

subpoenas were issued in the course of their investigation, and (3) what documents were reviewed and their availability for public review.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CROWLEY). Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Arizona will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHRADER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MAKING PUBLIC INFORMATION GATHERED BY HOUSE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, just minutes ago I introduced a privileged resolution that would require the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to make public information gathered for its probe into the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions.

In a report released earlier this month, the Standards Committee concluded that it could find no evidence of a quid pro quo regarding the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions. The committee exercised its authority under its own rules to release information gathered by the Office of Congressional Ethics, but released nothing more than a summary of its own findings.

According to one media source, "the committee report was five pages long and included no documentation of any evidence collected or any interviews conducted by the committee beyond a statement that the investigation included extensive document reviews and interviews with numerous witnesses."

I think it is fair to ask what the Standards Committee did regarding this investigation. We know the Standards Committee reviewed documents gathered by the Office on Congressional Ethics. What were these documents? We were also told the Standards Committee interviewed numerous witnesses. Who were they?

We know that the OCE has no subpoena power. It cannot compel cooperation from whom it investigates. Let me give an example of where it might have been useful to have some followup information from the Standards Committee.

Page 17 of the report notes that the OCE had reason to believe that a witness withheld information. It also notes that many remaining former PMA employees refused to consent to interviews. In addition, it noted that the OCE was unable to obtain any evidence within PMA's possession. I think it is reasonable to ask whether the Standards Committee issued subpoenas or otherwise sought cooperation from these reluctant witnesses. It appears they did not.

Perhaps what is most troubling about this investigation is that the Standards Committee concludes that while they could find no evidence of a quid pro quo between campaign contributions and earmarks, there is a widespread perception among campaign contributors and earmark recipients that such a quid pro quo exists.

It should be noted that the "perception" or "appearance" has been sufficient grounds for admonishment of a Member of Congress by the Standards Committee as recently as 2004. Yet despite finding that there is a widespread appearance of impropriety here, the Standards Committee provides no guidance to Members of Congress as to how they might avoid such an appearance. The existence of such a perception, I might add, inures to the benefit of Members of Congress and their campaign committees.

I have long advocated for a change to the Standard Committee's current guidance regarding earmarks and campaign contributions and have introduced legislation to this effect. House rules already require Members who earmark funds to certify that they and their families have no financial interest in the organization receiving earmark dollars, yet the Standards Committee states that campaign contributions do not constitute financial interests. Classifying campaign contributions as financial interests would go a long way toward dispelling the widespread perception of a quid pro quo and would do much to lift the ethical cloud hanging over this body.

As an aside, while we are updating guidance from the Standards Committee, we should certainly update the recent guidance implying that Members of Congress who, for example, earmark money for a freeway off-ramp next to property they own, thereby inflating the value of this property, are

not in violation of House rules as long as they are not the "sole beneficiaries" of such a rise in value. Such a standard does not pass the test of smell or laughter.

When behavior that is condoned by this body lends itself to a widespread perception of impropriety, we have an obligation not only to change the behavior, but to change the rules that police and govern such behavior.

Mr. Speaker, we owe this wonderful institution far more than we are giving it. The widespread perception of the dependent relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions carries no partisan advantage. The cloud that hangs over this body rains on Republicans and Democrats alike, and we will all benefit when this cloud is lifted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE NECESSITY FOR FUNDING NASA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Just a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, I stood on the floor of the House to introduce H. Res. 1150, which addresses the National Aeronautic and Space Administration as a national security asset and interest.

I served for 12 years on the Science Committee and as a member of the Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee. I visited almost every NASA center around the country. I have visited our science laboratories. I am very engaged with the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math Program, to help educate America's children to ensure that we remain at the cutting edge of science and technology and inventiveness, and as well to be able to build jobs for the 21st century. We are in that century now.

I have interacted with NASA and many of the astronauts over the years, watching them as they have launched into space, experiencing the tragedies of *Challenger* and *Columbia*, the loss of life of those brave souls who were willing to risk their lives to explore on behalf of the American people.

I want to work with the administration, because I believe they are knowledgeable about the value of human spaceflight. However, the approach to commercialize this important national security interest is not appropriate for now.

We live in a world that has changed. I chair the Subcommittee on Homeland Security dealing with transportation security and the protection of our infrastructure. Our infrastructure includes the buildings that we are in

today, hospitals and schools, private-sector buildings, mass assets of the Federal Government, and, yes, the NASA centers and the NASA shuttle and all of the equipment that goes into providing for human spaceflight.

Lending that space technology to commercial exploration and private-sector businesses on the basis of profit is not appropriate now. It will put us in a noncompetitive position with China, India, and Russia.

