

safeguards for information security and protection of personal information that provide equal or greater protection than H.R. 2221.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2221, the Data Accountability and Trust Act, and I am very pleased and gratified that we're considering this bill today. I've taken an active part and interest in data privacy, and I am happy that the House Members will now finally have an opportunity to vote on this important legislation which, frankly, I introduced in its original form in the 109th Congress.

As former chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection, CTCP, of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I held two hearings in 2005 on identity theft and security breaches involving personal information. These hearings led me to introduce the Data Accountability and Trust Act, which would require any entity that experiences a simple breach of security, such as a business, to notify all those folks in the United States whose information was acquired by an unauthorized person as a result of this breach. My bill was reported out of the Energy and Commerce Committee by a unanimous vote, but, unfortunately, it never made its way to the House floor for a final vote.

But today we're considering legislation that is almost identical to the bill I sponsored when I was chairman of the CTCP Subcommittee. So I would like to commend Chairman BOBBY RUSH for his leadership in introducing this bill, and I'm proud to be the original cosponsor of the bill.

My colleagues, importantly, this bill requires an audit of a data broker's security practices following a breach of security. The legislation also directs the Federal Trade Commission to create rules requiring persons in interstate commerce that own or possess data to simply establish and implement security policies and procedures that protect this data from unauthorized use and requires data brokers to establish reasonable procedures to verify the accuracy of their data and also to allow consumers access to such information while also including important protections to prevent fraudsters from accessing this same information.

The DATA bill also directs the Federal Trade Commission, the FTC, to post data breaches on its Web site, making important data breach information readily available to the public.

The CTCP Subcommittee worked in a bipartisan manner to address a few concerns that were raised about the broad scope of this bill, such as worries about duplicative regulations; but our staff committee worked in a bipartisan manner to solve these problems. So they have been mitigated.

Importantly, H.R. 2221 does not impose duplicative, inconsistent, or overlapping regulations. The bill ensures that any person who is in compliance with a similar data security law will then be deemed to be in compliance with H.R. 2221. Additionally, with respect to concerns that were raised about the access and dispute resolution requirements for information brokers, the DATA bill provides that if an information broker is in compliance with similar relevant laws, then the information broker will also be deemed to be in compliance with respect to that information.

Members should also note that the Data Accountability and Trust Act only applies to those entities that are subject to Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction. Banks, savings and loan institutions, thrifts, and the business of insurance are not subject to the requirements of this bill.

Consideration of this bill today is timely, as data security, data privacy problems continue to affect countless Americans each year. In fact, according to Privacy Rights Clearinghouse, almost 340 million records containing "sensitive personal information" have been "involved in security breaches since 2005."

One of the largest known breaches in our country actually occurred in January of this year at Heartland Payment Systems. In this case over 180 million personal records were compromised. Furthermore, universities across this Nation have had names, photos, phone numbers, and addresses of their students and their staff compromised or stolen. Sensitive technology companies such as SAIC, Science Application International Corporation, and large financial institutions such as Bank of America have also experienced these breaches. Hundreds of hospitals have had the personal information of their patients in their hospitals compromised.

Earlier this year, hackers broke into a Virginia State Web site used by pharmacists to track prescription drug abuse. They successfully deleted records of more than 8 million patients and replaced the site's home page with a ransom note demanding \$10 million for the return of these records.

Breaches have also occurred in the Department of Motor Vehicles; the IRS; the Federal Trade Commission itself; the FDIC, which is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; the State Department; the Department of Veterans Affairs; the Department of Justice. Of course, the list goes on and on.

□ 1500

Oftentimes, these data security breaches can lead to credit card fraud and even identity theft, which can require time and a whole lot of money and energy from consumers to simply repair their good name and to restore their credit history.

Consideration of this bill, the Data Accountability and Trust Act, is time-

ly and necessary to give the record number of data breaches that are occurring across this country their due and protection. So I urge my colleagues at this time to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, as has been noted, and as is obvious here, H.R. 2221 is a bipartisan bill that is the result of a cooperative process. This bill was first introduced in the 109th Congress by Representative STEARNS as the lead sponsor when the Republicans were in the majority. It was voted out of full committee by a unanimous recorded vote. This year, it was introduced by myself as lead sponsor, and after making further improvements to the bill, it was voted out of full committee by voice vote. Compromises were made on all sides to produce an effective piece of legislation.

I would like to thank both Members and staff from both sides of the aisle for their work on this bill. I want to thank Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BARTON, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and the chairman of the full committee, Mr. WAXMAN, for working in a bipartisan fashion to move this important legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, it is, again, unacceptable that in 2009 there is no comprehensive Federal law that requires all companies that hold consumers' personal information to protect that data. It is equally unacceptable that there is no Federal law requiring companies that experience a data breach to provide notice to those consumers whose personal information was compromised. This bill creates uniform, nationwide standards for breach notification. That's not only good for consumers, but uniform standards are also good for business, good for Americans, and good for our constituents. We need this law, and I urge my colleagues to support and pass H.R. 2221.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2221, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to protect consumers by requiring reasonable security policies and procedures to protect data containing personal information, and to provide for nationwide notice in the event of a security breach."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INFORMED P2P USER ACT

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1319) to prevent the inadvertent disclosure of information on a computer through the use of certain "peer-

to-peer” file sharing software without first providing notice and obtaining consent from the owner or authorized user of the computer, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1319

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Informed P2P User Act”.

SEC. 2. CONDUCT PROHIBITED.

(a) NOTICE AND CONSENT REQUIRED FOR FILE-SHARING SOFTWARE.—

(1) NOTICE AND CONSENT REQUIRED PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.—It is unlawful for any covered entity to install on a protected computer or offer or make available for installation or download on a protected computer a covered file-sharing program unless such program—

(A) immediately prior to the installation or downloading of such program—

(i) provides clear and conspicuous notice that such program allows files on the protected computer to be made available for searching by and copying to one or more other computers; and

(ii) obtains the informed consent to the installation of such program from an owner or authorized user of the protected computer; and

(B) immediately prior to initial activation of a file-sharing function of such program—

(i) provides clear and conspicuous notice of which files on the protected computer are to be made available for searching by and copying to another computer; and

(ii) obtains the informed consent from an owner or authorized user of the protected computer for such files to be made available for searching and copying to another computer.

(2) NON-APPLICATION TO PRE-INSTALLED SOFTWARE.—Nothing in paragraph (1)(A) shall apply to the installation of a covered file-sharing program on a computer prior to the first sale of such computer to an end user, provided that notice is provided to the end user who first purchases the computer that such a program has been installed on the computer.

(3) NON-APPLICATION TO SOFTWARE UPDATES.—Once the notice and consent requirements of paragraphs (1)(A) and (1)(B) have been satisfied with respect to the installation or initial activation of a covered file-sharing program on a protected computer after the effective date of this Act, the notice and consent requirements of paragraphs (1)(A) and (1)(B) do not apply to the installation or initial activation of software modifications or upgrades to a covered file-sharing program installed on that protected computer at the time of the software modifications or upgrades so long as those software modifications or upgrades do not—

(A) make files on the protected computer available for searching by and copying to one or more other computers that were not already made available by the covered file-sharing program for searching by and copying to one or more other computers; or

(B) add to the types or locations of files that can be made available by the covered file-sharing program for searching by and copying to one or more other computers.

(b) PREVENTING THE DISABLING OR REMOVAL OF CERTAIN SOFTWARE.—It is unlawful for any covered entity—

(1) to prevent the reasonable efforts of an owner or authorized user of a protected computer from blocking the installation of a covered file-sharing program or file-sharing function thereof; or

(2) to prevent an owner or authorized user of a protected computer from having a reasonable means to either—

(A) disable from the protected computer any covered file-sharing program; or

(B) remove from the protected computer any covered file-sharing program that the covered entity caused to be installed on that computer or induced another individual to install.

SEC. 3. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE ACTS AND PRACTICES.—A violation of section 2 shall be treated as a violation of a rule defining an unfair or deceptive act or practice prescribed under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(b) FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ENFORCEMENT.—The Federal Trade Commission shall enforce this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

(c) PRESERVATION OF FEDERAL AND STATE AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit or supersede any other Federal or State law.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term “commercial entity” means an entity engaged in acts or practices in or affecting commerce, as such term is defined in section 4 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44);

(2) the term “covered entity” means—

(A) a commercial entity that develops a covered file-sharing program; and

(B) a commercial entity that disseminates or distributes a covered file-sharing program and is owned or operated by the commercial entity that developed the covered file-sharing program;

(3) the term “protected computer” has the meaning given such term in section 1030(e)(2) of title 18, United States Code; and

(4) the term “covered file-sharing program”—

(A) means a program, application, or software that is commercially marketed or distributed to the public and that enables—

(i) a file or files on the protected computer on which such program is installed to be designated as available for searching by and copying to one or more other computers owned by another person;

(ii) the searching of files on the protected computer on which such program is installed and the copying of any such file to a computer owned by another person—

(I) at the initiative of such other computer and without requiring any action by an owner or authorized user of the protected computer on which such program is installed; and

(II) without requiring an owner or authorized user of the protected computer on which such program is installed to have selected or designated a computer owned by another person as the recipient of any such file; and

(iii) the protected computer on which such program is installed to search files on one or more other computers owned by another person using the same or a compatible program, application, or software, and to copy files from the other computer to such protected computer; and

(B) does not include a program, application, or software designed primarily to—

(i) operate as a server that is accessible over the Internet using the Internet Domain Name system;

(ii) transmit or receive email messages, instant messaging, real-time audio or video communications, or real-time voice communications; or

(iii) provide network or computer security, network management, hosting and backup services, maintenance, diagnostics, technical support or repair, or to detect or prevent fraudulent activities; and

(5) the term “initial activation of a file-sharing function” means—

(A) the first time the file sharing function of a covered file-sharing program is activated on a protected computer; and

(B) does not include subsequent uses of the program on that protected computer.

SEC. 5. RULEMAKING.

The Federal Trade Commission may promulgate regulations under section 553 of title 5, United States Code to accomplish the purposes of this Act. In promulgating rules under this Act, the Federal Trade Commission shall not require the deployment or use of any specific products or technologies.

SEC. 6. NONAPPLICATION TO GOVERNMENT.

The prohibition in section 2 of this Act shall not apply to the Federal Government or any instrumentality of the Federal Government, nor to any State government or government of a subdivision of a State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this second bill which I am urging adoption of is H.R. 1319, the Informed P2P User Act.

H.R. 1319 was originally introduced by the gentlelady from California, Mrs. BONO MACK; Ranking Member BARTON, the gentleman from Texas; and Mr. BARROW, the gentleman from Georgia.

H.R. 1319, similar to H.R. 2221, would better enable consumers to secure personal information. The focus under H.R. 1319 is on personal information which resides on “protected computers.” By making these users of file-sharing software programs more aware of the risk involved in downloading and running these programs, the P2P Act will reduce inadvertent disclosures of sensitive information over the Internet.

Under H.R. 1319, developers of file-sharing software programs would be prohibited from installing their software or from making it available for installation or downloading without first notifying consumers that their software is capable of searching and copying files from their computers. Developers would also have to provide consumers with a reasonable means to disable or remove the file-sharing program. H.R. 1319 would not require user notice prior to installation for software that was installed prior to the initial

sale of a computer so long as notice of the installation of a covered program is provided in some other form.

The P2P Act would also provide the FTC with discretionary rulemaking authority and expressly states that it does not apply to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I also rise in support of H.R. 1319, the Informed P2P User Act of 2009.

For the second consecutive Congress, Mrs. BONO MACK has introduced this legislation because too many American consumers are having their personal information stolen and their lives wrecked by the careless distribution of file-sharing software which more often than not is used to distribute copyright-infringing content and child pornography. These file-sharing software distributors can no longer be trusted to do the right thing.

The problem of inadvertent file sharing caused by peer-to-peer programs has been felt by thousands of consumers and widely reported by the press. Recent high profile cases, like Marine One schematics being found on a network in Iran, the public availability of United States Supreme Court Justice Breyer's financial records, and the compromising of our own House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct's network security only serve to underscore the dangers associated with file-sharing software and the importance of providing American consumers with the tools and information they need to make wise decisions online.

As a believer in the power of the free market, I am willing to afford commercial interest the opportunity to simply self-regulate; however, the distributors of file-sharing software have proven they are either unable or unwilling to handle their affairs without intervention. This bill is the logical consequence.

In the House of Representatives alone, inadvertent file sharing has been the subject of at least five congressional hearings in three separate committees. In each hearing, distributors of file-sharing software have come forth with a list of voluntary best practices or a commitment to correct the problem, but in each instance they have failed to deliver.

The Informed P2P User Act improves upon existing law because its substantive requirements very narrowly target the critical problem of inadvertent sharing. Unfortunately, many users of the software—particularly preteens or teenage children and their parents—are unaware of the potential dangers of file-sharing software. Today, by passing the Informed P2P User Act, we will move that much closer to arming American consumers with the information they need to protect their personal information.

Now, I thought I would go into what the bill includes:

One, it will create a system where users of file-sharing programs are provided with conspicuous notice and forced to give consent prior to installation and activation of a file-sharing program. And two, requires entities that develop file-sharing programs to make it reasonably simple to block or remove these programs once they are installed.

Additionally, this act will require an easy-to-understand notice and consent rule for file-sharing software. It is my belief that when the consumer is provided with this information, he or she will make a more informed choice.

Finally, my colleagues, the Informed P2P User Act ensures a narrow scope by exempting technologies like e-mail, instant messaging, real-time audio or video communications, and real-time voice communications.

This bill has broad bipartisan support, including 36 cosponsors, written endorsement of 41 State Attorneys General, and the full backing of child safety groups such as Stop Child Predators.

I would like to commend Congresswoman BONO MACK for all the work she has done here; the ranking member on our committee, Mr. BARTON; obviously Mr. RUSH for being on the floor; and Congressman BARROW for his leadership on this issue. I encourage the passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

Mr. BARROW. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his leadership on this issue and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1319, the Informed Peer-to-Peer User Act, which I introduced with Representatives BONO MACK and BARTON.

We live in a world where digital technology connects people in ways that make all kinds of collaboration and innovation possible. There is no question about the benefits of this technology; what I am worried about is the cost. This technology has made us all more productive all right, but it has also made it easier for others to invade our personal records and reveal private information about us and our families that we would never choose to disclose. This bill will protect consumers by making Internet users more aware of the inherent privacy and security risks associated with peer-to-peer file-sharing programs.

All too often, folks who connect to these networks don't even realize that their most personal and private files are visible to everyone else on the network at any time. They are posting their tax returns, their financial records, and personal messages on the Internet and they don't even know it. Recent reports have shown that peer-to-peer software was implicated in a security breach involving Marine One—the helicopter used by President Obama—and another high profile case

involved Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer.

There are all kinds of legitimate peer-to-peer software packages out there, and we are working real hard to make sure that none of those are impacted or limited by what is proposed by this legislation, and the committee members are going to continue to make sure that the scope of this bill doesn't interfere with the productive capacity of this technology. But this bipartisan bill is critical to protecting the privacy and Internet safety of American families. We have truth in lending and truth in labeling. I think it's time we had truth in networking.

I want to thank Congresswoman BONO MACK for her leadership and Congressman BARTON for his sponsoring this bill and working with me on this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the Informed Peer-to-Peer User Act.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the Informed Peer-to-Peer User Act.

As we are hearing today on the floor, it is imperative that we heighten public awareness of the dangers associated with P2P file sharing, and Mr. BARROW just spoke so well to those points.

The reason that this legislation is needed and why it effectively requires software applications to provide clear warnings to their users is because, as the gentleman from Georgia indicated, many people are not aware of what they are finding themselves in the middle of as their information is exposed on the Internet.

In addition, the Seventh District of Tennessee, my district, is home to some of the country's most talented and creative minds in the music industry, and they rely heavily on P2P file sharing in crafting and bringing forward their music.

□ 1515

However, P2P programs are notorious for stealing copyrighted work, and this legislation does much to curb the piracy and the copyright infringement while stepping up penalties that are badly needed for those that are knowingly and willingly carrying out these violations. Unknown and untracked predators have been given fertile ground to steal intellectual property in a system that had been previously void of any centralized mechanism to track, monitor, and prosecute the violators.

I do want to commend those on both sides of the aisle, especially Mr. BARROW, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. STEARNS, for all their hard work in crafting this bill, and I encourage everyone to support the legislation.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers.

I would just conclude by saying, oftentimes when we come to the floor, we have very controversial bills. We've had two consecutive bills here that had

bipartisan support. So it's important, I think, the American people realize that Congress can get things done, and these two bills are the best example of it. And so I urge all my colleagues to support this act.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume for a closing statement.

Mr. Speaker, again, as the gentleman from Florida has indicated, this is a bipartisan bill. It is the result of a very intense and cooperative process. It was voted out of the full committee by a unanimous recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank both Members and the staffs on both sides of the aisle for their hard work on this important piece of legislation. I want to thank, in particular, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BARROW, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RADANOVICH, and others for working in a true bipartisan fashion to move this important piece of legislation and to move it forward.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote for this bill and to approve this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1319, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to prevent the inadvertent disclosure of information on a computer through certain 'peer-to-peer' file sharing programs without first providing notice and obtaining consent from an owner or authorized user of the computer."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FISCAL YEAR 2010 FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION EXTENSION ACT, PART II

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4217) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4217

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Fiscal Year 2010 Federal Aviation Administration Extension Act, Part II".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TAXES FUNDING AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) FUEL TAXES.—Subparagraph (B) of section 4081(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code

of 1986 is amended by striking "December 31, 2009" and inserting "March 31, 2010".

