

one verse in the whole Bible that sort of sums up the Senate: Come and let us reason together. The Senate should always be the place for that.

Let me make two last points on this nuclear option. The first is that I would encourage the American citizens to be very careful in looking at statistics. They are difficult to use. They can be very misleading because almost always these statistics lack context. I hear the talking heads. I hear folks on talk radio. I have even seen a few people right here in this Chamber use these extensively, and very often there is no context. Sometimes, for example—if you just look at cloture motions—you can actually have a filibuster without filing a cloture motion, and you can have a cloture motion without there actually being a filibuster. So, again, that will skew the numbers.

The bottom line is, there is plenty of blame to go around—plenty of blame. If one person says it is all the other side's fault, they are not being truthful. There is plenty of blame to go around. On this both parties are at fault. I will give you one example. It was not too long ago that I heard people come down here and say the DC Circuit's workload was such that they needed more judges. Well, guess what. Now I have heard those very same people say that the DC workload is so light they do not need any more judges. The shoe is on the other foot. Democrats back in the day said the DC Circuit had a light workload and did not need any more judges. Now Democrats are saying it does need more judges.

We need to stop the games and get back to work. I think there is one way to fix this, and that is by following the Golden Rule. I think if we take those words of Jesus literally and apply those to what we do here in the Senate—"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you"—and really mean that and really apply that—to do unto others as you would have them do unto you—I think all these problems would go away.

It is about respecting one another. It is about working with one another. It is about respecting elections in other States, and national elections. Do unto others as you would have them do unto you and all this would go away. Also, a little dose of forgive one another would also help.

APPROPRIATIONS

Madam President, let me also spend a couple minutes here thanking Chairwoman MIKULSKI. She has a tough job as chairwoman of the Appropriations Committee, and she is an example of someone who is determined to work together to get work done, trying to get the appropriations process back on track. No doubt it has been sidetracked this year and in recent years. This year we have seen what I would term an irresponsible feud, especially down on the House side, blowing up the farm bill, pushing for shutting down the government, trying to get us in a bad place on the debt ceiling.

I am not trying to do the blame game, but I know that Chairwoman MIKULSKI is fighting very hard to put an end to that. We need to get back to our No. 1 priority. That should be growing our economy and creating jobs. There are lots of ways we can do that, but one is through the appropriations process, by investing in infrastructure. We can make responsible, targeted investments in our future with the right kind of spending on infrastructure, whether it is roadways or airports or schools or centers for innovation—whatever it happens to be. There are lots of smart ways to do that.

The history of this country shows it is a winning strategy when we work together and make the right kind of investments in our future. Arkansas is a good example. We have a number of items we could talk about today where Federal spending has made a real difference in our State. One of those is called the Bayou Meto water project. It started back in 1923. It has been the subject of a lot of fights, and I have some scars to show that I have been part of some of those fights. But they are making great progress there. Not only is it good for thousands and thousands of farmers, but it is also great for drinking water and for flood control, and there are 55,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat that are being protected through this project. So it is a win-win for everybody.

Arkansas airports would be another example. You may not think of Arkansas as an aviation State or an aviation powerhouse, but we have 29,000 jobs that are tied to commercial and general aviation. It is \$2.5 billion in our economy. Again, that investment in infrastructure is what makes that possible.

We also have the National Center for Toxicological Research down near Pine Bluff, AR—cutting-edge research, lots of effort on nanotechnology.

We have a great technology park in Fayetteville. They are trying to build one in Little Rock. All of these—and the focus on STEM, et cetera—all of these help create jobs and grow our economy.

Congress needs to focus on that. I am not saying it is going to be easy, but we need to work together. We need to pass a budget. We need to move our appropriations bills through the process. And we just need to, bottom line, get back on track. The way to move our economy forward is by really putting the interests of our country first and not these partisan and sometimes petty disputes, ideological disputes. We need to think about what is best long term for the country. Again, I think the appropriations process is the way to do that.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, it is my understanding we may have a vote this afternoon. I have often said the most important bill we pass every year—and we have passed every year for the last 52 years—is the National Defense Authorization Act.

