

I share the concern of many Rhode Islanders who were disappointed with the Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United v. FEC*, which would allow corporations to fund political ads without disclosing their funding sources. Unfortunately, this could facilitate unlimited political spending by anonymous donors in campaigns across the nation, allowing special interests and corporations to go unchecked in our democratic process.

Contrary to some arguments that have been made on this Floor today, this bill does nothing to restrict free speech. It simply ensures that our citizens know who is speaking.

This legislation takes several critical steps to protect the integrity of our elections and shine light on who is funding campaign advertisements. First, it prohibits large government contractors, those with over \$10 million in contracts, from making campaign expenditures. The bill further bars those companies that received TARP funding from participating in federal campaigns until the government is repaid. Additionally, this bill ensures that foreign governments do not influence our elections by banning corporations controlled by foreign nationals from making campaign contributions and expenditures.

I am especially pleased that the DISCLOSE Act contains strong language to require CEOs to stand by their ads by requiring them to appear on camera to "approve the message," just as candidates do today. Additionally, top donors must be listed in ads so that individuals know exactly who is financing the message. Again, this does not curb the freedom to speak or advocate for an issue or candidate, it simply ensures transparency. Finally, this legislation requires corporations and other organizations to disclose campaign related expenditures to their shareholders, members, and on their websites.

While I am disappointed with the inclusion of an exemption for certain organizations, I believe that this bill takes an enormous step towards improving our laws to bring greater transparency and accountability to our nation's campaigns. As a former Secretary of State and a proud representative of Rhode Island, I believe free and fair elections are fundamental to our democracy, and I urge my colleagues to support the DISCLOSE Act.

NASA'S CONSTELLATION PROGRAM

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 2010

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I remain very concerned about the direction of our Nation's space agency under the Obama plan. This Administration has made the surprisingly drastic decision to cancel NASA's follow-on to, the space shuttle, the Constellation program. Constellation would provide the means to service and use the International Space Station, and once again explore beyond low earth orbit.

Canceling the Constellation program threatens our country with the potential loss of tens of thousands of highly-skilled and well-paid jobs. As important as jobs are right now, by canceling Constellation we stand to lose more than just jobs. We are losing American know-

how and expertise. The NASA contractor team is a national asset, one that would be difficult and costly to duplicate.

Next year with the retirement of the Space Shuttle, the U.S. will have no way to launch anyone into space. American astronauts and our international partners will have to hitch rides on Russian spacecraft, launched from a Russian base, to get into low earth orbit and visit the International Space Station. I do not think this is the best plan to maintain American preeminence in space.

I have fought hard here in Congress to defend NASA's budget so that they can perform meaningful work. Yet there seems to be a disturbing trend at NASA where priorities are shifted away from what I think should be their top goal—manned space exploration. Rather than focus on the vital elements necessary to maintain American leadership in space, the Obama administration and NASA are distracted with programs that seem to spend money on anything but human space flight.

Last week, the administration came forward with a request to transfer \$100 million out of NASA's already limited human space flight budget and give it to the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor to fund an Interagency task force to spur "regional economic growth and job creation" aimed at helping Florida and other states bracing for job losses associated with the end of the space shuttle program. Our nation's best and brightest engineers and technicians want to be engaged in building rockets and spacecraft. America's space program already generates substantial amounts of regional economic growth. It does not make sense to kill a program that delivered huge returns on investment to create a government program to retrain and retool workers for some possible, undefined jobs in the future.

The announcement the cancellation of the Constellation program in favor of a \$100 million interagency task force, along with several other recently announced NASA initiatives, paints a broad picture of an agency without a clear mission.

NASA is a mission-driven organization that produces its best results with clearly defined goals and the resources to achieve them. With the retirement of the Space Shuttle and a plan to cancel the Constellation program, it is more important than ever that we work together to provide NASA with the legislative guidance it needs.

The men and women of our nation's human space flight program have given us so much to be proud of. Through their focus, sacrifice and dedication they have enabled the United States to be the global leader in human space flight. They have earned our respect and gratitude, and we should deliver a program that keeps them, and our nation, focused on leading the world in spaceflight.

