

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I see no one else seeking the floor, so I yield back the remainder of the time, which is now about 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert S. Mueller, III, of California, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a term expiring September 4, 2013.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 118 Ex.]

YEAS — 100

Akaka	Gillibrand	Moran
Alexander	Graham	Murkowski
Ayotte	Grassley	Murray
Barrasso	Hagan	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Hatch	Paul
Bennet	Heller	Portman
Bingaman	Hoeben	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hutchison	Reed
Blunt	Inhofe	Reid
Boozman	Inouye	Risch
Boxer	Isakson	Roberts
Brown (MA)	Johanns	Rockefeller
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Burr	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Cantwell	Kerry	Schumer
Cardin	Kirk	Sessions
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Kohl	Shelby
Chambliss	Kyl	Snowe
Coats	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coburn	Lautenberg	Tester
Cochran	Leahy	Thune
Collins	Lee	Toomey
Conrad	Levin	Udall (CO)
Coons	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Corker	Lugar	Vitter
Cornyn	Manchin	Warner
Crapo	McCain	Webb
DeMint	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Wyden
Feinstein	Merkley	
Franken	Mikulski	

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have spoken to the Republican leader fairly recently—it is all relative time, I guess. There will be no more rollcall votes tonight.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business until 6:30 p.m. tonight, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each. Senator COBURN is not on the floor, but I understand he wanted to speak for more than 10 minutes. I ask that Senator COBURN be recognized at 5:30 p.m. for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would like to get 20 minutes to speak following Senator COBURN.

Mr. REID. Sounds good to me.

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

Mr. REID. The rest of the Senators will be limited to 10 minutes.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 6:30 p.m., I be recognized.

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

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

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

The Senator from Kansas.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I have spoken several times over the last several weeks with regard to the issue at hand. Clearly, the time continues to escape us, and the day of reckoning is coming in regard to the debt ceiling issue. I have said from the very beginning that in my view it would be irresponsible not to raise the debt ceiling, but it would be as irresponsible if not more so to raise the debt ceiling without reducing the spending, getting our books more in balance, and moving us in the right direction toward a balanced budget in the future. I recognize this cannot be accomplished overnight, and I recognize there are those who bring different points of view and perspectives to the Senate floor. This is a body of people who represent individuals who live in all 50 States and have points of view and philosophies and backgrounds that are different than perhaps the constituents I represent from the State of Kansas.

I have been a strong supporter of the legislation entitled “cut, cap, and balance.” I actually believe it is not just cut, cap, and balance; it is cut, cap, balance, and grow. We could do so much for our country both in the fiscal sense and with the idea that we could better pay our bills if the revenues are increased by putting people to work, by creating a climate in which people could find jobs, people could improve their situation in regard to their jobs, and in the process of doing that the revenues increase to the Federal Treasury.

It was back in the days of President Clinton that we came the closest to having our books balanced. While there was spending restraint and disagreement among Republicans and Democrats about new spending programs or bigger government, in my view, the

real reason we had a balanced budget was because the economy was growing.

So I again ask my colleagues to pay attention to what I believe was the message of the 2010 election: It is the economy. It is the desire of people to have a better life, to save money for their children's education, to save money for their retirement, and to be satisfied that the job they have today is the job they will have tomorrow.

I believe there is much that we can do with regard to the regulatory environment, making the Tax Code fair and certain, issues regarding access to credit, a trade policy that will allow us to increase exports—both agricultural and manufactured goods—and a trade policy that reduces our reliance on foreign energy and gives us greater control over its costs. But the time has come for us to reach an agreement, and we anxiously await what action the House of Representatives may take.

In light of this point in time, I would like to share with my colleagues in the Senate an e-mail I received from one of my constituents, a Kansan named Gina Reynolds. Gina is from Shawnee. She expresses this point of view I think very appropriately for where we are today. In asking Gina if I could share with you what she wrote to me, she indicated this was the very first time she had ever written a Member of Congress. Here is what she had to say that I hope we will take into account. Again, while we bring philosophies and viewpoints and approaches to government to Washington, DC, there is an opportunity for common sense and good judgment to prevail.

