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 Schultz	
Thompson (PA)		

NOT VOTING—12

Bachmann	Ellison	McDermott
Blumenauer	Giffords	Runyan
Capuano	Gutierrez	Scott (VA)
Castor (FL)	Hinchey	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(l)(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

legislation; the Senate did. We are including their reform. So we are, in effect, acceding to the Senate. In the case of one airport under the current program which is within 90 miles, we are paying a per passenger subsidy of $851, and the nearest hub is 82 miles away. That is a $10 per mile subsidy.

So the second provision dealing with Essential Air Service caps the subsidies for each passenger, in addition to the fares they pay, at $1,000. During this economically difficult time, it is not possible to justify using taxpayer dollars to pay a subsidy of $1,000 per passenger at an EAS airport, and subsidies can frequently exceed that amount. If there are difficulties with that, there is other language that would allow the executive branch to waive this provision.

The EAS provisions included in the extension are limited and sensible reforms that target the most indefensible of the subsidies. If we can't do this, what can we do, especially after 23 or 24 extensions that have been holding the whole program and the efficiency and improvements in the air infrastructure of our country hostage.

The House-passed bill actually phases out the Essential Air Services program for all but Alaska and Hawaii. We are not insisting on that at all. We are modifying that and going along with largely what the Senate itself has been suggesting in this regard. So these provisions are a compromise, and EAS will continue to be discussed as we work to finalize the bill.

As Congress tries to find a way forward to address deficit and long-term debt issues, if we can't put an end to these extravagant subsidies, then we will never be able to rein in spending where really hard decisions are necessary.

Although I continue to hold out hope that we will reach a compromise with the Senate in the near future, it is necessary to pass this extension to provide the FAA with continued funding authority and provide needed EAS reform. Ultimately, we need to get back to the negotiating table to work out a long-term FAA bill. Short-term extensions are not the way to run such an important agency.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2011.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN MICA: I am writing concerning H.R. 2553, the ''Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV'' which is expected to be scheduled for floor consideration this week.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Code. Sections 2 and 3 of this bill amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by extending the current Airport and Airway Trust Fund (AATF) expenditure authority and the associated Federal excise taxes to September 16, 2011. In order to expedite H.R. 2553 for Floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on the bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 2553, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2011.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2553, the ''Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, Part IV.'' The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure recognizes the Committee on Ways and Means has a jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2553, and I appreciate your effort to facilitate consideration of this bill.

I concur with you that forgoing action on H.R. 2553 does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include our letters on H.R. 2553 in the Congressional Record during House Floor consideration of the bill. Again, I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I look forward to working with the Committee on Ways and Means as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2553, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011. This is the 21st extension of the FAA authority to fund airport improvement projects at current levels, through September 16, 2011. Regrettably, unlike all of the prior 20 extensions of the FAA authority, this bill includes a policy rider eliminating Essential Air Service eligibility for 13 airports in small and rural communities.

The issue today is not whether we support the Essential Air Service program or not. We should not be legislating on this extension. We should have a clean extension so we can move it over to the Senate and make certain that the FAA is funded through September 16.

There have been no hearings on proposals to reduce EAS this Congress and no hearings on this bill either. Members with affected communities should be allowed to make their case to the House and offer amendments to the bill that would preserve service to their communities.

Instead, this extension is inviting opposition and creating major problems because the Senate has indicated they will not accept this extension. Policy riders should be left out of the extension and taken up by the House and Senate conferees, if, in fact, we ever have conferees appointed here in the House.

Earlier this year, the House and Senate both approved comprehensive FAA reauthorization bills. In February, the Senate passed the FAA Air Transportation Modernization and Safety Improvement Act by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 87–8. Passage of the Senate bill was widely applauded by both labor and industry stakeholders, and it was estimated the bill would create at least 10,000 jobs.

In contrast, in April of this year, the House passed an extremely controversial H.R. 658 by a vote of 223–196, the narrowest vote margin for House passage of an FAA reauthorization bill in nearly three decades. The bill has been harshly criticized by labor and industry stakeholders because it would undermine aviation safety, slash FAA funding, and destroy good-paying airport construction jobs.

Since Chairman MICA introduced the FAA reauthorization bill, we have been warned and we have warned, actually, that it contains a number of controversial poison pill provisions that seriously jeopardize the enactment of a long-term reauthorization act this year.

The failure to enact a long-term FAA reauthorization act is costing taxpayers millions of dollars and the Nation tens of thousands of good-paying jobs. Short-term stopgap funding authorizations have stymied airport construction, job creation, and the FAA's overall ability to efficiently administer its programs. Further, multiple FAA extension acts have created uncertainty among local airport officials regarding the total amount of Federal funding available this year for airport construction. As a result, State and local airport officials are advancing fewer projects, less new construction is moving forward, and fewer jobs are being created.

Last week the Airports Council International of North America sent a letter stating that if Congress did not extend the airport grant program through September 30, ''safety and security projects will go unfunded and the much needed jobs associated with these projects will not materialize.'' So I am puzzled why the majority would disregard this warning. It is time that we move forward and that we get a clean extension so we in fact can move to conference and get a bill that is agreed upon that we can bring to the floor that can be signed by the President.

For the majority of the House who claims to care about creating jobs, reducing bureaucracy, and listening to the business community, this extension bill goes out of its way to create unnecessary red tape and problems.

