

were neglected entirely, and Millie was told to do the best she could with the pain. She went from doctor to doctor, and was often told that it was all in her head. About 6 years ago, she started exhibiting other symptoms, only to be given one misdiagnosis after another. Millie had pain in her neck, her shoulders, her wrists, her hips, and she fell constantly.

Finally in the summer of 2006, she was diagnosed with generalized dystonia, a condition where all of the muscles of her body are impacted. Shortly thereafter, Millie's life as she knew it came to an end. In a short period of time she went from climbing the Great Pyramid in Egypt to being in a wheelchair and bed bound. She was constantly in excruciating pain with chronic fatigue and involuntary movements of her arms, hands, neck, mouth, face and eyes.

Luckily, in 2008, she had deep brain stimulation surgery, which provided some relief. But she had yet another battle to fight. Her ability to swallow and eat were impacted to the point that she was on her deathbed, people thought.

Well, through her personal strength, through her resolve, Millie pulled through and she survived. Today, Millie has a feeding tube and braces on her legs, but she is as resilient and as determined as ever. She came to see me here in D.C. in my congressional office, lobbying all of the Members of Congress to be more knowledgeable about her disease dystonia.

Dystonia is a silent, brutal disease. The constant tug of war of muscles forces people to live in constant, severe pain and exhausted. But not Millie. Much of the time the body's struggles are all internal, hiding from an outside observer that the struggle with dystonia encompasses each and every moment. Those with dystonia often say that the disorder "robs you of the freedom to move." It is as terrible as it is debilitating, yet the vast majority of people with dystonia have no negative impact to their intelligence or perceptions. These individuals live their lives imprisoned by the uncontrollable actions of their body in conflict with the will of their minds.

Dystonia is unknown to most Americans, or at best misunderstood. Without proper awareness and diagnosis, the limited therapies that can help people like Millie will never be applied. Together, we must raise awareness of this disorder and support the research that can help find a cure to this silent internal storm.

Millie, I praise you. I congratulate you for your will and determination in the face of this terrible disorder. The challenges that dystonia has presented to you are exceeded by the promise and the hope that your survival has demonstrated. May your resolve, Millie, be a beacon to the hundreds of thousands of Americans who suffer from dystonia.

I welcomed you to the U.S. Capitol and I hope that you come back very

soon, Millie. You are going to find a cure because you are determined to do so.

Congratulations, Millie, and carry on.

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

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

HONORING DEWAYNE STAATS, VOICE OF THE TAMPA BAY RAYS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dewayne Staats, the iconic voice of the Tampa Bay Rays. Broadcasting major league baseball for over 30 years and calling games for the Rays since their inception, Dewayne will call his 5,000th major league ball game tonight when the Rays play the San Diego Padres at St. Petersburg's Tropicana Field. In fact, I think they just got started this evening. Baseball fans all across Tampa Bay and Florida have watched and listened to games called by Dewayne as the Rays have grown from an expansion team to American League champions and one of the best teams in major league baseball. I think the best.

Prior to joining the Rays, Dewayne spent years calling play-by-play for ESPN in a variety of sports, including major league baseball and NCAA baseball, basketball and football, as well as for several other major league teams, including the Houston Astros, the Chicago Cubs, and the New York Yankees. Dewayne began his career as a sports reporter while a student at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, and at the time became the youngest active broadcaster when he began calling major league games in 1976.

Remarkably, he has called six no-hitters, Wade Boggs' 3,000th base hit, and the game in which Pete Rose tied Ty Cobb's major league hits record. Among many accomplishments of an outstanding broadcast career, Dewayne Staats has been honored as one of baseball's all-time top 101 broadcasters by author Curt Smith.

Aside from masterfully calling Rays' games from the broadcast booth, Dewayne and his wife Carla are pillars in the Tampa Bay community, actively supporting the Veteran Employment Transition Foundation and Quantum Leap Farm, a therapeutic and recreational facility for wounded warriors and disabled adults.

Again, I congratulate Dewayne on the occasion of his 5,000th major league broadcast, and I look forward to hearing him call many more Rays wins.

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

tleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

□ 1930

THE SPACE PROGRAM

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized for this hour. I am real pleased to be joined by several of my colleagues.

I want to raise an issue that is of real concern to the people of the State of Texas, the State of Alabama, the State of Florida, those who have, for now, generations almost, been invested in and proud of that great American accomplishment of our space program.

We are an exceptional people, and there is an awful lot of people these days that seem to be ashamed of our exceptionalism. But one of the things that we have been exceptional in since its inception is our space program. I can remember, as a young teenager, when the Russians put Sputnik bleeping over the top of my house in Houston, Texas. And we all stood out in the backyard and watched that thing with its little flashing light going across and thought, Oh, my Lord, the Russians are in space and we are not there. What are we going to do?

But being the exceptional people that Americans are, we put our nose to the grindstone and our brains to work, and in a very short time we met the pledge that President Kennedy made that we would put a man on the Moon in the next decade. So we went from behind the eight ball and watching the Russians have the first satellite in space to manned spaceflight and a trip to the Moon on multiple occasions. In fact, we have had a movie about one of the Moon trips that almost ended in disaster.