Here is what she says:

I firmly believe the United States needs to start living within our means. However, I am frustrated beyond belief with the inability of Congress to do their jobs and ensure that we do not throw the country back into recession. While I and my husband are employed, we feel lucky to have jobs. We work hard, pay our taxes and try to raise our children the right way. It absolutely boggles my mind that we cannot come to a compromise on the debt ceiling issue that is so critical to the financial markets and the average American citizen.

For it is us, the middle class, that will suffer the most; from lost jobs, to lost 401Ks, and lost savings. We need real tax reform, real entitlement reform (for even though I am 42 years old, I do not believe I will ever see a dime of Social Security) and real spending cuts. Congress has had months to work on this issue, and now the time is to act in the best interests of the People, not the political interest groups, not some ideology.

It is sad to say, but I honestly don't know if my children will have a better future than me. I know that there are a lot of tough decisions yet to be made regarding spending and taxes, but we only make it harder by defaulting on any of our country's obligations. I am fiscally conservative and generally vote Republican, but I do not blindly follow any one path. I try to use my vote wisely and pledge my loyalty to my God and my country, not a political party.

I believe we have the greatest country on Earth, but our inability to compromise, to stop acting like spoiled children, saddens me. The Founding Fathers were able to compromise and write a document that has stood the test of time for 235 years. Can we not now do the same? Please do the right thing for the American People, the ones frustrated and angry and hurt by this self-produced impasse.

I thank Gina Reynolds for her message to me and Members of the Senate, for taking the time to communicate with her Senator, with me as a Member of Congress. I think she in many ways expresses a conservative yet common-sense point of view so many Kansans have.

I often think too many times we are caught in a circumstance that we find an inability to resolve. Sometimes we are trapped by our political party. In my view, while we ought to have strong opinions and ought to have a solid philosophy, we need to make certain that we are motivated for the right reasons and that the good of America is at the forefront of our minds.

I indicated in my maiden speech when I spoke here on the Senate floor 4 months ago as a new Senator that when I need a perspective as to what we need to do here—and sometimes we get bogged down in those things that are a lot less important—I will put my walking shoes on, my running shoes, and I will walk up to the Lincoln Memorial. You go by the World War II Memorial, you walk on past the Vietnam Wall, and you walk by the Korean War Memorial, and in each one of those locations, I am reminded that no American memorialized in those settings fought and died, sacrificed for their country for purposes of Republicans or Democrats but because they believed they had an obligation to serve our country and because they believed that in that service, they had the opportunity to make life better for their family and for future generations of Americans. We need to remind ourselves that we need that perspective. It is not a fight between the Republicans and Democrats. It is about doing what is right for America. We owe it to those who sacrificed in military service for our country, and particularly those who have died in that service, we will do what is right. I know my colleagues share that point of view. I think from time to time we have to be reminded about what the priorities have to be, what the focus must be.

Again, I appreciate the sentiments expressed by this Kansan and would indicate that we, as American citizens, and certainly me, as a Member of the Senate, our primary responsibility as citizens is to make certain we pass on to the next generation of Americans this country called the United States of America in which we maintain the freedoms and liberties guaranteed by our Constitution and we allow the next generation of Americans, our children,

our grandchildren, and young men and women yet to be born, people we don't even know, the opportunity to pursue the American dream.

