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