We've been open and obvious that we have taken the greatest minds that we could put together in our space program. And at the Johnson Space Center in Houston, Texas, we all in Houston, Texas, and in the State of Texas

have been proud of the fact of our space shuttles, of our space station that we, along with the new free enterprise Russians, have put together in outer space. Amazingly enough, we have just finally completed the space station the way it was conceived as it was started. It's all been done in small portions, putting it together. Now it's finished.

And now we have a new administration who has decided that they are no longer interested in manned space travel. And they have basically started to say we are going to do away with manned space travel and the Constellation program, which was the next phase of manned space travel, and we are going to let some friends of ours start some new businesses and try to go and let private industry go out there and do the shuttle service and launch our satellites. And basically, they have turned over the funds that would go to NASA for the manned space program and they have plans to turn it over to a few private individuals, amazingly enough, most of whom have been fairly large campaign donors of the Democrats and the Obama administration.

In fact, I think I can make an argument—we talk about earmarks in this Congress and all these terrible earmarks that people make—this has the potential, over the next few years, to be around 6 billion, with a B, dollars that the White House is going to earmark for certain individual companies, all of whom seem to have been involved in the success of that administration. Not that there is anything in a payoff in the way. Who knows?

Just a coincidence, I suppose, but we are canning manned space under our NASA program. We are going to lay off thousands of NASA workers and those contractors that work with NASA, and we are taking a new position that we are going to let new start-up companies start over and build a space program. I'm a privatization guy. I believe in privatization in everything we do, but this smacks of some strangeness, and I think that strangeness is what we are going to talk about here tonight.

I am joined by my friend Mr. HALL from Texas. I am joined by Judge POE, and I am joined by my good friend ROB BISHOP, who really informed me a lot about the immigration issue the last time we were together, and I am sure he has great insight.

So I will first recognize Judge POE for such time as he may wish to consume.

Mr. POE of Texas. Thank you, Judge CARTER. I appreciate you yielding a few moments on this very important issue.

Of course being from the Houston area and growing up with NASA, I have seen the success of this wonderful program. And like you and many others, as a mere child in 1969, I watched Neil Armstrong set foot on the Moon. And, of course, the first word when man landed on the Moon was "Houston," because that is where NASA was at the time and still is headquartered.

A lot has come from space travel. A lot of our technology, our electronic technology, our computer technology, scientific knowledge, medical knowledge, all has come because America went to space. And as you mentioned, Judge CARTER, we did so in just a few years with the challenge laid before us by President John F. Kennedy. Back in the sixties and the seventies and even in the eighties, and before that, Americans, when determined to do something, they could do it. And that is why we went to space, because nothing was going to get in the way of America going to space and landing people on the Moon.

But for some reason, and I think political reasons, we see the end of that wonderful glorious exploration, the last frontier. America has always led in the space program except, as you mentioned, when the Russians put the first Sputnik in space. And the benefits that have been received from NASA's spaceflight have been shared all over the world, from weather satellites on.

But now, because of a change in philosophy, the administration wants to go a new direction. That direction, of course, is not to space, not to the Moon, not to using the shuttle, not to keeping manned spacecraft available for Americans to go to the space station, because when that last shuttle flight is over with, we are done. We are out of spacecraft. We have no way to go into space.

So if we want to put an American in space after that last shuttle flight is over, we are going to have to hitchhike, and we are going to have to hitchhike with our good buddies the Russians. And right now the Russians charge us to fly with them as a passenger in one of their spacecraft. It started out at \$45 million, and then \$50 million, and then \$55 million, and now it's \$60 million to go into space with the Russians. But when they get the monopoly on spaceflight, when that last shuttle has finished its flight, who's to say what they'll charge us to go into space or if they'll let us even be a passenger in one of their spacecraft.

And then you have got the Chinese over here, you know, the people we owe our lives to and our debt to. They are working on a space program as well. And now there's that little tyrant in the desert, Ahmadinejad. The Iranians are working on spaceflight. They have already sent a spacecraft into outer space. I think it carried a frog, a snake, and two turtles. But now they want to go into space.

So while other countries, not really our buddies or our friends, are moving forward in space exploration because they understand the importance of it, we are backing off. America is just waving the white flag and giving up its leadership in space. That ought not to be. And we're going to lose technology. We're going to lose the education that our scientists have because it's going to disappear. And these jobs that are going to be lost, these are good jobs.

These are scientists, engineers, and they've worked on the space program for years. And now the Federal Government's coming in and saying we're going to turn all of this over to private industry.

Myself, like you, Judge CARTER, I'm a capitalist. I believe in free enterprise. But the private space exploration is 10 to 20 years behind the United States NASA program. They have 10 to 20 years to catch up to right where we are now. Can we afford to give up the leadership? Some say, well, it's to save us money. It isn't going to save us any money. We're just transferring Americans' wealth to an unproven entity, and that being the private sector. Let the private sector compete, but don't subsidize those programs.

And it's unfortunate that we're seeing the demise of NASA, a self-inflicted wound by our own Federal Government. That's unfortunate, and we should not give up our space leadership to anybody for any reason. After all, it's also a national security issue.

With that, I yield back to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, the administration proposes a \$1 billion cut in NASA's manned program. And at the same time, they are pushing \$115 billion in new spending for ObamaCare after \$700 billion in stimulus spending, which we are still looking for the stimulus.

