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