I think this Kansas constituent of mine expressed those sentiments very well, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to see that we do what is right for the future of our Nation and that this next generation of Americans can pursue that which we all idolize and believe in, the American dream.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, let me, first of all, compliment my friend and colleague, the Senator from Kansas, for his comments and for his approach. He made a few comments we haven't heard much of in this Chamber or in the other Chamber in the last few days. He said before he was a Democrat and before he was a Republican, he was an American. I want to compliment him on those sentiments, and I want to rise in that same vein because whether you are somebody from Kansas or somebody from North Carolina or folks I hear from Virginia who keep saying to me: Why can't you guys get this thing done? Why can't you both be willing to give a little to put our country first? As somebody who has had the honor of serving as Governor of Virginia and somebody who served as a businessman for 20 years, I never thought that I would be standing on the floor of the Senate 6 days, 5½ days away from the United States of America potentially defaulting on our obligations. Yet most of the debate and, Lord knows, almost all of the press conferences have been less about solutions and more about who is to blame.

Whether they are sitting in the gallery or they are watching at home or, like most Americans, trying to get through an unbearably hot summer, they wonder who are these folks they hired to get the people's business done.

I have been involved with a group of Senators over the last 9 months who have done something I didn't think was extraordinary, but unfortunately today is pretty extraordinary. There is a group of Democratic and Republican Senators who have said the most important issue we face in our country is to get our debt and deficit under control, and who have said that the only way we can get that under control is to sit together for hours on end, reason together, argue, and do something as basically American as compromise.

After months and months of going back and forth, last Tuesday, when we revealed the so-called plan—which, frankly, the Gang of 6 has built upon the work of a previous year's work of Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and business leaders, the President's deficit commission—a remarkable thing happened for a couple of days in this body. Instead of everybody coming out and saying why this couldn't happen, they said: Hey, this isn't perfect,

but this would actually lower our deficit by close to \$4 trillion, take on tax reform, take on entitlement reform, and cut spending. It might just be a path out.

Well, that lasted a couple of days, and then we got back to who was going to score points in the next 24-hour news segment.

Well, I desperately hope and pray that at this moment in our country we will rise to the task and make sure, with the eyes of not only the Nation but the world on us, that we do our basic job. Let's make sure the United States of America doesn't default next Tuesday.

The only way I think we are going to get there is if we lower the rhetoric, lower the finger-pointing, and recognize it is going to take ideas from both sides. It is going to take a change in attitude from some.

There is a Congressman who gave a press conference sometime in the last day or two who paraphrased Winston Churchill. He said:

We're going to fight you on the beaches. We're going to fight you at sea. We're going to fight you in the air to make structural changes in the way this place known as Washington, DC, operates.

Who is the "you" he is going to fight? Is he going to fight people who say maybe America and Americans want us to actually work together and compromise? I mean, this kind of sentiment goes beyond the pale in a moment when our Nation is in this kind of crisis.

There has been a lot of talk recently—particularly coming from the other body—that the only way to solve this problem is an amendment, a constitutional amendment. Well, I would point out 49 States have that kind of amendment. They have to balance their books. My State, Virginia, and the Presiding Officer's State, North Carolina, meet that goal. There are an awful lot of States that have that kind of amendment in place. I don't know what kind of accounting they use, but I have not heard many folks point to the California State budget and say: That is a balanced budget.

So some kind of process argument isn't going to solve the problem. We have to make the hard choices. We have to cut spending. We have to reform our entitlements. We have to reform our Tax Code to generate additional revenues.

The numbers don't lie. We are spending at an all-time high, 25 percent of our GDP. We are collecting revenues at only 15 percent of GDP. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out any time our Nation's budget has been in relative balance is when we have been with spending and revenues at 19.5 percent to 20.5 percent. Why can't we come together to put a plan in place that does that?

Folks who are watching are saying: Well, there is actually a plan. More than one-third of the Senate has said: We will be with you—about an equal

number of Democrats and Republicans. But instead we are going back and forth, ping-pong, who is going to have which plan? Who is going to win each day? It is also pretty remarkable at this moment in time—I don't know who this Congressman is, but when we have roughly one-fifth of the House who at least on record saying they will never vote to increase the debt limit, I wonder when they took the oath to uphold the laws of our country, which said we have to pay our bills, how that commitment matches with those promises or those political positions.

