

Thanks, everybody.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thanks, I appreciate it.

I want to go back to a little sign that LOUIE GOHMERT held up at the State of the Union speech, or something, the joint session, that said, "What plan?" Remember the President, at the 7-hour infomercial that was supposedly a summit on health care, he had a 12-page proposal. There was no legislative plan, there were no words on paper, and we didn't know how much it cost.

We Republicans are still in the dark, and I don't know if the American people know that. There is still no bill out there that we've been able to see. All these backroom deals that my good friend, JOHN FLEMING, is talking about, they're being cut on a bill not one of us has ever had a chance to read. Nobody has read the bill that these deals are being cut on. Every bit of this, every word in this bill is all behind closed doors, and these backroom deals. And no one is going to know about what all these deals are until it goes through.

But just to give the American people a chance, let me read a couple more. Judith Kaminsky: "To force unwanted, expensive, unconstitutional health care laws on the United States is not only a blow to capitalism, but a dismembering of our way of life and our rule of law. It's criminal to push so hard for something as unhelpful, unsafe, unpopular, and uneconomical as the current administration's want list. There are better ways to achieve a desirable outcome for the changes that might be necessary."

Mr. AKIN. Let's elect her to Congress. That's a good idea.

I think we're about out of time here. I just want to thank the A team for coming out tonight, just a great discussion.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET ON NASA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHU). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, tonight, my colleagues and I would like to share with you and the American people our deep concern with the effects of the President's budget on NASA.

By overwhelming concern with the decision to cancel the Constellation program, there are several reasons why this is bad for America, about which my colleagues and I will go into more detail over the next hour.

□ 2220

Madam Speaker, Constellation was and is the right path forward to maintain America's leadership in space.

Just this past week, the Constellation program successfully completed its preliminary design review. This is a milestone towards future development. This is a major programmatic milestone that should be noted and ap-

plauded by all of us in addition to the successful test launch of the Ar-135 I-X rocket back in September.

Madam Speaker, I am going to talk tonight about a couple of issues: national priority; national security and how important NASA and human spaceflight is for that; inspiration for our youth; and our educational purposes, particularly in the discipline of STEM—science, technology, engineering, math—and the technological benefits that every American, every person in the world, has gotten from NASA and human spaceflight.

America's global dominance in space exploration has always been for so much more than just the race to be first. It has signaled a commitment from our Nation to forge a path. Previously unimaginable scientific and technological discoveries are born both from necessity and from risk-taking. They are born out of unexpected consequences. It has been said many times before that it is not just the destination but the journey.

The journey on which our space exploration program has taken the United States has given rise to our global leadership on many, many fronts. Our Nation's global dominance in human spaceflight has coincided with our status as the world's only superpower, which is not by accident. The national commitment to be the best in national security and in space exploration goes hand in hand. That is precisely why there is always such strong bipartisan support for NASA and for human spaceflight.

Abandoning the enterprise of space exploration is a striking decision because it violates something that makes us human—the desire to know new things through personal experience. As Americans, our heritage is about exploration. Our nature is to seek out the unknown and to explore. The administration's decision to kill the Constellation is an affront to that heritage.

America cannot escape the irrefutable fact that to fly regularly into space is the most difficult technological challenge that we know is possible under complicated and expensive scenarios. Even when done successfully, it is difficult and dangerous. In the half century we have been putting human beings into space, we have lost three brave crews. The support that is needed requires an overarching vision that requires political courage. As he stood on the football field at my alma mater, Rice University, President Kennedy had that political courage when he made the commitment to go to the Moon by the end of the decade.

A person either believes that expanding the range of human action is a noble undertaking, worthy of the cost and the risk, or a person does not. I fundamentally believe that this goal represents the heart of American entrepreneurialism. It is what sets our Nation apart from the rest of the world. It is why Russia, China, and India are making the investments nec-

essary to catch up or to even surpass us.

Is human exploration worth the cost? If Americans question this, then we should ask why other nations are desperately ramping up their human space exploration.

What do China, India, Japan, and Russia know that we don't know? They clearly know what America has known for years, which is that the direct investment alone is worth the cost and that the indirect benefits have provided economic drivers and scientific discoveries that have far exceeded expectations.

Think about what human spaceflight has done for America. There is the Hubble space telescope, one of the greatest pieces of technological advancements in our society. Unfortunately, when it was launched, it was launched in a flawed vehicle. It had a flawed refractory mirror on it. It was basically a \$2 billion piece of junk that we put into orbit.

Yet, because we had a human spaceflight capability and because we had men and women who were willing to take the risk to go into space, they went up and repaired the Hubble telescope four times. They brought it back, and made it one of the most incredible pieces of technology in our society. They brought back images from across the solar system and the universe. It wouldn't have happened without human spaceflight.

We risk losing this with the President's budget. The President's decision of NASA's role in human spaceflight is not only a step back for America; it is a calculated decision that says we aren't up to the challenge.

Yes, our Nation is in a fiscal situation that should force us to examine our spending priorities. We may disagree on how our limited resources should be spent, but there are fundamental national priorities that are worth the investment. Abandoning human space exploration isn't the tough decision that America needs.

We need leadership that clearly states we will not cede our leadership in human spaceflight to any other nation on Earth. We should not hand over space to the Russians, to the Chinese, or to India. If we stay on the path the President's budget lays out, the United States faces the very real and very humiliating prospect of paying billions of dollars to Russia for years to hitch rides to the international space station, which has been largely built by American taxpayer funds.

We used to pay the Russians just over \$20 million to take one of our astronauts to the space station. They have learned capitalism very well; and now, this year, it is going to cost us \$50 million, which is more than double the price that it was last year. That contract only extends through 2013. So, in all likelihood, we are going to have to renew another contract with them in the future. They have got a monopoly. They are going to charge us whatever

they want, and we are going to have to pay it if we want access to the space station, which, again, the American taxpayers have largely funded.

This is unacceptable. We need to stay the course with the Constellation to make sure that we minimize that gap and to make sure we get our astronauts delivering our people to the space station and beyond—to the Moon and beyond.