The taxpayers have already invested \$9 billion in the Constellation program, which was supposed to be the next step in the space program. It will cost \$2.5 billion to shut down the Constellation program. So we are talking about \$11.5 billion is going to be spent just to trash the program that we've already spent \$9 billion on.

And, you know, space has always been a very glorious position for us to take. And we rose above the international bickering. We shared the space station with other nations. Recently, within the last couple of years, the Japanese on one of our shuttles took a major pod containment system up there, and they've got a piece of it. The Russians have some of it. Others have put technology on the space station to where now it is what we envisioned with all the various technologies and abilities to study long distances in space. And we've taken all that, and now, as my good friend from Texas says, to get to our space station that we put together, we're going to have to hitchhike with the Russians.

Now, we all know, as we developed the space station, we also developed the rocket power and the use of rocketry, which became a great part of our national arsenal. And, in fact, we are concerned about the ability of the people in Iran who are trying to develop a nuclear weapon to get a midrange missile to deliver it in their promised attacks on Israel. The rockets that defend our Nation came from the rockets that propelled us into outer space on our great jaunt and exploration of outer space.

So when you start hitting us in our technology, as I would argue the Obama administration is doing, and wasting \$11.5 billion to shut down a program and putting us behind in the future development of these vehicles, where does this make sense? Are we just ceding the fact that now that the Obama administration is in charge of the country and they believe that American exceptionalism is a myth, they are going to prove it by taking away the things we are exceptional in? I have real issues with that. I think all of us do.

I'd like to recognize my good friend ROB BISHOP from Utah to talk to us a little bit about—he is on several committees that have looked into this. He's got a good insight into what's going on. So whatever time you wish to consume, my friend.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Let me start, if I could, for just a second about jobs, because we are talking both inside these Halls and outside about jobs. The President and the Vice President are going on, it's called his recovery summer tour in which he's going to talk about the creation of jobs. In the talking points sent out from the White House, they are talking about the 30,000 miles of new transportation, 80,000 new homes that will be weatherized, 800 programs in parks that are being increased, 2,000 drinking water projects, all in the name of creating jobs.

The President's also asking Congress for \$20 billion in additional stimulus money to protect government jobs, in addition to the \$135 billion we did in the original stimulus bill to do that. And for only \$2 billion—now think of that, less than a tenth of what the President wants in a new stimulus bill to create and protect jobs; a rounding error in either the TARP or the TARP 2 or Son of TARP or Stimulus I or Stimulus II—this administration could protect 25,000 to 30,000 jobs in the private sector.

□ 1945

These are scientists and engineers, and these are the jobs that this administration's policy with NASA are going to let go and give their pink slips.

But early on in the Bush administration, it was decided the space shuttle era had ended. After the problems and the catastrophes with Challenger and Columbia, a Presidential commission came through and decided we wanted to come up with a newer, safer way to go to the Moon, space station and beyond; and the result of that was Constellation.

Constellation is a program that is designed to be safer than the space shuttle by a factor of 10. It's using solid rocket motors because those are the safest type of vehicles. It separates the cargo from the passengers so, if there is a problem, they can be safer. Time magazine called this the best invention of last year. This is the science that we

have to come up with the best way of going into the future, and it's built by a free enterprise company. It consists of the Orion capsule where the passengers would be, as well as the Aries rocket that will power it at the same time.

If this White House, if the administration, if NASA gets their way and decides to cancel this greatest invention of the last couple of years, there is no Constellation, there will, as has been said, still be astronauts who need to go up to the space station. As has been said, they will be going up on Russian craft, and in the next year's budget, this administration has already penciled in \$75 million per astronaut visit. As has been mentioned by the good gentleman from Texas, Russians have learned the lessons of capitalism, and they realize when they have a monopoly they can play that game. But \$75 million per astronaut trip so that we can subsidize the Russian rocket industry.

So that, indeed, as we are looking at the future and we're coming up with this, this summer of recovery is not necessarily going to be about American jobs. The summer of recovery is how we will be spending American taxpayers' money to make sure that the Russian technicians are on the line building Russian missiles. Perhaps the Chinese are on the line starting to build new Chinese missiles so that we can keep their jobs and we will rely on Russian technology because we know how effective that has been in the past, Russian technology for our astronaut visits.

We sometimes ask the question, where are the jobs? Well, in Russian, you also ask it. In their version of where are the jobs, with this policy of this administration, NASA, jobs aren't going to be here. Jobs are going to be in Russia. Jobs are going to be in China, eventually in India; and even Japan's getting in on the trick. That's where those jobs are going to go.

We are firing 30,000 American citizens who have good jobs in science and engineering to build the Constellation program and for what? To lose our leadership in space? To subsidize the Russians and the Chinese industry? To put more Americans out of work in this summer of recovery? It simply does not make sense.

I'd like to enter into an interchange with the gentleman. We've got a lot of things to talk about how this interchanges with our military commitment and what this administration is doing that is totally unusual in trying to push this program forward to destroy—we're not losing the space race this time. We're forfeiting the game.

Mr. CARTER. Perfect statement, "forfeiting the game." We were leading the game, we were winning the game until this administration came into the White House, and we just stepped up and decided to forfeit the game.

Here's an article from Labor Magazine. It was published on April 15, 2010:

"Obama is pushing the privatization of NASA and the turnover of the government agency to his financial supporters Elon Musk and Google owners Page and Brin.