The FAA needs the certainty, stability, and direction that a long-term

reauthorization act provides. Further, the American people and the American public deserve a long-term FAA reauthorization act that will create jobs, improve safety, and modernize our infrastructure. We need to stop playing partisan games, quit posturing, and pass a clean extension through September 16, appoint conferees, and in fact reach agreement on a long-term FAA reauthorization bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), chairman of the full Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank our chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, Mr. PETRI, for his leadership. Also Mr. COSTELLO, who formerly chaired the committee and now is the ranking member. I want to thank him for his dedication to our Nation's aviation system, safety. And also Mr. RAHALL. You couldn't ask for better partners. Mr. RAHALL is the Democrat leader of the committee, and we have a great working relationship. We have had a great working relationship to try to move forward legislation like a long-term reauthorization of FAA and other major transportation legislation that has been mired in delay. Quite frankly, my colleagues, I find myself very frustrated being here.

Now, this is the 21st extension. I complimented and don't let me not compliment the staff on both sides. We have great professionals that deal with this.

□ 1350

The Congress is fortunate and the Nation is blessed to have the kind of leadership we have with staff working on these important issues to move what accounts for about 8 to 9 percent of our GDP. That's the aviation industry forward, setting the policy, the programs, the funding formula, all those things these folks are responsible for. And they're good stewards of that responsibility. So I thank them in advance. I also want to thank Senator ROCKEFELLER, Mr. Speaker, and others who have worked with us trying to bring this to a conclusion. KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, the ranking Republican on the Senate side, worked in good faith to try to get this, again, inexcusable delay in passing the long-term reauthorization.

That being said, again, I find myself so frustrated. This is the 21st delay. We have a former chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. PETRI now chairs it. He's been active on this. I was chairman for 6 years of the subcommittee. We were all wanting to do the same thing—and that's move forward with reauthorization.

The irony of this is I chaired the Subcommittee on Aviation in 2003, when we were wrote the last reauthorization. And we did that in some 6 months. And there were controversial provisions. That 4-year bill expired in 2007. We have not passed a reauthorization, even when the other side had humongous numbers in this Chamber and control of the other body. At one point, I think 60 votes to get something done. Nothing was done. Seventeen extensions under their watch. And, quite frankly, I'm embarrassed that this is the fourth extension. But I'm trying to do in 6 or 7 months what couldn't be done in almost 5 years. And we're going to get it done. We're going to get it done one way or the other.

Now, we have also done three what they call clean extensions to move this process forward. And we did need some time. You have to be reasonable because this is a new Congress. The other body, the Senate, passed their bill in February. We passed the first day in April our legislation. And here we find ourselves on the fourth, again, extension, which is regrettable.

All this, I say, my colleagues, could be resolved I think in a matter of an hour. There's been great work and discussions, informal discussions, in what we call preconference, where some of the principles get together and discuss the terms. All these issues are not new. Mr. COSTELLO and I, Mr. Oberstar and I, we had discussed this. In fact, I think the other body took up the pending legislation from last time. My goodness, it was pending for 48 months. So there's no new issues here. Again, we find ourselves stalled in the process.

That being said, I call on the Members to pass this extension. This is a clean extension, except for one change; and it has two parts. The first part deals with Essential Air Service. That's the program that underwrites, again, routes for air service from local communities. This is a program that started at about $50 million a decade ago and now is approaching $200 million. We had a vote here in the House, and we decided to sunset that program, I guess with the exception of two of our exceptional States, Hawaii and Alaska, who have some unique geographic limitations on service. But the other body passed a provision, the Senate, passed a provision that would eliminate service based on distance, I think it's 90 miles, and it affected some 10 communities. Mr. Speaker, I'll insert in the RECORD the 10 communities affected.

So this is language that the other body passed and we are including. Now, I have made one exception, and it affects three airports, three States: Nevada, Montana, and New Mexico. A provision I put in is that no State or no airport operation that has service where the subsidy exceeds a thousand dollars a ticket can receive that subsidy. I don't think that's unreasonable, when we've got from now until the beginning of August to get our Nation's finances together. I want to see folks come down here to vote to continue to see subsidies for more than a thousand. One of these subsidies, and I won't state the State but you can figure it out, is $3,719 per passenger. That's obscene when our country is on the verge of debt crises and disaster.

If I have to take the entire reauthorization and we continue—now this extends through the 16th of September. I'm putting everybody on notice that each time we will pass reauthorization, if we have to do it extension by extension. So we're starting with this small part of what the other body has passed, and I'm adding what I think is a reasonable provision. A thousand-dollar subsidy in itself is almost obscene, if you ask the average Member of Congress. In fact, when I went to the Rules Committee, one of the members on the other side of the aisle was stunned that we were paying those kinds of fees.

Now, don't come here and tell me that we don't legislate on extensions. In fact, the other body put an entire bill, a regional safety legislation, on one of the past 17 extensions. So we've done this before. We need to work together on this. I would implore Members on both sides of the aisle to support this because this is in the people's interest. This has to move forward. I don't know of any other mechanism. I certainly am not going to allow this fiasco to continue and certainly I don't want the FAA to close down at midnight on Friday night. And that won't happen. Essential services will continue. Air traffic controllers will be at their job. There may be some people furloughed. But it is not my fault. It will be the responsibility of the other body, who does not take this up and pass it. They will be furloughing people and putting people out of jobs.

If you want to see people work, then let's pass the FAA bill. It has the Next Generation air traffic control provisions. It has safety provisions in there that are long overdue.

So, again, I'm a bit frustrated. I want the best for the Nation. I want the best for our air traffic control system, our aviation system, and thousands of people who depend—not just working in the Federal Government, but in this important industry—to move forward. Again, I'm so disappointed. But we're going to find one way. I may not be the most powerful Member, I may not be the most intelligent Member, I may not be the highest ranking Member. But I'll tell you what: I am a persistent Member. And we will pass reauthorization one way or another. We're going to get it done. So I appreciate everyone's indulgence in working with me on this project.

