

Then there is another issue that also comes to the floor. We had, this week, testimony from the Congressional Budget Office. The highway trust fund goes flat this summer. That means the Federal Government, beginning this summer, will make no new commitments to the States for repairing the 140,000 bridges on the national system that need repair or replacement, repairing or replacing the 40 percent of the national highway system that is in very sad repair, the \$60 billion backlog in our transit.

Nope, we can't afford a penny of that. In fact, the Ryan budget says we are going to abandon—abandon—Federal investment in the national transportation system, and we are going to devolve it to the States. The States will fund, pay for, and somehow coordinate a national transportation system because we simply can't afford it.

Well, oddly enough, the shortfall in the trust fund is \$16 billion a year. That is the exact cost of the R&D tax credits.

Why can't they wave their magic wand and say, well, hey, a million direct jobs and a couple million more indirect jobs in transportation, not only in construction, but in design, engineering, in manufacturing and research, we don't want to lose those?

We are not talking about maybe keeping or getting a few jobs. We are talking about losing well over a million direct jobs and a couple more million indirect jobs in the area of transportation, but their magic wand doesn't work for transportation.

Now, there could be a lot of cynical reasons for why they are just pushing this one R&D proposal. It probably doesn't have anything to do with campaign contributions or powerful interests that are out there. I am sure it doesn't.

One has got to wonder: Why is transportation—national transportation—old hat and unaffordable, but R&D, somehow wave the magic wand, and we can afford it?

Now, I was conflicted at coming here this morning because, at the same time, one of the greatest advocates that this body has ever had for national transportation, James L. Oberstar, died suddenly the other night.

I thought Jim would—rather than having me go up to his memorial service today, he would rather have me come to the floor and advocate for something he believed in and knew was essential for the future of this country, which is adequate investment in our system, a coordinated national system of transportation and infrastructure, an energy-efficient, 21st century system, and a repair to our 20th century system.

That is what we need. No more of these political shenanigans on the Republican side. Let's get serious about real investments and putting America back to work.

□ 1030

#### NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOLS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, so often folks will use this time in the morning to draw attention to failures or to divisions, but I want to use this time to draw attention to successes.

This is National Charter Schools Week, among other things, Mr. Speaker, and I happen to have two charter schools in my district. I represent only two counties, Mr. Speaker, Gwinnett County and Forsyth County, in the great State of Georgia. Both have outstanding public school systems.

And so often when we start talking about charter schools, Mr. Speaker, we talk about an either/or, as if somehow charter schools and public schools are in competition with one another, but that is not the story that I tell from the great State of Georgia. In fact, Gwinnett County, one of my two counties, won the Broad Prize in 2010 for the absolute finest urban education school district in the Nation. Interestingly, they are now reeligible to win that prize again this year after a 3-year waiting period. They are in the final two. Just amazing stories of young people and their successes. And they come through, among other things, two charter schools in my district.

We have the Gwinnett School of Mathematics, Science, and Technology, GSMST, Mr. Speaker. They don't have a football team. They have a robotics team, and an outstanding robotics team at that. If you want a future in the STEM fields, you can find no better education in the United States of America than the Gwinnett School of Mathematics, Science, and Technology, and it is free if you just happen to live in Gwinnett County. A wonderful story of success through the charter school program. Absolutely any student in the county is eligible. In fact, it takes a lottery to get in, Mr. Speaker, because so many young people, so many families want their children to be able to avail themselves of this charter school program.

The Washington Post called it the 17th most challenging high school in the land. U.S. News & World Report called it the third best high school in the land. I, of course, believe it is the number one best high school in the land, but an amazing testimony of what you can do when you free an institution, when you free the teachers, when you free the students to be the very best they can be.

Now, right next door, Mr. Speaker, to GSMST, the Gwinnett School of Mathematics, Science, and Technology, we have the Maxwell High School of Technology. Now, the Maxwell School aims to take folks, these young people who are trying to find their way in life, and prepare them for a job tomorrow—program after program, Mr. Speaker,

whether it is Web design, whether it is welding, architecture, technology field after technology field, not thought of theoretically, Mr. Speaker, but thought of from how can you graduate from high school and begin to provide for yourself and your family. That is not available in the normal public schools, but it is available at the Maxwell High School of Technology. And again, any student in Gwinnett County is welcome to come and be there.

Mr. Speaker, we still live in a land where there is more that unites us than divides us. We still live in a land that brings people together rather than tears people apart, and the charter school debate should be that debate. It should be the debate not that pits public schools against private schools; it should be the debate that brings us together around making sure that every young person in this land, every family in this land who has a dream of what they want to do with their life, that we have the public schools in this land that can help them fulfill that dream.

Mr. Speaker, we are doing that successfully in the Seventh District of Georgia, and I look forward to joining my colleagues in this Chamber to make sure we can do that successfully in every single congressional district in this land.

#### CELEBRATING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF JOHN HOUBOLT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John Houbolt, a native of Joliet, Illinois. He was one of the great unsung heroes of the Apollo program.

Politicians are fond of citing President Kennedy's famous speech made in this room at a joint session of Congress more than 50 years ago to "commit this Nation, before this decade is out, to landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to the Earth." Politicians like to imagine that anything is possible if the right politician and speechwriter can muster just the right words to stir a country to action, but engineers know differently. If you do not have a workable engineering concept and a set of design parameters that respect both available resource limitations and engineering reality, then no amount of fine words from politicians is going to make any difference. Dr. John Houbolt provided that crucial engineering concept that made the 10-year success of the Apollo program possible.

John Houbolt came from humble beginnings, working 16 hours a day on his family's dairy farm near Joliet, Illinois, where he developed an early interest in aviation, building model airports in his free time. He graduated from Joliet Township High School and Joliet Junior College. He obtained a bachelor's and master's degree from the University of Illinois in civil engineering. He then went on to obtain a

Ph.D. and serve as an engineer at NASA's Langley Research Center. His contributions to the U.S. space race in the 1960s were vital to NASA's successful Moon landing.

He is best known for his advocacy of lunar orbit rendezvous, the crucial mission design decision that proved essential to carry the Apollo crew safely to the Moon and back in 1969. Dr. Houbolt, along with several of his colleagues at Langley, became convinced that this relatively obscure technique was the only feasible way to land on the Moon by the end of the decade.

Initially, NASA rejected Dr. Houbolt's plan for being too complicated and risky, but like the world's greatest innovators, Dr. Houbolt didn't let initial failure stop him. Despite opposition from NASA and from leading rocket scientists at the time, Dr. Houbolt tenaciously advocated for lunar orbit rendezvous.

To convince the decisionmakers at NASA to consider his plan, Dr. Houbolt took the bold step of writing a letter directly to the associate administrator of NASA—at the time a clear breach of protocol. “Do we want to go to the Moon or not?” asked Dr. Houbolt. Because of his tenacity, NASA gave his idea another chance and eventually approved it.

Now, John Houbolt won that argument, despite having had all the political winds blowing against him, because he had fundamental engineering reality on his side. It was simply not possible, with the engines and boosters that could plausibly be developed in the 1960s, to launch a payload that would allow a manned rocket to land in its entirety on the Moon, including all of the fuel necessary to return to the Earth. But, as John Houbolt pointed out, if you left the fuel for the return trip in lunar orbit and rendezvoused with the command module after making the lunar landing, then a single Saturn booster, already under design at the Marshall Space Flight Center, could do the job.

NASA Administrator George Low later said of this pivotal moment:

It is my strongly held opinion that without the lunar rendezvous mode, Apollo would not have succeeded; and without John Houbolt's letter, we might not have chosen the lunar orbit rendezvous mode.

The lunar rendezvous mode has been described by space historians as “Langley's most important contribution to the Apollo program” and is widely credited for allowing the United States to accomplish the goal President John F. Kennedy set out in 1961, to land a man on the Moon by the end of the decade.

Dr. Houbolt received numerous awards for his work, including NASA's Medal for Exceptional Scientific Achievement. He was elected to the National Academy of Engineering and was the first recipient of Joliet Junior College's Distinguished Alumni Award.

Additionally, the Joliet Historical Museum is home to a permanent ex-

hibit dedicated to Dr. Houbolt and to his family, titled, “The Soaring Achievements of John C. Houbolt.” They have now declared July 20, 2014, the 45th anniversary of the Moon landing, as Houbolt Family Day at the museum. The museum will be open free to the public each July 20 to encourage families to learn about Joliet's local contribution to one of humankind's greatest scientific achievements.