Even more unsettling is knowing, when we finally have the ability to get there on our own, we may find the Chinese are already there and working it. Their goal is to be to the Moon by 2023. The United States' goal: question mark. We don't know when we're going to be back to the Moon, if at any time in the near future. Americans have rightly grown accustomed to serving as the global leader in human space exploration. Sadly, we will be in for a huge shock when reality sets in that we no longer hold that title.

NASA has long been a cradle for innovation. Without human spaceflight, where is the incentive for future scientists and engineers to take up these careers?

Human spaceflight is so much more than the basis for an inspirational movie. It is the heart of American ingenuity; and in our pioneering nature as Americans, we say, Place our Nation at the forefront of technology and science. Madam Speaker, we must make the commitment that America will always stay number one.

I urge my colleagues to look closely at what our Nation has achieved through our leadership on human space exploration and to think about what is at stake if we walk away.

I have some of my colleagues here tonight whom I would like to recognize. One is my good colleague from Louisiana, Congressman CAO.

Thanks for coming tonight, ANH. I look forward to your comments.

Mr. CAO. Thank you very much, PETE.

I know that the NASA program is extremely important to your district, and I know that it is very integral in providing good jobs to your people in your district. It is also the same with mine. I have a NASA facility plant in New Orleans East, a facility that is called Michoud.

Earlier this year, President Obama released his 2011 budget. To my surprise and to the surprise of many other Members—I'm pretty sure you're included—the President recommended canceling NASA's Constellation human spaceflight program. During a time when our space shuttle program is phasing out, I am very concerned that this decision will leave our Nation with no means of transporting our astronauts to and from the international space station. It could set the U.S. space program back decades.

Nearly 50 years ago, President John F. Kennedy showed remarkable vision when he directed NASA to launch the Apollo program to the Moon. America

remains the only country in the world to have landed a person on the Moon and to have brought him back to Earth safely. We have achieved what people once thought to be impossible because we pushed ourselves and because we challenged our understanding of science and the universe. To this day, we still enjoy the countless benefits reaped from the first spaceflight.

Technologically, NASA is regularly commercialized, and it can be found in countless products, like in improved medical devices, in household smoke detectors, in barcode scanners, and in every computer.

□ 2230

So we see that the technology from spaceflight is incorporated into our everyday lives.

It has also allowed us to improve weather forecasting, which is extremely important in Louisiana, given the threats of hurricanes and tornadoes and what have you in the region. If you were to listen to the former NASA Administrator, Dr. Mike Griffin, he wrote, "I believe that this budget request advocates a strategy that is, frankly, disastrous for the U.S. human spaceflight program."

Harrison Schmitt, former U.S. Senator and Apollo 17 astronaut, said, "It is simply bad for the country."

With the loss of our manufacturing base, many jobs have been moved to other countries. The manufacturing of the space vehicle is among the very few areas where we still enjoy a technical advantage, and I think it is extremely unwise to give it up.

Like you said, the Chinese are pushing to bring a person to the Moon. The Russians are continuing their space program, and I am pretty sure that they are catching up with us in the technical field to put a person on the Moon and beyond. And we, as one of the most powerful countries in the world, the most advanced country in the world, we are scaling back on our space program, one of the few areas where we still have a technical advantage beyond other countries.

The Michoud facility in my own district was slated to build components of the Orion crew module and the Ares 1 and Ares 5 cargo rockets. Michoud faces the prospect of losing thousands of high-skilled jobs. In a time in which we are trying to preserve jobs, trying to create jobs, this cut will destroy jobs. With the Michoud facility facing a reduced workforce of 1,000 employees, that is 1,000 good-paying jobs that we can preserve and we can retain.

We have this world-class manufacturing facility in New Orleans which has been used to build the Saturn rockets for the Apollo program and the main fuel tanks for the space shuttle, among many other notable achievements, and we will lose all of the experience and all of the manufacturing jobs, along with \$9 billion of taxpayer money that could have been spent on the Constellation Program.

Some have made the argument that the future of manned spaceflight is best outsourced to the private sector, as indicated in the budget proposal. But I think, though, commercial spaceflight is a promising and exciting endeavor, and we need to keep those programs in our country, in our districts, to provide those good-paying jobs to our people. If we are trying to preserve jobs in the United States, I think it is unwise to outsource those good-paying jobs to other countries. Institutional knowledge of over 40 years of human spaceflight would be lost under the current budget proposal.

Just to close, I just want to quote a statement given by Charlie Duke, an Apollo 16 astronaut. He said, "We cannot afford to lose our leadership in space. The Constellation Program must be continued."

You know what, PETE? I cannot agree with him more. I am pretty sure you can also agree with me on that assertion. Thank you very much for your hard work and dedication to this project.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you for those very kind comments, and I couldn't agree with you more. One of the problems I have with this decision is how it was sprung upon all of us.

I am the ranking member on the subcommittee that has jurisdiction over NASA, and I found out, like probably all of you, everybody here in the Chamber, by reading the newspaper. No one ever gave me a heads-up that this was coming. Nobody ever gave our ranking member a heads-up this was coming. I don't think even the chairman of the committee had any knowledge that this was coming. It seemed to be a small little cabal in the White House that made this decision that has a tremendous impact on our society.

You mentioned the loss of jobs. There are going to be thousands and thousands and thousands of good-paying, high-tech jobs, the kind of jobs we want here in America, that are going to go away. As you alluded to, once those people walk out, they are gone.

Mr. CAO. And I do recognize that we are facing a budget problem, a budget crisis in this country, and we have to cut costs, but I believe that we have to do it in a responsible manner. Cutting one of the few areas in which we have an advantage over every other country in the world seems to me to be a very unwise decision.

Mr. OLSON. Again, there is no reason why we should ever, ever, give up our leadership in human spaceflight. We have worked for it from the onset, over 50 years ago now, almost 50 years ago since NASA was formed.

Again, you referred to President Kennedy's speech. The ultimate called shot; we are going to be on the Moon by the end of this decade. And we were behind the Soviets, as you remember, at that time. We hadn't done anything. Yet because of American ingenuity, American persistence, and American innovation, on July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong backed down that ladder, put

that foot on the lunar surface, and uttered the famous words that every American knows, "one small step for man; one giant leap for mankind."