"A full bore campaign is now being waged by the Obama administration to shut down the U.S. unionized space program and turn it over to 'new age' speculators who want to build a new space program in a 'regulation-free' zone in Florida."

And the plan is by billionaire and former owner of PayPal, Elon Musk. Musk has a company called Space Exploration Technologies Corporation, and the question is, "Should the United States hire Elon Musk, at a cost of a few billion dollars, to run a taxi service for American astronauts?"

"In fact, the SpaceX operation like much that Musk and his backers from Google Larry Page and Sergey Brin want the U.S. to give him \$6 billion in the next 5 years to build" this operation.

Now, that's a very interesting thing. We take a program, we put \$9 billion into it, it's cost us \$2.5 billion to shut it down, we shut it down, and we come up with \$6 billion more over the next 5 years that we're going to give to some good friends to come up with a brand new program and they are, as Judge Poe points out, way behind in developing the rocket to get them to anywhere we want to go in space.

I yield back to my friend.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the way the gentleman from Texas has put this. Let's face it: two concepts this administration kept throwing at it: we're going to save money in this and we're going to privatize it, both of those concepts are flat out false.

As has been said, this administration expects to spend \$6 billion more on NASA than they are right now without doing any kind of manned space flight, \$6 billion more for satellites to do climate control and feeding the hungry in the world. And in addition to that, the money that will now go to these new companies, these startup business companies, this is not free enterprise.

The Constellation went out on a bid that was won by free enterprise companies. The people building right now are free market sector companies. What this administration wants to do is to take the money away from those who are already building Constellation, scrap the program, and then turn over to any other group to come up with a new plan, a new goal. We don't have a new plan or a new goal, but they're going to give it to new companies.

This government is basically saying these private sector companies are now going to be the losers; our friends in this private sector group are now going to be the winners. But as the gentleman from Texas said, this group is not just simply a business free enterprise group. They're already being subsidized by NASA to the point of millions of dollars and have already told NASA they need more.

This has nothing to do with free enterprise. This has everything to do with this administration picking winners and losers among the free enterprise and elements. So those who have the contracts now are going to lose them and lose their jobs, and that money is going to transfer over to another group that is also being subsidized by NASA. It's not free enterprise, this bit, and this is not saving the taxpayers money. This is simply mind-boggling that we are now going to simply say we have no plan for space.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, so we're just basically saying, Obama just said I want to change this program from one free enterprise group to my guys that are on my side; and, unfortunately, they're a little behind, but we'll beef them up and we'll try to get them there by spending the American taxpayers' money. It is stimulus for a new group of private companies. It's amazing.

But who else is going to be competing? This is interesting. Taxpayers have already invested \$9 billion in the Constellation, which will be lost. This is sort of a comedy piece that my staff put together. Everyone there is Oriental, but it has to do with the recent announcement—you know, we had promised that with the new Constellation program, we were going to go back to the Moon just to do some additional research there.

The Chinese had announced in February of 2004 that they've started their Moon exploration program. Phase I involves orbiting a satellite around the Moon. Phase II involves sending a lander to the Moon. Phase III involves collecting lunar soil samples. China plans to complete its space station and a manned mission to the Moon by 2020.

So not only are we giving up the fact that we're exceptional, but those people who are trying to show how exceptional they are—and quite honestly, the Chinese have done pretty much a turnaround since they learned that capitalism really works, and now they're doing the Moon explorations. Now, I'm sure there are one world order folks that say it doesn't really matter as long as we all sing Kumbaya and go to the Moon.

But the reality is, remember what technology and the defense world came out of, the technology that we developed in our space program; and that's something we can never forget. We can never forget to make sure that American exceptionalism allows us to stay on top of those things that keep us breathing free air in this country. If we ever concede that to those who maybe wouldn't like us as much as we might think they do—they may like our money but they maybe don't like us and our system of human beings having rights and freedoms and protections under our Constitution, and maybe those same people who don't feel so good about that part of American exceptionalism would like to impose

their will on us someday. Are we going to give up our jaunts into space and our learning from that?

We're all walking around with cell phones in our pockets, some of us two or three of them up here in this crazy place we're in. All that technology developed out of the technology that started off with the space program. Simple things like Teflon and there's a million things out there in the world we don't even know about that came out of the space program, and yet industries have come out of the production of those products. I can't even remember them all, but I remember at one time we loved to talk about it when we talked about our space program. We've stopped talking about that.

But the point is, we're taking people that have dedicated their lives to the exceptional job of exploring that great wondrous thing called space, and we've told those people, we're laying you off to the tune of 20,000 to 30,000 of you in Texas and Alabama and Florida and other places so that we can start over with a bunch of our buddies in their backyards coming up with a new space program. I've got real issues with that.

But not only is China looking at a space program; the Russians are planning a manned Moon mission by 2025 to 2030, a manned Mars mission by 2035 to 2040. My Lord, everybody else sees those frontiers that we used to see. Remember when President Kennedy talked about the new frontier, space? We watched programs on television as kids about that frontier of space that we were going at, and we did it.