SUBSIDIZED EAS COMMUNITIES AND DISTANCES TO NEAREST HUB—BASED ON FY 2009 HUB DATA

[Excludes communities located in Alaska]

EAS Community	Nearest large/medium hub	Miles
Athens, GA	Atlanta Hartsfield-Jackson Int'l, GA (L).	72
Morgantown, WV	Pittsburgh Int'l, PA (M)	75
Jamestown, NY	Buffalo Niagara Int'l (M)	76
Bradford, PA	Buffalo Niagara Int'l (M)	77
Hagerstown, MD/Martinsburg, WV.	Washington Dulles Int'l, VA (L)	78
Jonesboro, AR	Memphis Int'l, TN (M)	82
Johnstown, PA	Pittsburgh Int'l, PA (M)	84
Oil City/Franklin, PA	Pittsburgh Int'l, PA (M)	85
Lancaster, PA	Philadelphia Int'l, PA (L)	86
Jackson, TN	Memphis Int'l, TN (M)	86

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. I commend our ranking member, Mr. COSTELLO, Chairman MICA, Subcommittee Chairman PETRI, my senior Senator, JAY ROCKEFELLER, in the other body and his ranking member, KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, for the tremendous efforts they have put in this legislation and so much other legislation important for our infrastructure in this country. I recognize that those on the majority, their heart is in the right place. Perhaps those whose pay grade is above them have different opinions and different agendas on this legislation. And perhaps that's the reason why we need to appoint conferees, as the other body has done, and move forward and let the normal process work its will in this legislation.

But instead, we're here to consider the 21st short-term extension of FAA programs and authority and the fourth short-term extension this Congress, as our chairman has just stated. Twenty-one extensions. It's now old enough to drink. Instead of celebrating, however, this should give all cause for concern. This past Saturday marked the 100th day since the Senate appointed conferees on long-term reauthorization. The sun has risen and set over the Capitol more than 200 times since then. House and Senate negotiators have boiled down the remaining issues to just a few.

□ 1400

But the House Republican leadership still has not appointed conferees to move this process forward, despite the fact that, as Chairman MICA has acknowledged to the press late last week and even in his comments here today, the remaining differences are so few they could be resolved by conferees in 20 minutes. So I ask: What is the Republican leadership waiting for?

We find ourselves now faced with the need for a 21st extension. Unlike the three other extensions this Chamber has passed this year, this extension contains a policy rider that would cut 13 small and rural communities from the Essential Air Service program.

There have been no hearings on proposals, as Ranking Member COSTELLO has stated, to reduce EAS and no hearings on this proposal in particular. That said, I would note for the record that the provision of this extension dealing with EAS is an improvement over the proposal in the House-passed reauthorization bill that would have cut the EAS program altogether for the lower 48 States.

There's no question that a sunset of the program would not pass the Senate and be enacted, and at least my Republican colleagues have stepped back from the brink on that particular proposal. However, I am disappointed that instead of appointing conferees to address the future of the EAS program and other outstanding issues in this long-term reauthorization, my Republican colleagues have instead chosen to force a major policy provision into an otherwise clean FAA extension bill at the last minute.

Holding hostage the negotiations is not the way to move the reauthorization process forward. In fact, it is almost guaranteed to set us back in our efforts to work with the other body and reach agreement on a long-term reauthorization.

I object to the tactics used by my Republican friends and colleagues, and I implore them to act in good faith, appoint conferees, and work toward enactment of a long-term reauthorization bill that will put Americans to work and improve the safety of our skies.

Mr. PETRI. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you so much for yielding again.

The question has been brought up to try to shift the responsibility for, again, the possibility of the other body's not acting here to the question of the Republicans not appointing conferees.

I might point out just for the record that in the 110th Congress—this is for an entire 2 years—the Senate never passed an FAA reauthorization bill, so we never even got to preconference. We never got to the issue. So they never appointed conferees. There was a bill passed. And, again, huge majorities on both sides.

In the 111th Congress, the House and Senate passed FAA reauthorizations and preconferenced for 5 months without naming conferees. They never named any conferees.

This process of preconferencing is part of the bipartisan nature of our committee and our work and bicameral discussions. As I said, they've been excellent. The staff has been working well. These aren't new issues. The other side controlled the process for some 4 years. The bills have been out there for some time.

I have the commitment from the leadership, when we are ready to go and having resolved most of the issues, and, again, there are only a couple and everyone knows what they are, I think that they can fall in place. But we need the leadership of the other body, in fact, the leader of the other body, to step forward and act in a responsible manner in dealing with me or the leadership of the House or someone in responding to a major impediment that we have to move this process forward. Then our leadership has said they will appoint conferees. We can sit down, resolve those issues in a public forum, and pass this. We could do that tomorrow.

So, again, it's not the question of appointing conferees. And if I have to take more strident measures to get this job done, we're going to get the job done one way or the other, as I said.

Now, I had a Republican ask me to modify the language that the Senate passed before the Rules Committee. There's a tape. You can all see it; it's part of the RECORD. And I said, No, I don't want to do that. I want to take what the Senate passed. The only difference here in the Essential Air Service is that I provided language that says that if you get more than a $1,000 subsidy that affects three airports, that will not be allowed. That's the only thing standing between us and shutting down part of our Federal Aviation Administration.

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield myself 10 seconds just to make a point to the chairman.

The 5-month period that he referred to, one, the Republicans in the Senate, as he knows, blocked our ability to appoint conferees. In particular, the Senators from Tennessee put a hold on it until the Colgan families made their point to let the hold move forward.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the former chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This used to be a legislative body. I'm not quite sure what it is now.

The way, traditionally, the House and the Senate resolve differences is the House and the Senate each pass a bill—most people learn this in their high school civics class. Then each side appoints conferees and they get together and hash through the differences. I've actually served on some of those conference committees. I've actually voted across the aisle on some provisions of bills in those conference committees.