I agree with you, we cannot give that up. I think if you could talk to Astronaut Schmitt, Apollo 17, that was the last Moon mission, and if you could have talked to him when he got back home and said, Well, you know, sir, we are not going to be back for at least 40 years, he would have taken money and said, No, we are going to go back. We are going to be there over and over. We are going to be at Mars by 40 years from now.

Unfortunately, we are looking at cutting the program and continuing our domination of low-Earth orbit, which the Augustine Commission that the administration cites as sort of the bible for their action also here basically said, the front page of their summary, we are done with low-Earth orbit. There are no more challenges for our Nation in low-Earth orbit. We have got to fund a fantastic space station up there that is delivering science and discoveries to us every day, but we are not challenging ourselves from an exploration perspective going beyond low-Earth orbit.

We have to do that, and the Augustine Commission recognized that, and killing the Constellation just completely curtails that. There is no plan to get beyond low-Earth orbit. And, quite frankly, that is not what our country wants. That is not what we need. As you alluded to, we are number one, we have been number one throughout history, and we should never give that up.

Thank you for your comments.

Very briefly, I would like to talk about sort of the education perspective, some of the issues involved with promoting our youth and getting them involved again in the STEM disciplines, the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

When we think about the new competitive global economy, we know that China and India don't hesitate to encourage their top students to pursue science and math careers. They know that it is this expertise that will dictate their countries' futures. Unfortunately, these are the careers which America is losing ground on, calling into question our own future.

The problems with U.S. test scores and recruiting teachers in science, math, and engineering fields are well publicized. U.S. students lag well behind their Asian and Indian counterparts, and we risk losing the level of excellence in science, research, and innovation that is necessary to meet the needs of our future.

Harvard University and many others recruit top students from China to be educated here in America. Why? Because Chinese students are laser-focused on a top education, and their test scores reflect that. Unfortunately, after those students receive a top-tier degree at an American school, they go

back home and return to their country and we will not benefit from that knowledge that they got here in America. And here at home we have some American students graduating from high school needing remedial math courses to begin college level math.

□ 2240

We have a shortage of teachers to inspire young minds and we have deemphasized the pursuit of solving difficult problems and seem to choose the path of least resistance. While the solutions to those problems may require a great national epiphany, we do see small but important steps taking place every day across America. The Johnson Space Center in the district I'm fortunate to represent in Houston hosts several programs in which employees volunteer their time to mentor students in math, science, and engineering.

Just recently, just this past Monday, I was pleased to be present when Hannah Gorse, a student at Pearland High School in the district I represent, won a slot at the prestigious NASA High School Aerospace Scholars Program. Hannah is a junior there at Pearland High School. She told me that all she wants to do when she grows up is become an astronaut or an aerospace engineer and work in human spaceflight exploration. As part of this program, she designs things. I was stunned. She designed a CEV—a crew exploration vehicle. A lunar rover, for those of you who have been following the space program. She's designed parts to a shuttle; she designed components for the international space station, all as part of this program.

Madam Speaker, Hannah is the kind of student we want to get the math or science degree and channel her intellect toward great achievements in human spaceflight. We cannot take that inspiration and opportunity away from our students. And we do exactly that by killing the Constellation Program.

The NASA High School Aerospace Scholars Program allows students to write essays, solve math problems, design upgrades for the international space station, like Hannah did, among other projects. It's coordinated, as I said, through the Johnson Space Center, and serves as a valuable tool for students like Hannah to encourage them to pursue the career degrees in math and science. These innovative initiatives encourage and inspire students to be the pathfinders we want when we show the way forward. These young leaders will scale greater heights in their critical careers that will help develop new technologies in science, engineering, and health care.

There's another opportunity for our Nation through the government to have a role in this solution, but to do so we must fully commit to our Nation's human spaceflight program. The Constellation Program is that program. A robust national program like Constellation maintains our global

leadership in human space exploration and inspires generations of young minds like Hannah Gorse to create the next level of American superiority. As we speak, China and India are demonstrating their commitment to human space exploration, and they have the students graduating with the degrees to get the job done. Again, the Chinese plan to be back to the Moon between 2025 and 2030. The United States has no plans to go back to the Moon at this time.

Space exploration has always been a primary motivator for students to pursue careers in math, science, and engineering. Children stare up at the stars or watch grainy footage of the first man on the Moon or watch a shuttle blast off at nighttime, and a future scientist, astronaut, or engineer is born. As it stands now, the administration's budget is putting the U.S., the global leader in human spaceflight exploration, firmly into fourth place. Without a manned space program, again, we will be forced to pay Russia over \$50 million per astronaut to give access to the international space station.

The United States has been a beacon of cutting-edge technology when it comes to pioneering the path in science and space exploration. We were the first to set foot on the Moon because we made a national commitment to being first and being the best. That's what America does. We must continue that investment so our next generation reaps the benefits of excellence in science, math, engineering. Human space exploration is part of that national plan. There's still time to correct our national decline in both education and space exploration. They go hand-in-hand.

Madam Speaker, a strong human space exploration program is a key motivator for America's students to pursue careers, again, in science, math, and engineering that we desperately need to compete globally. It requires a national commitment, both public and private. That is America at its best—and that's what we want to keep. We do that by maintaining the Constellation Program.

If my colleague from Utah would like to speak to some of these issues, I yield the floor to him.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank my good friend from Texas for yielding me some time on this significant issue. I have read some of the comments that have been made in the past, saying, You're a conservative. NASA is saying in this new budget that they want to commercialize and privatize the program. Why aren't you supporting that? I have to admit, I think it comes down to an issue of semantics. When I think of privatization, I make three assumptions: It will cost the taxpayer less money, there will be a smaller government force in use, and there will be a better product.

I think, as the gentleman from Texas would agree with me, this plan that NASA has put forward doesn't do any

of those. Indeed, it costs more for a NASA budget. It increases the cost that the taxpayer will be spending on NASA. There are no Federal jobs that will be eliminated, only private-sector jobs, to the tune of about 30,000 jobs nationwide of scientists, engineers, mathematicians, those kinds of jobs that we don't really want to lose and we're trying to encourage young students to go into, and there is not a better product.