(b) TICKET TAXES.—

(1) PERSONS.—Clause (ii) of section 4261(j)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "December 31, 2009" and inserting "March 31, 2010".

(2) PROPERTY.—Clause (ii) of section 4271(d)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking "December 31, 2009" and inserting "March 31, 2010".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2010.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 9502(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking "January 1, 2010" and inserting "April 1, 2010"; and

(2) by inserting "or the Fiscal Year 2010 Federal Aviation Administration Extension Act, Part II" before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 9502(e) of such Code is amended by striking "January 1, 2010" and inserting "April 1, 2010".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2010.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 48103(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(7) \$2,000,000,000 for the 6-month period beginning on October 1, 2009."

(2) OBLIGATION OF AMOUNTS.—Sums made available pursuant to the amendment made by paragraph (1) may be obligated at any time through September 30, 2010, and shall remain available until expended.

(3) PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.—For purposes of calculating funding apportionments and meeting other requirements under sections 47114, 47115, 47116, and 47117 of title 49, United States Code, for the 6-month period beginning on October 1, 2009, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall—

(A) first calculate funding apportionments on an annualized basis as if the total amount available under section 48103 of such title for fiscal year 2010 were \$4,000,000,000; and

(B) then reduce by 50 percent—

(i) all funding apportionments calculated under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) amounts available pursuant to sections 47117(b) and 47117(f)(2) of such title.

(b) PROJECT GRANT AUTHORITY.—Section 47104(c) of such title is amended by striking "December 31, 2009," and inserting "March 31, 2010,".

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES.

(a) Section 40117(1)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "January 1, 2010," and inserting "April 1, 2010,".

(b) Section 44302(f)(1) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking "December 31, 2009," and inserting "March 31, 2010,"; and

(2) by striking "March 31, 2010," and inserting "June 30, 2010,".

(c) Section 44303(b) of such title is amended by striking "March 31, 2010," and inserting "June 30, 2010,".

(d) Section 47107(s)(3) of such title is amended by striking "January 1, 2010," and inserting "April 1, 2010,".

(e) Section 47115(j) of such title is amended by striking "January 1, 2010," and inserting "April 1, 2010,".

(f) Section 47141(f) of such title is amended by striking "December 31, 2009," and inserting "March 31, 2010,".

(g) Section 49108 of such title is amended by striking "December 31, 2009," and inserting "March 31, 2010,".

(h) Section 161 of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (49 U.S.C. 47109 note) is amended by striking "January 1, 2010," and inserting "April 1, 2010,".

(i) Section 186(d) of such Act (117 Stat. 2518) is amended by striking "January 1, 2010," and inserting "April 1, 2010,".

(j) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2010.

SEC. 6. FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS.

Section 106(k)(1)(F) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(F) \$4,676,574,750 for the 6-month period beginning on October 1, 2009."

SEC. 7. AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT.

Section 48101(a)(6) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(6) \$1,466,888,500 for the 6-month period beginning on October 1, 2009."

SEC. 8. RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 48102(a)(14) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(14) \$92,500,000 for the 6-month period beginning on October 1, 2009."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to give Members 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4217.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

H.R. 4217, the Fiscal Year 2010 FAA Extension Act, Part II, extends the financing and spending authority for the Airport and Airway Trust Fund. The trust fund taxes and spending authority are scheduled to expire on December 31, 2009, a few days from now. This bill simply extends these taxes for 3 months.

Earlier this year, the House passed legislation allowing the trust fund to operate through 2012. Unfortunately, the Senate has not considered this important legislation. Today's bill simply keeps the Airport and Airway Trust Fund taxes and operations in place until a long-term measure can be signed into law.

Air travel plays a critical role in our economy and in our lives. The world's busiest passenger airport, Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport, is located in my congressional district. This airport alone has a direct impact of \$24 billion on our economy. Failure to act will prevent the FAA from spending funds that are already in the trust fund. As a result, important airport construction projects around the country would shut down.

This bill also extends a number of authorizing provisions that are under the