I would like to say this about the process we have gone through. I do not recall ever having worked with a chairman when I have been in the minority who has been so easy to work with as Chairman LEVIN has been on this Defense bill. It is one we all understand we have to do. It has to be a reality. A lot of what we do around here we can wait a month and do it. But on this we cannot, because right now we have men and women in the field. We have their paychecks. We have things that have to happen to keep this going as it has in the last few years.

Maintenance and modernization are right now. If we were not able to pass this now, our research and development would no longer be able to be there in time to take care of the immediate needs we have.

I am very upset about what has happened to our defense system. Under this administration, we have lost \$487 billion in Defense—coming out of the hide of Defense. In addition, we are now looking at the sequester. I will only say this, perhaps for the last time: Why should our defense system, which is only accountable for 18 percent of the budget, be responsible for 50 percent of the cuts? It is because this administration is determined that is what is going to happen to the military.

So now we have people such as General Odierno, Commanding General of the U.S. Army, who said:

... lowest readiness levels I have seen within our Army since I have been serving for the last 37 years. Only two brigades are ready for combat.

Admiral Greenert, the CNO of the Navy:

... because of the fiscal limitations and the situation we are in, we do not have another strike group trained and ready to respond on short notice in case of contingency. We are tapped out.

Admiral Winnefeld is the No. 2 guy in the military system. He is the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He said:

There could be, for the first time in my career, instances where we may be asked to respond to a crisis and we have to say we cannot.

I have given a lot of talks on the floor about how serious things are right now.

Put the readiness chart up there.

I would only comment to this. A lot of people think there is an easier answer for this, and that we can, through efficiencies in the Pentagon, take care of these problems. A lot of work needs to be done. My junior Senator certainly is going to be concentrating on that, on the efficiencies. However, if all

of the efficiencies were granted, that is only the blue line on this chart. This chart talks about sequestration, if nothing changes, what is going to happen to our military. We have that.

The next one up there, the next larger, is force structure. We are talking about how many brigades, how many boots on the ground, how many ships, what it is going to look like.

The next one up there is modernization. Modernization is a very small line. Here is the big one over here. That is our ability to fight a war. That is our readiness.

If you look down here at the bottom at fiscal years 2014 and 2015, you can see all of that is going to be gutted in the first 2 years if we do not make a change in it. I tried to do that. I have an amendment. I still have an amendment that is out there that could correct that situation. I think it is important for people to understand that the readiness is going to be hurt more. This is after \$487 billion has been cut from our defense system.

General Amos, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, who testified under oath, said:

We will have fewer forces arriving, less-trained, arriving late in the fight. This would delay the buildup of combat power, allow the enemy more time to build its defenses, and would likely prolong combat operations. Altogether, this is a formula for American casualties.

It gets back to that orange line up there. The orange line is when you do that, you have to accept a greater risk. That means American lives. I have already given that speech.

Right now we are getting close to the time when we are going to be actually casting a vote. I think I have kind of good news. Hopefully it is good news. I made a statement yesterday that the problem the Republicans have is they have not been able to get amendments in. We have gone through this in years past, and always something has broken loose where we are able to have amendments. Well, up until yesterday, the Republicans had 81 amendments that we wanted to be considered. Frankly, that is not all that uncontrollable. That could have been done. We could have still gotten through that this week. But as it is right now—the good news is, I said yesterday on the floor that I was going to come in and try to work all night long, and the staff has done this, to come up with 25 amendments and say: If we, the Republicans, can have 25 amendments to be considered, they can be voted down, but just to be considered on the floor, that we would be receptive to having the results.

Here is the interesting thing about it. We have heard a lot of people talking about, well, why is it all of a sudden this has to be done in 5 days? Yet we have been sitting around here for 3 months when we could have been considering it.

I would like to suggest, if you look at this, this is every year how many days

it has taken for consideration. It is always more than what we have for the rest of this week. I only say that, because in spite of that, we still have a way of doing it.

For those who might think that the recorded votes we are requesting—it is not going to be that many votes. We are asking for 25 on the Republican side. Democrats have 25. That is 50. But if you look at years past—for example, last year we had total amendments offered of 106, but only 34 were voice voted, only 8 required a recorded vote.