As the gentleman from Texas said, it was ironic that the other day the Constellation Program passed their predesign review, which means after expensive engineering and technical checks, they passed everything. There is nothing technologically wrong with Constellation. It is ready to go forward. Ironically enough, on that very same day, one of the alternatives that the NASA administration would like us to fund was having a test on their engine, and it was a total failure. Ironically, NASA didn't publicize either of those events—the engine failure or the complete success in the predesign and review of Constellation.

So let me just spend a moment and talk about these commercial startup enterprises that NASA administrators are telling us they want to transfer all American taxpayer moneys into going into this direction. These are programs like Rocketplane Kistler, which after a 14-month review or alliance with NASA, was terminated because it failed to meet any of its goals. Or, SpaceX, which over 8 years working with NASA and being funded by taxpayer money, has had a 40 percent success rate. The Falcon 9 was supposed to be ready for flight in 2009. It's not there yet. It is now scheduled for sometime in 2010, but that was the engine failure that I talked about that happened this very week. They are behind. They have already received \$158 million of tax money, but obligations of NASA run in the multibillions of dollars.

Orbital, another of those companies, is 7 months late on all of their assignments, which means if you actually look in the proposed budget, there is \$312 million assigned to a category called: Additional incentives for commercial cargo providers. If you want to take the spin off of it, it's a bailout for these companies who are not meeting their deadlines, who are not providing the product.

After \$600 million to these kind of companies, NASA can clearly say they have no hardware to show for it. They have no services that have been delivered with it. There are no intellectual property rights. And this is what certain administrators within NASA call the "bold new direction for this country." It is ludicrous.

When the *Columbia* accident occurred—and was a tragic event all of us mourned—there was an intense study to find out what went wrong and how to prevent it. And they came up with two goals: that if there is an entity that's going to be successful, they have

to first have a clear goal of what their mission is. And second, they have to have an ultimate emphasis on safety.

Let me talk about safety for just a moment, because the Bowman report, as much as we may not like it, clearly said the Federal Government's supervision in this area produces a safer project. But in that report as well there was a mandatory report given by the Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel after that *Columbia* accident. In the report in 2008, in which the current chairman—General Bolden was a member—as well as this year's report, at no time were they supportive of making entrepreneurial commercial options the primary means of U.S. human spaceflight.

□ 2250

So what were they supportive of? Well, Constellation. Time magazine this year—actually I'm sorry, the end of last year—came up with their 50 Great Inventions of the Year. And what was the invention they rated number one? Ares, the Ares rocket which is part of the Constellation program. That's what they did.

In the official report to NASA, it says, The simplicity of the Ares design makes the mature Ares 1 clearly superior to all other vehicles no matter what choice of qualification method. Even accounting for error bars on method and model inputs, Ares 1 is superior to all other options with more than a 90 percent confidence.

In short, results suggest that the Ares 1 launch vehicle is clearly the safest launch vehicle option and the only one that can meet the goal post-*Columbia* of having a launch vehicle that was 100 times safer than the space shuttle which it was designed to replace. What they are doing, simply, is Constellation is meeting the goals.

Now, once again, the goals are somewhat nebulous. If you don't have a goal, almost anything you appropriate can meet your goal. And I am suggesting that the NASA administrators right now do not have a clear goal.

Deputy Administrator Garver gave a speech today over in Maryland in which she said that the President's budget should be approved by Congress because it will enable NASA to align with the priorities of the Nation. And those priorities, these key national priorities that I am referring to are: economic development, ending poverty, hunger and creating jobs; international leadership in geopolitics, or world peace; education; and environment.

Now, I hate to say anything, but in 1958 when NASA was started, their goal was to—and I will quote, Provide for research into problems of flight within and outside Earth's atmosphere and to ensure that the United States conducts activities in space devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of humankind. Nearly 50 years later, NASA proudly pledges to redefine what is possible for the benefit of all humankind by using NASA's unique competencies in scientific and engineering systems to ful-

fill the agency's purpose, to pioneer the future in space exploration, scientific discovery and aeronautics research.

Mr. OLSON. If my colleague would yield for a quick question. So economic development, international global leadership and education?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. And environment. I think at some time, Ms. Garver needs to explain what she meant, as this is the priority of NASA now when, in reality, this should have been the priority of NASA. And once again, if you have those goals, I think it makes sense to take away the program that everyone who knows what they are talking about says is clearly the best innovation we have and the only way of supplanting the space shuttle with safe vehicle mechanisms for the future and for manned space flight. But once again, if your goals are to eliminate anything that deals with the traditional role of NASA, then perhaps those goals aren't significant whatsoever.

I have one last area, and if the gentleman from Texas has time, I would like to go into that or I could wait if you would like to.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Let me try one last thing. We talk a lot about the industrial base. It's a term that maybe not a lot of people understand. As I define the industrial base, I simply want to say that the kinds of people, the kinds of jobs that put a man on a rocket and shoot him to the Moon are the same kinds of people and the same kinds of jobs that build our missile defense against those who wish to attack this country. That is our industrial base.

Last year, this country engaged in some significant—and I think unwise—decreases in our military missile defense system, and it had the effect of putting our industrial base in disarray.

However, if now NASA goes through with this, I think, unwise and naive approach of canceling Constellation, it is going to destroy that industrial base, which means not only will you not have the ability of putting a man in space very quickly with a program that works. If, indeed, our projections of the threat of countries like North Korea and Iran are underestimated, we will have no capacity to ramp up for a missile defense future.

Now, what that simply means is—and the Pentagon has recognized this—last year, three different reports came to us. In April of last year, the Defense Department report to Congress on the solid rocket motor industrial base said, If there was a delay in Constellation, it would have a negative impact on our defense system. Next month after that, there was another report. This time the solid rocket motor capabilities report to Congress in June which had a different conclusion. This report said, If there was a delay in Constellation, there would be a significant negative impact on the military capabilities of this country.

Later, the Assistant Secretary for Defense for Acquisitions sent us a letter in which he simply said that the technological base in the world is not a birthright which means several years ago the Air Force dropped all of its military missile plants to build these projects. We are relying on the private sector, and it's into the birthright. It's about certain kinds of jobs, very rare kinds of skills that are not easily replicated in the commercial world. And if we allow them to erode, it would be difficult to rebuild.

Mr. OLSON. Would my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Please.