My sense is they want to have an amendment to the Constitution. What they are advocating, this we will never change, our way or the highway approach, the amendment they ought to talk about is basically restructuring our whole Constitution and turning our government into a parliamentary system. There are a lot of places around that if you win an election, you get to choose the chief executive. You get to control the legislature. You can pass anything you want. Yet these very same folks are the ones who say they want to support the Constitution.

Well, the Constitution and the genius of our Constitution was the fact that the Founders said the most basic American principle was checks and balances. We have a House, we have a President, and actually they have to work together. Somehow the attitude of some of these Members in the House, do it our way or let's drive our country over the cliff, is dramatically as un-American as anything I have ever seen.

At the same time, we hear other Members who say: Maybe we just need a little more economic shock to make us do the right thing. What are these folks thinking of? The stock market closed down 200 points today. It has been down about 400 points this week. There are an awful lot of Americans who only now are starting to recover from the financial crisis of 2 years ago. There are an awful lot of retirees who saw their 401(k)s plummet 2 years ago, who slowly have seen that nest egg that is going to get them through rough times recover.

Now 400 points—how much more stock market decline do we need before we all have the courage to do the right thing, 1,000 points? Do we need to put another 1 million Americans out of work? Do we need to throw more people out of their homes because of the tax increase that will result—the real increase that will result with the rise in interest rates that will happen next week?

There are others who say: Let's do it short term. Let's kick the can down the road for a short while, something that is being discussed in the House. It doesn't matter whether it is Democrat or Republican. It matters because that approach will result in a lowering of our debt rating. I know people's eyes glaze over when they hear about debt ratings. Unfortunately, debt ratings matter—and we are the only country in

the world with a AAA debt rating. That means we are kind of the gold standard.

If we have that debt rating reduced, it is not only a black eye for America, it not only means that what we have to pay in interest rates will go up, not just for government but if you have a school bond, if you have a State bond, the prices are going to go up. You have an auto loan, a home mortgage, you have a student loan, you are a business trying to expand, the cost of that is all going to go up.

The very same folks who say they will never look at raising more revenues don't seem to mind at all that if we have to have an interest rate rise because of a default or downgrade of our debt, doesn't that take more money out of Americans' pockets? I just don't get it.

Frankly, as the Presiding Officer knows, I have been pretty obsessed about this issue for months on end. I hope that we will check our Democratic and Republican hats and go with what my colleague, the Senator from Kansas, said and recognize when we get out of bed tomorrow morning we get out of bed as Americans, not as Democrats or Republicans; that we not only get over the debt limit, which, hopefully, through some convoluted process we will, but we also recognize that getting past August 2 doesn't mean, OK, we are done, everybody go have a nice August. All that does is buy us a bit of time to decide whether we are going to come back to the really hard issues of not only how we start with some spending cuts, which will be part of our down payment, but how we really make sure the entitlement programs—important to so many of us on both sides of the aisle, but particularly on this side of the aisle—are actually there 10, 20, 30 years from now.

The notion that they are not going to change, that they cannot continue to be sustainable at the current rate, it is not Democratic or Republican.

Thank goodness a lot of us are living a lot longer. When I was a kid there were 15, 16 people paying in for every Social Security retiree. Now there are 3. We have to make sure that for my kids, your kids, that there is Social Security in their framework. At the same time we have to have our colleagues on the Republican side recognize that we have to reform our Tax Code in a way that makes it simpler, flatter, and, yes, generates some additional revenue.

The only way we are going to get there, if and when we get past this August 2 date, is if we combine that effort with long-term debt reduction. I am more than open to any valid, balanced comprehensive bipartisan plan that is around.

For the effort of the so-called Gang of 6, a third of the Senate said, yes, this is worth considering. It isn't perfect, I can assure you. Some would even say, from some of the descriptions I have heard, that it may not meet all of those. But I will tell my colleagues

three things it is: It is comprehensive, bipartisan, and, under any analysis, it does what our country desperately needs: It starts to drive our debt-to-GDP ratio in the right direction, which is a fancy way of saying we can maintain our books on a path to lead us to fiscal stability. Frankly, what that would also allow us to do is get back to what we should be spending our time on, which is creating growth in this economy and starting to unleash American creativity and innovation. But that is not going to happen if we spend all of our time pointing fingers back and forth about how we got here or which short-term plan best meets the short-term interests of the next 5 or 6 days.