I can go back to all of the rest of the years that are on this chart. But the bottom line is this: What I am asking for today is 25 for the Republicans, 25 for the Democrats. Of those, not more than 15 to 20 would require votes. We could do that in 1 day. So it can be done. We could finish this and still give Republicans the opportunity to have their votes.

What I have here is a list of the 25 amendments we are asking for. Again, I am not even for all 25 of them, but they should all be considered one way or another. This probably would end up requiring maybe at the most 10 votes. So I am offering these amendments and telling the majority—by the way, I have already talked about what a great relationship I have had during this consideration as the ranking member of Armed Services with the chairman CARL LEVIN. So I am offering to CARL LEVIN and to the Democrats, the majority in the Senate and the majority on the committee, these 25 amendments. All we are asking for is for those 25 to be considered. We can do this bill right, the way we have done it for 52 years. We can have a bill. We can have it by the end of this week. So I am offering that.

I also announced yesterday that in the event I can come up with a total number of 25 that our caucus would agree with, that if we could do that and we were refused, when the time comes I will vote against going to the bill. Now I think that very likely could happen this afternoon. However, if they accept them, I am committing right here on the floor that I will be in full support and I will vote for it. I want people to understand, in the unlikely event that the majority does not accept these—the consideration of these 25 votes, I will be voting against cloture on the bill when that vote comes up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I am not on the Armed Services Committee, although I was 38 years ago. But I would think that if there are any two people in this body who could work out a program to get the votes set up and voted on it is the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan and the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma. I would hope and encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to listen to the Democratic and Repub-

lican leaders of this Committee, because I think they can probably work it out.

There has been a lot of discussion about the major rules change that occurred here today. In my capacity as President pro tempore, I was presiding during that time and did not get a chance to speak. I want to say a few things.

In the four decades I have served here, I have been here with both Democratic majorities and Republican majorities, through both Republican and Democratic administrations. We have had moments of crisis when I worried that our political differences outweighed the Senate's common responsibility. Yet we were always able to steer our way out of trouble. Majorities of both parties have come and gone, but I have never lost faith in our ability to see ourselves through the divisions and come together to do what is best for the Nation.

I have always believed in the Senate's unique protection of the minority party, even when Democrats held a majority in the Senate. When the minority has stood in the way of progress, I have defended their rights and held to my belief that the best traditions of the Senate would win out, that the 100 of us who stand in the shoes of over 310 million Americans would do the right thing. That is why I have always looked skeptically at efforts to change the Senate rules.

But in the past 5 years it has been discouraging. Ever since President Obama was elected, Senate Republicans have changed the tradition of the Senate, with escalating obstruction of nominations. They crossed the line from the use of the Senate rules to abuse of the Senate rules. In fact, the same abuse recently, and needlessly, shut down our government at a cost of billions of dollars to the taxpayers and billions of dollars to the private sector. I think it is a real threat to the independent, judicial branch of government.

As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I am worried that the Republican obstruction is damaging our ability to fulfill the Senate's unique constitutional responsibility of advice and consent to ensure that the judicial branch has the judges it needs to do its job.

Republicans have used these unprecedented filibusters—and they are unprecedented—more than at any time that I have served here. They have obstructed President Obama from appointing to the Federal bench even nominations that were supported by Republican Senators from the State from where the nominee came. They have forced cloture to end filibusters on 34 nominees, far more than we ever saw during President Bush's 8 years in office. Almost all of these nominees were, by any standard, noncontroversial and ultimately were confirmed overwhelmingly. In fact, Republican

obstruction has left the Federal judiciary with 90 or more vacancies during the past 5 years.

Take for example the Republican filibuster of a judicial nominee to the Tenth Circuit, Robert Bacharach last year, despite the support of the Republican Senators from Oklahoma. This marked a new and damaging milestone. Never before had the Senate filibustered and refused to vote on a judicial nominee with such strong bipartisan support, and who was voted out of the Judiciary Committee with virtually unanimous support. Republicans continued to block Senate action on the Bacharach nomination through the end of last Congress and forced his nomination to be returned without action to the President. There is no good reason—none—why Robert Bacharach was not confirmed to serve the people of Oklahoma and the Tenth Circuit as a Federal judge last year. He was finally confirmed this year unanimously.

