. I will strongly support his nomination. I am following in this instance the wisdom of Chief Justice Roberts, who has said: "It's a tradition of the American Bar that goes back before the founding of our nation that lawyers are not identified with the positions of their clients."

So I say to my colleagues, let's move forward in that spirit. Let's return to our historic constitutionally mandated role. Let's give Mr. Srinivasan a speedy up-or-down vote, which I believe he has earned with decades of public service and public sector experience.

To be honest, if this nomination cannot move forward, if this nomination is filibustered for what can only be political reasons, I cannot imagine what nomination could move forward to this court. A filibuster of this nomination would sadly prove to me, just as it did to those of the other party in 2005, that the judicial nomination standards and procedures at work are unworkable, the system is broken, and it would lead to a reconsideration.

There was a crisis of this sort when the parties were of opposite configuration in 2005 that led the majority to threaten the so-called nuclear option to end judicial filibusters by the party

in which I serve, a result that was avoided only at the last moment for the good of the Senate and the Nation. I urge my colleagues to come together to give this good man a vote and avoid another such crisis today.

Let's do our job so the judges of the DC Circuit Court of Appeals can do theirs for the people of our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

#### GAO DUPLICATION REPORT

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I would note to my colleague from the State of Delaware, if I heard him correctly, we just now have had a hearing on a nominee for the DC Circuit Court. He is not even on the Executive Calendar because he has not even been voted out of the Judiciary Committee. So the Senator makes a lot of great points. But I think the fact we are talking about a potential judge who has not even cleared the Judiciary Committee yet may be a bit premature.

He will get a fair hearing. I think we have noted that more judicial nominees were approved in the last two Congresses than the two Congresses before under the last 4 years of the Bush administration.

I rise to say this evening there has been a lot in the news. One thing that has not been in the news very much is the third and final report of the Government Accountability Office in terms of looking at duplication within the Federal Government.

I hope as the American people listen to this, they will take a couple things away. No. 1, we have a great organization called the Government Accountability Office. They have done a wonderful job. We mandated this 4 years ago. They have been on time with their reports. What they have shown us has been tremendously revealing. The first thing I want Americans to note is Congress has failed to act on the first two reports—no substantive action whatsoever.

One significant thing in the Senate was the elimination of the ethanol mandate. With this report today comes an estimated \$98 billion a year in savings. What we take by looking at this report could potentially yield us \$98 billion in savings by eliminating duplication in what they just found in this one report.

Let me go through it for 1 minute. They found 679 different renewable energy programs across 23 agencies—not across the Energy Department. If we are going to have renewable programs, that is where we should have it. Across 23 different agencies of which we spend \$15 billion a year, they found instances where we are giving grants from different agencies to the same projects for the same thing, spending three times as much money as we should be spending on the one project even if we did not have that.

So the potential for us to work our way out of the consequences of the sequester is at our fingertips. Here, drug

abuse prevention and treatment, 76 separate programs, not run through the Department of Health and Human Services, run through 10 different departments with overlap that shows no metrics but multiple agencies having programs doing exactly the same thing: \$4.5 billion a year. That is half the size of my Oklahoma State budget a year.

Catfish inspection. I saw in the President's budget today three different agencies where one has to meet the requirements before they can have their catfish inspected. The only thing they did not recommend in the budget today is getting rid of the Agriculture Department. They approve your cheese pizza. But the FDA approves your pepperoni pizza. So if you are a pizza maker, you have to comply with one agency on one type of pizza and another agency on a different type of pizza.

Defense foreign language support. Those are people who come in and help us learn other languages, interpret for us other languages so we can have an effective response and not have a communication error. We have 159 different programs in the Pentagon alone. What they are estimating is that we could save tons of money. We do not know exactly how much it costs because the Pentagon does not know how much they are spending on it, which is another one of the problems.

The GAO report said this week one of the reasons they cannot estimate the savings more accurately is because the majority of the agencies have no idea what they are spending on these programs. The question I have had is, why not? If they do not know what they are spending, why are we not doing something about it?

Higher education assistance: 21 different programs, four different agencies—not all in the Education Department, which is from where I think we would do education assistance, \$174.7 billion a year. That includes Pell grants. That includes student loans, the cost associated with student loans.

