

make sure that we have a plan in place for other types of energy. The issue with deepwater drilling is not just a question of—of course we need more energy and we need more oil, but to do it in places where there is no plan in place to clean it up for BP or anyone else is unacceptable.

So I think this is also an opportunity to not only clean this up and deal with this issue, but also to recognize this is a moment in time that should be our put-a-man-on-the-Moon moment, or the Manhattan Project, where every American says, you know something? Yes, we're going to have oil and, yes, there are others—there is a lot of natural gas and a lot of opportunities out there, but why not more solar? I live in a State, we call it the Sunshine State. Why aren't we building the jobs and having the types of technology which we're not only creating for Florida, but for the United States and the rest of the world? Whether it's hydrogen or nuclear or any other possibilities, there are lots of opportunities, and we should use this moment as a time to also recognize we shouldn't be dependent on fossil fuels.

So as we look at this historic disaster, we should also look at this as an opportunity for the future. And I believe that now is the time to not only bring the best and the brightest to clean up this mess. It is also an opportunity to bring our best and brightest minds together to end our dependence on foreign oil over the next 10 years and become a world leader in the kind of clean, affordable alternative energy that will create good jobs right here in the United States.

ON THE REPATRIATION OF AMERICAN MANUFACTURING JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise to discuss a critical issue for American families: job creation.

With unemployment still hovering around 10 percent, this country must focus on new and innovative ways to create jobs in America. I believe that we must be aggressive and creative in our approach to job creation. That's why I've been urging both the Federal Government and my home State of Virginia to work to repatriate jobs that are going overseas, to bring them back to America. We must launch a systematic program, led by all the Governors of each State, to identify American companies that are doing business abroad and incentivize the repatriation of jobs back to America. This is necessary and feasible.

Earlier this year, The Wall Street Journal reported that a major American manufacturer, Caterpillar, was considering expanding its manufacturing inside the U.S. rather than overseas. According to the article, repatriation is gaining momentum; and after

a decade of rapid globalization, economists say companies are seeing disadvantages of offshore production, including shipping costs, complicated logistics, and quality issues. Political unrest and theft of intellectual property pose additional risk. I applaud Caterpillar's effort and call on every other American company to follow its lead.

I believe that every American company has a moral obligation to try to create jobs in America. American companies with overseas factories take ample advantage of American law enforcement, the American justice system, and countless other resources provided by the American taxpayer. In doing so, they have an obligation—a burden—to contribute and to support American job creation.

When an American company operating factories overseas needs law enforcement help, they turn to the FBI, not the Chinese secret police. When an American company is the victim of cyberattack or intellectual property theft, they turn to the American Government for support and assistance, not to the Chinese Government, which is spying and stealing from them and arresting Catholic bishops and Protestant pastors. That's why I believe that, if asked, American companies will support their home country in creating new jobs.

Many of the world's largest companies are American, but much of this manufacturing and call-center work has shifted overseas over the last two decades. This trend is fueled primarily by the opening of international markets, cheap labor, and affordable shipping.

Although free trade has yielded significant benefits to our economy and consumers, the U.S. has done a poor job of encouraging domestic manufacturing investment. Now is the time for American companies to reevaluate their business models and return home. Our competitive dollar makes the U.S. an excellent location to export to international markets. Rising oil and gas prices have added to the cost of international air and shipping, which has helped level the playing field for U.S. domestic producers. More importantly, we have a highly skilled and efficient workforce in the U.S. that is ready to help companies start producing at home.

Finally, I believe that a repatriation initiative is important because it focuses the U.S. on competing internationally for these jobs rather than States competing with other States for existing American jobs. Instead, this will lead to net job growth throughout the United States.

Over the last 4 months, I've been urging Secretary of Commerce Locke and other officials in the Department to launch a national repatriation initiative in conjunction with its export initiative. As a result, I will be urging the Appropriations Committee to include language in this year's bill, the 2011

Commerce-Justice-Science bill, to direct the Department to launch such an initiative working with the Governors of this country. I hope the administration and my colleagues in the Congress will embrace this initiative and reach out to large American companies about bringing the jobs home to America. A major repatriation program will allow us to create new jobs, promote U.S. exports, and demonstrate that America can still be a highly competitive manufacturer in a global market.

CALLING ON PRESIDENT OBAMA TO STAND UNEQUIVOCALLY WITH ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call on the President to give Israel the unequivocal, robust, and vigorous support it deserves.

Since the May 31 Gaza flotilla incident, Israel has been under media attack, and even in the past few days many articles and international newspapers take a grossly anti-Israel slant. Make no mistake about it, the purpose of the flotilla was to provoke an incident, thereby to set up an international media campaign against Israel. The flotilla was an aggressive and hypocritical attempt to manipulate world public opinion and to isolate Israel. Thankfully, it has not worked in the United States, where Rasmussen polling shows that despite the anti-Israel bias of so much media coverage, less than 20 percent of Americans think that the Israeli Government is to blame for the deaths that resulted from the incident.

Madam Speaker, the facts of the incident were clear within 48 hours, and it's high time our government sent a much more powerful and unambiguous message, that the United States fully supports Israel's action to intercept the flotilla. The administration should emphasize that Israel's action was legal, that it was right, and that the U.S. stands with Israel without any ifs, ands, or buts, or so long as, or any other qualifiers.

It's a matter of record that on May 25 the Israeli Government offered to offload at its port of Ashdod the humanitarian aid the flotilla carried and to have the U.N. personnel deliver it to Gaza. On that same day, the Israeli Government also stated it would not permit the flotilla to break its blockade of Gaza, which is not only legal under international law; but I believe it's also just, given the rampant maritime arms smuggling, the 7,000 rocket attacks Hamas has launched on Israel from Gaza since 2005, and the unlimited aid that can flow to Gaza through proper checkpoints.

