National Women's History Month actually started in March of 1980 as National Women's History Week. In 1987, the celebration was expanded to a full month. This month, we mark 30 years of shining a bright light on the importance that women have played in shaping the great Nation we live in today.

This year's theme is ''writing women back into history.'' Through events, celebrations, and many additional measures, 2010 will help ensure that the historical and groundbreaking achievements made by thousands of women will find their rightful place in our history books.

Today, I am proud to recognize the grandmothers, the mothers, and the daughters who have given us so many reasons to celebrate National Women's History Month. I look forward to witnessing other young women become future leaders and history makers.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF SERGEANT VINCENT L.C. OWENS

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of a brave American soldier who sacrificed his life for freedom, Sergeant Vincent L.C. Owens from Fort Smith, Arkansas.

Sergeant Owens was a decorated soldier who was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 187th Infantry Regiment, 101st Airborne Division, stationed in Fort Campbell, Kentucky. He was the recipient of many awards, including two Army Commendation Medals, two Army Achievement Medals, a Valorous Unit Award, an Iraq Campaign Medal, and a Global War on Terrorism Service Medal.

On March 1, 2010, Sergeant Owens died of injuries sustained when the vehicle he occupied received direct fire. He was only 21.

Vincent was an accomplished young man, known for his work ethic and drive, for his focus and desire to be the best, and, most importantly, for his commitment to his family. Vincent made the ultimate sacrifice. So, too, did his family—his wife, Kaitlyn; his mother, Sheila; and his father, Keith.

Mr. Speaker, Vincent is a true American hero. I ask that my colleagues keep his family and friends in their thoughts and prayers during this very difficult time.

SAVING NASA, A NATIONAL SECURITY INTEREST AND ASSET

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased tonight to acknowledge that there is a lot of energy behind the engine of NASA and the Constellation Program. There is a lot of interest across America, not so much for the individual States that are impacted but for the research engine of the international space station and the importance of human space exploration.

Today, I will introduce, along with 16 cosponsors, H. Res. 1150, which declares NASA a national security interest and asset. It emphasizes the importance of the work of NASA. As well, it indicates that the elimination of the Constellation Program will, in fact, create a national security risk to the United States and will diminish the Nation's efforts to advance scientific research in space.

In addition, we are asking and indicating that there should be partnerships between universities and that NASA centers should be established to provide research opportunities to conduct research on behalf of the United States at the international space station. In addition, this legislation will ask for the full funding of the Constellation Program.

We must save NASA. We must save jobs. This is an American imperative.

PRESERVE, PROTECT AND DEFEND AMERICA'S MANNED SPACE PROGRAM

(Mr. CULBERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleague and fellow Houstonian, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, in expressing our strong support for the fine men and women at NASA.

Our manned space program has preserved America's leadership in space, which has led to America's leadership in technology and in scientific advancement. The great men and women of NASA and of our manned space program have created in so many ways so many technological spin-offs that we must preserve America's leadership in space. We must preserve America's ability to protect the high ground. Unavoidably, the outer space today is the high ground militarily just as surely as Cemetery Hill and Little Round Top were at Gettysburg.

There is strong bipartisan support in this Congress to preserve America's manned space program and to oppose the recommendation—and that's what it is—of the Obama administration to close down America's space program. That is unacceptable. America will never surrender her leadership in the world, and we certainly will not surrender our leadership in outer space.

We are very proud of the men and women at NASA and in our manned space program, and we will be working together in a bipartisan way to preserve, protect and defend America's manned space program.

□ 1930

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intent to offer a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct initiated an investigation into allegations related to earmarks and campaign contributions in the Spring of 2009.

Whereas, on December 2, 2009, reports and findings in seven separate matters involving the alleged connection between earmarks and campaign contributions were forwarded by the Office of Congressional Ethics to the Standards Committee.

Whereas, on February 26, 2010, the Standards Committee made public its report on the matter wherein the Committee found, though a widespread perception exists among corporations and lobbyists that campaign contributions provide a greater chance of obtaining earmarks, there was no evidence that Members or their staff considered contributions when requesting earmarks.

Whereas, the Committee indicated that, with respect to the matters forwarded by the Office of Congressional Ethics, neither the evidence cited in the OCE's findings nor the evidence in the record before the Standards Committee provided a substantial reason to believe that violations of applicable standards of conduct occurred.

Whereas, the Office of Congressional Ethics is prohibited from reviewing activities taking place prior to March of 2008 and lacks the authority to subpoena witnesses and documents.

Whereas, for example, the Office of Congressional Ethics noted that in some instances documents were redacted or specific information was not provided and that, in at least one instance, they had reason to believe a witness withheld information requested and did not identify what was being withheld.

Whereas, the Office of Congressional Ethics also noted that they were able to interview only six former employees of the PMA Group, with many former employees refusing to consent to interviews and the OCE unable to obtain evidence within PMA's possession.

Whereas, Roll Call noted that ''the committee report was five pages long and included no documentation of any evidence collected or any interviews conducted by the committee, beyond a statement that the investigation 'included extensive document reviews and interviews with numerous witnesses.' '' (Roll Call, March 8, 2010)

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee included in their investigation any activities that occurred prior to 2008.

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee interviewed any Members in the course of their investigation.

Whereas, it is unclear whether the Standards Committee, in the course of their investigation, initiated their own subpoenas or followed the Office of Congressional Ethics recommendations to issue subpoenas.

Therefore be it:

Resolved, That not later than seven days after the adoption of this resolution, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall report to the House of Representatives, with respect to the activities addressed in its report of February 26, 2010, (1) what witnesses were interviewed, (2) what, if any,

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

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

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

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

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As an aside, while we are updating guidance from the Standards Committee, we should certainly update the recent guidance implying that Members of Congress who, for example, earmark money for a freeway off-ramp next to property they own, thereby inflating the value of this property, are not in violation of House rules as long as they are not the ''sole beneficiaries'' of such a rise in value. Such a standard does not pass the test of smell or laughter.

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

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

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

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

THE NECESSITY FOR FUNDING NASA

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

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

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

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

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

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