Veterans employment training. We have six programs, not all of them run by the Veterans Affairs Department but run by the Veterans Affairs Department and other agencies. We are spending \$1.2 billion. Here is what we know. We are running these programs, and veterans unemployment, even though they have a skill when they come out of the military, is higher than what the average is in the country. So it is obviously not working.

Also, in the report is something that is very important to me. Let me find it, if I might for a moment. GAO's report exposes a government office that does some good things. It is called the National Technical Information Service. It was established in 1950 and tasked with collecting and distributing certain reports. Despite the fact—here is what GAO found: 75 percent of the information that NTIS supplies, all you have to do is Google it. You do not

have to go to NTIS. All you have to do is Google it. So 75 percent of their budget is spent providing reports to other government agencies and other people that you can get with the touch of your iPhone. Why would we continue to do that?

This is just one example that I bring up. We are continuing to fund an agency where three-quarters of what they do has no bearing on it. If it went away, it would not affect us at all. The other thing is they charge other Federal agencies a fee for this information that the other Federal agencies, at a touch of their computer, can get for free.

It is another case of inefficiency. What else did the GAO report show? What the GAO report showed is that we have done nothing of significance in the last 2 years based on what they have recommended we do given their first two reports. Our office calculates, based on the three reports that GAO has given us, that we could save in excess of \$250 billion a year if we would follow the recommendations of the Government Accountability Office.

If you are sitting out there wondering why we are having tax proposals increased in the President's budget and that we are having such a hard time with the sequester, you only have to look at one place; that is, Congress. Congress refuses to follow and do the oversight. We have had GAO do a lot of it. We refuse to pass amendments that eliminate duplication. We refuse to make the tough choices. So, consequently, we are spending \$250 billion a year—that is \$2.5 trillion over 10 years—that we should not be spending.

Where does the money come from to pay for that? It comes from our kids. It doesn't just come in dollars, it comes from a reduced standard of living and limited opportunities in the future because we don't have the courage or the work ethic to address the very real issues which are in front us, on the tips of our fingers, where the money is, where we could actually save money.

We have had almost 1,000 days since the first report came out. We have done one significant thing in the Senate; we have eliminated the ethanol tax credit and saved \$6 billion the first year and about \$4 to \$5 billion afterward. This is the one thing we did. We fought tooth and nail while we did it, but we did it.

This is one bill to save \$6 billion in 3 years out of \$250 billion. No wonder the confidence level in the Congress is at 13 percent. What we are actually doing is throwing away our kids' future as we fail to address these issues.

When we are spending money we don't have on things we don't absolutely need, and we are borrowing money against our children's future, I can't think of a greater immoral act of the Congress. It is not red hot lit up as some of the more controversial issues such as the gun bill we are doing or immigration; however, I will state it will have a profound effect if we were to address it in terms of the future of our

country, the health of our country, and the job-creating capacity for our country.

Yet what is it about your Senator or your Congressman which keeps them from having the courage to challenge the status quo? I know what it is. It is the desire to get reelected by not offending anybody.

We don't have tough oversight hearings. We will not allow bills through committees which actually eliminate waste. There is a bill that has passed the House sitting on the docket right now called the SKILLS Act. It takes 47 job-training programs and puts them into 6. It saves billions of dollars a year and puts metrics on the outcome. We will not even bring it to the floor even though it saves \$5 to \$6 billion a year in addition to markedly improving the outcome of our job-training programs. It is not here.

It passed the House. The House is doing oversight in every committee right now. The Senate is not.

The House is reading the GAO reports and acting on them. They are not right 100 percent of the time, they are right about 95 percent of the time. Nothing is going to be done about it unless we have an oversight hearing to actually discover information. Nothing actually happens unless we write a bill to change things.

Yet this is not the emphasis in the Senate. There can be no greater emphasis than for us to get out of the financial troubles we are in. There can be no greater emphasis than for us to create an environment which produces jobs in the country when we stop wasting money at the Federal Government level.

Our answer is more government—not less, more. Our answer, according to the President's budget, is more taxes, not less.

I commend the President. He has \$25 billion worth of programs he wishes to eliminate in his budget, \$25.8 billion. He could send over what the GAO said and eliminate \$250 billion a year.