Republicans last year also filibustered William Kayatta, another consensus circuit nominee who had the support of both Republican home State Senators. Like Judge Bacharach, Mr. Kayatta received the ABA Standing Committee on the Federal judiciary's highest possible rating and had strong bipartisan support and unimpeachable credentials. The same also applies to Richard Taranto, whose nomination was returned to the President at the end of last year after Republicans blocked action on his nomination to a vacancy on the Federal Circuit for more than eight months, despite no opposition in the Senate and despite the support of both Paul Clement and the late Robert Bork. Neither of these nominees faced any real opposition. Yet Republicans stalled both of them through the end of last Congress and forced their nomination to be returned without action to the President. They were both confirmed this year with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Senate Republicans used to insist that the filibustering of judicial nominations was unconstitutional. The Constitution has not changed, but as soon as President Obama took office Republicans reversed course. It struck me, because the very first—the very first—nominee to the Federal bench that President Obama sent here was filibustered. Judge Hamilton of Indiana was a widely-respected 15-year veteran of the Federal bench nominated to the Seventh Circuit. President Obama reached out to the longest-serving Republican in the Senate, Senator Dick Lugar, to select a nominee he supported. Yet, Senate Republicans filibustered his nomination, requiring a cloture vote before his nomination could be confirmed after a delay of seven months.

It is almost a case of saying: Okay, Mr. President, you think you got elected? We are going to show you who is boss. We are going to treat you differently than all of the Presidents before you.

This has never been done before, to filibuster the President's very first

nominee. Somehow this President is going to be told he is different than other Presidents.

Senate Republicans have obstructed and delayed nearly every circuit court nominee of this President, filibustering 14 of them. They abused the Senate's practices and procedures to delay confirmation of Judge Albert Diaz of North Carolina to the Fourth Circuit for 11 months, before he was confirmed by voice vote. They delayed confirmation of Judge Jane Stranch of Tennessee to the Sixth Circuit for 10 months before she was confirmed 71 to 21. Senate Republicans used procedural tactics to delay for months the Senate confirmation of nominations with the strong support of Republican home State Senators—including Judge Scott Matheson of Utah to the Tenth Circuit; Judge James Wynn, Jr. of North Carolina to the Fourth Circuit; Judge Henry Floyd of South Carolina to the Fourth Circuit; Judge Adalberto Jordan of Florida to the Eleventh Circuit; Judge Beverly Martin of Georgia to the Eleventh Circuit; Judge Mary Murguia of Arizona to the Ninth Circuit; Judge Bernice Donald of Tennessee to the Sixth Circuit; Judge Thomas Vanaskie of Pennsylvania to the Third Circuit; Judge Andrew Hurwitz of Arizona to the Ninth Circuit; Judge Morgan Christen of Alaska to the Ninth Circuit; and Judge Stephen Higginson of Louisiana to the Fifth Circuit.

The results are clear and devastating. The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service has reported that the median time circuit nominees had to wait before a Senate vote has skyrocketed from 18 days for President Bush's nominees during his first term in office to 132 days for President Obama's nominees during his first term in office. This is the result of Republican obstruction and abuse of Senate rules. In most cases, Senate Republicans have delayed and stalled without explanation. How do you explain the filibuster of the nomination of Judge Barbara Keenan of Virginia to the Fourth Circuit who was ultimately confirmed 99 to 0? And how else do you explain the needless obstruction of Judge Denny Chin of New York to the Second Circuit, who was filibustered for four months before he was confirmed 98 to 0?

In 2012, Senate Republicans refused to consent to a vote on a single circuit court nominee until the majority leader filed cloture, even for nominees with home State Republican support like Adalberto Jordan of Florida—strongly supported by Senator RUBIO—and Andrew Hurwitz of Arizona, strongly supported by Senator Kyl. They blocked the Senate from voting on a single circuit court nominee nominated by President Obama last year. Since 1980, the only other Presidential election year in which there were no circuit nominees confirmed who was nominated that same year was in 1996, when Senate Republicans shut down the process against President Clinton's circuit nominees.