But not now. What they're saying here is, after they have worked out all the differences with the Senate and only in the way that their bill passed the House—that is, my way or the highway, or, my way or your plane's grounded, however you want to look at it—then they will appoint conferees to a meaningless conference on something that's already agreed to and then we'll come back and pass their bill.

It doesn't work that way. It won't work that way. And this is just not a simple problem, because if the FAA has to close down all of its capital improvement programs—Friday night, very expensive, 4,000 people laid off—thousands of projects across the country that would put construction workers to work and suppliers to work won't happen. So this isn't a no-cost playing games kind of thing that they're doing here.

And what's it all about? The bottom line is it's about whether or not labor should have the right to organize. That is what hung up the bill in the Senate before because they wanted to have a level playing field. We wanted to have a level playing field between providers of railroad and airline services and allow people to actually organize, to be

represented. And, of course, Federal Express hated that, and their two Senators held up the last conference in the last Congress, plain and simple.

Now they're on the same wavelength here. The Republicans here want to overrule the National Labor Relations Board and impose a rule for organizing that says you have to have a majority of people voting and a majority of the majority voting; i.e., if you apply the same rule that they want to the United States House of Representatives, not one Member of this House would have won their election. Not even some people who are in totally partisan districts, Democrat or Republican. No one would have won because no one got a majority of the majority of the votes. That's the rule they want to apply to labor.

So if you want to organize a union, there's 100 people. First off, you've got to get 51 positive votes. Anybody who doesn't vote counts as a negative vote. So if we apply those same things, we would never have Federal elections in this country. You would never be able to elect anybody to anything. And they say, oh, that'll be fair for labor.

That's what's hanging up this bill: their anti-labor fervor, their hatred of working people and their right to organize. It's absolutely obscene that they are going to do that and cost us more jobs by not having a capital improvement program.

Mr. PETRI. I would just point out to my colleagues that the provision that was changed by the National Labor Relations Board to which my colleague referred has been the law of this land for a generation. So it's not anti-labor fervor at all; it's more regular order.

Madam Speaker, how much time does each side have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentleman from Wisconsin has 12½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois has 19¼ minutes remaining.

□ 1410

Mr. PETRI. I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you, my colleagues.

You just heard the comments. Again, I couldn't have a better friend or compatriot on many issues and on many improvements that we've made to transportation on the committee together: Mr. DEFAZIO, the gentleman from Oregon. He said this used to be a legislative body. Yes, it was a legislative body before the other side took over 4 years ago and closed down quite a bit of the process.

Now, has this been an open process on the FAA reauthorization? I submit to you that it has been from the committee.

Go back and check the committee records. We held more votes on this FAA reauthorization in committee than we held probably for the last 6 years—I know certainly for the last 4 years—on that one piece of legislation. On the floor, we had an open process. I think there were some 30 amendments, and 23, I believe, were made in order. So, unless they were duplicative or the Rules Committee took them out, it was an open process as opposed to a closed process with closed rules that, again, we had on major pieces of legislation for some time. So this has been an open process.

The House is going to act. The House is going to pass this. If we have to pass additional extensions, as I said, with the rest of the reauthorization piece by piece, then we are going to pass a reauthorization to set the policy, the programs, the projects, and the priorities for our aviation industry and for FAA. The only projects that will be stopped are projects for which, if the other body doesn't act on this extension, they will be responsible for.

The only difference in the extension—and we gave them three clean extensions, and this is a clean extension with their provision that passed with their language unanimously in the other body—is that I added three States—actually, three airports—that subsidized in excess of $1,000 per ticket, per passenger.

Again, when the Nation is going down the tubes almost literally because of debt, we can't make one little, tiny change and move this process forward? keep people working? put safety provisions that are in this reauthorization that we don't have now and move forward with it? There is something wrong.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me thank the leadership on the committee and then simply appeal to my chairman, Mr. MICA, to come and reason together, because this has been a committee that has had a history of reasoning together. Without my standing here and going through it, you are very aware of what the most objectionable part of this extension is.

If we are serious about passing an extension, let's pass the extension and deal with the other issues at another time. Yes, it has been since 2007, and it has been because of the battling back and forth. You're either pro-labor or anti-labor, but we are ruining the lives of workers. We are subjecting safety to the whims, and we are messing up projects and wasting money by allowing this bickering to continue.

I would simply appeal to our chairman to please come to the table, and let's pass a clean extension bill.

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

Madam Speaker, I just thought, as long as we were spending some time talking about the modest cleaning up of the series of, kind of, earmarks that have accumulated over the years in the Essential Air Service program, which was referred to by the chairman of the committee as a program that started out as a true essential air service to help provide access to the outside world to very isolated communities, it has gradually been kind of earmarked, going from $50 million to some $200 million in cost. They're not isolated, but they are subsidized. God knows why.

Let me just mention a few of the areas that would be affected by these modest changes: that it has to be more than 90 miles from another airport and, secondly, that we try to cap the subsidy, unless it's varied somewhat by the Secretary, at $1,000 per seat, per flight.

One that would be affected that is currently being subsidized is Jonesboro, Arkansas. It's 82 miles from Memphis. You can't drive 82 miles, and you want the Federal Government to provide service?

Athens, Georgia, is 72 miles from Atlanta, and it's getting subsidized.

We're worrying about billions of dollars of subsidies. If we can't even do this, where do we start? They say a big journey starts with a single step, and we're not willing to take even in this small area the most modest of steps.

Harristown, Maryland, which is north of here, is 78 miles from the Dulles Airport. It's getting a subsidy of over $800 per flight, and it's right near Baltimore as well.