The problems are not really with the President, it is with us: our intransigence to do our job and keep in our focal point what is most important. What is most important is our future and the capability for us to create opportunity in the future for our children and our grandchildren.

I have been fighting this for 8 years. There is a lot of oversight which has been done, tons of reports. The American people are going to eventually learn everything that is in this report because there is an app coming out which will be on people's cell phones very soon, and they may find out anything about everything where the government is wasting money. They will be able to look at an address in their own city and see how much money a company, business, or that farmer received from their Federal tax dollars. They will be able to see that in about 3 months.

When the American people discover our incompetence, it will not matter

that we didn't offend somebody. They are going to see we didn't do our job. We are not doing our job because we are not addressing the things we actually have some control over.

What do we do now? Here is what GAO explains: Although Congress had made some limited progress in addressing the issues we have previously identified, additional steps are needed to address the remaining areas to achieve associated benefits. A number of the issues are difficult but not impossible. Implementing many of the actions will take time and sustained leadership.

The key word there is "leadership." Who is going to lead in the Senate to solve our problems? It is not party identified. Real leadership about solving the real problem is in front of us.

It is time for each congressional committee in the Senate to undertake the waste and overlap identified by GAO within their jurisdiction, begin writing bills to consolidate and eliminate these programs, and put metrics as far as performance on every one of them. It is also time for the White House to put real muscle into their proposal coming in through OMB.

I am thankful we will have a new OMB Director. She will be terrific. She has the skills, dedication, and qualifications. I praise the President for nominating her. She will fly through the Senate because she is superqualified for the job. Also, she knows what she is doing. But it will not matter what she does if we don't respond, if we don't do our work.

#### GUN CONTROL

Mr. President, I would like to take the time now just to spend a moment or two on the guns issue.

I spent a lot of time over the last few months thinking about Sandy Hook. I actually met with a large number of those people today. I am an A-plus-rated member, a lifetime member of the NRA. I firmly believe in the second amendment, and I firmly believe in the tenth amendment.

We are hearing a lot of politics about the gun situation. What we are not hearing is how do we really keep guns out of the hands of people who shouldn't have them. This is what we need to be addressing.

Whether this would prevent a Sandy Hook, nobody knows. There are some things we do know. What we do know is the vast majority of people who are convicted the first time of a gun crime didn't steal their gun, and they didn't buy it from a federally licensed firearm dealer. They bought it from one of us.

The very fact we are going to have a piece of legislation go through here which will not solve the real problem of keeping guns out of the hands of the mentally impaired and felons is a shame. There are ways we can do that.

I haven't spoken to one owner I know who hasn't agreed with the fact that they would like to know if they sold their gun—they don't want it to go into the hands of a felon or somebody mentally impaired. Yet we are hung up

on records. The proposal which comes from Senator TOOMEY, Senator MANCHIN, and Senator KIRK is a step forward. I will not deny it. However, tell me how a record which will only be looked at after a crime is committed is going to help anybody who is a victim of a crime. It is not.

If we really wish to solve this problem, what we need to do is put into the hands of Americans who are law abiding the ability to know they didn't sell their gun to somebody who is on the NTIS list. Give me the ability to know when I sell my gun to a stranger that they are not on that NTIS list.

This has been rejected out of hand because there is no record with it. The reason there doesn't need to be a record is because we are putting an onus on responsible citizens doing the right thing. Also, the government has no right to have a record of when I transfer a gun. They do have a right to expect me to be a responsible citizen when I sell my gun.

The question is, Are we as a body going to take something which is far less than appropriate to actually keep guns out of the hands of felons and mentally impaired and call it a day? This is what is getting ready to happen. Are we going to make a difference and not impair second amendment rights at all and not impair tenth amendment rights because we give States supremacy on that? If they want to give us something more or different, they may.

We are going to go through a great deal of debate and have all these amendments. I thank Senator REID for making it an open amendment process. I called and spoke to him last night. I said I was happy to support going to this bill provided we use the regular Senate procedures and we actually are able to offer amendments which are germane to this bill in any number of ways. He is going to allow this process. I take him at his word he will allow this.

When it is all said and done, will we have made a difference to those families who are wanting us to make a difference? Would we have made a difference?