Mr. OLSON. What kind of consultation went on with DOD, with NASA and this decision? I heard press reports that said there was little, if none. DOD, just like you and I, woke up and read the paper and saw what had happened had not had any opportunity to let the powers that be, the administration know that you are putting our national security at risk by cutting the Constellation program. I wonder if my colleague has heard anything along those lines.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. If you would yield, I will try to come up with that because, indeed, the deputy administrator of NASA said that she did have consultations. But one she said she consulted is the very same person who said that if it's allowed to erode, it would be difficult to rebuild.

I'm on the Armed Services Committee, and we had the opportunity to question Secretary Gates when he came in. I asked if there was any consultation. He said no. I asked the same thing of the Air Force chief, if they had had any consultation. His response was over this entire issue—and I added the Minuteman III issue as well—We recognize not just the Minuteman challenge going forth but a broader industrial base issue which we're going to have to wrestle with this year. So we do not right now have a long-term solution to that in hand, which means that the Defense Department was caught unaware.

There was no communication between NASA and Defense. If, indeed, there was, then clearly NASA was not listening to what was being told to them because we have had a year of comment from the Defense Department and from the Pentagon, saying that this is a significant issue, that if, indeed, North Korea and Iran have a greater capacity than we think, and you've destroy the industrial base, we do not have the capacity to react to it and defend this country.

Now, what we are simply doing in this program is not just dismantling our manned space mission. We're not just losing the ability to go up to the Moon and beyond. We are also destroying our defense capability at the same time, and that is a consequence of this rash and naive proposal that has to be fully explored, and this Congress needs to address because it is the future of this country.

This NASA opinion, in my estimation, is nothing more than managing America's decline in the world, and that is not the role we should be doing. That is not the purpose of this country. That's not the purpose of this Congress. This Congress needs to make the clear statement that NASA is going on the wrong approach. It has to have a proper goal for its mission. It has to properly fund its goal for its mission. This, the Constellation, is the solution to the space shuttle and beyond.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, sir, I couldn't agree more with my colleague from Utah. And just to reinforce some of your things for my people back home, one of the things I heard being at the Johnson Space Center this past Monday, numerous people came up to me and said, What's our plan? I mean, what's our mission? This is an organization that has been focused on a mission for 40 years. And right now, they have no idea what they're working towards. Some nebulous stuff about global warming research, climate change research, developing the private sector doesn't do anything to inspire them.

Again, these are the best, most qualified engineers, propulsion people, defense, as well, in the world. And we are giving them no mission and possibly letting them walk out the door. Once they walk, they're gone.

□ 2300

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It is not wise for us to take our 30,000 best scientists and engineers and give them pink slips.

One thing you said as well, when John Kennedy gave us the challenge to go to the Moon, those people who started to study engineering, science, and math, it skyrocketed because there was a challenge. There was a mission there.

NASA is talking about all kinds of programs to encourage kids to get excited about space with their summer school programs. They instituted a new computer simulation game so students could pretend to go up to the space shuttle. I am contending to you, it is cruel to excite these kids about this future when you give them no realistic way of exercising that dream because we have stopped the mechanism of doing it.

Once again, as we should have learned out of *Columbia*, we have to put safety first. This program is not. And secondly, we have to have a clear goal. If we don't do those two things, we are courting another disaster. This plan of certain NASA administrators is courting another national disaster.

Mr. OLSON. My colleague, getting into the safety issue, which is a big issue, has NASA published any safety regulations or requirements for the commercial spaceflight operators? I have had many come in my office and say they are working towards that, and I have gotten information from other people who say, no, NASA has not published anything yet. Have you heard anything?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. To my understanding, that has not taken place because those other commercial endeavors are not far enough along in their testing and their success pattern to be to that stage. Once again, it goes back to why we should keep Constellation. It was designed to have that factor of safety. That was the purpose for its design. That is its simplicity. For example, there has to be a way of escaping. That is the Orion capsule, where people will be kept. It has to have an escape process. None of the other commercial ventures have any kind of plan or design for that component yet, and it is a long, long way away.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, sir. And there was an issue with that as well. The administration put out, as I understand it, the test was supposed to be in your district. It was supposed to happen in April, and there was a notice to cease and desist, and we contacted the administration, a bipartisan letter, saying I'm sorry, Constellation is the law of the land. You don't have the ability to cut and choose programs that you don't think are going to be valuable or project into the future, because the President only has a voice in this. Congress is the final authority.

I thank my colleague for coming here late because you speak the truth. It is a battle that we can win. The American people get this. Thank you again for your time tonight.

Finally, I would like to finish up with talking about some of the technology issues associated with Constellation and its cancellation.

The administration's budget plan again cancels NASA's Constellation to develop vehicles that will ensure America has access to space and capabilities to go beyond low-Earth orbit. But what they have done, they have eliminated Constellation which does that in favor of undefined "game-changing technology efforts" without clearly defined goals and metrics.

This is exactly what my constituents back home are saying: What is our goal? What is our mission?

In my experience, whenever someone, whether it is a company or government agency, proposes that some new radical breakthrough is just around the corner and will provide the solutions to all of our problems, I want to immediately grab my wallet, button my back pocket, and hunker down. Spaceflight is governed by the laws of chemistry and physics, and there are very few game-changing technologies.

I want to say that I am an avid supporter of NASA, and I think technology development is an important part of what we have gotten from NASA. New technology is one of the many benefits we get from human spaceflight, but that technology development must be the result of a mission-driven pursuit with clearly defined goals and objectives. Like my colleague mentioned, the difficulty of the mission is what forces the development of technology. The proponents

are always ardent and sincere in their desire to make a difference, but history shows that it is not an effective way to manage programs.

I want to explain how the misguided quest for game-changing technologies and flexible paths similar to what is currently proposed have led to wasteful and ultimately futile spending efforts over the past 18 years.

This is a chart of NASA's human spaceflight development programs from 1992 to 2010. The red areas are cancelled programs; blue, completed programs; ongoing, yellow. As you can see, we only have two ongoing programs out there right now, and they are the commercial private programs. We have got the international space station still rolling strong, probably going to go beyond 2015 to 2020. We have completed a superlightweight tank, completed the X-43A, but then ran into the X-43B and cancelled that program. And then the only other thing we have was the DARPA program, which failed. This is one of the challenges of NASA. We have gone through all of these programs and changes with different administrations, and we are looking to do that right now, another change, a huge change in our human spaceflight path by shifting gears to the program of record, the Constellation Program, and going to some unknown, unproven technology from the private sector.