I, for one, believe the plan Senator REID has laid out is not perfect, but it gives us the time to deal with this debt and deficit problem in a serious way. It gives us the ability to ensure that we don't have a credit downgrade. Unfortunately, the plan being debated in the House right now may have some merits, but the one thing that is clear is that it will lead to a downgrade—not my words, but the words of all the rating agencies. Whether we like them or not, they are the folks who set that standard.

Again, I urge folks who are making statements such as “We are going to fight you on the beaches, we are going to fight you at sea, we are going to fight you in the air,” to consider your fellow Americans here. If you don't like our system of government, then be honest and propose a change to a parliamentary system. If you do honor and respect the Constitution which we all took an oath to uphold, recognize that it is a Constitution that puts in place checks and balances to have us all work together, give a little, and recognize that when we get out of bed in the morning, we are not a Democrat or a Republican but an American first and foremost.

I hope and pray we will find the path through these next 5 days and that we won't do the unthinkable. I have said on a couple of occasions—I am sure it will come back and bite me—that if we don't do this we should all get fired, because the fact is the most basic promise we make is to uphold the laws and rules of our country. Frankly, I can't think of anything that is more quintessentially American than making sure we pay our bills and that we honor our obligations. So let's get that done, and then let's work together to make sure we put in place the long-term, comprehensive, bipartisan approach that is needed so we can get this Nation back on the right fiscal path but, more importantly, back on the right path to ensure that everybody gets that fair shot for that economic growth we all seek so much.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COBURN. 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. COBURN. I ask to speak as in morning business.

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

SPENDING

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, we have a lot in front of us as a nation. Our perception is that our country is anxious, and I think it has good reason to be anxious, but it doesn't have anything to do with the debt ceiling debate. It should be anxious because we are not listening. We are not paying attention to the anxiety and fear and worry that the country they know and the freedoms and liberties they have are slipping away from them. They are slipping away because we are putting America into debtor's prison. We are slowly losing our ability to make free choices about our future because we failed to be responsible in the past with the money the American people have given us.

We have had a lot of debates and a lot of statements over the last couple of weeks, but no one ever talks about what the real problem is. The real problem is we are spending money on things with good intentions that don't accomplish their purposes. We are spending money we don't have on things we don't absolutely need, and the programs we do have, we fail to oversee to see that they are running both efficiently and effectively. As a consequence, we find ourselves in the midst of an economic downturn with a \$1.5 trillion to \$1.6 trillion deficit, borrowing \$4 billion a day. That means every day and a half, we borrow more money than the State of Oklahoma spends in a year. We hear all of the political speeches and all of the fingerpointing, but we don't hear the real solutions to our problem.

Let me explain what I mean. Everybody agrees we are going to have to make some cuts, but not everybody is honest about the numbers associated with those cuts. Everybody agrees we are going to have to tighten our belt, but nobody wants to offer specifically where to tighten our belt. What I wish to do today is offer specific places where the government today—right today, in this body and the one across the Capitol—could make a big difference in the outcome of our future by cutting specific programs this week and next week.

That is the one rare thing we never hear in Washington. Everybody says we need to cut, but when it gets down to talking about what to cut, nobody wants to come up with any cogent ideas because they don't want to take the political heat, because every program, no matter how well intended and

how inefficient, has those people who are going to fight for that program because it has money coming into the coffers for something.

The other point I wish to make is the reason we are anxious and the reason we are worried is we have abandoned the very principles our Founders gave us that would keep us healthy, and that was the Constitution and its enumerated powers section, which spelled out very succinctly what was our responsibility and what was the States' responsibility.