DEMOCRACY IS STRENGTHENED BY CASTING LIGHT ON SPENDING IN ELECTIONS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 2010

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H.R. 5175) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit foreign influence in Federal elections, to prohibit government contractors from making expenditures with respect to such elections, and to establish additional disclosure requirements with respect to spending in such elections, and for other purposes:

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, in January 2010, the Supreme Court in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* held that corporations and unions alike have the right under the First Amendment to speak out in political races. What that decision overturned was the portion of current law that allows political speech to be banned based on the speaker's corporate identity. The Supreme Court ruled that this ban is unconstitutional and violates the First Amendment right to free speech and I share this sentiment.

The Constitution clearly states "Congress shall make no law, abridging the freedom of speech." Upholding the Constitution and our freedoms does not in any way degrade our democratic process. The First Amendment has long been applied not only to isolated individuals but also to groups and associations whose members gather for a wide variety of purposes ranging from political to commercial.

Political speech is indispensable to decision-making in a republic and this is no less true because the speech comes from a corporation. If the government can ban expenditures related to political speech, it could easily apply that to any communication. In the argument before the Supreme Court, Deputy Solicitor General Malcolm Stewart even asserted that under current law the government has the authority to "prohibit the publication" of books and movies by corporations containing even one line of advocacy for or against a candidate for public office. That statement is chilling.

During the drafting of H.R. 5175, the so-called "DISCLOSE" Act, Democrats dismissed Republican requests to collaborate and wrote the bill behind closed doors. Due to lack of support for this unconstitutional bill, they were forced to pull it from consideration on at least two occasions. After weeks of opposition to this very bad bill which was opposed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Citizens Against Government Waste and National Taxpayers Union, the Democrats were able to craft language acceptable to the NRA which then lifted its opposition because it became exempt from the bill. That action alone violates what the Supreme Court said which is that all groups must be treated the same.

The DISCLOSE Act's effort to limit political speech is not even-handed, those favored by the Democrats are excluded from the requirements, and it encourages partisan advantages. But the bill is more than inequitable treatment; it is an outright attack on free speech and the First Amendment. It is government censorship and I oppose H.R. 5175.

IN HONOR OF REVEREND RICHARD W. JONES

HON. JOHN H. ADLER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 2010

Mr. ADLER of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Reverend

Richard W. Jones, a longtime resident of Willingboro, New Jersey who recently passed away at age 85. Reverend Jones was a true leader in the community serving as Sheriff's Officer in Burlington County for 24 years and the inspirational Pastor of Tabernacle Baptist Church for 49 years. He was also a loving husband, of 52 years, to his wife, Ethel.

While Reverend Jones was conferred with a doctorate of human letters from Thomas Edison State College in 2001, perhaps his greatest legacy will remain his work at Tabernacle Baptist Church. His hard work and enduring faith led to the completion of his church's sanctuary and the expansion of the education wing in 1995, which is rightfully named the R. W. Jones Family Life Center. He was also responsible for the expansion of his church's multipurpose room, that included a gymnasium, aerobics room, locker room, cafeteria, and banquet room which was dedicated in 2008 as Unity Hall.

Reverend Jones was a humble man who affected not only the people in his congregation but those he met throughout his life. During his pastorship, he ordained more than 60 deacons and provided guidance to thousands of local residents.

Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring a man whose life serves as a role model to many people and whose church will continue his legacy for a long time to come.

IN HONOR OF CONSUL GENERAL
JANJA ZMAUC OF SLOVENIA ON
THE OCCASION OF SLOVENIAN
STATEHOOD DAY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 2010

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of the Consul General from the Republic of Slovenia, Mr. Jure Zmauc, and his wife, Mrs. Janja Zmauc, on the occasion of Slovenian Statehood Day celebrated annually on June 25th.

In 2009, Mr. Jure Zmauc, Mrs. Janja Zmauc, daughter Nika and son Aljaz moved from Slovenia to Cleveland. Mr. Zmauc served there for four years as a foreign diplomat representing the largest Slovenian population in the world outside of Slovenia. Mr. Zmauc's responsibilities in the United States include developing educational, business and tourism ties for Slovenia and supporting Americans of Slovenian heritage throughout Northeast Ohio.