I support the private sector. I think they have a role in certainly some cargo resupply of the space station, but they need to prove that they have the capabilities, and they are not close. As my colleague from Utah alluded to earlier, they had a firing of an engine, and I believe some of the fire came out towards the side. Everybody here knows that rockets, it needs to come out the bottom and generate propulsion up. Coming out the side is not something that you want to see. That is what we are dealing with right now. That is what the administration has chosen to hang our future in human spaceflight on. I think it is an incredibly poor decision.

Congress, we have seen a number of game-changing proposals over the years. Again, this graph shows all of the different programs that have been "game changers," and the blue ones are the only ones that actually came to fruition.

What this represents are billions of dollars being spent without anything to show for it. Again, the Constellation is on track. We have had a very successful test launch of the Ares I-X. We passed our PDR this week. This program is the program of record. It deserves to go forward. It is in America's best interest, and we need to stay the course, put Constellation, bring it up and put U.S. astronauts in space again, get rid of that gap with the space shuttle being retired, get our astronauts up there again, going to the space station and going to the Moon and going beyond.

It is up to Congress to remember the lessons of the past and ensure that the administration's ill-conceived proposals are thoroughly reviewed. We should not agree to open-ended, unproven, unconstrained technological demonstrations. Anything we agree to must be clearly defined. NASA must show us how and why it is included, and it should be part of an as yet to be defined broader goal for human spaceflight exploration.

Would my colleague like to add anything?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I would just like to echo what you have said in all of these particular areas. It is important that we move forward. I think it is common sense that we do not cede space to the Russians and the Chinese. The United States has been a leader in this area. It has been very productive for us. We ought to ensure that our goal is to be number one and to continue to be a leader.

Having our astronauts standing on the edge of space trying to catch a Russian taxi where the meter will say \$51 million as soon as they sit down is not the way America becomes a leader in this particular world. We have the ability to do the right thing. It is planned. We need to follow through with the original plan and not change courses right now to an experiment that is unproven and has a history of failure.

I appreciate the gentleman for allowing me to join him tonight. This is an important issue for all of us, and it is important for America's future.

Mr. OLSON. You raise some great points. Again, \$51 million to put our astronauts on facilities to get up to the international space station. As I understand it, that contract has been signed through 2013, and it is highly unlikely given the current situation, and certainly a cancellation or with the attempted cancellation of the Constellation Program, that we will have the capability to get our astronauts up to the station by 2013. It will probably be 2015 or somewhere in that window.

The Russians were a communist country when I was born. They have moved over to capitalism. They have figured it out. They have it down. It was \$20 million last year. Now that we are in the throes of this, getting rid of the Constellation and having this gap, it is up to \$50 million, and who is to say what it is going to be after 2013 when the contract expires.

□ 2310

So we've got ourselves in a big pickle, and we need to stick with the program of record.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues who have joined me here tonight, and I saw my colleague from Houston, my fellow Texan come here.

It's just stunning that this decision has been made, and again, the manner in which it was made. No one at the NASA centers—not the director of the Johnson Space Center, he was not con-

sulted—had any input into this decision.

Across the center, again, Congress, no one that I'm aware of, had any inclination of what was going to happen until he got up and read the paper and saw that the Constellation Program had been canceled. And again, if it's allowed to stand—and we're going to do everything we can here in this Congress to ensure that it doesn't stand—but if it's allowed to stand, it condemns the United States to being an average country in terms of human spaceflight, giving up the leadership that we've had for almost 50 years now. It will ensure that we will lose hundreds of thousands of jobs here in America, good paying high-tech jobs, the kind of jobs we are trying to generate particularly in this economy. And it will take away the inspiration—you can't put a dollar value on this, but the ability to inspire America's youth to get into science, technology, engineering, and math degrees.

The Constellation Program is the right program for our human spaceflight efforts at this time in our history. We can't cancel it. We need to go forward and do everything we can to minimize that gap.

To my colleague from Texas, from the 18th Congressional District of Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), thank you for coming out tonight, Congresswoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Thank you very much, Congressman OLSON, and to the colleagues that have joined you tonight and who recognize the importance of this hour, albeit how late it might be, to really emphasize the uniqueness of America's space program and the uniqueness of, if you will, the human space exploration.

As I was listening to the debate, I was very much convinced that we do have an opportunity to save this valuable asset. I think we know that the NASA budget actually, as I understand it, has seen an increase in 2011. And I think all of us would admit—and thank the President—that's a good thing that the budget itself has increased, but we know that the program that deals with exploration to the Moon and Mars have suffered a blow.

So I would say that we have an easy fix, a reprogramming of the moneys to allow for a program that has now had a sufficient start to be able to redesign itself, to be able to focus on what's important about human space exploration. But the main thing is to save it, because when we save it, we not only save jobs of today—Johnson, Huntsville, Mississippi, Florida, and places around the Nation—but we save the jobs for 2020, 2030, 2040, and beyond.

I think it's important for our colleagues to know that we built the space station. I was on the Science Committee. That space station is barely a decade old—it is a decade-plus. We put it together piece by piece. And when our friends, the Russians, were delayed, they had bad economic times, we moved on.

The space station is the size of a football field. And the necessity of human space exploration is to be able to tend to that space station which has the possibilities of massive research that creates jobs.

Let me thank my friends on the floor. And Congressman OLSON, let me thank you for your leadership—we have joined you in this bipartisan effort—for signing onto the legislation, H. Res. 1150, which establishes or, if you will, determines that NASA is a national security asset, and it is. Because involved in NASA is much of our military science, climatic science, and technology not yet discussed or discovered.

And so I would rise today to support the moving forward on the Constellation Program, but also the working with this administration. I think we all know that we have a leader at NASA who knows Houston, for example, but also knows the human space exploration program. General Bolden was an astronaut and a marine. That's good news for us. And the reason why it is good news is because that is a voice that can be part of this discussion.