So we have whole departments. One, for example, would be the Department of Education that Thomas Jefferson said if we ever have the Federal Government doing anything on education, we would have to change the Constitution. That is a direct quote of his. He was one of our Founders. He, as well as Madison and Monroe and others, wrote extensively about what their intentions were in the Federalist Papers. Yet we have allowed ourselves to be walked, like in a dream state, into the contention that the Constitution does not make any difference and that it would, in fact, if we paid attention to it, limit our opportunities for the mistakes we have made. The mistakes we have made—though well-intentioned—are that we can be the answer for every problem in America. We cannot.

What made our country great was self-reliance, individual freedom and initiative, personal responsibility and accountability. That is what built our country, in a system that said: If, in fact, you work hard, the opportunity is there for you to gain, for you and those you love. Now we have a government that at every place, for every decision that is for the economic benefit of those individuals who would grab that dream, they are confronted with layers upon layers of bureaucracy, with rules and regulations, to the point where no longer are they presumed innocent by the Federal Government, they are presumed guilty, and they have to prove themselves innocent to the bureaucracy to be able to accomplish that which would set them free, that which would put them ahead, that which would establish an opportunity to gain the wealth this country promised.

I put forward a week ago last Monday \$9 trillion in potential cuts. Now, I know people are not all going to agree with me, but every one of these cuts is backed up with a government study that says what we are doing in these programs is not effective. Whether it is the Congressional Research Service, the inspector generals, the Government Accountability Office, OMB, or the Congressional Budget Office, there are over 3,000 footnotes to the 600 pages that are in here that explain very well why we should not be doing this \$9 trillion worth of stuff.

I understand we can have a great debate on whether, one, it is our constitutional responsibility. Some of it certainly is when it comes to defense. No. 2, we can have a great debate on

what we think are priorities, those things that fit within the Constitution that are our responsibility. But we cannot debate the facts of the outright waste, the outright fraud, the outright abuse, and the outright duplication of multiple sets of programs.

This is far from a complete list, as shown in this chart. But over the next 10 years, we could save \$150 billion to \$200 billion just by eliminating duplicative programs. We have over 100 programs on surface transportation. That is 100 sets of bureaucracies, 100 offices, 100 sets of regulations, 100 sets of rules. The question we ought to ask is, If we have responsibility on surface transportation, why in the world do we have 100 different programs?

We have 82 teacher improvement and training programs run by the Federal Government. Nobody will come down here and answer me why. It is indefensible we have it. Yet nobody will come down here and join me to eliminate it. We have to be asking the question: Do we have good reason to be anxious when we will not do the obvious?

We have over 180 economic development programs, but we have 88 economic development programs that we spend \$6.8 billion a year on run by four separate agencies, and not one of them has a study that shows they are effective in developing economic activity—not one of them. So why would we continue to send money into programs with good intentions that are not working? Yet we have over 180 of them, 88 within four departments. We have not been able to find all the rest of them, but we know they exist.

That is 88 sets of bureaucrats, well-intentioned Federal Government workers doing what this Congress and Congresses before us have told them to do but not accomplishing the purpose for which that money—almost \$7 billion a year—is sent.

We have 80 other separate programs for transportation assistance. You see the little community vehicles, the ones to help those who have a disability. Why do we have 80 separate programs? Nobody can answer that. It is easy to figure out how they happen. They are well-intentioned. We ought to help people who cannot get around. The question that ought to be asked is, Is that a State responsibility or a Federal responsibility? If it is a Federal responsibility—that is debatable, but if it is, why would we have 80 separate programs?

We have 56 different programs run by seven different agencies to teach Americans financial literacy. We have to ask ourselves the question: How can a government that is running a \$1.6 trillion deficit and has \$14 trillion of debt—and our debt-to-GDP ratio is 100 percent—how do we have any authority to teach anybody about financial literacy? That is No. 1.

No. 2, where is it in the Constitution that we are responsible for teaching people financial literacy? That is both a State function, a city function, and a