There is Glendive, Montana, which is 60 miles from another essential airport in Montana. It's just 60 miles. You could drive over to Sidney—but no, they're asking for a $1,357 subsidy, per passenger, flying from Glendive under this program.

Alamogordo, New Mexico, is 89 miles from a hub airport in El Paso, but instead of driving 89 miles, there continues to be a $1,500 subsidy. You can rent a car. This is a profligate, hard-to-defend use of the taxpayers' money, yet people are talking about closing the government down or the FAA down unless they can spend $1,500 to subsidize a flight when you can drive 89 miles to another airport.

This is what we're talking about, and this is why my constituents and many others are wondering when we're going to get serious out here about taking the modest steps to get our financial affairs and our stewardship of the Federal taxpayers' money under better control.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the debt limit isn't the only deadline that is upon us. Here we are, facing Friday—D-day for the Nation's aviation system. This is the third Congress where our committee has passed this bill. Most of the sections of the bill do not have major disagreement. But, now, we are going for a bare 2-month extension.

On the policy rider, all I've got to say is, why make it more difficult when

you know that when it goes to the other body, it's either going to be stripped out or we're going to be facing another terrible deadline.

I appreciate that negotiations have been going on all along with staff. I do believe, though, that the failure of the majority to appoint conferees is a problem with this bill because, once members are appointed, it seems to me that sends another signal and gets another set of people in it to move the bill. So the conferees do matter and should have been appointed.

These are difficult issues, and they shouldn't be left to linger: Next Generation Air Transportation.

□ 1420

If we don't modernize our air transportation, we're going to be left behind even developing countries. Runway safety. We've had collisions on runways at airports right here where there are major airports. Aircraft noise, and we always have this issue, of whether or not the perimeter rule is going to be extended or violated again. Well, you know, I oppose increases of the perimeter rule, but I oppose even more not sitting down to figure it out with conferees at the table.

We've got the air ambulance operation issues, the oversight of foreign carriers and, of course, the notorious national mediation board issue, where what constitutes a majority could only be an issue in this Congress. Is it the majority of votes cast, or is the majority of those in the class or in the whole group? If it's a majority of votes cast, then, of course, it's what all of us in the Congress use every 2 years to get elected.

There are matters in this bill that the Congress has to do anyway that would be especially useful to do now as we recover from the Great Recession.

We should pass this bill providing jobs, which is something we have to do anyway, now, when it would count, would matter very much to the entire country. Let's reauthorize the entire bill and quit short-term extensions.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois has 15¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. PETRI. I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, the chair of the Aviation Subcommittee went through the list of the airports that are within 90 miles that would be affected by the provisions of this extension.

Now, all of those 10 airports were included in an amendment and a provision that's in the Senate bill and passed unanimously. The only difference, and he spoke briefly to one of them, again is the provision that I put in putting a restriction on paying more than a thousand dollars per ticket, per passenger subsidy. Those subsidies start in Montana at one airport with $1,357.

Another airport, one airport in New Mexico, has a subsidization per ticket per passenger of $1,563.

Now the granddaddy, the big enchilada in this whole thing is one airport in Nevada. Every ticket is subsidized $3,719.

Now you're telling me that they are going to close down parts of the FAA to preserve this subsidy when this Nation is on the verge of a financial debt crisis unheard of in the history of our Nation.

So, again, I've tried to deal on a bipartisan, bicameral basis working with folks to get this done. Twenty-one extensions over 4 years. I'm not adding an entire bill. I'm adding that one provision. The other side added in one of their extensions an entire bill.

The other language Mr. PETRI spoke to was 10 airports that are within the distance of 90 miles that the Senate passed unanimously. So it's not like I am taking some language.

A Republican tried to change that in the Rules Committee, and I recommended against it. And we did not change it because, again, I want to have language that the Senate passed.

So that's what we boil down to on the eve of a crisis with FAA, on the eve of a crisis with our Nation's finances, we're going to come and vote here. And I want people to go back and say, ''I voted for a $3,700 subsidy for air service for one passenger for one ticket.'' I want to see that list of names.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, at this time I would yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I rise today in continued opposition to the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, H.R. 2553. I will continue to oppose the FAA reauthorization until the FAA rethinks their ill-advised redesign for the airspace around New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia.

I have opposed this airspace redesign from day one, along with some of my Republican colleagues in New Jersey as well, and have thwarted its implementation every step of the way.

Time and time again, the FAA has pursued the airspace redesign while ignoring the concerns of my constituents in Rockland County, New York. The FAA created their proposal with zero input from the very people whose lives would be most harmed by the proposal. In fact, even when we brought this up to the FAA, they had to be dragged kicking and screaming into holding a public forum in Rockland County. This plan, which will only save minutes on flight time, will disrupt the lives of thousands of residents in my district in Rockland County in New York and in northern New Jersey who live under the new flight plans.

As my constituents have noted to me, the noise and air pollution in the area will increase. It is unknown how this increase in air pollution will affect the disproportionate rate of childhood asthma in my district. The modernization of our aviation system is necessary to bring it into the 21st century, to keep pace with the increased number of flights, and to also maintain our technological advancements by implementing new equipment to keep our system the safest in the world.

However, there are several alternatives to this plan, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposition to this reauthorization. Not only are we going to have planes going into Newark Airport fly directly over my constituents, but now there are other paths of planes coming in from JFK airport as well.

This is government at its worst running roughshod over the people that it's supposed to serve, not taking any kind of input. In fact, they come up with a redesign plan. And then when it's challenged, the person who decides the challenge was the very author of the redesign plan to begin with. Sounds like a kangaroo court to me.

So I am going to continue to oppose these things. I think at a time when we're all talking about government spending less and being more sensitive, this is a good place to start. And I will continue to oppose the FAA reauthorization until the FAA halts and revises their deeply flawed airspace redesign plan for New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, we heard from Chairman MICA, who we have worked with very closely. He has done, I think, his very best up to this point to try and get an FAA reauthorization bill both out of the House and to the point where we can get it to a conference committee.