I don't take the initial budget by the President as a statement that human space exploration is not good. And I think it is important tonight to take a stand for our continued effort and energy in working to bring about the right kind of response between the Congress and the administration, a budget that is right there in the President's budget, one that can be reprogrammed, reformed, enhanced, if you will, to emphasize the importance of saving the space exploration, this Constellation Program.

Now, let me say this, Constellation is Moon and Mars. And there are scientists who probably have different perspectives, but I don't think anyone can have a different perspective on the pushing of the human capacity and what it brings about in terms of our own enhancement, both in terms of the knowledge that we gain—and I remember when we were trying to gain votes, Congressman OLSON, that we would say things which were really true—the kind of research on the space station had to do with heart disease, cancer, HIV/AIDS. And discoveries today are being utilized. Those discoveries are saving lives, but they also create jobs, medical jobs.

So I, one, want to continue to raise the question. I want to put in the RECORD that the potential of jobs lost at Johnson Space Center could be anywhere from 4,000 to 7,000 high-tech jobs. And each day jobs are being created more and more. And then of course the idea of the national security information—classified, climatic, as I've said, the weather research that's being done—and the need I think most of all—let me not say most of all because we stand on our own merit here in the United States, we are inventors, we are world leaders, but there are other countries that have looked to our lead-

ership, Russia, India, China, all competing to be part of space exploration.

Let me close and yield back to you by saying this: I want to see business involvement in this industry, but I believe it is important for NASA to, in essence, be part of the government and for the jobs we save all over this Nation on behalf of the American people.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of NASA programs across the country and to express my concerns about the Administration's proposal to cancel NASA's Constellation Program, which includes the Orion Crew Capsule, the Altair Lunar Lander, and the Ares I and Ares V rockets.

These programs, which together comprise our human spaceflight program, were authorized in both 2005 and 2008 by Republican and Democratic Congresses respectively. It is under the Constellation program, that NASA is currently developing new launch vehicles and spacecraft capable of travel to the moon, Mars and other destinations. Not only does canceling the Constellation Program jeopardize America's leadership role in human space exploration, but it will have detrimental effects on our economy and national security.

Take, for example, the Johnson Space Center in Houston, Texas. The Johnson Space Center has the lead to manage the Constellation Program and several of its major elements, including the Orion Crew Exploration Vehicle and the Altair Lunar Lander. Without Constellation, the Johnson Space Center could lose anywhere from 4,000 to 7,000 high-tech jobs. If the JSC loses 4,000 direct jobs, an additional 2,315 indirect jobs would be lost, totaling 6,315; loss of income and expenditures locally would be over \$567 million. If the JSC loses 7,000 direct jobs, an additional 4,052 indirect jobs would be lost, totaling 11,052; loss of income and expenditures locally would total almost \$1 billion.

When speaking of the decision to cancel the Constellation Program, Administrator Bolden stated that "NASA intends to work with the Congress to make this transition smooth and effective, working responsibly on behalf of the Taxpayers." To the contrary, I believe that the best use of taxpayers' money is to continue the investment in NASA to build America's scientific future. That future will create jobs. Finally, I would like to reiterate that the present Administration's plan for the Constellation Program would cause drastic job loss across America and would place America in a behind the edge position as it relates to competitiveness in scientific research.

NASA and the space industry are critical to Houston's economic success in both the short and long term. According to the Bay Area Houston Economic Partnership, NASA accounts for nearly 16,800 direct federal jobs and serves as the engine for another 3,100 civilian jobs that together supply more than \$2.5 billion in payroll into Houston's regional economy. As you are aware, the Johnson Space Center is the primary location for training Astronauts for spaceflights and this move; yet, the proposed budget will effectively cancel America's human spaceflight program.

In his statement announcing NASA's budget, Administrator Bolden stressed that changes in the FY 2011 budget would be "good for NASA, great for the American workforce, and essential for our nation's future prosperity."

While I seek the same objectives, I strongly disagree with the closing of this project and I believe it will hurt America's scientific progress.

Additionally, the aerospace industry would lose as many as 20,000–30,000 jobs nationally in either of these scenarios.

Given our current economic downturn, we cannot take the possibility of these job losses lightly and the Johnson Space Center is just one example of what the cancellation of this program would do to other NASA centers nationally.

It will take years for the commercial spaceflight industry to get up to speed to reach the level of competence that exists at NASA today. Our government has already invested literally years and billions of dollars into this program. We should build upon these investments and not abandon them. Our country can support the commercial spaceflight industry, but not at the expense of our human spaceflight program, which for years has inspired future generations and driven technology that enhances our quality of life.

This technology is crucial to our national security. NASA conducts aeronautics research to address aviation safety, air traffic control, noise and, emissions reductions and fuel efficiency. NASA's contribution to our knowledge of air and water supports improved decision making for natural resource management and emergency response, thus enabling us to better respond to future homeland security threats.

Knowledge of Earth's water cycle is a critical first step in protecting our water supply; water flows over the Earth's surface in oceans, lakes, and streams, and is particularly vulnerable to attack.

NASA sensors provide a wealth of information about the water cycle; and contributes to improving our ability to monitor water resources and water quality from space; we must also protect the quality and safety of the air we breathe; airborne contaminants can pose danger to human health; and chemical, nuclear, radiological, and biological attacks are plausible threats against which we can protect.

Thus, join me in my efforts to restore funding for the Constellation to the FY 2011 budget for the following reasons:

(1) Elimination of the Constellation program, will present Homeland security implications for Cyberspace, critical infrastructure, and Intelligence community of the United States;

(2) Elimination of the Constellation program will compromise the effectiveness of the International Space Station as it relates to the strategic importance of space station research, and intelligence;

(3) Continuation of NASA's Constellation program is crucial to improving national security, climate, and research in science and medicine.

It is my hope, Madam Speaker, that this Congress will continue to support NASA's Constellation Program and to support balanced energy policies that promote economic growth and will help us meet our clean energy goals.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2010.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I hope you will consider joining me as a co-sponsor for the resolution I will introduce expressing the sense of Congress that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is a national

security interest and asset, and that the elimination of funding for the NASA Constellation program in the President's proposed FY 2011 budget presents national security concerns.