Dr. Houbolt retired after a distinguished career in 1985. He and his family remained noted philanthropists and supporters of the community of Joliet, touching countless individuals with their generosity.

Dr. Houbolt passed away on April 15, 2014, at the age of 95. His life is an example of the impact that a determined, intelligent, and passionate individual can have. I rise today to remember Dr. Houbolt for his outstanding contributions to American science and engineering.

In a society where we seem to celebrate mainly the accomplishments of our heroes in sports and entertainment, as well as those who ride our rockets off into space, it is important also to celebrate the heroes of science and engineering who make the modern world possible.

#### CHICAGO'S GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, April was a particularly violent month in the city of Chicago. Thirty-two people were shot and killed in the city, 19 of them under the age of 25.

You have heard me talk before about the epidemic of gun violence, about how urban violence in cities like Chicago is robbing us of a generation. But nothing illustrates how our gun violence permeates everyday life in Chicago more than the stories of the deaths of those 19 young people.

They, like scores of teens and young adults across the city, were stalked by gun violence. It followed them home from school, creeping up on their porches or tapping on their car windows; and, in an instant, an everyday activity became an unspeakable tragedy.

Jordan Harris, 24, was shot during a house party.

Michael Flournoy, 17, was shot in front of a neighborhood church.

Adrian Soto, 17, shot on a sidewalk.

Gakirah Barnes, 17, shot in the street.

Andres Cervantes, 22, shot while sitting in a car.

Joshua Martinez, 20, shot on a front porch.

Keno Glass, 16, shot in a drive-by shooting while on spring break.

Trevolus Pickett, 20, shot in a gangway.

Nicholas Ramirez, 19, chased and shot while he was driving.

Anthony Bankhead, 18, and Jordan Means, 16, shot in an apartment during an argument.

Timmy Bermudez, 19, shot while driving in an ambush on Easter Sunday.

Quinton Jackson, 22, shot in a building hallway.

Darius Kelly, 22, shot in a drive-by.

Demario Collins, 19, shot while sitting in a car.

Martavarian Emery, 21, shot from outside while standing in a kitchen.

Jaquez Williams, 17, shot on a sidewalk.

Cindy Bahena, 21, shot while riding in the backseat of a car.

And then there is Endia Martin, a 14-year-old girl who was shot and killed last week by another 14-year-old girl in a dispute over a boy.

Endia, a high school freshman and an honor student, and the 14-year-old suspect, an honor student, friends since elementary school, had been feuding on Facebook. After school last week, the teen suspect confronted Endia with a gun. That gun, a .38 caliber revolver, went from a local gun shop popular with straw purchasers to a man who resold the gun illegally and falsely reported it as stolen. From there, it made its way to a 25-year-old man who gave the gun to his niece, the 14-year-old suspect.

The girl, standing in a crowd of onlookers and instigators, drew the gun from her waistband and pulled the trigger. The gun actually malfunctioned. She handed it to someone in the crowd who fixed it and handed it back to her before she fired again, hitting Endia in the back and another teen in the arm.

This shooting painfully underscores the need for commonsense gun reforms, like cracking down on straw purchasers and better tracking gun sales to curtail illegal trafficking. There were many opportunities along the journey of that .38 caliber revolver to save Endia's life.

The shooting also spotlights the need for better social supports, greater accountability within our families and communities, and increased responsibility for the welfare of our children.

Losing a bright light like Endia is a tragedy, but so is the baby-faced accused killer sitting in juvenile lockup right now, the product of a community of accomplices who encouraged one child to kill another. As a society, we failed both girls. We have failed to provide Endia with a safe community she deserved, and we failed to teach her killer to value her own life, much less anyone else's.

Preventing senseless killings like this requires a combination of legislative initiatives and community action. We in Congress must do our part to stop the bloodshed by passing commonsense gun legislation. We must also do more to support programs on the ground that provide our young people with alternatives to violence. It is a moral imperative we can no longer ignore.

Before I go, I would like to pay tribute to Leonore Draper, a beloved and dedicated gun violence prevention advocate in Chicago who herself was