

damage to our watersheds, which provide New Mexico with the majority of its surface water, has impacted drinking water supplies and increased the threat of floods during monsoon season.

With the Midwest recovering from floods and tornados and the West battling fires and drought, the current resources available to fight these disasters are simply not enough. Funds for the Natural Resource Conservation Service's Emergency Watershed Protection program, which assist with the protection of watersheds that have been impacted by natural disasters, have almost been depleted as a result of the disasters around the country. It's vital that we provide more resources for this critical program that can strengthen watersheds affected by the combination of fire, damage, high temperature, and lack of rainfall.

I encourage my colleagues to support efforts to address funding shortfalls to the Emergency Watershed Protection program so we can help our communities recover.

□ 1220

WARRIORS' WATCH RIDERS

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the contributions of the Warriors' Watch Riders, a troop support group, for their commitment to our veterans, their families and our community.

Rain or shine, the Warriors' Watch Riders in my district provide a motorcycle escort to our servicemembers and welcome them home as they return to our community.

When one of our servicemembers makes the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty, the Warriors' Watch Riders recognize their sacrifice, honor their memory, and offer support to their families.

I have seen firsthand how the Warriors' Watch Riders bring communities together with the roar of their motorcycles. Bonds are built, tears are shed, and families, friends, and neighbors come together with the Warriors' Watch Riders to show respect for the sacrifices those in uniform make to ensure our freedom.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Warriors' Watch Riders for all they do for the men and women who serve our country.

MEDICARE GUARANTEE THREATENED

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, the Republican bill cuts, caps, and balances all right; cuts Medicare, caps Medicaid, and balances the budget on the backs

of our seniors, people with disabilities, and the middle class.

When Willy Sutton was asked why do you rob banks, he said, because that's where the money is.

Asking the elderly and people with disabilities to shoulder the responsibility for our national debt—really? Nearly half of Medicare beneficiaries have income at or below 200 percent of poverty. The median income for seniors is just over \$19,000 a year. The Republican proposal will end the Medicare guarantee, double out-of-pocket costs for seniors and people with disabilities, and send them an invoice for \$6,000.

Of course we need to address our fiscal challenges, but not by ending Medicare in the process.

REPUBLICAN FRESHMEN CUT SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our Republican friends jumped for joy when they passed a draconian bill that would cut \$6 trillion and jeopardize a lifeline for millions of Americans, and that is Social Security. We have all been referring to a President that endeared himself to this whole country, President Reagan. His letter to Senator Baker said: The Nation can ill-afford to allow such a result. The risk, the costs, the disruptions, and the incalculable damage lead me to but one conclusion: The Senate must vote to raise the debt ceiling—in 1983 when the country was much smaller.

But what do we face here? Frivolous activity like Republican freshmen who, in their manner of affect, showing disrespect for the Office of the President. One Member said: 'I have a challenge for the President. I dare him, I double dare him to even think about cutting Social Security.' What about the Member? Should he be dared to not cut Social Security? The Republican vote yesterday already cut Social Security. And you've just cut Social Security as Republican freshmen. Why don't we engage in negotiation and let the approach be negotiation and resolution—not obstruction. Why don't we engage in negotiation and work together as a Nation, as the American people want? I would like a little more respect from my colleagues for the President of the United States, President Barack Obama.

CUT, CAP, AND BALANCE DEAD ON ARRIVAL

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, last night we voted once again in the House of Representatives to cut Medicare, to cut Social Security, and to reward the wealthiest 2 percent of our Nation with

tax cuts, and of course big business with tax cuts. The Republican majority wasted a crucial day of debate instead of protecting and working on the financial security for our Nation.

We could have debated a strong jobs agenda like the Make It in America agenda that the Democrats have. We could have discussed how we could strengthen partnerships with businesses to retain America's workers for the jobs that are actually needed here.

But what did they do? As one former Republican budget adviser calls it, they debated something that was "a misleading political cheap shot."

The Republicans Cut, Cap, and Balance Act is harmful for this country, and it is not a serious proposal. It is not going to be signed into law. They wasted our time. So I am glad that that bill is dead on arrival in the Senate. But I really wish, I really wish they would get down to working for America.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2553, AIRPORT AND AIR- WAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2011, PART IV

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 357 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 357

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2553) 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 the airport improvement program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this rule and the underlying bill. House Resolution 357 provides for a closed rule for consideration

of H.R. 2553, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV.

So far in the 112th Congress, three short-term extensions have been signed into law to allow for the continued aviation trust fund revenue collections and aviation program authority necessary to operate America's airports. The latest short-term extension expires this Friday, July 22.

H.R. 2553 would extend the program for a little less than 2 months, until September 16. The bill maintains current funding levels for FAA, its employees, and airports around the country. The bill includes two simple Essential Air Service (EAS) reform provisions, one of which has already passed the Senate by unanimous consent.

Both the House and Senate have passed separate versions of multiyear reauthorization bills, so this short-term extension will hopefully give the House and Senate the time needed to work out the differences between the two bills so we can stop kicking the can down the road.

To say that, that is exactly what we are doing. For starters, this is the 21st extension of the FAA program since the last reauthorization. We have been at this exact juncture 20 other times. The last reauthorization, shepherded by Chairman MICA, was over 7½ years ago. That is a long time. Since September 30, 2007, the FAA has been operating on a series of short-term, stopgap extensions.

Quite simply, it is time to stop doing this. It is too much. The safety of our airline passengers is something we ought to take into consideration and pass a necessary, meaningful and long-term FAA reauthorization.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has worked to provide us yet another short-term extension which will ensure the continued safety of airline passengers, with the hope that the Senate and the House can finally come to the table and realize a long-term reauthorization.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV, extends aviation trust fund revenue collections and aviation program authority at current funding levels through September 16 of this year while also imposing new restrictions on the Essential Air Service program.

Frankly, it is no substitute for a long-term Federal Aviation Administration authorization, and casts further doubt on airport construction and safety improvements instead of ensuring air passenger safety, creating jobs, or investing in air traffic control modernization.

□ 1230

As I'm sure most Americans would agree, the word "uncertain" does not belong in a conversation about our Nation's aviation system and it certainly does not belong in the same sentence as air passenger safety. I note a friend in the House who is a pilot agrees with that statement. Over the course of almost 4 years, however, great uncertainty surrounding long-term funding for the FAA has threatened and continues to threaten both. Without steady funding, the FAA is unable to best manage the long-term programs and projects that are vital to the future of our aviation system, including lifesaving airport safety improvements and the transition to the very important Next Generation Air Transportation System that we know as NextGen.

Make no mistake, the United States has the safest, most efficient aviation system in the world. We can all thank our highly skilled, dedicated aviation professionals for that. But in order to ensure that it remains that way, we must stop kicking the FAA reauthorization can further down the road. I know these cans around here get tired of being kicked down the road.

The measure before us is the 21st short-term FAA extension to be considered since the last FAA authorization bill. Vision 100 expired at the end of September 2007. I repeat: This is the 21st short-term FAA extension we have considered in less than 4 years. It is also the sixth extension of operation authority for fiscal year 2011. Meanwhile, there has been no progress for weeks on a long-term authorization.

While short-term extensions have their place in the legislative process, they should be the exception, not the rule, especially when authorizing the important safety and modernization activities of the FAA. The extension not only fails to address the long-term aviation needs of our Nation, but also denies many of our small and rural communities the air service and economic opportunity made possible by the Essential Air Service program.

By including these policy riders, House Republicans risk a shutdown of our aviation system. Senator ROCKEFELLER, after our Rules Committee meeting last night, made that very clear in a letter from him to Chairman MICA.

Instead of appointing conferees, as the Senate did 100 days ago, House Republicans seem to be pointing fingers and effectively forcing a vote on the future of the EAS program ahead of conference legislation. While House Republicans continue to play the blame game with the Senate, American businesses and workers are losing out on much needed economic opportunities.

Aviation, as we all know, is an economic engine for the United States, contributing \$1.3 trillion to our economy, accounting for more than 11.5 million jobs and \$396 billion in earnings, and contributing 5.6 percent to our Nation's gross domestic product.

Without full-year funding for the FAA, local officials are unable to move forward with project proposals. Because of this, the FAA is an estimated \$800 million to \$1 billion behind in obligating funding, which translates to tens of thousands of jobs. Furthermore, if the FAA is unable to utilize these funds before the end of the fiscal year, they risk being reprogrammed or rescinded. This, in my view, is irresponsible, dangerous, and unacceptable. The FAA will have to do more with less, which reduces its ability to help airports finance safety improvements such as special runway overshoot areas, runway resurfacing, proper signage and lighting, and equipment to prevent snow and ice buildup on runways.

These measures not only save lives but increase efficiency at a time when air traffic is projected to continue growing significantly. According to the FAA, the number of passengers on U.S. airlines is forecasted to increase by about 75 percent within the next 20 years and to reach 1 billion passengers annually within the next decade. We must invest more in our aviation system, not less. Long-term FAA authorization should be an immediate priority.

In the 110th and 111th Congresses, the House, under Democratic leadership, passed FAA reauthorization bills that would have created jobs, improved aviation safety, and provided the FAA with the tools necessary to modernize airport and air traffic control infrastructure.

My friends on the other side should do the responsible thing and appoint conferees so that the House and Senate can work out their differences and finalize a long-term FAA reauthorization bill. Unfortunately, my friends on the other side of the aisle are clearly preoccupied with further isolating small and rural communities than moving this debate forward. In fact, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has held no hearings specifically on the EAS program this year, nor did they hold a markup on the measure before us.

The Senate is not going to pass this. The letter from Senator ROCKEFELLER makes it very clear, as the chair of the relevant committee in the Senate, that this is not going to pass in its form with the policy riders attached. Yet, without the ability to offer amendments on the floor, as I requested in the Rules Committee last night, to consider a clean extension, one free of the policy riders that will hurt our small and rural communities, we face a shutdown. I believe my good friend from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) said on Friday this short-term extension would expire and then our aviation system stands to shut down. That would be most unfortunate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. I thank my colleague for yielding, and I'd like to thank my colleagues on the Rules Committee for so expeditiously bringing up this rule for consideration this afternoon of I think it's the 21st temporary extension of the reauthorization of the FAA legislation.

This reauthorization has been held hostage for several years, and it is not cost-free. It's interfering with the efficiency of operations, the ability to plan and to expend funds on needed airport improvements all across the country. So we're paying a price for this sort of thing, and I really don't think we should be allowing people to assert that they have the right unilaterally to hold up the whole process, that it's their way or the highway, especially when what we're doing in this particular mild change to reform a needed part of this legislation, Essential Air Service, which is badly in need of reform, is basically acceding to language that's already in the Senate bill. By agreeing to the bill that in this respect has passed the other House, this is non-negotiable that we can be so bold as to simply say, Fine, we'll agree to the language that you have which basically provides that if an airport is within 90 miles of a major airport, it's not eligible for Essential Air Service.

□ 1240

The other provides that the cap on subsidy from the Federal Government would be \$1,000 per passenger.

Now, what are we talking about? You can rent a car for a lot less than \$1,000; and most people, frankly, prefer not to go through a couple of changes, to a feeder airline to a hub to another destination, if you're able to avoid it. An hour 45 minutes, hour and a half air travel is certainly perfectly reasonable, especially when you consider in addition that if it really is essential, the Secretary of Transportation has the ability to waive this legislation. So people are just unilaterally assuming that somehow some terrible thing will happen when the authority already exists in the executive branch to prevent that from happening.

So to further hold the whole system hostage over a small effort to reform what really has been, I think, over a period of years an accumulation of earmarks—people had the ability to provide for a subsidy for an airport in their district in this area or that area because they were in leadership on the committee or in the Congress, and we've seen this pile up and pile up, and it's really about time it gets addressed.

And asking people to find a way to get to an airport, if it's less than 90 miles that they have to find alternative transportation, rather than having the Federal Government subsidize it in a few airports around the country seems to me to be something that is badly in need of doing. It saves money for the taxpayer. Not a whole lot, but I think estimates are between \$8 million and \$9 million a year. I guess around here that doesn't amount to a whole

lot, but in most communities and families and other areas, that's a lot of money.

Of course, we have to remember the Federal Government isn't the only government concerned. If people really do want a subsidized service because of some local need, the community or the State or the county involved is certainly perfectly free to do that.

So why we should be picking a couple dozen communities around the entire United States and subsidizing to the extent of over \$1,000 per passenger to provide this sort of almost air limousine service for a few individuals in these communities is beyond me.

Yet if this is nonnegotiable and we can't concede to the language already in the Senate bill and we're going to have to shut down the whole system, except for essential air service, because of trying to do this modest reform after 23 extensions or 24 extensions, we've really come to a pretty kind of arbitrary and unreasonable place here in this House.

So I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman. And I want to associate myself with his very detailed and well-stated opening statement on this legislation.

I think the premise should be that all of us agree on the importance of the FAA. I have served as the chairwoman of the Transportation Security Subcommittee of the Homeland Security Committee and now serve as its ranking member. Through that timeframe, I have seen the overlapping need to view particularly FAA's work and particularly air traffic controller work as part of both the safety and security of this Nation.

I remind my colleagues of the activist role that air traffic controllers in particular took during 9/11. During the massiveness of confusion and the loss of the destination or the placing of three of our major airlines and planes that were flying in, airplanes, the air traffic controller was really a team that was on the first response, if you will. So their work is enormously important.

And my colleague mentioned some numbers that I think are extremely important: \$1.3 trillion is what we find as the revenue in the airline industry, 11½ million jobs, a 75 percent increase in employees within 20 years and 1 billion in the next decade. I want to say that this means that we have a great obligation to protect the American traveling public.

I also want to associate myself with the idea of not protecting our small airports and disadvantaging those airports by this legislation. And again I assume Chairman ROCKEFELLER's comments play to that as well.

But I had offered an amendment that was sent to the Senate to establish a mandate that at the top 20 United States airports there should be no fewer than three air traffic controllers on duty during periods of airfield operations. I firmly believe this provision will ensure that air traffic control towers at high-volume airports in this country will be appropriately staffed at all times.

Mr. Speaker, we engaged with the conference committee very diligently. We have all heard the recent stories of air traffic controllers falling asleep or being locked out of the control tower or, for whatever reason, not being able to be on the job, on duty at critical times.

Now, I know that air traffic controllers reflect the diversity of America and the various ills and concerns. We also know they have long concentrated hours and it's a difficult job. Just recently there was a question of whether or not an air traffic controller was inebriated on the job, whether he drank on the job or he came to the job, he or she, with this condition. But if that was the case and there was one air traffic controller there, there's zero. If that was the case and there were two, then there was one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlelady an additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

I submit that by simply having a codified policy that at the busiest and most critical airports we mandate there be personnel redundancy in control towers, we can make the aviation system much safer and much more secure.

The American passenger has value. Those dear souls who lost their lives on 9/11 who were not exposed to this concept of terrorism had value. The American passenger is entitled to safety and security. Think about the people on planes flying across our country. They are our grandmothers, husbands, wives, babies, family members, businesspersons, associates, colleagues. They're American passengers and their lives have value. To ensure their safety and security, I believe we need more than what is presently moving in this bill that has not come to the floor, and I believe we should move on with the conferees to be appointed because, as I said, I sent my language to the initial negotiation. We need to move on so there's an opportunity for us to work this idea.

But this is more than a study. We don't need another study. We have already seen the mishaps. On 9/11 we discovered the value and importance of these particular workers, and we now have discovered the problem.

I ask my colleagues to raise the question and to question this rule and this bill, or this extension, because we are putting our American passengers in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider yet another extension for FAA programs, I rise today to discuss a key issue that I urge the conferees on the FAA Reauthorization bill to consider.

Prior to H.R. 658 being sent to the Senate, I offered an amendment to establish a mandate that at the top 20 U.S. airports, there shall be no fewer than three air traffic controllers on duty during periods of airfield operations. I firmly believe this provision will ensure that air traffic control towers at high volume airports in this country will be appropriately staffed at all times. This is a matter of national security.

We have all heard the recent stories of air traffic controllers falling asleep, or being locked out of the control tower, or for whatever reason, not being able to be on the job, on duty at critical times.

I submit that by simply having a codified policy that at the busiest and most critical airports we mandate there be personnel redundancy in control towers, we can make the aviation system much safer.

The American Passenger has value. The American Passenger is entitled to Safety and Security.

Think about the people on planes flying across our country. They are our grandmothers, husbands, wives and babies. They are American Passengers and their lives have value. To ensure their safety and security we must insist that Air Traffic Controllers are vigilant. To ensure their vigilance we must set reasonable minimum standards.

After 9–11, we discovered the vital importance of protecting our domestic airspace. Air Traffic Controllers are part of the front line of defense to protect the ensure the safety of our air space. If they lose contact with a plane, they can alert authorities. If an Air Traffic Controller at a major domestic and international airport is asleep at the wheel who will make that call?

It is unfair to put the lives of American passengers at high volume airports at ANY time in the hands of one individual, who may at some point be incapacitated. Even pilots have co-pilots. What if the Controller fell ill? What then? What would you tell those passengers on the plane? Hope for the best? We need to provide the support that Air Traffic Controllers need in addition to the responsibility.

This language I support creates a mandate, that at all times there must be a minimum of three air traffic controllers in the tower during hours of airfield operation. I commend Secretary LaHood for ordering a second air traffic controller to be on duty overnight at National Airport. However, the Secretary's action simply evidences that there is no current mandate for multiple air traffic controllers. According to the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, most airports operate 24 hours a day with two controllers in the tower for the midnight-to-6 a.m. shift. The operative word is "most", we must act to create a uniform nationwide standard, verifiable and enforceable by the FAA. Again, safety and security are mutually needed to protect the public. This mandate of 2 air traffic controllers on duty at the top 20 airports is vital to America's National Security.

I urge the conferees to adopt this important provision.

Mr. WEBSTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 min-

utes to my very good friend from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we meet this afternoon to consider this very necessary legislation, too many Americans are looking at yet another Friday without a paycheck. Too many Americans are leery when they hear the phone ring for fear it's another dunning phone call from a creditor they can't pay. Too many Americans are stuck for yet another week in a part-time job that doesn't come anywhere close to paying their families' bills.

The country has a jobs crisis. We have the same number of private sector jobs in America today that we had in 2001, and we have 14 percent more people looking for work. We have a jobs crisis.

This is the 196th day of the majority that now runs the House of Representatives, and on not one of those days has the majority taken advantage of the opportunity to come to the floor, work together on legislation that would address this jobs crisis here in our country.

□ 1250

I believe that resolving this crisis requires us to work together in three areas:

First, we have to get our fiscal house in order as a government. We can no longer borrow 40 cents of every dollar we spend, and we certainly cannot let this country fail to meet its obligation to pay its bills—a deadline that is on August 2. Failure to do that would mean more than simply failing our country's national obligations. It would mean higher mortgage rates; it would mean higher car loan rates, higher small business rates; and if we miss the deadline, it would mean not enough money to pay Social Security checks or our troops or our creditors. We cannot let that happen.

Just across this Capitol, there are signs of hope, where Members of the other body from both political parties have begun to have a serious proposal put on the table that would significantly address our budget problem by reducing entitlement spending, which we must do; by reducing spending on regular government programs, which we must do; by reducing spending on defense in areas that would not weaken our country, which we must do; and yes, by requiring the wealthiest and most successful of Americans to pay a bit more towards solving this problem. That is a fair and balanced way to approach this problem. I am heartened by the fact that, across the Capitol, both Republicans and Democrats are beginning to make that effort. We should make the same effort here, something we could agree to.

Second, we've got to stimulate the demand for businesses in this country.

I think the main reason so many employers are not hiring is they legitimately fear there won't be enough customers to buy their appliances or their antibiotics or their software, that there isn't enough demand in our economy.

One of the reasons we don't have that demand is we send \$1 billion a day to Middle Eastern countries which sell us oil. Why don't we keep that \$1 billion here in the United States of America and put it to work by putting Americans to work, whether it's in building windmill farms off the coast or solar farms throughout our rural areas or in exploring regular, conventional sources of energy in a safe and environmentally conscious way. Let's do that.

Why aren't we investing to give ourselves a continued lead in the biotechnology industry? As scientists are figuring out ways to grow new tissue that heals hearts and livers and kidneys, why aren't we working to retain our leadership position in the world in order to create jobs here in our country?

So these are ways that we could and should work together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ANDREWS. Why aren't we doing far more than we're doing this afternoon on this airport bill?

Airport investment puts Americans to work, and good air travel makes growth possible, but look at what we're doing: a temporary, scanty extension of our investment in our air traffic system because we can't get our fiscal house in order to agree to the kind of extension that we need.

We have 196 days of missed opportunity. Let's not make tomorrow the 197th day of missed opportunity. Let's come together; work together as Republicans and Democrats, and create an environment where entrepreneurs can begin to create the jobs that we so desperately need here in our country. Yes, we have a deficit in America—it is a very serious deficit—but the most serious deficit we have is a jobs deficit, and until we can find a way to put 15 million unemployed Americans back to work, our deficits will continue.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the people who might be watching this that we're talking about House Resolution 357, which is a rule that would allow us to reauthorize an extension of the Airport and Airway Extension Act, which is called H.R. 2553. That's our discussion. That's what we're talking about.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would ask my good friend from Florida whether he has any other requests for time. I am prepared to close.

Mr. WEBSTER. No. I am ready to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. In so doing, Mr. Speaker, having now fully

read Senator ROCKEFELLER's letter, I do ask that it be made part of the RECORD. I will read only four sentences from it. He says to Chairman MICA:

"I strongly urge you to reconsider your position and send over a clean FAA extension and appoint conferees for the FAA reauthorization bill, as the Senate did on April 7, 2011, to move this important legislation forward. Further efforts to add policy components to FAA extensions that have not been negotiated with the Senate will likely shut the FAA down."

As Transportation Secretary LaHood and FAA Administrator Babbitt have said, the United States faces a pivotal time in aviation history. In order to ensure the safety of the flying public and bring our air transportation system into the 21st century, the FAA needs a long-term reauthorization bill. While H.R. 2553 buys us a little more time, we cannot afford to continue ignoring the underlying problem.

Mr. Speaker, I try very much not to be as parochial as I can be in many instances, but in West Palm Beach, we are building a new airport tower, and we need the NextGen facilities. At the Fort Lauderdale Airport—that is my hometown airport—we are expanding the runway. It becomes increasingly difficult to complete the projects when money for doing so comes in increments rather than in a block that will allow that they go forward in a meaningful way.

Toward that end, the failure to enact a multiyear FAA reauthorization is just going to result in delays to much needed infrastructure improvements, including, as I have mentioned, the ground-based and NextGen technologies; and it will ultimately cost our Nation more in the long run with regard to passenger safety, jobs and the environment.

Enough is enough. We need a clean extension now in order to pass a long-term authorization as soon as possible. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and on the underlying bill.

UNITED STATES SENATE, COMMITTEE
ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND
TRANSPORTATION,

Washington DC, July 19, 2011.

Hon. JOHN MICA,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office
Building,
Washington, DC.

JOHN, As you are well aware, Congress has passed 20 routine Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) extensions since 2007. I was genuinely hopeful that we would have had a comprehensive bill after four months of negotiations, but appreciated that a handful of difficult issues remained to be resolved before agreement on a final bill could be reached. I was under the impression that we were still operating on a shared desire to complete this important legislation.

It is for this reason that I am deeply puzzled by your decision to introduce an FAA extension with language that adversely affects the Essential Air Service (EAS) program. This surprise maneuver is a complete reversal from the discussions we have been having for several months, and strongly sug-

gests you have not been negotiating in good faith.

As troubling and problematic as the extension you introduced is, I am even more taken aback by the blistering press release you issued in conjunction with it. Its hostility was unexpected. The tone and tenor of the release was so different than any of our previous interactions, I almost did not believe you wrote it.

As your press release inferred, you inserted the EAS language into the FAA extension in retaliation for the Senate's refusal to accept your language on the National Mediation Board (NMB). At no point during our discussions, have we ever linked reforms to the EAS program to language on NMB. I made it clear from the beginning of our negotiations that the NMB language included in your bill—or any other language adversely impacting workers rights—could not pass the Senate. As you know, the Senate voted on this issue last year and our Leadership considers this matter settled. Your attempt to punish the Senate by hurting small community air service has backfired—this language only guarantees that the Senate will reject the FAA extension.

As I told you on numerous occasions, EAS is critical to West Virginia. Specifically, I discussed how Morgantown and Clarksburg depend on the EAS program. Air service has been a critical factor in the economies of these communities, and drives economic growth across my state. Our every conversation had me convinced that you appreciated the reasons I am so dedicated to supporting this program. I believed you when you indicated you wanted to work with me on reaching language acceptable to both chambers. The language in the FAA extension you introduced with Congressmen Camp and Petri makes it harder to find a path forward on this issue.

Over the last twenty-four hours, it is my understanding that you have asserted to others that you had no role in developing this extension, claiming that it was a leadership decision. If this is true, I am unclear as to why you sponsored it, and issued such a searing press release along with it. If you truly have no authority to make final decisions on the FAA bill, I urge the House to formally appoint conferees and allow me to negotiate directly with your colleagues who can make decisions.

I strongly urge you to reconsider your position and send over a clean FAA extension and appoint conferees for the FAA reauthorization bill, as the Senate did on April 7, 2011, to move this important legislation forward. Further efforts to add policy components to FAA extensions that have not been negotiated with the Senate will likely shut the FAA down. You need to think about this very, very carefully. Any consequences resulting from such an action will fall squarely on your shoulders. Right now you are in control of the agency's immediate future.

Sincerely,

John D. Rockefeller IV.

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

Mr. WEBSTER. In closing, I would like to address one thing about the change that's in this particular reauthorization, that of essential air service, which has basically become the government-funded corporate jet program. We've tried to reduce that. If you're a businessman and you live in a rural community, instead of being willing to drive an hour and a half to get on a plane at a medium- or small-sized hub, you're willing to have the government fund your airplane for you. It's

basically a corporate member, somebody who has a business there. He gets on a jet, and to the tune of up to \$3,720, we subsidize that. The taxpayers of this country subsidize that, so it's like a subsidized corporate jet.

It's a sad thing. We want to reduce that. We'd like to do away with it, and a lot of us would like to do away with it altogether; but it would reduce that down to \$1,000 instead of having to drive, maybe, an hour and a half to an airport. It's a sad thing.

However, another sad thing is that we're here. I am sad about the fact that we're standing here on the floor once again to vote for another extension. I wish it had worked out. I wish we could get together, and I hope that happens in the next few weeks if we approve this. This extension is necessary to ensure continued safety for all who fly, be it for business or pleasure or for any other reason, in the American skies.

I ask my colleagues to join me today and vote in favor of this rule and of passage of the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WEBSTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 183, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 608]

YEAS—239

Adams	Carter	Gallegly
Aderholt	Cassidy	Gardner
Akin	Chabot	Garrett
Alexander	Chaffetz	Gerlach
Amash	Coble	Gibbs
Austria	Coffman (CO)	Gibson
Bachus	Cole	Gingrey (GA)
Barletta	Conaway	Gohmert
Bartlett	Cravaack	Goodlatte
Barton (TX)	Crawford	Gosar
Bass (NH)	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Benishek	Culberson	Granger
Berg	Davis (KY)	Graves (GA)
Biggart	Denham	Graves (MO)
Bilbray	Dent	Griffin (AR)
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Griffith (VA)
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart	Grimm
Black	Dold	Guinta
Blackburn	Dreier	Guthrie
Bonner	Duffy	Hall
Bono Mack	Duncan (SC)	Hanna
Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Harper
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Harris
Brooks	Emerson	Hartzler
Broun (GA)	Farenthold	Hastings (WA)
Buchanan	Fincher	Hayworth
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Heck
Buerkle	Flake	Hensarling
Burgess	Fleischmann	Herger
Burton (IN)	Fleming	Herrera Beutler
Calvert	Flores	Huelskamp
Camp	Forbes	Huizenga (MI)
Campbell	Fortenberry	Hultgren
Canseco	Fox	Hunter
Cantor	Franks (AZ)	Hurt
Capito	Frelinghuysen	Issa

Jenkins	Miller (MI)	Scalise	Scott, David	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman	Hunter	Mica	Royce
Johnson (IL)	Miller, Gary	Schilling	Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Schultz	Hurt	Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)
Johnson (OH)	Mulvaney	Schmidt	Sewell	Tierney	Waters	Issa	Miller (MI)	Scalise
Johnson, Sam	Murphy (PA)	Schock	Sherman	Tonko	Watt	Jenkins	Miller, Gary	Schilling
Jones	Myrick	Schweikert	Sires	Towns	Waxman	Johnson (IL)	Mulvaney	Schmidt
Jordan	Neugebauer	Scott (SC)	Slaughter	Tsongas	Welch	Johnson (OH)	Murphy (PA)	Schock
Kelly	Noem	Scott, Austin	Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	Wilson (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Myrick	Schweikert
King (IA)	Nugent	Sensenbrenner	Speier	Velázquez	Woolsey	Jones	Neugebauer	Scott (SC)
King (NY)	Nunes	Sessions	Stark	Visclosky	Wu	Jordan	Noem	Scott, Austin
Kingston	Nunnelee	Shimkus	Sutton	Walz (MN)	Yarmuth	Kelly	Nugent	Sensenbrenner
Kinzinger (IL)	Olson	Shuler				King (IA)	Nunes	Sessions
Kissell	Owens	Shuster				King (NY)	Nunnelee	Shimkus
Kline	Palazzo	Simpson	Bachmann	Ellison	Runyan	Kingston	Olson	Shuler
Labrador	Paul	Smith (NE)	Blumenauer	Giffords	Young (AK)	Kinzinger (IL)	Owens	Shuster
Lamborn	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)	Capuano	Hinchey		Kissell	Palazzo	Simpson
Lance	Pearce	Smith (TX)	Castor (FL)	McDermott		Kline	Paul	Smith (NE)
Landry	Pence	Southerland				Labrador	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)
Lankford	Petri	Stearns				Lamborn	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Latham	Pitts	Stivers				Lance	Pence	Southerland
LaTourette	Platts	Stutzman				Landry	Petri	Stearns
Latta	Poe (TX)	Sullivan				Lankford	Pitts	Stivers
Lewis (CA)	Pompeo	Terry				Latham	Platts	Stutzman
LoBiondo	Posey	Thompson (PA)				LaTourette	Poe (TX)	Sullivan
Long	Price (GA)	Thornberry				Latta	Pompeo	Terry
Lucas	Quayle	Tiberi				Lewis (CA)	Posey	Thornberry
Luetkemeyer	Reed	Tipton				LoBiondo	Price (GA)	Tiberi
Lummis	Rehberg	Turner				Long	Quayle	Tipton
Lungren, Daniel	Reichert	Upton				Lucas	Reed	Turner
E.	Renacci	Walberg				Luetkemeyer	Rehberg	Upton
Mack	Ribble	Walden				Lummis	Reichert	Walberg
Manzullo	Rigell	Walsh (IL)				Lungren, Daniel	Renacci	Walden
Marchant	Rivera	Webster				E.	Ribble	Walsh (IL)
Marino	Roby	West				Mack	Rigell	Webster
McCarthy (CA)	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland				Manzullo	Rivera	West
McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield				Marchant	Roby	Westmoreland
McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)				Marino	Roe (TN)	Whitfield
McCotter	Rogers (MI)	Wittman				Matheson	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield
McHenry	Rohrabacher	Wolf				McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Whitfield
McKeon	Rokita	Womack				McCaul	Rogers (MI)	Whitfield
McKinley	Ros-Lehtinen	Woodall				McClintock	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
McMorris	Roskam	Yoder				McCotter	Rokita	Whitfield
Rodgers	Ross (FL)	Young (FL)				McHenry	Rooney	Whitfield
Meehan	Royce	Young (IN)				McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield
Mica	Ryan (WI)					McMorris	Roskam	Whitfield
Miller (FL)						Rodgers	Ross (AR)	Whitfield
						Meehan	Ross (FL)	Whitfield

NAYS—183

Ackerman	Doyle	Maloney
Altmire	Edwards	Markey
Andrews	Engel	Matheson
Baca	Eshoo	Matsui
Baldwin	Farr	McCarthy (NY)
Barrow	Fattah	McCollum
Bass (CA)	Filner	McGovern
Becerra	Frank (MA)	McIntyre
Berkley	Fudge	McNerney
Berman	Garamendi	Meeks
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez	Michaud
Bishop (NY)	Green, Al	Miller (NC)
Boren	Green, Gene	Miller, George
Boswell	Grijalva	Moore
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	Moran
Braley (IA)	Hahn	Murphy (CT)
Brown (FL)	Hanabusa	Nadler
Butterfield	Hastings (FL)	Napolitano
Capps	Heinrich	Neal
Cardoza	Higgins	Oliver
Carnahan	Himes	Pallone
Carney	Hinojosa	Pascarell
Carson (IN)	Hirono	Pastor (AZ)
Chandler	Hochul	Payne
Chu	Holden	Pelosi
Cicilline	Holt	Perlmutter
Clarke (MI)	Honda	Peters
Clarke (NY)	Hoyer	Peterson
Clay	Inslee	Pingree (ME)
Cleaver	Israel	Polis
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Cohen	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Connolly (VA)	(TX)	Rahall
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Reyes
Costa	Kaptur	Richardson
Costello	Keating	Richmond
Courtney	Kildee	Rothman (NJ)
Critz	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Crowley	Kucinich	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Langevin	Rush
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Davis (CA)	Larsen (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	T.
DeFazio	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Deutch	Loebask	Schiff
Dicks	Lofgren, Zoe	Schrader
Dingell	Lowe	Schwartz
Doggett	Luján	Schwartz
Donnelly (IN)	Lynch	Serrano

NOT VOTING—10

□ 1330

Messrs. CONYERS, CLYBURN and Ms. BROWN of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. LEWIS of California, CAMP, MCKINLEY, and CRENSHAW changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, due to official House business, I was unable to vote on the following measure:

Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 2553—Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV (H. Res. 357).

Had I been able to vote, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 178, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 609]

AYES—242

Ackerman	Capito	Foxx
Adams	Carney	Franks (AZ)
Aderholt	Carter	Frelinghuysen
Akin	Cassidy	Galleghy
Alexander	Chabot	Gardner
Amash	Chaffetz	Garrett
Austria	Coble	Gerlach
Bachus	Coffman (CO)	Gibbs
Barletta	Cole	Gibson
Bartlett	Conaway	Gingrey (GA)
Barton (TX)	Costa	Gohmert
Bass (NH)	Cravaack	Goodlatte
Benishak	Crawford	Gosar
Berg	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Biggart	Culberson	Granger
Bilbray	Davis (KY)	Graves (GA)
Bilirakis	Denham	Graves (MO)
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Griffin (AR)
Black	DesJarlais	Griffith (VA)
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Grimm
Bonner	Dold	Guinta
Bono Mack	Dreier	Guthrie
Boustany	Duffy	Hall
Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Hanna
Brooks	Duncan (TN)	Harper
Broun (GA)	Ellmers	Harris
Buchanan	Emerson	Hartzler
Bucshon	Farenthold	Hastings (WA)
Buerkle	Fincher	Hayworth
Burgess	Fitzpatrick	Heck
Burton (IN)	Flake	Hensarling
Calvert	Fleischmann	Herger
Camp	Fleming	Herrera Beutler
Campbell	Flores	Huelskamp
Canseco	Forbes	Huizenga (MI)
Cantor	Fortenberry	Hultgren

NOES—178

Altmire	Engel	Matsui
Andrews	Eshoo	McCarthy (NY)
Baca	Farr	McCollum
Baldwin	Fattah	McGovern
Barrow	Filner	McIntyre
Bass (CA)	Frank (MA)	McKinley
Becerra	Fudge	McNerney
Berkley	Garamendi	Meeks
Berman	Gonzalez	Michaud
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Miller (NC)
Bishop (NY)	Green, Gene	Miller, George
Boren	Grijalva	Moore
Boswell	Hahn	Moran
Brady (PA)	Hanabusa	Murphy (CT)
Braley (IA)	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Brown (FL)	Heinrich	Napolitano
Butterfield	Higgins	Neal
Capps	Himes	Oliver
Cardoza	Hinojosa	Pallone
Carnahan	Hirono	Pascarell
Carson (IN)	Hochul	Pastor (AZ)
Chandler	Holden	Payne
Chu	Holt	Pelosi
Cicilline	Honda	Perlmutter
Clarke (MI)	Hoyer	Peters
Clarke (NY)	Inslee	Peterson
Clay	Israel	Pingree (ME)
Cleaver	Jackson (IL)	Polis
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Cohen	(TX)	Quigley
Connolly (VA)	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Cooper	Kaptur	Reyes
Costello	Keating	Richardson
Courtney	Kildee	Richmond
Critz	Kind	Rothman (NJ)
Crowley	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Davis (CA)	Larsen (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	Sánchez, Linda
DeFazio	Levin	T.
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeLauro	Lipinski	Sarbanes
Deutch	Loebask	Schakowsky
Dicks	Lofgren, Zoe	Schiff
Dingell	Lowe	Schrader
Doggett	Luján	Schwartz
Donnelly (IN)	Lynch	Scott, David
	Maloney	Serrano
	Markey	Sewell

Sherman	Tierney	Waters
Sires	Tonko	Watt
Slaughter	Towns	Waxman
Smith (WA)	Tsongas	Welch
Speier	Van Hollen	Wilson (FL)
Stark	Velázquez	Woolsey
Sutton	Visclosky	Wu
Thompson (CA)	Walz (MN)	Yarmuth
Thompson (MS)	Wasserman	
Thompson (PA)	Schultz	

NOT VOTING—12

Bachmann	Ellison	McDermott
Blumenauer	Giffords	Runyan
Capuano	Gutierrez	Scott (VA)
Castor (FL)	Hinchee	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1337

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, due to official House business, I was unable to vote on the following measure:

H. Res. 357—Closed Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2553—Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV.

Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "nay."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2553 and to include extraneous material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY EXTENSION ACT OF 2011, PART IV

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 357, I call up the bill (H.R. 2553) 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 the airport improvement program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 357, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2553

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 "Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV".

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 "July 22, 2011" and inserting "September 16, 2011".

(b) TICKET TAXES.—

(1) PERSONS.—Clause (ii) of section 4261(j)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "July 22, 2011" and inserting "September 16, 2011".

(2) PROPERTY.—Clause (ii) of section 4271(d)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking "July 22, 2011" and inserting "September 16, 2011".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 23, 2011.

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 "July 23, 2011" and inserting "September 17, 2011"; and

(2) by inserting "or the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV" 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 "July 23, 2011" and inserting "September 17, 2011".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 23, 2011.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 48103 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

"(8) \$3,380,178,082 for the period beginning on October 1, 2010, and ending on September 16, 2011."

(2) OBLIGATION OF AMOUNTS.—Subject to limitations specified in advance in appropriation Acts, sums made available pursuant to the amendment made by paragraph (1) may be obligated at any time through September 30, 2011, and shall remain available until expended.

(b) PROJECT GRANT AUTHORITY.—Section 47104(c) of such title is amended by striking "July 22, 2011," and inserting "September 16, 2011,".

SEC. 5. EXTENSION OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES.

(a) Section 40117(1)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking "July 23, 2011," and inserting "September 17, 2011,".

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

(1) by striking "July 22, 2011," and inserting "September 16, 2011,"; and

(2) by striking "October 31, 2011," and inserting "December 31, 2011,".

(c) Section 44303(b) of such title is amended by striking "October 31, 2011," and inserting "December 31, 2011,".

(d) Section 47107(s)(3) of such title is amended by striking "July 23, 2011," and inserting "September 17, 2011,".

(e) Section 47115(j) of such title is amended by striking "July 23, 2011," and inserting "September 17, 2011,".

(f) Section 47141(f) of such title is amended by striking "July 22, 2011," and inserting "September 16, 2011,".

(g) Section 49108 of such title is amended by striking "July 22, 2011," and inserting "September 16, 2011,".

(h) Section 161 of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (49 U.S.C. 47109 note) is amended by striking "July 23, 2011," and inserting "September 17, 2011,".

(i) Section 186(d) of such Act (117 Stat. 2518) is amended by striking "July 23, 2011," and inserting "September 17, 2011,".

(j) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on July 23, 2011.

SEC. 6. ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE REFORM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 41731(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iii) as subclauses (I) through (III), respectively;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(3) in clause (i)(I) (as so redesignated) by inserting "(A)" before "(i)(I)";

(4) in subparagraph (A)(ii) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking "determined" and inserting "was determined";

(B) by striking "Secretary" and inserting "Secretary of Transportation"; and

(C) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) is located not less than 90 miles from the nearest medium or large hub airport; and
"(C) had an average subsidy per passenger of less than \$1,000 during the most recent fiscal year, as determined by the Secretary."

(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO DECIDE A PLACE NOT AN ELIGIBLE PLACE.—Section 41731(b) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking "Secretary of Transportation" and inserting "Secretary"; and

(2) by striking "on the basis of a passenger subsidy at that place or on another basis" and inserting "on any basis".

(c) EXCEPTIONS AND WAIVERS.—Section 41731 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) EXCEPTIONS FOR LOCATIONS IN ALASKA.—Subsections (a)(1)(B) and (a)(1)(C) shall not apply with respect to a location in the State of Alaska.

"(d) WAIVERS.—The Secretary may waive subsection (a)(1)(B) with respect to a location if the Secretary determines that the geographic characteristics of the location result in undue difficulty in accessing the nearest medium or large hub airport."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1340

Mr. PETRI. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for the third consecutive Congress, we are working to pass a long-term reauthorization of the FAA. This year both the House and Senate passed their own reauthorizations; but, unfortunately, negotiations with the Senate have slowed, and it is necessary for us to pass another extension to enable the FAA to continue to operate.

This bill is a short-term extension of FAA funding and programs through September 16 at current levels. This extension also includes important reforms to the Essential Air Service program. These reforms could result in as much as \$20 million in savings for the American taxpayer.

The first reform provision was adopted unanimously by the Senate and is included in its reauthorization bill. That provides that only airports that are 90 miles or more away from a large- or medium-hub airport would be eligible to participate in the Essential Air Service—90 miles away. People can obviously and in most instances would prefer to drive 90 miles rather than take a connecting flight. It seems like a sensible thing. We hadn't thought about it when we passed our original