You know, recently we had hearings in this House where we heard from some of those pioneers, and we heard from the first man who walked on the Moon. Neil Armstrong, a man who basically stays out of the world of politics and lives a relatively quiet life for being such a national American hero, came up here and said we cannot afford to lose NASA. It will be a serious blow to the United States of America to lose NASA. In a minute, I'm going to ask my friend RALPH HALL who was at some of those hearings or heard some of these things that were said to tell us a little bit about that.

Mr. HALL, would you like to talk to us about what some of these great American heroes talked about in the NASA program?

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank you, Judge, for this opportunity to discuss a stroke of the pen that affects all Americans, a stroke of the pen early in his administration, a stroke of the pen by the President of the United States that canceled out the Constellation, and that's what it's all about, and that's why we're here, and that's why we're fighting for NASA. That's why the great Neil Armstrong, first man on the Moon, stepped out, didn't know he, with his other two compatriots, had no idea when they left here that they'd ever come back alive. They're great patriots. They're great, those among us,

and we've lost some. We've had some tragedy in NASA, but we've had great successes. Those men came here and testified that it'd be outrageous to cancel Constellation.

□ 2000

Now I want to talk about that just a little bit. It's been nearly 5 months since the administration proposed the very radical changes to NASA's human space flight and exploration programs by canceling the Constellation. Just took his pen and ran a line through it. Well, I don't understand that. And I don't understand the lack of sufficient details that Congress would need to determine if it was even close to a credible plan that he suggests. Yet, in spite of our very best efforts to obtain more information from NASA, the situation has not improved; indeed, the President's trip to Kennedy Space Center on April 15 only added to the confusion as he laid out more aspirational goals, but provided no clear idea of how they fit together or how we expect to pay for these new ventures. As such, I still have basic concerns about our ability to access and use the International Space Station after the shuttle is retired.

I remain concerned with the "gap" in U.S. access to space, and I want to ensure that we can effectively use the enormous research capabilities of the International Space Station. In examining the President's plan, I still don't see any viable way to minimize the gap and provide for exciting research on the International Space Station.

The President's most recent decision to send an unmanned "lifeboat" to the space station at a potential cost of \$5 billion to \$7 billion does absolutely nothing to solve this problem and largely duplicates existing services provided by the Russians. Although we've already spent nearly \$10 billion on the Constellation system that has achieved significant milestones and is well on its way to providing continued U.S. access to space, the administration's decision to cancel Constellation has further stalled development and jeopardized our undisputed leadership in space, and that's what it's all about.

As I've said many times before, as a member of the Space Subcommittee, I am concerned with the proposed commercial crew direction of this administration. While we have long supported the development of commercial cargo operations, I believe it's prudent that we first test cargo capabilities before risking the lives of our astronauts on newly developed systems.

I have also not seen credible data to suggest that there is a viable market for commercial crew carriers, as they claim there is, with no backup, no information on it. In the absence of that data, I fear that we might be setting ourselves up for failure if or when the markets don't materialize.

Anyone can claim to be able to take over commercial crew or to take over the space program, to take over the

building of the next instruments of investigating space. Buzz Aldrin, who supports commercial crew—I've read his ideas, and I'm still looking for concrete data that they can finish what they started. It's easy to start these programs and take them over and then have the Federal Government have to step in at great loss of time, at great loss of international partners, at great loss of contractors, at great loss of employees, and great loss to the government for additional money to take over. I admire Mr. Aldrin and I will clearly inspect his suggestions.

Finally, in examining options beyond low Earth orbit, I'm unclear of when we might see the development of a heavy lift system, or whether NASA still considers the Moon as a logical destination. We've been told that a new "game changing" technology development program will provide capabilities for accessing the far reaches of space, but we have very few specifics on mission, goals, and direction.

In the absence of a defensible, credible plan, I and many of our Members continue to support the Constellation program as currently authorized and appropriated by successive Congresses. GAO will continue investigating whether NASA is improperly withholding funds and improperly applying the Anti-Deficiency Act as a means of slowing Constellation work. I believe that Congress—and when I say Congress, I mean both Democrats and Republicans—Congress has been clear that it supports the unhindered continuation of Constellation until it authorizes an alternative program.

We can no longer wait for NASA to provide justification for its radical changes. Time is running out. Our space station and those who man it—our many NASA employees, our international partners, our astronauts—await an answer that we can live with and that we can lead with. I yield back my time.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, RALPH.

Mr. HALL is the dean of the Texas delegation. We are awfully proud to have him. He has been working long and hard for many, many years to make sure that every time we shoot a human being into outer space we plan to bring them back.

It's easy to develop a space program where you can say, well, if the guy we shoot out there, if we lose him, it's no big deal, we at least have the technology to learn how it works. There are some that have developed space programs this way, but we've never developed it that way. Some people would say we're a great dinosaur, this NASA. This great dinosaur comes from the basic premise, a part of what makes Americans great, that every human life is important. Therefore, you test and retest and retest again, and you take another path and you find a new direction until you are assured of one thing: That that precious human life you put upon that exploding bomb called a rocket, you're capable of putting that

human life out into space and bringing that human being back alive.

I would argue that we're the only space program where that has been a priority. What makes us so much more exceptional than others is because we've had accidents, but they were accidents. But our planned program didn't plan in expendability. We didn't plan for people to be expendable until we learned how to do it. We did it, we got through it, and we made it work.