So he said he is very frustrated with the process. We are very frustrated with the process. And today the extension that the majority is offering even frustrates us more because we know that this is an extension, not a clean extension, but it has a rider on it involving Essential Air Services.

The debate today and the discussion about this extension is not about Essential Air Service. Some members may support Essential Air Service, others may not support it. There's been a lot said on the floor today about subsidizing a $3,000 subsidy per ticket. Just for the record, we are not debating that. That is to be taken up by conferees if we ever get to conference. Members can, in fact, have their opportunity to make changes in the EAS program at that time. It should not be a part of this extension.

But for the record let me say that in reference to an airport that was mentioned in Montana, it is actually 607 miles from Denver, to the Denver airport. So if you live in that community, it's not just a short drive to get in a rental car and drive to the Denver Airport. Also, the Nevada airport that was

referenced from Salt Lake City, you are talking 234 miles. And the list goes on and on.

□ 1430

So that's an issue that we can debate at the appropriate time. Some changes may need to be made to the Essential Air Service program. But I think also we need to keep in mind, we're not just talking about passengers getting from point A to point B when there's hundreds and hundreds of miles to get to the nearest large hub airport to catch a flight, but we're also talking about moving medical supplies, donor organs, and a number of other things. So it's not just passengers.

And let me also say, my friend Mr. MICA mentioned as well that we've had an open process here. Well, in fact, we have not. The process has not been open on this extension. In fact, the majority dropped the bill on Friday without consulting the minority. They did not consult with us about what may be in the extension. In addition to that, they went to Rules Committee and asked for a closed rule so that no Member who might be affected by this legislation or might have an Essential Air Service airport in their district that may want to go to the Rules Committee and, in fact, get an open rule or come to the floor to debate the merits of keeping their airport on the EAS program, they did not have that opportunity because the majority asked for a closed rule.

Had the majority come to us in the minority and said, We want a clean extension; we want to move it forward, we wouldn't be here today. We, in fact, would probably have voice voted this extension. It would have gone to the Senate. It would have been voice voted there. And, in fact, we would have been a step closer to making certain that the FAA is able to operate after the deadline on Saturday.

Finally, let me say that we are frustrated because I've heard Chairman MICA say many times and, as the ranking member, Mr. RAHALL, has said, We have worked closely together. We have done everything we can do in order to work together with Mr. MICA and Mr. PETRI in order to get a bill. But I have read reports and I have just heard Mr. MICA say on the floor again today that, you know, we could wrap this conference up in 20 minutes. And he said today we could wrap it up within an hour, that there is only one issue that is remaining.

Just for the record, let me say, if that's the case, we have not been consulted on that one issue. There are several issues. And just for the record, I would say major issues that have not been resolved on our side, on the House side between the majority and minority, let alone with the other body are: one, funding levels; two, Essential Air Service; three is repeal of the National Mediation Board rule; four is the DCA perimeter rule, often referred to as ''slots.''

Other outstanding issues are occupational safety and health protection for flight attendants, the 3-hour rule for tarmac delays, the lithium battery issue, and the aircraft activity disclosure to the public, the BARR program. And I have a list of other things to our knowledge that have not been resolved.

So when the chairman or others say that we could wrap this up in 20 minutes or in 1 hour, I don't believe that is the case. In fact, I know it's not the case. We have not been consulted or negotiated to the extent that we could reach an agreement among ourselves on the House side, let alone with our colleagues over in the other body. So let me just say that it's a disappointment to me.

We have worked closely together to move the FAA extension on a permanent basis. We are here on Wednesday. The FAA extension, in fact, will expire—the FAA will have to lay off employees this Saturday if, in fact, this extension is not approved by both bodies and sent to the President. And the Senate has already told us that they are not going to accept this extension with this rider, in fact, in the extension. They will approve the clean extension. And it's my understanding the other body is going to pass a clean extension and send it over here sometime today or by the end of the week.

It would be my hope that the majority would, in fact, accept a clean extension so that the FAA can continue to serve the flying public and do all of the things that are essential to keeping the safest aviation system in the world as safe as possible so that we can begin to try and get a permanent bill and a long-term bill as well.

Finally, I would conclude by saying that we need to appoint conferees. The Senate has passed their bill in February of this year. We have passed our bill in April. And we are here now in the latter part of July, and Chairman MICA is saying that all of these issues have been resolved but one, and we do not even have conferees appointed. So I would just encourage the leadership—Ranking Member RAHALL. And I have sent a letter to the Speaker and to the leadership and to the majority saying, Look, let's appoint conferees. The Senate has appointed conferees.

The only opportunity we had to appoint conferees in the last Congress was, in fact, stifled and held up by the Senate and, frankly, by two Senators from the State of Tennessee over one issue.

Let's get the nonsense behind us. There are things in the Essential Air program that I would like to see changed. There are things in the bill that I would like to see us reach an agreement on. The only way to do that is to get an extension passed so the FAA can get past Saturday and operate until September 16. It will give us an opportunity to appoint conferees so that we can meet with the conferees who have already been appointed in the other body to reach a permanent agreement.

The American people deserve better than what they're getting today on the floor of this House, and the American people deserve to know that we, in fact, are doing everything that we can to move forward to keep the safest aviation system in the world exactly that—the leader in safety around the world.

So with that, I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this extension in the hopes that we could pass a clean extension.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, let me just conclude by urging my colleagues to support this 21st extension with a very, very modest change from a purely clean extension in that it yields to the Senate for a provision that's included in the Senate bill to eliminate, quote-unquote, ''Essential Air Service for airports within 90 miles of another airport.''

