

doing the right thing. There is no reason that we should pay a less percentage of our tax than somebody who draws minimum wage.

Those who want to create jobs and create the conditions for recovery will vote yes. Those who want to kill jobs, want to stop our recovery in its tracks and want to keep things the way they are, will vote no. Those who want our economy to prosper and succeed will vote yes. Those who want this Congress and this country to fail will vote no.

There are people betting on our country to fail. Maybe that will help them in November. Those who put people first will vote yes. Those who put politics first will vote no.

The American people are watching and they are waiting for us to act. They demand that their Senators understand what they are going through and how they are struggling.

I met a man who is back in Washington to attend seminary. He writes insurance for small contractors. One problem. There are no contractors who write insurance for. There is no work.

The American people are watching and they are waiting for us to act. I do my very best to understand. I know what the people of Nevada are going through. I have heard from the Senator from Michigan what the people of Michigan are going through. I have heard from the Senator from New York, the Presiding Officer, what the people of New York are going through.

But it is not just Nevada, New York, and Michigan; it is, with very few exceptions, everywhere in America. I know how much good a bill like this would help a family in Nevada, a family in Michigan, a family in New York. We are not Senators from New York, Senators from Michigan, Senators from Nevada. We are United States Senators. We have an obligation to protect our States, and we do our utmost to do that. But we also have to recognize national problems. That is why we are United States Senators.

I do hope other Senators here, for the sake of those in Nevada and New York and Michigan and States all around the country, for the sake of those in our States, for the sake of our Nation's economy will vote yes. For those who still do not see the value in creating jobs, cutting taxes, and closing corporate loopholes, I hope they will take some time today to come to the floor and listen to their fellow Senators who believe in this legislation.

I hope they will listen with an open mind and with their constituents' best interests in mind. The time to decide is closing in on us. But it is not over yet. It is not too late to do what is right.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

DEFICIT EXTENDERS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, last night Senate Democrats introduced their latest version of the deficit extenders bill.

It has one thing in common with every other version they have offered: it adds new taxes and over \$30 billion to an already staggering \$13 trillion national debt despite consistent bipartisan rejection of that idea.

Both sides have offered ways to address the programs in this bill that both sides agree should be extended. And now we even agree on redirecting untimely and untargeted money from the failed stimulus bill. The only difference is that the Republican proposal reduces the deficit while the Democrat proposal adds to it.

So the only thing Democrats are insisting on in this debate is that we add to the debt.

The principle they are defending here is not some program. The principle Democrats are defending is that they will not pass a bill unless it adds to the debt.

DISCLOSE ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, as I stand here this morning, House Democrats are desperately trying to round up the votes they need to pass Congress's latest effort to do what the first amendment specifically says it cannot, namely, to make a law abridging the freedom of speech.

The first thing to say about the so-called DISCLOSE Act is that it was authored behind closed doors without even a flicker of sunlight. In other words, a bill that is purportedly about bringing transparency to the electoral system was written without any. Just yesterday, a 45-page amendment was proposed to the bill without any public oversight.

The second thing to say about this bill is that it was written by the House Democrats' campaign committee chairman, who has been out trumpeting it as a "response" to the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Citizens United*.

As I noted yesterday, Democrats have done this before with free speech rulings they have found to be politically inconvenient. In the mid-1990s, they did not like Justice Breyer's decision in *Colorado Republicans*, so the Clinton administration and Elena Kagan set about finding ways to benefit Democrats at the expense of Republicans. So past is prologue.

This bill is not about preserving any principle of transparency. It is about protecting incumbent Democrat politicians. As for the substance, a brief review of the bill itself shows that the DISCLOSE Act is about as ill-named as the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and ensures as much freedom as the poorly named Employee Free Choice Act. But, of course, House Democrats have said they do not care what they pass. They just want to pass

something. Now that is quite the way to legislate.

Supporters of the bill say it is needed to deal with special interests. But the loopholes Democrats wrote into it show that they view some interests as more special than others. Take for example the spate of new speech prohibitions that did not exist prior to the *Citizens United* decision.

That is right, this bill goes far beyond what the court held to muzzle the speech of some while granting a pass for others.

Expansive new restrictions on government contractors and TARP recipients, but not their unions or government unions.

Expansive new speech restrictions on domestic subsidiaries which employ Americans who pay American taxes, without restricting unions at these same companies or international unions.

And that is just in the first few pages. Over the next few weeks I will highlight more of these "winners and losers" provisions Democrats are advocating in this bill.

If there were any doubt that this one-sided bill is not about principle but about changing the rules to the political game, just look at the special treatment House Democrats have been shopping around for weeks in an effort to sell this bill. They have engaged in a game of special interest carve outs which is the legislative equivalent of a game of Twister.

For example, in drafting a bill that House Democrats say is designed to deal with special interests, they have deliberately exempted what they have long called one of the biggest special interests of all: the National Rifle Association.

So in writing a bill that is supposedly about diminishing the influence of special interests, Democrat leaders cut a deal to allow a chosen few to operate unfettered by its restrictions, thereby enhancing the power of those chosen few. Apparently they did not learn their lesson from the reaction they got to the Cornhusker Kickback or the Louisiana Purchase.

What is transpiring in the House right now with this bill turns the first amendment on its head. Incumbent politicians are intentionally protecting some large groups so they can muster the votes to restrict many more citizens groups that have less political clout but whose participation in the political process the incumbent politicians find inconvenient.

Let me be clear. I support the second amendment, and I support the NRA's vigorous exercise of its first amendment rights in order to defend the second amendment rights of its members. But this is not about the Democrats' affinity for the second amendment. If it were, they would have carved out an exception for the Gun Owners of America as well. As it is, the GOA vehemently opposes this bill. Why? Because they know it restricts first amendment rights.