It's a shame to have that kind of history of a program that has dedicated itself to exploring space and still caring about that one small, little glimmer of spark called a human life, and we do it. We have no assurance that this new direction is even going to come close to having that same basic spirit that created NASA. We are threatening a great human institution.

I want to yield some more time to my friend, Mr. BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Texas again as both he and Mr. HALL were very eloquent in pointing out the problems that we are facing with the cancellation of the Constellation program by NASA.

I'd like to take one small detour from here to try and point out once again that the decision by this administration to cancel Constellation, by NASA, was done arbitrarily, capriciously, and actually without foresight of what the implications would be and their unintended consequences on our military side. For what this administration did not realize is that the people—the industrial base that builds the rockets to send a man to the moon—are the same people who build the rockets to shoot down North Korean and Iranian missiles that are coming at us. This industrial base is there with the expertise, and if you fire 20,000 to 30,000 of that base, this is not a spigot you can turn on and off and add them back, if indeed by some miraculous idea you think you need to change direction and start over again. That is what we have found—that the impact on NASA has a unique, specific, and dangerous impact on the defense of this country because if we are having a missile defense system, the fact that we are going to fire 25,000 to 30,000 people in this industrial base means that those people will not be working on our missile defense system.

The Defense Authorization Act that passed this House and is now over in the Senate, in the report language it concluded that if indeed Constellation is canceled, the cost to our military for our missile defense program will increase 40 percent to 100 percent, that the increased cost to anything that is propulsion, any of our technical missiles—the HARM missile, the Sidewinder missile, anything that has that propulsion—it will increase the cost for us to build those 40 percent to 100 percent. The Minuteman III cost will double. The Navy's missile program cost will double, and it's at a time when Secretary Gates over at Defense has

said that they want the administration to find roughly \$100 billion in cuts for next year's budget.

Now, did we ever take the time to figure out the implications of this program? Not only are we firing 30,000 of our best and brightest, our scientists and engineers, not only are we ceding space to the Chinese and the Russians and eventually the Indians and the Japanese, no longer are we forfeiting the game, no longer are we no longer taking a part, we are putting our missile defense system at risk at the very same time. This administration has naively lurched into this program without considering the unintended consequences.

If I could also say one thing in conclusion before I yield back to the gentleman from Texas. There are three things that NASA has done in trying to push this program of cutting Constellation that violate the obvious intent of Congress. Number one, Congress passed in the omnibus appropriations bill language that said the Constellation would not be cut until Congress approves those cuts. Nonetheless, first of all, they deferred the Constellation contracts, didn't terminate them—it was cute—they just deferred them so the money would not flow. Number two, they then moved the Constellation manager—didn't fire him, they just moved him—to disrupt the program. And number three, and a very novel, unique way—in fact, the spokesman said, well, these are unique circumstances—for the first time ever, ever in the history of NASA, they have said termination costs, the liability of termination costs must come from existing contracts. NASA has never done that when it terminated a program. When Congress told it to terminate a program on solid rocket motors, they always appropriated money for the closing costs. What this means is that the premarket private sector companies that are building Constellation right now have got to, from their current contracts, take money out to terminate, which means they fire their employees and they turn to their subcontractors and they break those contacts so they fire their employees. This is all a concentrated effort on the part of NASA and this administration to destroy this program before Congress has a chance to finalize our work and say whether we want it destroyed or not. I think it's very clear that this Congress has never at any time given the indication to NASA that we think Constellation should stop. But this is a program being done by the administration in violation of clearly the intent of Congress and, as the gentleman said, maybe even under the specifics of the rule of law of Congress, to force us into a fait accompli where Congress does not want to go and this Nation should not go.

This is a sad situation, this is sad, this is unprecedented on the part of NASA, and it is not good for the country. I appreciate being able to be a part

of this evening tonight because Constellation is very, very important to this country. This is our future. We should not lose that. I yield back to the gentleman from Texas and thank you for allowing me to be a part of this.

Mr. CARTER. Recapturing my time, as the gentleman was pointing out something, it just popped into my head, the old civics course that everybody in this country at least used to take in high school about the three branches of government that were created by our Founders and what they did. The laws were written by the Congress, the legislative branch, administered and enforced by the executive branch—which is the White House—and interpreted and held to the standards of the Constitution by the judicial branch. And as the gentleman pointed out, this Congress has never taken the position that we were going to trash the Constellation. In fact, we wrote specific language that said the Constellation shall remain until Congress acts.

□ 2015

Now, the President, without a law or a direction by this Congress, has decided to use magic tricks that have never been used before to delay to the point of disaster and to destroy the Constellation.

We just heard today, when Judge POE got up here and talked, that at least a court of this land has pointed out that the closing down of the gulf to offshore drilling was arbitrary and capricious, and it has granted the extraordinary relief that is very seldom done in the court system by granting an injunction against the President of the United States and the White House to prevent them, by one of the whims that they came up with, from closing down drilling in the gulf. This court has said, Sorry, boys. You can't do that.

Well, now we've got a Constitution, and we've got a Congress that has got a provision and a law that has been passed as the law of this land to be enforced by the executive branch of this government that says that we will not destroy the Constellation program until the Congress decides to do so, but the President, who, I guess, didn't take civics in high school, has decided it doesn't really matter whether Congress acts or not. He is going to destroy the program. I don't think that's the way it works. I don't think that's the way it's supposed to work.