We've talked about the individual flight subsidy. Let me just look at this issue from another point of view to make it perfectly clear what we are talking about.

Eight of the 10 airports that would be affected are because they are within 90 miles of a hub airport. So that makes it much more convenient to just drive over. And what's the subsidy to each airport each year? Let me just mention it: Athens, Georgia, over $1 million of Federal money so that people don't have to drive 72 miles. We have Morgantown, West Virginia, right near the Pittsburgh hub, nearly $1.5 million. The same thing with Hagerstown, over $1 million so you don't have to drive 70-some miles to Dulles. Jonesboro, Arkansas, gets an $800,000 subsidy when it is right next to the Memphis International Airport. The same thing, $1.6 million going to Johnstown, Pennsylvania, which is 84 miles from the Pittsburgh International Airport. Franklin/Oil City is getting a subsidy of nearly $1 million a year. They are 85 miles from the Pittsburgh International Airport. Lancaster, Pennsylvania, nearly $1.4 million, also by Pittsburgh. And Jackson, Tennessee, $1.2 million in Federal taxpayer money, which is only 86 miles from the Memphis International Airport.

It's hardly essential use of Federal taxpayer money to provide nonessential, subsidized airport service for people who could otherwise drive in an hour, hour and a half to a hub airport that most of the people in the area probably are doing already. So it's a very modest step. We are just doing what the Senate provides. I would urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2553, the Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011. This bill would add controversial policy riders that have not been negotiated and would cause undue harm to critical FAA programs that support thousands of public and private sector jobs. I urge my colleagues to pass a clean FAA extension so that capital accounts

which support Grants-in-Aid for Airports, Facilities and Equipment can continue to remain functional. Without this much needed funding stream these programs would be shut down, and approximately 4,000 employees would be furloughed. With a 9.2% unemployment rate nationwide Congress must act in a bipartisan manner to help stabilize and enhance job creation. Again I urge my colleagues to come to a reasonable consensus and support a clean extension of airport and airway funding.

Mr. PETRI. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 357, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1440

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RAHALL. Yes, I am opposed to the bill.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rahall of West Virginia moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2553, to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 7. BAGGAGE FEES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) FEES.—No air carrier may charge any fee for the transport of 4 or fewer items of baggage checked by a member of the Armed Forces who is—

(1) traveling in scheduled air transportation on official military orders; and

(2) being deployed on or returning from an overseas contingency operation.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''baggage'' does not include an item whose weight exceeds 80 pounds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, in June, the American public learned that a major U.S. airline greeted a group of Army soldiers who were returning home from the front lines in Afghanistan with a bill for almost $3,000, or $200 apiece for each soldier to check four bags on a scheduled domestic flight. Americans were rightly outraged by the incident, which was explained in a YouTube video posted by one of our troops. In the video, one soldier notes that his fourth bag, for which he was charged $200, contained an M–4 carbine rifle, a grenade launcher and a 9-millimeter pistol, ''the tools I used to protect myself and Afghan citizens while I was deployed.''

A spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars told the Associated Press the fees were ''the worst welcome home any soldier could receive. The shock of even being charged is enough to make most service men and women simply shake their heads and wonder who or what it is they are protecting.''

Members of the Armed Forces who are serving our country on the front lines should not endure personal financial hardship when they are traveling to or returning from war zones. Yet, the media's reporting of the incident last month showed that major U.S. carriers were applying the same or similar policies across the board. Airlines were charging soldiers to check four reasonably sized bags and were profiting at the expense of the brave men and women of the Armed Forces who were going to or coming home from war.

This amendment, this motion to recommit, prohibits U.S. air carriers from charging soldiers for up to four bags of checked baggage. It applies to bags that weigh 80 pounds or less and is consistent with many airlines' published policies.

I urge my colleagues, in a bipartisan fashion, as they should, to support this amendment. If the amendment is adopted, it will not kill the bill. The House will vote on the bill immediately after this amendment is adopted.

This motion recognizes a tremendous debt of our gratitude owed by the United States to the men and women of our Armed Forces. Members of the Armed Forces who are going to the front lines or coming home from a war zone should not be given a bill with their boarding passes.

I urge my colleagues to join me in ensuring that our Nation's airlines treat our warriors with the respect they deserve for defending our country. This should be a bipartisan, overwhelming ''yes.''

And I close by saying, vote for our veterans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. I withdraw my point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. CRAVAACK. I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Madam Speaker, I think it is absolutely outrageous what happened to those soldiers. As a military officer for 24 years, and as an airline pilot for 17 years, I think it is absolutely heinous what happened to those soldiers. Quite frankly, it's outrageous. And I think we should ask Chairman MICA for open debate on this issue. It's something that definitely should be taken a look into.

As a matter of fact, I think it is so critical I will ask Chairman MICA to make sure that this never happens to another United States servicemember.

But, unfortunately, Madam Chairman, we're bringing this up on a motion to recommit. My question would be, why didn't we bring this up earlier, this act? We should be debating this when——

Mr. RAHALL. Will the gentleman yield on his question?

Mr. CRAVAACK. Just a moment, sir, and I will yield.

We should have opened this up when we had open committee, and this should have been brought up then. But not now, in the motion to recommit, when we have FAA jobs on the line, and we need to get this bill moved forward.

I look forward to engaging in that debate a little bit further on, and I look forward to working with you and ensuring that this does not happen again, but now is not the time. We need to investigate this a little bit later on.

I yield to the gentleman fron West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. In response to the gentleman's question asked a few seconds ago, it was a closed rule. There was no way we could have brought this up in the amendment process. The gentleman's party controls the rules of this body and controls the legislative debate.

Mr. CRAVAACK. Reclaiming my time, we did have an FAA open debate, Madam Speaker, and we could have brought this up at this time.

Mr. RAHALL. If the gentleman would continue to yield, the incident did not occur until after the markup of this bill, by the way.

Mr. CRAVAACK. We should not be opening this at this time on a motion to recommit. I will fully work with the other side in trying to make sure that this does not happen again to another soldier, and I look forward to that discussion, but having it right now is a little bit disingenuous on this FAA reauthorization.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Madam 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 passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 233, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 610]

YEAS—187

Ackerman	Becerra	Brady (PA)
Altmire	Berkley	Braley (IA)
Andrews	Berman	Brown (FL)
Baca	Bishop (GA)	Butterfield
Baldwin	Bishop (NY)	Capps
Barrow	Boren	Cardoza
Bass (CA)	Boswell	Carnahan

Carney
Carson (IN)
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kind
Kissell
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Platts
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—233

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Amash
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Bachmann
Blumenauer
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Ellison
Giffords
Hinchey
Hoyer
Payne
Pelosi
Runyan
Young (AK)

□ 1513

Messrs. STEARNS, STUTZMAN, PEARCE, MARCHANT, CANTOR, and ROSKAM changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. WELCH, DOGGETT, SCHRADER, RICHMOND, BISHOP of Georgia, OLVER, and BERMAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RAHALL. Madam 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 243, noes 177, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 611]

AYES—243

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—177

Ackerman
Altmire
Amash
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.

Kaptur	Napolitano	Scott (VA)
Keating	Neal	Scott, David
Kildee	Olver	Sensenbrenner
Kind	Pallone	Serrano
Kucinich	Pascrell	Sherman
Langevin	Pastor (AZ)	Shuler
Larsen (WA)	Paul	Sires
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Slaughter
Lee (CA)	Peters	Smith (WA)
Levin	Peterson	Speier
Lewis (GA)	Pingree (ME)	Stark
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Sutton
Loebsack	Quigley	Thompson (CA)
Lowey	Rahall	Thompson (MS)
Luján	Rangel	Thompson (PA)
Lynch	Rehberg	Tierney
Maloney	Reyes	Tonko
Markey	Richardson	Towns
Matsui	Richmond	Tsongas
McCarthy (NY)	Ross (AR)	Van Hollen
McCollum	Rothman (NJ)	Velázquez
McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Walz (MN)
McKinley	Rush	Wasserman Schultz
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Waters
Meeks	Sánchez, Linda T.	Watt
Michaud	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Miller (NC)	Sarbanes	Welch
Miller, George	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
Moore	Schiff	Woolsey
Moran	Schrader	Wu
Murphy (CT)	Schwartz	Yarmuth
Nadler		

NOT VOTING—12

Bachmann	Ellison	Payne
Blumenauer	Giffords	Pelosi
Capuano	Hinchey	Runyan
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANKFORD) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1523

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 2596, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012

Mr. WOLF, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–169) on the bill (H.R. 2596) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

APPROVING RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS AGAINST BURMA

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 66) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 66

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress approves the renewal of the import restrictions contained in section 3(a)(1) and section 3A (b)(1) and (c)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This joint resolution shall be deemed to be a ''renewal resolution'' for purposes of section 9 of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

SEC. 2. PAYGO COMPLIANCE.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled ''Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation'' for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This joint resolution shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this joint resolution or July 26, 2011, whichever occurs earlier.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this joint resolution, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 66, which would continue the imposition of sanctions against the repressive regime in Burma for another year.

The purpose of imposing sanctions against Burma is to promote democracy and respect for human rights and improve living conditions for the Burmese people. Unfortunately, the ruling junta is still dedicated to working against, not toward, those objectives. For that reason I am in favor of continuing our practice of extending import sanctions against Burma for another year.

Burma's regime is one of the world's most repressive and continues to oppress democratic movements and humanitarianism. On November 7, 2010, the military junta, known, ironically, as the State Peace and Development Council, or SPDC, held an election for the first time in 20 years. However, while elections are usually considered a step towards democracy, in this case it was actually a step backwards. These elections were not transparent, inclusive, or credible.

Notably, Burma's leading pro-democracy party, the National League for Democracy, as well as others, was not allowed to participate in the elections. And by ensuring that most candidates were former high-ranking government and military officials, the election ''victory'' by the government-backed Union Solidarity and Development Party simply means that the military junta remained in control with the veneer of an election to simply justify itself.

Shortly following the elections, Aung San Suu Kyi—freedom fighter, Nobel Peace Prize recipient and Congressional Gold Medal winner, and general secretary of the NLD—was finally released after having been falsely detained for 15 of the past 21 years.

However, in a move highlighting how little things have changed in Burma, the junta recently warned Suu Kyi that ''there may be chaos and riots'' if she continues on her cross-country tour to meet with supporters. The government also chided Suu Kyi and the NLD for their political work and threatened that ''they should stop doing so to avert unnecessary consequences.'' On Suu Kyi's last tour in 2003, she was attacked by a pro-government mob that killed many of her followers and landed her under house arrest for the next 7 years.

In short, the recent election does not represent any kind of shift in domestic Burmese politics. In fact, the political situation in Burma and for the Burmese people has not changed at all.

The human rights situation is no better. The State Department human rights report on Burma, echoed by the March United Nations Human Rights Council Resolution, cites a laundry list of grave human rights violations that are simply appalling. According to the State Department, this repugnant regime, in which military officers wield the ultimate authority at every level of government, continues to use forced labor, denies participation in any democratic processes, and commits extrajudicial killings. The regime detains civic activists indefinitely and without charge, and it engages in harassment, abuse, and detention of human rights and pro-democracy activists. The regime is rumored to hold an estimated 2,100 political prisoners.