So this resolution is simple. It declares the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as a national security interest and asset. It indicates that the United States has invested in the human space program since May 5, 1961. We all can remember the words of our President, John F. Kennedy, that challenged this Nation when he asked the question, Not why, but why not? Although those words came from his brother, he captured it in the early 1960s when he asked and demanded what we could do not for ourselves, but what we could do for our country.

At that time, we established the United States as a leader in the role of space exploration, and as well in the advancement of scientific research, and therefore that equals a national security interest. It does so because science provides security, and the penetration of the scientific knowledge that we have lowers the security of this Nation.

My Committee on Homeland Security deals with protecting the infrastructure. Infrastructure is security. Infrastructure involves the science labs. Infrastructure involves the many space centers we have around the Nation. The States that are involved are Florida; Huntsville, Alabama; Texas; and the various sites in California as well.

□ 1945

And so I would ask that this legislation be moved quickly in the United States Congress and in this House because the 2010 NASA budget funded a program of space-based research that supports the administration's commitment to deploy a global climate change research and monitoring system. That research can be done better on the international space station. That international space station needs to be supported. It needs to be able to carry astronauts and scientists there to continue the research to make the quality of life for Americans and the world better. In the early stages of the international space station, research was done involving HIV/AIDS, stroke, heart disease, and cancer. That research has created opportunities for a better quality of life, and it saved lives.

Let us not miss the opportunity, the treasure of being able to explore in space; the genius of America to allow us to be at the cutting edge of science; and, yes, to protect a natural security interest, which is the National Aeronautics Space Administration and all of its assets.

And so I look forward to working with General Bolden, an astronaut and

a very able appointee of the President of United States, to see how we can save NASA and the Constellation program that will allow us to be at the cutting edge of science, not in America, but around the world.

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

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BUYING INTO MEDICARE

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a simple 4-page bill that allows any American to buy into Medicare at cost. Let me explain why I have done that. I have five children. When one of my children was born, I found out from the insurance company that the insurance company would not pay for the birth of my child. I had what I thought was excellent health care coverage from this insurance company, but it turned out otherwise. As a result of that, I had to pay \$10,000 for the birth of my child.

You know, it could have been worse. Maybe I wouldn't have that \$10,000. A lot of Americans face that situation when they have health care bills that their health insurance company won't cover. It could have been worse. I had twins who were born afterwards, who were born a month premature, spent weeks in the hospital. God only knows what those bills would have looked like. I probably would have been broke.

But the fact is that I felt, like many Americans feel, that I had an adversarial relationship with my insurance company and that every penny they spent on my care was a penny less for their profits. And that is a fundamentally unfair situation that causes untold health care needs around this country that go unmet and, frankly, untold death.

That's why we need another option. We need a public option. We're going to be seeing a Senate bill that doesn't have a public option. We're going to be seeing reconciliation that doesn't have a public option. But America needs a public option. That's why I've introduced this bill.

There are other reasons as well. Another reason is that all across this country there are areas, including areas in Florida, where one or two private insurance companies dominate

the market to the extent that they have 80 percent of all the insured in the area. There is no competition. It's a monopoly in the case of one. It's an oligopoly in the case of two. Either way, these insurance companies pretty much do whatever they want. They can offer you care or they deny you care. They can cut you off when you already have care. And they can charge you pretty much anything they want.

Well, a public option would change that. In an area where one company had 80 percent of the market, suddenly there would be an alternative. Where two companies have 80 percent of the market, suddenly there would be an alternative. That alternative is an alternative that is already used by one-eighth of our population. That alternative is Medicare.

This simple bill would allow anybody—any American, any permanent resident—to buy into Medicare at cost. And what it does is it takes this enormously valuable public resource called the Medicare Provider Network and makes it available to all Americans. We've spent billions putting together a Medicare Provider Network that stretches from Nome, Alaska, all the way to Key West, Florida. We've spent billions doing that, and yet only one-eighth of the population can use it.

The most expensive part of preparing a health care plan for any American in any location is to set up the provider network, hundreds and hundreds of contracts with hospitals, with specialists, with nurses, with testing companies. All these things have to be done before you actually serve the first patient.

Well, we have a system like that called Medicare, and yet it's open to only one-eighth of the population. It's as if we're saying that only one-eighth of the population, senior citizens, can drive on Federal highways. That's how important the Medicare provider network is, and that's why we have to open it to everybody.

This is not a plan for subsidies. Everyone would have to pay their own cost. This is not a plan that's meant to help anybody, except for the people who cannot otherwise get insurance, or people like me, who simply don't trust the insurance companies anymore because of the raw treatment that we've received.

Let's face it, it's never going to be any different. The insurance companies are always going to look for ways to chintz you. They're always going to look for ways to charge you more and give you less, and the difference is what they call profit. And that's a system that a lot of people just can't accept anymore. They just don't want it anymore.

And for those people who have it in their mind that there will be some kind of government death panels, what about the real death panels that exist in this company—the insurance company death panels; the ones that look for rescission when you get sick, the