We like to say this, and we recite this in a lot of places: We are a country of laws, not of men.

It is not what man runs the White House or what man runs some position in this country. It is what the law is. The law is passed by this Congress and by other legislative bodies around the 50 States in this Union. Our executive branch is to enforce those laws and to uphold them. Our judiciary is to remind them when they don't, and they have done so as recently as yesterday.

What is kind of strange is that the Carter administration decided to cede the Panama Canal. America would no longer manage the Panama Canal. It was going to save us money to get rid of the Panama Canal. Now, it's kind of funny. There is a Chinese flag imposed on this picture because now the Chinese manage the Panama Canal. That's kind of outsourcing American exceptionalism. We built that canal. Now we're outsourcing the Moon, potentially, to the Chinese under the Obama administration, and we are outsourcing the space program and the missiles that go along with that space program, and we're outsourcing the rocketry, which makes us exceptional.

You know, this administration has been very critical about the outsourcing of jobs outside the country. It has been pointing fingers at lots of people, saying they're destroying American jobs by outsourcing. What in the world do you think you're doing with these 20,000 to 30,000 high-paying, technical jobs—the great brain trust of America? You're outsourcing them to the Chinese, to the Indians, to the Russians—and maybe to the Japanese.

Why shouldn't we be concerned about this, Mr. President? I think that's a question we've got to ask ourselves. I think we've got to start asking, With how much are we willing to say we're no longer exceptional and that we're just going to outsource everything to everyone else?

I really believe the American people want to say to us here in Congress, Hey, wake up. Give us jobs like you've always given us jobs, and we as Americans will do those jobs, and we'll do them better than anybody else in the world. We always have and we always will. I'm not ready to give up on us, and I don't think my colleagues are ready to give up on us or on the American people.

We are still the exceptional people who put a man on the Moon in a decade like the President of the United States John F. Kennedy said. We are still the people who created the first, basically, aircraft that you could fly out into outer space—the shuttle program—a phenomenon that we used, and we landed them there on the runway just like an ordinary airplane rather than parachuting them into the ocean like the first programs we did. We have done wonders with NASA.

I hope and I pray—and I think everybody else hopes and prays—that the President will reconsider and will allow Congress to discuss this and will allow Congress to make decisions as to whether or not we're going to make these kinds of radical changes to the future of man's exploration of space and whether, when we do, if we change, we are protecting the sanctity of human life. All of these things are important. All of these things are things we ought to be concerned about. Right now, we've just got to be concerned about why this administration is giving up on American exceptionalism and

why it is outsourcing our space program to foreign countries.

I'll yield whatever time Mr. BISHOP would like so he can make a comment on that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has approximately 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I have only one last insight to give, and I appreciate, once again, the gentleman from Texas taking this time to point out how significant this issue is that, indeed, the Constellation program was the way forward into the future. It was to replace the space shuttle. It went through the science. It is our future. It is being built by the private sector. Yet, we are deciding to cancel it with no other goal in mind. We don't have a plan. We don't have a program. We don't even have a name. We don't have an idea for what the future may bring.

There was a study that was done after the last space shuttle catastrophe, and it said there are two things that will destroy manned spaceflight, the mission to manned spaceflight and NASA. Those are, number one, not to consider human safety, as the gentleman has said. Then number two is not to have an organized plan.

I just have, in a note of irony, a flyer that went to all of our offices that came from NASA that tomorrow, in the Rayburn foyer, there will be the new era of innovation and discovery, which means that there will be an interactive, all-day event highlighting NASA's robust Earth and space science portion, cutting-edge aeronautics, and continued leadership in human flight.

I am so grateful that there will be an interactive game that we in Congress can play about spaceflight, because, if the decisions of NASA and of this administration are allowed, there won't be a real manned spaceflight for us to see. At least we'll have a game so that we will remember what we used to do and what might have been.

I yield back.

Mr. CARTER. In reclaiming my time, that is ironic because one of the things you hear from parents is, When am I going to be able to get my kids to have their own imaginations and to not play somebody else's video games? To me, it sounds like this is somebody else's video game.

You know, you'll remember when we diverted satellites from protecting our troops in Iraq to over the poles to check on global warming. From what I'm hearing from this administration, their plans for NASA are that we're going to have low-orbit satellite programs to check on global warming. Oh, I forgot. We don't call it "global warming" anymore. It's called "climate change." I apologize. It turns out we may not be warming. Well, that's just a whole other debate. Yet it seems like all of the resources seem to be going towards desperately trying to confirm that debate.

I want to thank the gentleman for coming down, my distinguished friend

from Utah, ROB BISHOP, who is one of the smartest guys in Congress, who is a good friend of mine, and who is a classmate of mine. We came into this august body together. We share an awful lot of concerns about the future of what we are doing. I'm really happy to have ROB BISHOP looking at the scientific side of our world, because he has got great insight into it. I want to thank him for sharing that insight with us tonight.

I want to thank the Speaker for allowing us to take this time to talk about something that we are very proud of. We in Texas have a lot to be proud of. One of the things we point out that we are proud of is the manned space center in Houston, Texas. When you look on the Texas map, which tells you all the great things to come see in Texas, we highly recommend that people visit the manned space center, because we know great things were done by great men and women at that place, and great things continue to be done there.