Madam Speaker, the Turkish group that organized the flotilla has documented ties to Hamas, which is recognized by the U.S. Department of State

as a foreign terrorist organization. Radicals with ties to other terrorist groups were aboard the ships. The flotilla launch was marked by violent, anti-Semitic rallies. Flotilla participants spoke to al Jazeera of martyrdom and sang intifada songs. All this shows the grotesque hypocrisy of those who would portray the flotilla participants as somehow being harmless peace activists. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Madam Speaker, the response of the Israeli Government was extraordinarily restrained and responsible. Israeli troops boarded the ships in the flotilla carrying paint ball guns, but when the crew beat them with iron rods, stabbed and lynched them and threw one of them off the deck, they got the order to defend themselves with their side arms. This, too, was right. Every government permits its troops to defend themselves when they are attacked.

I call on President Obama to give Israel our government's full support and to make unmistakably clear our government's position that Israel, in its response to the Gaza flotilla, was fully in the right. Whether or not the Israeli Government decides to adjust the blockade, our government must make it perfectly clear to all that we will never permit an anti-Israel media campaign to isolate America's most faithful and trusted friend in the Middle East.

□ 1745

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE FIRST AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I take these 5 minutes to speak on a subject that is of utmost importance but that does not regularly get discussed here on the floor, which is the First Amendment to the Constitution, that part of it which deals with freedom of speech—that is, with freedom of political speech.

Now, obviously, the First Amendment of the Constitution does not merely protect political speech, but in the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court, known as *Citizens United vs. Federal Election Commission*, the Supreme Court noted that the First Amendment has its fullest and most urgent application to speech uttered during a campaign for political office.

In other words, they said, if you look at the essence of the First Amendment protection, it goes, first and foremost,

to political speech. They had this in laying the premise for the decision that they came to because the Supreme Court realized that the First Amendment's protection for political speech had been under assault by various pieces of legislation passed by this body, not that it was done for evil purposes or intentionally to undercut the Constitution of the United States; rather, it was done in a good-faith effort to try and deal with political campaigns and with the position of money in political campaigns.

The Supreme Court decided back in the 1970s, in *Buckley vs. Valeo*, that money is speech, meaning that the money you have you can use as you see fit to further your speech. You can print pamphlets; you can buy a megaphone; you can buy a radio ad; you can buy a television ad; you can hire somebody to represent your interest to appear in an ad for you. In other words, the Supreme Court recognized that, in the way that we communicate, oftentimes, it takes the use of money to further that communication.

So they made a decision at that point in time that, by terms of the First Amendment, you could not stop one from using one's money to express one's point of view. Then they went to the point of asking, But how does that apply when you are giving money to a candidate?

In those instances, the Court said that the government might be able to put some restrictions on speech—that is the use of money—but only if it is for the purpose of avoiding the corruption of the process. That is the only basis upon which the government can put some limitations, or parameters, around political speech.

In the *Citizens United* case, they had to decide: As people individually and as associated with others—and the First Amendment talks about freedom of association—what are they allowed to do, permitted to do, protected under the First Amendment, when they expend funds to express a point of view during a period of time that is close to an election?

That is why the Court said that First Amendment freedoms are at their height when the speaker is addressing matters of public policy, politics and governance and has its fullest and most urgent application to speech uttered during a campaign for political office, because that is the point in time when you might have the most influence on your fellow citizens.

Now, what does this have to do with what we are doing here on the floor?

Well, there is a bill that has been introduced, called the DISCLOSE Act—*Democracy is Strengthened by Casting Light on Spending in Elections Act*. We are led to believe by the majority that all this does is promote disclosure. Yet, in fact, what it does under its very terms is chill political speech, so much so that the National Rifle Association came out with a large complaint about the bill, saying that it would have an

undue burden on its operations in expressing itself and would intimidate membership. Now, some people scoffed at it and said, Well, it's the National Rifle Association talking again.

But what happened?

We have found that the majority listening to the National Rifle Association has created a specific exemption for that group and for others similarly situated, but not for others. That is the crux of the question: Do we have a situation in which now we say not only too big to fail but, for some, too big to file?

It is an affront to the First Amendment, and my hope is that we will not bring this bill to the floor, because, of all things, we should be most protective of the speech of our fellow citizens when they engage in political debate.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEPENDENCE ON OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

DISCLOSURE

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to engage in a colloquy with my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle, who will be along shortly, but before I launch into the issue of national security and of our dependence on oil, I would like to just address what my colleague from California was talking about, give an example of why disclosure is important, and would like to recognize the fact that it was the Republican Party mantra for nearly 20 years that the solution to campaign finance reform was disclosure. Now, apparently, they want to stand up and say they don't want disclosure after having, for 20 years, said they want disclosure.

Go figure.

The fact of the matter is, in California, in an election held just 2 weeks ago, disclosure under the State law has played a critical role in stopping Pacific Gas & Electric from ripping off the ratepayers of California and has played a critical role in stopping Mercury Insurance Company from doing the same to their customers.

The California law required disclosure. PG&E spent over \$40 million in, what I think, was blatant, false advertising, and at the bottom of each one of those ads, they had to read, "Paid for by Pacific Gas & Electric." Similarly, with Mercury Insurance Company, the public took one look at those ads, which they saw repeatedly, and said, Oh, that's who's behind it. Well, I'm a "no" vote.

Disclosure works, my Republican colleagues. It's what you wanted for more than 20 years, and now that you're about to get it, you don't want it. Well, I think not.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEPENDENCE ON OIL

Let me go to the subject at hand that we are to talk about this evening,