If we don't allow responsible citizens the ability to know whether they are selling their gun to a felon or a mentally impaired person, we haven't made any difference. We have made a lot of noise, but we haven't made a difference.

Let me tell you why the Toomey-Manchin proposal will not work. The largest gun show in America is in Tulsa, OK. It is called the Wanenmacher Gun Show. Tens of thousands of people come to it twice, maybe three times a year. The sale will be impeded by requiring an FFL license, which is to say a gun dealer at the show will be required to do a background search against the NTIS list for somebody who purchases a gun at the show whether they are buying from that dealer or not.

The first thing which will happen is the Federal firearms licensed dealer will say: I want a fee for transferring this gun, for doing the work—and rightly so. I don't blame him. What is the option?

The option which will happen is the people who are going to make the deal buy the gun. Subsequently, 2 or 3 days after the gun show, they will buy the gun because they will not be at the gun show anymore.

Look at the opposite side of that. If we had a portal or we could get a certificate which says someone is not on the NTIS list and are able to buy a gun anytime, anywhere, somebody selling a gun would have a pin code to make sure their identity is correct and see their ID. Whether a person is in a gun show or outside a gun show, the responsible gun seller will know they didn't sell a gun to somebody mentally impaired or a felon.

We will have all sorts of statements, but what we are going to do isn't going to decrease guns in the hands of felons and the mentally impaired. We can say we need to win. If we want a bill to get through the Senate and get through the House which will actually make a difference in people's lives, that felons and the mentally impaired aren't empowered to buy guns, we need to do something different.

My friends in the second amendment community don't even like my proposal. I understand this. But there is no impairment when all you need to do is go to your cell phone to receive a clearance to know somebody is not on the NTIS list.

We get to decide. Are we going to do it in a way which smells good, looks good, but doesn't do anything? Are we going to fight to do something which actually makes a difference? I hope we choose the latter. I am not convinced we will. The reason Senator MANCHIN couldn't get me to agree to what he had agreed to with Senator TOOMEY is because I don't think it is going to work. I think the vast majority of gun purchasers at gun shows are going to wait to buy them later from the very same people who were going to sell them at a gun show so they do not have to pay a fee and wait 3 or 4 days on a background check. If that happens, what good have we done? How have we made a difference? We haven't.

It is a sad fact, as a practicing physician, and having done training and surgery, I have had to operate on a lot of people who ended up with the consequences of a weapon being used on them.

Oklahoma has a gun culture, and I own multiple guns. I cherish my second amendment right. But with that right comes some responsibility to do the right thing. Liberty without responsibility isn't liberty, and it will not last unless we attach responsibility to it. So if we really believe in the second amendment, and if we really believe in the tenth amendment, we will relook at what we are going to do in terms of

gun transfers. There is a way to do it that will actually make a big difference in people's lives in this country, and it may actually get through the House.

What we are proposing, what we are seeing proposed right now, is never going to pass the House. Consequently, we will have done something in the Senate with no long-term consequences and actually making a difference for the American people.

Mr. President, I thank the Presiding Officer for the time. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO MARGARET THATCHER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher who passed away Monday.

In the 1970s, Britain was mired in debt and even had to go to the IMF for a bailout. Britain was known then as "The Sick Man of Europe"—how we think of Greece today.

Governments of both political parties had tried to stimulate the economy through Keynesian spending policies and government intervention into the economy was widespread.

Britain faced massive strikes in the winter of 1978-1979, known as the Winter of Discontent. There was talk that Britain had become ungovernable.

Then Margaret Thatcher came on the scene. Her policies of fiscal responsibility and promotion of "free enterprise" completely reversed Britain's economic decline. Her foreign policy achievements were no less impressive. This was the era of détente.

Most people accepted that the Soviet Union was strong and successful and was here to stay so we had to learn to live with it. It was fashionable for political leaders to talk as though the Soviet system was just different, but no better or worse than our own.

Margaret Thatcher had no hesitation in pointing out the truth that the Soviet Union and its satellites held their citizens in bondage and she encouraged dissidents who sought freedom. In fact, it was a speech in 1976 when she was still just leader of the opposition in which she warned about the Soviet military buildup that caused a Soviet army newspaper to coin her nickname the "Iron Lady."