To drive a stake in the heart of the manned space program is a tragedy, not only for the State of Texas but for the whole United States and, I think I can effectively argue, the world. Let's not outsource another of our industries. Let's not give up on American exceptionalism. Let's go back and reconsider the Obama administration's desire to trash this program. Let's go back to putting us on a path with a plan, as Mr. BISHOP pointed out, to go out and explore those new frontiers we have left to explore.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to take this opportunity here on the House floor to spend a few minutes talking about some friends of mine who are celebrating their 40th wedding anniversary, and I wanted to take a second here to say what good friends they are, what great Americans they are, and what great people they are.

HAPPY 40TH ANNIVERSARY

Bill and Margie Skeleski will be celebrating their 40th wedding anniversary this week. They have been not only tremendous supporters of me, but they have been great people in the community, and I wanted to take this opportunity to wish them a happy anniversary and many, many more years.

You have never been to a holiday breakfast unless you have been to the Skeleskis' house, but I must say there are eggs and quiche and sausage and all kinds of different desserts, and not a

day goes by when I don't see Margie Skeleski somewhere and she wants to bake me a cherry pie. So I want to thank her for all of her generosity.

She and her husband are just two of the sweetest, kindest, nicest people in our community, and they treasure all of the things that, I think, we as Americans need to spend a little more time thinking about, which are the importance of family, the importance of community, the importance of church and faith, and the importance, really, quite frankly, of a nice piece of pie. They all come together, and they have been just tremendous influences on my life, so I wanted to say thank you and congratulations to all of them and to their family as they celebrate this very special day.

CONGRATULATIONS

I would also like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to extend a hearty congratulations to the president of Youngstown State University, Dr. David Sweet and his wife, Pat, who are both leaving Youngstown State University after a long tenure.

Dr. Sweet and his wife came to Youngstown State University when it was a sleepy university somewhere in the center of the city of Youngstown. They came in with a vision for the community, and they came in with a vision of the university. I think history will judge him as one of the leaders on how a university can have a transformational effect on a community.

Youngstown State University and the city of Youngstown both have been recognized for the partnerships that they have created, but Dr. Sweet, on every account that we would measure his success or failure as a president, has clearly succeeded. Enrollment is up by 25 percent. Minority enrollment is up. The university has created the first science, technology, engineering, and math college. Of all of the universities in Ohio, he took Youngstown State University and used it as an engine for not only economic growth and research, but also for helping to redefine the city of Youngstown. In so many ways, he provided leadership for our university and for our community.

I wanted here, on the floor of the House of Representatives, to recognize his leadership, his team—Hunter Morrison, Dr. George McCloud and all of the leaders that he had in his administration—and their ability to take this university, to really transform it and, in turn, to transform our community.

I wanted to say thank you, Mr. Speaker, to Dr. Sweet and to his wife, Pat, for their passion, for their contributions that they made to our community and to Youngstown State University. We stand on their shoulders as we continue this work, but clearly, we would not have been here today to make the kind strides that the university is making, doing the kind of research, hosting international energy seminars and forums and really transforming the role of that university. I want to say thank you. We clearly

wouldn't be in the position we are in today if it weren't for the leadership of Dr. Sweet and Pat Sweet. With that, I say thank you.

□ 2030

THE ECONOMY

Also, Mr. Speaker, we'd like to take this opportunity to spend a little time—and I will be joined by some of my colleagues here in the next few minutes—to talk about what has been going in our country economically and really what the plan is and what the plan has been for President Obama, the Democratic Congress, and pushing forward an agenda that I think, without dispute, has taken our country from going off a cliff, which is where we were just a couple of years ago, a year and a half ago, where the stock market was at 6,000-plus; where the economy was bleeding 750,000 jobs, almost 800,000 jobs a month; and where there was a complete collapse of the global economic system.

Because, quite frankly, there has been a debate going on in America that those of us—and my side, for sure—have been losing. The debate since 1980 has been how do we cut taxes for the wealthiest people in the country; how do we therefore raise the tax burden on the middle class; how do we cut government at every single turn; how do we deregulate and completely try to remove government out of every aspect of the financial markets and the role of regulating businesses; and, quite frankly, our friends on the other side, Mr. Speaker, won that debate.

Through the 1980s, up until the current President, really with a good fight put on by President Clinton—and he made great strides in his own way—but we have been fighting the system. But over the course of the last couple of years we have seen exactly what happens when this philosophy, economic and political philosophy are implemented.

It is Milton Friedman and the supply-side economists and the Republican Party versus the Keynesian demand-side Democrats on our side. And our Republican friends in the earliest parts of this decade, up until 2006 and then 2008, controlled every lever of government; controlled the House, controlled the Senate, controlled the White House, implemented their economic policies across the board. And in Ohio, the Republicans controlled every Statewide office, including the governorship for 16 years, and the State legislature for longer.

Controlled everything and implemented their policies—their energy policy, their foreign policy, their economic policy. They deregulated Wall Street. They continued this path, this role of appointing industry lackeys to critical oversight positions on Wall Street, critical oversight positions in the oil and gas industry. Even big donors to oversee FEMA. And over the course of the last few years, we have seen how this philosophy, when implemented, works. And it works for those