In the 8 years George W. Bush served as President, only five of his district court nominees received any opposition on the floor. That was over 8 years. In just 5 years, 42 of President Obama's district court nominees have faced opposition. The majority leader had to file cloture on 20 of them. Federal district court judges are the trial court judges who hear cases from litigants across the country and preside over Federal criminal trials, applying the law to facts and helping settle legal disputes. They handle the vast majority of the caseload of the Federal courts and are critical to making sure our courts remain available to provide a fair hearing for all Americans. Nominations to fill these critical positions, whether made by a Democratic or Republican President, have always been considered with deference to the home State Senators who know the nominees and their States best, and have been confirmed quickly with that support. Never before in the Senate's history have we seen district court nominees blocked for months and opposed for no good reason. Many are needlessly stalled and then confirmed virtually unanimously with no explanation for the obstruction. Senate Republicans have politicized even these traditionally non-partisan positions.

As chairman of the Judiciary Committee I have always acted fairly and consistently whether the President has been a Democrat or a Republican. I have not filibustered nominees with bipartisan support. I have steadfastly protected the rights of the minority and I have done so despite criticism from Democrats. I have only proceeded with judicial nominations supported by both home State Senators. I will put my record of consistent fairness up against that of any chairman and never acted as some Republican chairmen have acted in blatantly disregarding evenhanded practices to ram through the ideological nominations of President George W. Bush.

Regrettably, the answer to my fairness and to my commitment to protecting the rights of the minority has been unprecedented and meritless obstruction. Even though President Obama has nominated qualified, mainstream lawyers, Republicans in the Senate have done away with regular order, imposing unnecessary and damaging delays. Until 2009, judicial nominees reported by the Judiciary Committee with bipartisan support were generally confirmed quickly. That has changed, with district nominations taking over four times longer and circuit court nominees over seven times longer than it took to confirm them during the Bush administration. Until 2009, we observed regular order and usually confirmed four to six nominees per week, and we cleared the Senate Executive Calendar before long recesses. Since then, Senate Republicans have refused to clear the calendar and slowed us down to a snail's pace. Until 2009, if a nominee was filibustered, it

was almost always because of a substantive issue with the nominee's record. We know what has happened since 2009—Republicans have required cloture to consider even those nominees later confirmed unanimously.

This obstruction was not merely a product of extreme partisanship in a Presidential election year—it has been a constant and across the board practice since President Obama took office. At the end of each calendar year, Senate Republicans have deliberately refused to vote on several judicial nominees just to take up more time the following year. At the end of 2009 Republicans denied 10 nominations pending on the Executive Calendar a vote. The following year, it took 9 months for the Senate to take action on 8 of them. At the end of 2010 and 2011, Senate Republicans left 19 nominations on the Senate Executive Calendar, taking up nearly half the following year for the Senate to confirm them. Last year they blocked 11 judicial nominees from votes, and refused to expedite consideration of others who already had hearings.

The effects of this obstruction have been clear. When the Senate adjourned last year, Senate Republicans had blocked more than 40 of President Obama's circuit and district nominees from being confirmed in his first term. That obstruction has led to a damagingly high level of judicial vacancies persisting for over four years.

This year, Senate Republicans reached a new depth of pure partisanship. They have decided to shut down the confirmation process altogether for an entire court—the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit, even though there are three vacancies on that court. Senate Republicans attempt to justify their opposition to filling any of the three vacancies on the DC Circuit with an argument that the court's caseload does not warrant the appointments.

We all know that this ploy is a transparent attempt to prevent a Democratic President from appointing judges to this important court. We all know what has happened here in the DC Circuit. In 2003, the Senate unanimously confirmed John Roberts by voice vote as the 9th judge on the DC Circuit at a time when the caseload was lower than it is today. He was confirmed unanimously. No Democrat, no Republican opposed him. Not a single Senate Republican raised any concerns about whether the caseload warranted his confirmation and during the Bush administration they voted to confirm four judges to the DC Circuit—giving the court a total of 11 judges in active service.