Together with President Reagan, she sought every opportunity to undermine the Soviet system until it collapsed. If this doesn't sound like a bold position

today, it is only because Reagan and Thatcher were proven so profoundly right that everyone now claims to have always agreed.

I should also note that there is a temptation for many people remembering Mrs. Thatcher's legacy to note that she was the first female prime minister of the United Kingdom. While this is a significant historical fact, to mention it as though it was one of her most important accomplishments comes off as patronizing.

Margaret Thatcher rejected the identity politics that is so popular today. She said:

I've always believed that what matters in politics, as in the rest of life, isn't who you are or where you come from, but what you believe and what you want to do with your life. What matters are your convictions.

Because of her convictions and because she acted on those convictions, she restored Britain's economy, national spirit, and international reputation. Millions of people around the world now live in peace and freedom thanks in large part to her efforts. As a result, Margaret Thatcher is unquestionably one of the most significant leaders of the 20th century.

Mrs. Thatcher's legacy shouldn't simply be relegated to history though. We have a lot to learn from her today. As the President submits his overdue budget this week, I would ask my colleagues to ponder this quote by Margaret Thatcher:

If spending money like water was the answer to our country's problems, we would have no problems now. If ever a nation has spent, spent, spent and spent again, ours has. Today that dream is over. All of that money has got us nowhere but it still has to come from somewhere.

Those who urge us to relax the squeeze, to spend yet more money indiscriminately in the belief that it will help the unemployed and the small businessman, are not being kind—or compassionate—or caring. They are not the friends of the unemployed or the small business. They are asking us to do again the very thing that caused the problems in the first place.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, are we in a period of morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on the motion to proceed at this point.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I thought so. 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.

#### INAUGURATION OF JOE BERTOLINO

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Northeast Kingdom of Vermont is a special place. In a State that abounds in natural beauty, the Kingdom, as many Vermonters affectionately call the State's northeast corner, is heralded for its rural splendor. While the

rural character and unspoiled landscape is what defines the Kingdom to many, it is also home to an academic institution that has educated Vermonters for more than 100 years.

Since its founding in 1911, Lyndon State College has served as an economic engine for the region, educating students in a diverse range of academic pursuits. Lyndon has distinguished itself by developing academic programs that mirror the emerging economic needs of the community, such as its first-of-its-kind Mountain Recreation Management program. At the same time, Lyndon remains committed to a liberal arts education and educating students to be well-rounded professionals.

On Friday, April 19, Lyndon State will inaugurate its fifteenth president, Joe Bertolino. Joe comes to Vermont from Hunter College in New York, where he served as vice president for enrollment management and academic affairs. Joe's passion for working with students is evident in his easygoing manner and in how he has engaged students since arriving on campus last summer. At a college of only 1,400 students, Joe's personal touch sets the clear tone that under his leadership Lyndon will be a student-centered institution. Joe has undertaken a number of creative initiatives to build community spirit among Lyndon students and alumni, including an informal policy called "Go Green, Go Gold," that encourages the Lyndon State community to wear the school colors on Wednesdays.

Beyond this personal approach, Joe has laid out an ambitious plan for the college's future. I have had the opportunity to meet Joe during a recent visit to Washington and am encouraged to welcome his energy and creative thinking to Vermont. Lyndon State College is a vital part of Vermont's higher education community, and I wish Joe the best as he is officially inaugurated as the college's next president.

I request unanimous consent that an article from Lyndon State about President Bertolino be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### LOVING LYNDON

(By Leon Thompson)

[From the Lyndon State College Twin Tower Topics]

To the director of YMCA Camp Ockanickon, Joe Bertolino—an accordion-playing member of his high school debate team in New Jersey—didn't seem so suited for counseling other geeks. Not at first.

"Do you hike?" the director asked. "No," Joe said. "Swim?" "No." "Boat?" "No." "Arts and crafts?" "Maybe."

The director wondered, "Is there anything you do?" "I get along with people," Joe said. "That's when my life began," Dr. Joseph Bertolino said this fall, a week after delivering Lyndon State College's State of the College Address, as the fifteenth president. "To me, the meaning of life is relationships, and leadership is all about relationships."