The twenty-fifth of June is Slovenian Statehood Day, an annual celebration of Slovenia's independence and the sovereignty it gained in 1991. It is a commemoration of the struggles and triumphs of the people of Slovenia. It also serves as an opportunity for residents of Northeast Ohio to celebrate the customs, traditions and contributions of Slovenian Americans to our community.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, please join me in recognition and welcome of Consul General Janja Zmauc and his family. Their representation of Slovenia in our community connects our communities and our nations—from the shores of Lake Erie to the Adriatic Sea.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 2010

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, on the evening of Wednesday, June 23, 2010, and on Thursday, June 24, 2010, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 382 through 394.

Had I been present for rollcall 382, on a motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 5481, To give subpoena power to the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall 383, on a motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 3993, the Calling Card Consumer Protection Act, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall 384, on a motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 1388, Supporting the goals and ideals of National Hurricane Preparedness Week, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall 385, on ordering the previous question for H. Res. 1468, Providing for consideration of H.R. 5175, the Democracy is Strengthened by Casting Light on Spending in Elections Act, and for other purposes, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall 386, on agreeing to H. Res. 1468, Providing for consideration of H.R. 5175, the Democracy is Strengthened by Casting Light on Spending in Elections Act, and for other purposes, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall 387, on a motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Con. Res. 285, Recognizing the important role that fathers play in the lives of their children and families and supporting the goals and ideals of designating 2010 as the Year of the Father, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall 388, on agreeing to the amendment, King of Iowa Amendment No. 2 to H.R. 5175, the Democracy is Strengthened by Casting Light on Spending in Elections Act, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for rollcall 389, agreeing to the amendment, Patrick Murphy of Pennsylvania Amendment No. 5 to H.R. 5175, the Democracy is Strengthened by Casting Light on Spending in Elections Act, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall 390, on a motion to recommit with instructions H.R. 5175, the Democracy is Strengthened by Casting Light on Spending in Elections Act, I would have voted "no."

Had I been present for rollcall 391, on passage of H.R. 5175, the Democracy is Strengthened by Casting Light on Spending in Elections Act, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall 392, on a motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 1464, Recognizing the 50th anniversary of the conclusion of the United States-Japan Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security and expressing appreciation to the Government of Japan and the Japanese people for enhancing peace, prosperity, and security in the Asia-Pacific region, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall 393, on a motion to suspend the rules and concur with the

Senate amendments to H.R. 3962, To provide affordable, quality health care for all Americans and reduce the growth in health care spending, and for other purposes, I would have voted "aye."

Had I been present for rollcall 394, on a motion to suspend the rules and agree to the conference report to H.R. 2194, the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act, I would have voted "aye."

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE
UNIFORMED DIVISION MOD-
ERNIZATION ACT OF 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 2010

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for S. 1510, the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division Modernization Act. I support the underlying bill but I want to highlight language that would allow the Department of Defense to waive, on a case by case basis, repayment of Voluntary Separation Pay for certain individuals. I worked on this issue during the National Defense Authorization Act markup and am pleased that the House will approve this important language within this bill.

Many individuals, who had voluntarily retired, responded to their country's call and returned to service at DOD following 9/11, and several more returned following Hurricane Katrina. According to the House Armed Services Committee, an estimated 22 individuals would benefit from this language in my home State of Georgia, and an estimated 40 individuals would benefit across the nation.

Current law allows the Department of Defense to offer voluntary separation incentive pay for individuals to voluntarily retire. If an employee receives this separation pay and returns to federal service within 5 years, the individual must repay the amount received—unless the individual is considered to be the only qualified applicant available for the position. Before being rehired, these individuals were assured that they would not have to repay the VSIP—because their country needed them. This language provides short-term, limited authority to the Secretary of Defense to waive on a case-by-case basis repayment of the separation pay.

This limited, case-by-case waiver authority, meets the objectives of the Civilian Human Resources Strategic Plan to: "provide effective policies and programs related to stability of employment that support management's ability to restructure organizations while retaining needed skills of affected employees and accommodating their needs in an efficient and humane manner."

Passage of this bill, with this language, will ensure that those heroic Americans, who responded to their country's call to duty, are not penalized. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.