Today there are only eight judges on the court; yet, when Patricia Millett was nominated to that exact same seat by President Obama, a woman with just as strong qualifications as John Roberts—they both had great qualifications—she was filibustered. Some say we should not call that a double stand-

ard. Well, I am not sure what else one might call it. We also should not be comparing the DC Circuit's caseload with that of other circuits, as Republicans have recently done. The DC Circuit is often understood to be the second most important court in the land because of the complex administrative law cases that it handles. The court reviews complicated decisions and rulemakings of many Federal agencies, and in recent years has handled some of the most important terrorism and enemy combatant and detention cases since the attacks of September 11, 2001. Comparing the DC Circuit's caseload to other circuits is a false comparison, and those who are attempting to make this comparison are not being fully forthcoming with the American public. Years ago, one of the senior most Republican Senators on the Judiciary Committee said this:

[C]omparing workloads in the DC Circuit to that of other circuits is, to a large extent, a pointless exercise. There is little dispute that the DC Circuit's docket is, by far, the most complex and time consuming in the Nation.

Now, however, that same Senator has engaged in the precise pointless exercise he once railed against.

This is an unprecedented level of obstruction. I have seen substantive arguments mounted against judicial nominees, but I have never seen a full blockade against every single nominee to a particular court, regardless of the individual's qualifications. Republicans attempted to take this type of hardline stance with certain executive positions last year and earlier this year, when they refused to allow a vote for any nominee to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the National Labor Relations Board. Rather than representing substantive opposition to these individual nominees, this obstruction was a partisan attempt to sabotage and eviscerate these agencies which protect consumers and American workers. I have heard some call this tactic "nullification." It is as if the Republicans have decided that the President did not actually win the election in 2008, and was not re-elected in 2012.

Senate Republicans backed off this radical and unprecedented hardline stance on executive nominees earlier this year, but they have shown no signs of doing the same with the DC Circuit. And it is not for lack of qualified nominees. This year, Senate Republicans filibustered the nominations of three exceptionally qualified women: Caitlin Halligan, Patricia Millett and Nina Pillard. Earlier this week Republicans filibustered another stellar nominee to this court, Judge Robert Wilkins.

I am a lawyer. I have tried cases in Federal courts. I have argued cases in Federal courts of appeal. I always went into those courts knowing I could look at that Federal judge and say: It doesn't make any difference whether I am a Democrat or a Republican, whether I represent the plaintiff or the defendant; this is an impartial court.

If we play political games with our Federal judiciary, how long are the American people going to trust the impartiality of our Federal courts? At what point do these games start making people think maybe this is not an independent judiciary? If that day comes, the United States will have given up one of its greatest strengths.

Let's go back to voting on judges based on their merit—and not on whether they were nominated by a Democratic President or a Republican President. Let's stop holding President Obama to a different standard than any President before him—certainly no President since I have been in the Senate, and I began with President Gerald Ford.

This obstruction is not just bad for the Senate, it is also a disaster for our Nation's overburdened courts. Persistent vacancies force fewer judges to take on growing caseloads, and make it harder for Americans to have access to justice. While they have delayed and obstructed, the number of judicial vacancies has remained historically high and it has become more difficult for our courts to provide speedy, quality justice for the American people. In short, as a result of Republican obstruction of nominees, the Senate has failed to do its job for the courts and for the American people, and failed to live up to its constitutional responsibilities. That is why the Senate today was faced with what to do to overcome this abuse and what action to take to restore this body's ability to fulfill its constitutional duties and do its work for the American people.

HONORING PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Seeing the distinguished Presiding Officer who is not only a New Englander, but in this case from Massachusetts, let me just speak personally for a moment on a very, very sad day.

Tomorrow will be November 22. And ever since I was a law student, November 22 has always brought a feeling of dread to me. Tomorrow will be 50 years since President Kennedy was murdered.

My wife Marcelle and I were living in Washington at that time. She was a young nurse, a registered nurse, working at the VA hospital on Wisconsin Avenue, a site that is now occupied by the Russian Embassy. She was helping to put this equally impoverished law student through Georgetown Law School. We had been there in this basement apartment, first during the Cuban missile crisis. And like everybody, we held our breath in this city, wondering if this new, young President, John F. Kennedy, could get us through this crisis without plunging the world into nuclear war. I was excited—we both were—to be in the same city.

My family has always been Democratic. Back in Vermont, the joke was: "That's the street where the Democrats live." There were so few of them