The President's proposed FY2011 budget eliminates funding for the Constellation Program which includes the Orion Crew Capsule, the Altair Lunar Lander, and the Ares I and Ares V rockets. These programs, which together comprise our human spaceflight program, were authorized in both 2005 and 2008 by Republican and Democratic Congresses respectively. It is under the Constellation program, that NASA is currently developing new launch vehicles and spacecraft capable of travel to the moon, Mars and other destinations. Not only does cancelling the Constellation Program jeopardize America's leadership role in human space exploration, but it will have detrimental effects on national security.

NASA conducts aeronautics research to address aviation safety, air traffic control, noise and, emissions reductions and fuel efficiency. NASA's contribution to our knowledge of air and water supports improved decision making for natural resource management and emergency response, thus enabling us to better respond to future homeland security threats.

Knowledge of Earth's water cycle is a critical first step in protecting our water supply; water flows over the Earth's surface in oceans, lakes, and streams, and is particularly vulnerable to attack.

NASA sensors provide a wealth of information about the water cycle; and contributes to improving our ability to monitor water resources and water quality from space; we must also protect the quality and safety of the air we breathe; airborne contaminants can pose danger to human health; and chemical, nuclear, radiological, and biological attacks are plausible threats against which we can protect.

Thus, join me in my efforts to restore funding for the Constellation to the FY 2011 budget for the following reasons:

(1) Elimination of the Constellation program, will present Homeland security implications for Cyberspace, critical infrastructure, and Intelligence community of the United States;

(2) Elimination of the Constellation program will compromise the effectiveness of the International Space Station as it relates to the strategic importance of space station research, and intelligence;

(3) Continuation of NASA's Constellation program is crucial to improving national security, climate, and research in science and medicine.

(4) The United States should maintain its funding of the Constellation program and should begin funding commercial space in five years and not sooner.

To join as a co-sponsor, please call my office for Mona K. Floyd of my staff or email (Mona.FloydPmail.house.gov).

Very truly yours,

SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. OLSON. Very briefly, I would like to thank my colleague from Texas for all her support of the Johnson Space Center. True hero back home. And I couldn't agree with you more about every American has benefited from the human spaceflight.

I thank all my colleagues for coming here tonight.

CHARLIE WILSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Earlier this evening, Madam Speaker, colleagues came to the floor of the House to salute our late colleague, the Honorable Congressman Charles Wilson, who made the people of the world happy because of his enthusiasm and leadership.

Congressman Wilson was born June 1, 1933, in the small town of Trinity, Texas. He attended public schools there and graduated from Trinity High School in 1951.

While attending Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas, Wilson was appointed to the United States Naval Academy. He received his B.S. degree, graduating eighth from the bottom of his class in 1956.

□ 2320

However, that was not a testimony to how Charlie Wilson would serve this Nation.

He served in the Navy, attaining the rank of lieutenant. He graduated as a gunnery officer. He was assigned to a destroyer to search for Soviet submarines. He then took a top secret post at the Pentagon as part of an intelligence unit that evaluated the Soviet Union's nuclear forces.

Wilson came into politics by volunteering for John F. Kennedy's Presidential campaign in 1960. After a 30-day leave from the Navy, he entered his name into the race for Texas Representative from his home district. While back on duty, his mother, sister and their friends went door-to-door, campaigning. It worked. At age 27, he was sworn into office. For the next dozen years, Wilson was known as "the liberal from Lufkin."

In 1972, he came to the United States Congress. He was a power. He was a man who enjoyed the friendship of many of our colleagues. He was a staunch supporter of the elderly, of women, and of equal rights. He was unique in his time.

He came to this Congress in a segregated time, coming from Houston, Texas, and the surrounding areas; but he knew my colleagues Congressman Mickey Leland and Congresswoman Barbara Jordan.

I know that he had a relationship that showed no discrimination, no bias. I know he loved this country. He wanted to do well by our allies; and, yes, he was the star of "Charlie's War." He was the one who led quietly an opposition to the Russians' takeover of Afghanistan. That story will always be his—brave, quiet, but successful. As the story is told, he didn't do a lot of talking about it, but he got the job done.

We will miss Congressman Charlie Wilson. I am so honored and privileged to have had the opportunity to serve with him for 2 years when I first came to the United States Congress. He was a joy to serve with. He was a defined Member of this body, who respected this body but who had a great time. We will miss him as he has lost his life just recently.

We say to his lovely wife who shared times with him for 11 years, Thank you for sharing Charlie Wilson. Thank you for giving him the joy of his life, and thank you so very much for recognizing what a special treasure he was to the American people and to the great State of Texas.

Madam Speaker, my words, I hope, will be a mere comfort to his family and friends.

To my colleagues in the Texas delegation, yes, we have a fallen hero; but we have a friend we will be able to remember for a lifetime.

God bless you, Charlie Wilson. May you rest in peace.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the contributions Congressman Charles Wilson made to the people of Houston, Texas, and the nation. He served the people of Houston, Texas with vigor. Congressman Wilson was born June 1, 1933 in the small town of Trinity, Texas. He attended public schools there and graduated from Trinity High School in 1951.

While attending Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas, Wilson was appointed to the United States Naval Academy. Wilson received a B.S. degree.

From 1956 to 1960, Wilson served in the U.S. Navy, attaining the rank of lieutenant. Having graduated as a gunnery officer, he was assigned to a destroyer that searched for Soviet submarines. He then took a top secret post at the Pentagon as part of an intelligence unit that evaluated the Soviet Union's nuclear forces.

Wilson stumbled into politics by volunteering for John F. Kennedy's presidential campaign in 1960. After a 30-day leave from the Navy, he entered his name into the race for Texas State Representative from his home district. While back on duty, his mother, sister and their friends went door to door campaigning. It worked. And at age 27, he was sworn into office.

For the next dozen years, Wilson made a name for himself as the "liberal from Lufkin." In 1972, Wilson was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from the Second District of Texas, taking office the following January.

Though he did not speak much on the House floor, he spoke through his actions. He was a staunch supporter of the elderly, women, and equal rights. Charlie Wilson supported abortion rights and the Equal Rights Amendment. Wilson also battled for regulation of utilities, Medicaid, tax exemptions for the elderly and a minimum wage bill.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the contributions of Charlie Wilson as a representative of the people of Houston and this nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and March 9 on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to: