

they need more and more folks there to make our civil aeronautics system work properly.

The amendment would conflict with recommendations just passed a few months ago by the NOTAM working group for improvement of that act, and that was passed just 2 months ago. So I have to cite those same reasons for opposing the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I continue to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chair, briefly, in response to my colleague from Tennessee, the majority of FAA NOTAMs do not originate from outside agencies. This is a fraction of a fraction of all NOTAMs, and it is only those that will be affected by this amendment.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, this is not what some who oppose it would say. This is, in fact, a very minor one, but it comes with specific requirements that exist for a reason. Agencies have chosen and actually embarrass the FAA by asking for a closing of airspace only to find out in the light of day, in a matter of days that, in fact, it was a huge mistake—sometimes politically driven. It doesn't matter why. The FAA has the right and the responsibility, and all we ask for is when it comes from an outside agency that it, in fact, have a once-over before being codified.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. ISSA is a worthy adversary, but it is still 40-love.

Mr. Chair, I ask everybody to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1515

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OBERNOLTE) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Deirdre Kelly, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

SECURING GROWTH AND ROBUST LEADERSHIP IN AMERICAN AVIATION ACT

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ROSE). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in part A of House Report 118-147.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. ____ DESIGNATIONS FOR MEAT AND FOOD PROCESSING FACILITIES.

Section 2209 of the FAA Extension, Safety, and Security Act of 2016 (49 U.S.C. 44802 note) is further amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(C), by adding at the end the following:

“(v) A concentrated animal feeding operation.

“(vi) An eligible meat and food processing facility.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) ELIGIBLE MEAT AND FOOD PROCESSING FACILITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘eligible meat and food processing facility’ means a facility that—

“(1) is an establishment operated under Federal meat inspection pursuant to the Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 71 et seq.), and—

“(A) with respect to cattle, has a slaughter capacity of greater than 500 animals per day; or

“(B) with respect to pork and sheep, has a slaughter capacity of greater than 1,000 animals per day;

“(2) is an official establishment operated under Federal poultry inspection pursuant to the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 453) and, with respect to poultry, has a slaughter capacity of greater than 10,000 animals per day;

“(3) is an official plant operated under Federal egg inspection pursuant to the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1033) with at least 500,000 laying hens;

“(4) is a facility that processes (e.g., washes, grades, packs) shell eggs for the table egg market with at least 500,000 laying hens; or

“(5) is a facility that manufactures or processes food located in any of the State or Territories and operated under section 415(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 350d(c)).”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JACKSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, my amendment will help to safeguard the privacy of America's farmers and ranchers that work day and night to produce the food the world relies on.

This amendment would give our agricultural producers and food processors the opportunity to impose unmanned aircraft restrictions around their operations upon a formal request to prevent drones unauthorized access to their land.

In 2016, Congress created a process by which critical infrastructure facilities can impose restrictions on drone flights around their operations.

The Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency designates the food and agriculture sector as a critical infrastructure sector, which is so vital to the United States that its success is imperative to our national security and our economic security.

In the event of an emergency situation or disaster, protection of our agricultural land across the country is going to be vital.

Intelligence officials have even gone so far to warn that America's agriculture industry has been targeted by suspicious drone activity, potentially by domestic terrorists or other bad actors.

Food security is national security, plain and simple.

This amendment would ensure that we give our farmers, ranchers, and food producers the same ability to restrict the use of drones around these facilities that we give to amusement parks, outdoor facilities, and a variety of other interests that do not have similar national security implications.

Mr. Chair, I urge every Member in this body to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, this amendment would add animal feeding operations and meat and food processing facilities to a growing list of sites over which the FAA will restrict drone flights.

These restrictions that currently exist are intended to be used for facilities where overhead drone activity would present a potential public safety and security concern—critical infrastructures like energy and oil facilities and State prisons.

There is no practical reason why animal agriculture facilities should qualify for this kind of restriction, particularly when having that restriction might endanger energy and oil facilities. These facilities do not involve sensitive or potentially hazardous operations as energy and oil facilities and State prisons do.

These restrictions already exist to ensure the safety of such facilities, facility workers, and the public.

The designation is not intended to be used to inhibit First Amendment rights, protect intellectual property, or help facilities avoid accountability.

Allowing such exceptions is a slippery slope in restricting First Amendment rights as the national airspace is public space.

This would delay FAA rulemaking to create these public safety restrictions by several months or years, sacrificing public safety to shield meat processing facilities and possibly endangering time that could better be spent with energy and oil facilities and State prisons.

I urge Members to side with public safety, energy and oil facilities, and

State prisons and vote “no” on this amendment.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I will point out that this amendment is structured and written in such a way that this does not apply to all agricultural and food production facilities. It only applies to the very few largest operations in the United States, the ones that, in fact, supply 80 percent of the food production in this country.

There is a national security risk here. We talk at length in this Chamber all the time about how agriculture is becoming a national security issue.

Mr. Chair, I encourage all of the Members in the House to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I will close in reciting the previous argument that this is not about protecting public safety and that First Amendment rights would be violated.

I looked back to see my crowd here, to see how we would win this voice vote, and it looks very daunting. I feel a little bit like Davy Crockett at the Alamo. Nevertheless, I continue to voice my opposition, and I ask my colleagues who are here to vote “no.”

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JACKSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. KEAN OF NEW JERSEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in part A of House Report 118-147.

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:
SEC. _____. AIR STATISTIC REPORTS.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall ensure that the Bureau of Transportation Statistics revises and maintains Technical Reporting Directive No. 31 (14 C.F.R. Part 234) to provide that the following events are not included within the air carrier codes specified in such Directive:

(1) Aircraft cleaning necessitated by such incidents as the death of a passenger, excessive bleeding, service animal (SVAN) soiling, and extensive debris left by customers.

(2) Aircraft damage caused by extreme weather, bird strike, foreign object debris (FOD), sabotage, and other similar causes.

(3) Awaiting the arrival of connecting passengers or crew due to weather or local or National Airspace System logistics.

(4) Awaiting the results of an unexpected alcohol test of a crewmember caused by the suspicion or accusation of a customer.

(5) Awaiting gate space due to congestion not within the carrier's control, including the utilization of common gates or uncontrollable gate returns resulting from constraints of the National Airspace System.

(6) A baggage or cargo loading delay caused by an outage of a bag system not controlled by a carrier, including wind affecting ramp conditions, late connecting bags resulting from an air traffic controller delay, airport infrastructure failure, and similar causes.

(7) Cabin servicing or catering delays due to weather or wind.

(8) Vendor computer outages, cybersecurity attacks (provided that the carrier is in compliance with applicable cybersecurity regulations), or issues related to the use of airport-supplied communications equipment (such as common-use gates and terminals, power outage, and lighting).

(9) Availability of crew related to hours flown, rest periods, and on-duty times not caused by a carrier, including a delay of a crew replacement or reserve necessitated by a non-controllable event, and pilot or flight attendant rest related to weather, air traffic controller, or local logistics.

(10) An unscheduled engineering or safety inspection.

(11) Public health issues.

(12) Fueling delays related to weather or airport fueling infrastructure issues, including the inoperability of a fuel farm or unusable fuel which does not meet specified requirements at delivery to an airport due to contamination in the supply chain.

(13) Government systems that are inoperable or otherwise unable to receive forms which have been properly completed by an air carrier.

(14) Overheated brakes resulting from a safety incident, including those resulting from emergency procedures.

(15) Mail from the U.S. Postal Service that was delayed in arrival.

(16) Unscheduled maintenance, including airworthiness issues manifesting outside a scheduled maintenance program and that cannot be deferred or must be addressed before flight.

(17) A medical emergency.

(18) Positive passenger bag match flags that require removal of a bag in order to ensure security.

(19) The removal of an unruly passenger.

(20) Ramp service from a third-party contractor, including servicing of potable water, lavatory servicing, and shortage of third-party ramp equipment.

(21) Snow removal or aircraft de-icing due to the occurrence of extreme weather despite adequate carrier resources, or the removal of snow on ramps.

(22) An airport closure due to such factors as the presence of volcanic ash, wind or wind shear.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, today, pursuant to the authority from Congress, the Department of Transportation requires airlines to report delayed or canceled flights. The rules also require a cause to be listed for the cancellation and delay. Every cancellation or delay must fall into a category of causes, one of which is air carrier.

In practice, many causes of cancellations and delays outside an air carrier's control end up in this category.

In effect, it has become a catchall category. This is a problem because without good data reflecting the causes of cancellations and delays, it is impossible to identify the root causes. If you can't identify the real problems, you can't, as a Member of Congress or a policymaker, craft a good policy solution.

This amendment would require the Secretary to refine the reporting directives to provide more detailed information about the cause of a cancellation or delay, rather than simply dumping them all into a catchall category.

It builds upon the committee's acknowledgment of this obvious problem in section 716 of the bill and is simply a more robust effort to address it.

Any event listed in this amendment such as weather damage, unscheduled safety inspections, volcanic ash, or public health issues would no longer be categorized as carrier-caused.

The mischaracterization of causes endemic to the current system is fixable, and we should take this opportunity to fix it.

If adopted, this amendment will result in greater transparency to the traveling public regarding the cause of a canceled or delayed flight. Better data will allow the Secretary and airlines to develop strategies to mitigate their true causes.

This amendment simply attempts to make sure the Department of Transportation and the FAA are gathering more accurate descriptions of the causes of a canceled or delayed flight, and in turn, will allow the FAA and the airlines to better inform their decisions moving forward.

Just today, the FAA's effort to explain the cause of major day-to-day issues in real time were reported in various news sources.

My amendment will support this goal by improving the data that goes into the system for explaining the causes of delays and cancellations.

I share the FAA's goal of providing better data and more transparency, and this amendment will help provide them with the data they need to identify and to fix the problems that we have all been experiencing through air travel.

Finally, I thank Representative CHAVEZ-DEREMER of Oregon and Representative LARSON of Connecticut for their bipartisan support and for joining me in offering this amendment.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment offered by Representative KEAN, not as an individual from District 9 but as the ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee being given certain responsibilities for that position.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Since the beginning of the pandemic, we have seen a spike in the number of

mass flight cancellations and significant delay events. Some of these events were not completely attributable to the airlines.

The acceleration of the number of worker retirements during the height of the pandemic affected every industry's workforce, and many of the airlines were understandably not prepared for the massive increase in air travel demand as the effects of the pandemic started to dissipate.

This led to the rise in significant delays and cancellations that have affected passengers over the last several years.

This also underscores the importance of the Department of Transportation accurately reporting the on-time performance of flight delays and cancellations so consumers will have a full and accurate picture of what to expect when traveling.

Unfortunately, this amendment would restrict airline service quality performance reporting by removing a host of critical reporting elements.

For example, the amendment would remove airlines' requirements to report delays due to vendor computer outages, including cybersecurity attacks. I know I would like that to continue to be reported, and I assume most of my colleagues would, as well.

This amendment would also remove airlines' requirements to report delays due to crew availability related to hours flown, rest periods, and on-duty times not caused by a carrier. This is something Federal regulators need to understand in order to make effective policy.

Further, this amendment will move airlines' requirements to report delays due to an unscheduled engineering or safety inspection. Again, I want to know when this happens because this is potentially critical information to inform an airline safety management system and can help the FAA understand whether the safety management system is working effectively.

The amendment would also remove the reporting of public health issues so airlines wouldn't need to report delays due to the COVID-19 pandemic or other pandemics in the future.

That kind of data helps both Congress and the public health officials take measured and appropriate action to potentially help airlines in times of financial need.

Accurate and comprehensive data is critical to helping this Congress and the Department of Transportation make good policy and take appropriate action.

It helps us to take informed steps to improve the passenger experience, identify root causes for trends and delays, hold airlines accountable for what is in their control, and target fixes elsewhere for things outside of the airlines' control. This amendment would significantly reduce the granularity of data collected.

While I am happy to work with Representative KEAN to determine a fair

and reasonable way to report airline statistics regarding significant delays and cancellations, I have to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, as I said earlier, this amendment, which is bipartisan in nature, actually increases the scope of transparency and ensures that the traveling public, that the policymakers, and we as Members of Congress have a better knowledge and understanding of what is happening and what is causing delays on a real-time basis, and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I reiterate my opposition. I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

□ 1530

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in part A of House Report 118-147.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. ____ WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To ensure that sufficient firefighting resources are available to suppress wildfires and protect public safety and property, and notwithstanding any other provision of law or agency regulation, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall promulgate an interim final rule under which—

(1) an operation described in section 21.25(b)(7) of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, shall allow for the transport of firefighters to and from the site of a wildfire to perform ground wildfire suppression and designate the firefighters conducting such an operation as essential crewmembers on board a covered aircraft operated on a mission to suppress wildfire;

(2) the aircraft maintenance, inspections, and pilot training requirements under part 135 of such title 14 may apply to such an operation, if determined by the Administrator to be necessary to maintain the safety of firefighters carrying out wildfire suppression missions; and

(3) the noise standards described in part 36 of such title 14 shall not apply to such an operation.

(b) SURPLUS MILITARY AIRCRAFT.—In promulgating any rule under subsection (a), the

Administrator shall not enable any aircraft of a type that has been manufactured in accordance with the requirements of and accepted for use by any branch of the United States Military and has been later modified to be used for wildfire suppression operations, unless such aircraft is later type-rated by the Administrator.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO FAA DOCUMENTS.—In promulgating an interim final rule under subsection (a), the Administrator shall amend FAA Order 8110.56, Restricted Category Type Certification (dated February 27, 2006), as well as any corresponding policy or guidance material, to reflect the requirements of subsection (a).

(d) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the Administrator's authority to take action otherwise authorized by law to protect aviation safety or passenger safety.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED AIRCRAFT.—The term "covered aircraft" means an aircraft type-certificated in the restricted category under section 21.25 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, used for transporting firefighters to and from the site of a wildfire in order to perform ground wildfire suppression for the purpose of extinguishing a wildfire on behalf of, or pursuant to a contract with, a Federal, State, or local government agency.

(2) FIREFIGHTERS.—The term "firefighters" means a trained fire suppression professional the transport of whom is necessary to accomplish a wildfire suppression operation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I think is going to be loved by both sides of the room here today since it makes so much sense.

The situation we have is, it will fix an issue under the FAA regulations that currently prevents a privately owned, restricted category aircraft that is already performing a wildfire suppression operation from transporting firefighters to a scene.

Now, if this exact same aircraft were owned by a public entity such as the Forest Service, BLM, et cetera, that aircraft would be allowed to transport firefighters while performing a wildfire suppression operation. Even more egregious is the fact that if this government agency were to decide to lease this private aircraft for 90 days or more, that would magically transform it into the type of aircraft that would be allowed to transport firefighters on the way to a suppression action.

Under the current guidelines, however, they are not allowed to do so. This would either force contractors to have to get 90 days or longer leases with entities that may not want the aircraft for 90 days or be able to afford that. This may be a small local entity, local government.

What we are doing is allowing some flexibility here to not be locked into 90-day aircraft contracts that aren't needed and, at the same time, prevent unneeded ferrying back and forth, one for fire suppression activities and then another one to transport the personnel

when it would be perfectly logical to transport them on the same trip, saving fuel, saving wear and tear on the aircraft and the people, and even a little extra unneeded pollution in the air from running the aircraft, right?

My amendment requires the FAA to move forward with allowing private aircraft to also transport firefighters when they are fighting wildfires. The current policy is an unnecessary barrier to being able to deploy and fully utilize the capabilities of existing wildfire contractors for wildfire suppression.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, which directs the FAA to issue an interim final rule to allow restricted category aircraft to be used to transport firefighters to and from wildfire sites and other conforming changes.

While I support the intent of helping firefighters, this amendment is not the way to do it. In fact, if we are talking about firefighters, a firefighter lost his life in Memphis today fighting a fire. Several were injured, and we hope they will recover quickly. It is a difficult profession.

Restricted category aircraft are certified by the FAA for only very specific types of missions. Many of them are aircraft specifically built for military operations.

This amendment would create a shortcut for manufacturers interested in selling aircraft. However, the aircraft are not certified to the safety standards needed to carry passengers. This is an attempt by one manufacturer to create a domestic market for its aircraft without going through the FAA safety certification process. That is just not cricket.

Furthermore, interim final rules are only issued in situations where a regulatory process or requirement is clearly and directly creating a safety or security hazard.

There are multiple paths for this aircraft to be put to good use in helping firefighters, and manufacturers should follow those processes.

Congress should not be writing safety loopholes for companies to sell aircraft that potentially put our Nation's firefighters at risk. I stand with our firefighters.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I am really wounded by that because the logic just isn't there. What we are talking about is an aircraft that is fully certified. If it was under a 90-day or longer contract, everybody would be hunky-dory with it. It would be perfectly kosher.

However, in this situation here, since it doesn't have that long of a contract, it is not now considered a public aircraft. It meets all the standards for safety, for transporting personnel as well as transporting the products with which they will be putting out the fire.

I am just mystified as to the logic of why we can't do this. It will save sorries. It will save a lot of unneeded pain. It will also allow local entities to be able to afford to keep these aircraft around because they are not going to be locked into 90-day contracts. I am just at a loss as to why this couldn't be agreed to by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, let me put my colleague's mind at rest. I don't intend to call for a roll call. I will oppose the amendment, but I do not intend to call for a roll call.

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comment of my colleague from Tennessee. He mentioned a while ago with Mr. ISSA "40-love," so I will pick up on the "love" part of that and say that this is a friendlier discussion.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA). The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 60 will not be offered.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 61 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in part A of House Report 118-147.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 772 of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment many times over the last 15 years because until we can cut this poster child for government waste, I despair of us ever being able to bring Federal spending under control.

They call it Essential Air Service, but it is the least essential program in the entire U.S. Government. This is a direct subsidy paid to airline companies to fly empty and near-empty planes from small airports to regional hubs.

This was supposed to be a temporary program to allow local communities

and airports to adjust to airline deregulation in 1978, 45 years ago. Instead, it has grown to include 111 airports in a program that has doubled in cost in the last decade.

I emphasize that this program has nothing to do with emergency medical evacuations. It solely subsidizes regular, scheduled, commercial service that is so seldom used that it cannot support itself. Why can't it? Because in many cases, the small airports in the program are less than an hour's drive from regional airports.

Essential Air Service flights are flown out of Merced Airport near my district in the Sierra Nevada of California, yet Merced is less than an hour's drive from Fresno Airport, offering scheduled flights throughout the West.

Subsidized service is available from Lancaster, Pennsylvania, just 31 miles from Harrisburg International Airport. Subsidized flights from Pueblo, Colorado, are just a 45-minute drive from Colorado Springs Airport, and on and on.

There is supposed to be a \$200 cap on the subsidy and a minimum of 10 passengers per day, yet 55 airports are able to waive these requirements, and they have all been granted. Per-passenger subsidies on some flights are now nearly \$1,000 per passenger. By comparison, you can charter a small plane for around \$150 to \$200 an hour. Currently, 42 of the 111 flights subsidized are for flights of 9 people or less. These flights of 9 or less are still costing the taxpayers over \$120 million in fiscal year 2023.

Over the next few years, this program will cost taxpayers over a billion dollars in direct appropriations, which this amendment would cease. The program is receiving \$390 million in subsidies this year.

If a route cannot generate enough passengers to support its costs, the passengers themselves are telling us it is not worth the money to them. Maybe we should listen to them.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES), chair of the full committee.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment and urge Members to vote "no."

The Essential Air Service program has proven to be a vital tool for rural connectivity, and for decades, it has been providing commercial air service to rural America.

It ensures our constituents in rural communities are connected to the national air transportation system and provides businesses across the country with the opportunity to grow their

businesses and families easier access to loved ones across the Nation. It drives economic development in many of our districts.

This amendment most certainly eliminates air service to our smallest, most rural communities. I have been a longtime, strong supporter of the EAS program.

In order to ensure the program's long-term viability, smart and targeted reforms are needed to ensure the program can continue to serve our communities.

Those reforms are in this underlying bill. It phases in cost-saving reforms to secure the program's long-term stability and ensures that it will continue to meet the needs of communities served while reining in the ballooning costs.

I, myself, have an EAS airport in my district that will be subject to the cost-share provision beginning in fiscal year 2027. I fear that without reducing costs, the entire program will cease to exist in due time, thanks to the program's cost.

Let's do anything we can to attempt to save this program. I think anything that we do if we are not attempting to save this program is literally a disservice to our constituents. Please vote "no" on the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, reform, not repeal is what we should be looking for. Essential Air Service is a critical transportation lifeline for many rural communities. It was put in place to guarantee small communities maintain a minimum level of air service.

The most important State is Alaska, where the majority of surface transportation is not passable year-round. Alaskans rely heavily on air travel to stay connected. This would be an economic disaster for the State. There are currently approximately 60 communities in Alaska alone, and another 110 in the lower 48, that depend on service through EAS.

As a friend of DON YOUNG, MARY PELTOLA, and the Alaskan people, I ask Members to vote "no" and to continue EAS service to the people of Alaska and others in rural areas that need it. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this is a nearly 50-year-old temporary program. It is indicative of everything in Washington: Nothing ever dies here. We just spend more and more money.

The DOT literally picks winners and losers, where neighboring airports have to compete against the Federal Government, which subsidizes routes for the very same market. Approved subsidies include funding leisure routes. That is not essential. That is leisure.

Flights on EAS routes are relatively empty compared to nonsubsidized flights, and the obvious outcome of subsidizing these routes is that they are not economically viable. That is why they are subsidized. It is because nobody really needs them. There are other options that are reasonable.

The industry continues to suffer from a pilot shortage, a mechanic shortage, labor all across the board, ATC, et cetera. All we are doing is making it worse by misallocating these resources.

Pilots are flying planes to places where there aren't any customers, and they are canceling routes where people need to fly.

The bill does make significant improvements. However, the program remains inherently unfair and represents a significant misallocation of resources at a time when we can ill afford to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I respect the intent of the author of this amendment, Mr. McCLINTOCK, who I respect very much. I agree with his desire to cut wasteful government programs, but we have a fundamental disagreement on the value of this program.

Speaking for my community, and I do represent Lancaster Airport, this service allows my constituents to connect with Pittsburgh and other major airports where they can link with routes to take them across the country.

Every dollar invested into the program yields a great return. Lancaster Airport is the third busiest airport in Pennsylvania, behind Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. This is an important link to keep it a strong commercial hub and to service our community.

EAS also serves 172 airports across the country. If this amendment gets adopted, many of those communities would lose their airports. Losing EAS eligibility would not only disconnect communities in rural areas from the national air service, but it would also have a ripple economic effect.

Again, I commend the author of this, and I commend the chairman for the changes that have been made to this program. It is important that we keep it.

□ 1545

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment from the distinguished gentleman from California.

Rural districts like the one I represent often get written off as "flyover country." Essential Air Service, or

EAS, ensures that "flyover country" is just a saying and is not a reality.

As I have mentioned before, Minnesota's Eighth District is the most beautiful place in the world. Just take a flight to International Falls, Minnesota, and check out Voyageurs National Park, or fly to Brainerd and recreate in one of the many beautiful family-owned resorts. Fly to Bemidji and see beautiful Lake Bemidji, or take a flight to Hibbing, Minnesota, and fly over the biggest mining country that we have. None of this would be possible without EAS.

For most in Minnesota's Eighth District, getting down to Minneapolis Airport can be a real challenge. The EAS airports in my district provide an opportunity for my rural constituents to quickly, conveniently, and safely connect with the rest of this Nation and the world.

I want the constituents that I represent to have access to air travel just like everyone else, not be punished because we live in rural America.

My constituents matter. Our local economies and our local airports matter, and rural America matters.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, Mr. GRAVES promised us reforms. Well, we have been hearing those promises for the last 15 years that I have been bringing these amendments up, and they never happen.

My Republican colleagues love to campaign for economies in government. Yet, when the easiest possible economy in government is presented to them, they can't bear it.

I would pose this question: Why should the taxpayers of every community in America pay for the tickets for their subsidized air service when those airports are often less than an hour's drive from a regional airport?

If their customers aren't willing to pay for those tickets, why should the people of our districts be required to pay for them through their taxes?

It is time that Republicans kept their promises and started making the fundamental reforms that are necessary to bring spending under control before we bankrupt this government.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chair, I would inquire how much time remains in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chair, our Nation has always had a national commitment to infrastructure. Mr. Chairman, that has been true whether it has been the interstate highway system, universal telephone service, or rural electrification.

We don't ask each rural county to pay exclusively for their portion of the interstate or high voltage transmission line that resides within their county borders. That, sir, would be absurd. These are assets with national benefit.

Now, that is the same wisdom, thankfully, that we apply to our national aviation infrastructure. That

does not mean an airport everywhere, of course; not any more than it means an interstate everywhere. It does mean a national commitment to having the essential infrastructure necessary to bind together 50 States into one unified America.

This amendment destroys that national commitment to infrastructure and to essential air service. It is misguided, and I urge a "no" vote.

I will close, Mr. Chair, by noting this: There may be some airports within an hour, but there are many, including in South Dakota, that are 2 hours or 3 hours away from these hubs.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 64 printed in part A of House Report 118-147.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:
SEC. _____. **REPORT ON SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FLIGHT RECORDS.**

The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall submit to Congress a report containing the flight records of the Secretary of Transportation for any flight on an aircraft owned by the Federal Aviation Administration for the 3 years preceding the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment.

Secretary Buttigieg and President Biden's policies have created chaos within the FAA. Under the Biden administration, we saw the first full ground stoppage of all flights since September 11.

Taxpayers deserve to know where Secretary Pete was jetting off to on a private jet while our constituents were dealing with canceled and delayed flights. My amendment will force the FAA to hand over the flight logs for the Transportation Secretary's private FAA jet from the last 3 years.

The Washington Post reported that Secretary Buttigieg took 18 secret tax-

payer-funded private flights. Taxpayers deserve transparency and oversight.

I urge my colleagues to support transparency for the Secretary's private flights and adopt my amendment.

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I respectfully claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this would require the FAA to submit a report on flight records for the Secretary of Transportation for the previous years. Obviously, as the gentlewoman indicated, it is about Secretary Buttigieg who, I think, has done an outstanding job as our Secretary.

This amendment provides no benefit to the FAA. They already know where he has been going, and it would be a waste of the administration's limited time and resources.

In fact, there is no reason to think that his flights haven't been for reasons that benefit the United States and the Department of Transportation.

Now, if the amendment was something about Senators leaving their States during emergency climate events and going to Acapulco, or to wherever it was in Mexico, I could agree to it, maybe. But that is not what it is about.

There is no basis as to why this report should be needed. There are many pressing issues the FAA should dedicate its attention toward in this reauthorization, and the gentlewoman's amendment would detract from those efforts.

To that end, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment which has no basis in fact concerning anything Secretary Buttigieg may have done in any way improper.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, it was Cancun I was trying to think of. So if the amendment dealt with Cancun when Texas was having a climate emergency, that is a different situation, and people might need to know about that.

But Secretary Buttigieg, there is no reason to think he has done anything wrong whatsoever, so there is no basis behind this amendment, no fact basis. It is just conjuring up something, and that is why I continue to oppose the amendment.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment because it would be a waste of FAA time, and it is certainly something that is intended to sully the name of our distinguished Secretary of Transportation who has done an outstanding job.

I think the time that the airlines were closed down was because of the modems. It didn't have anything to do

with the Secretary of Transportation, or even the FAA.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 65 printed in part A of House Report 118-147.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title IV, add the following:

SEC. _____. **RESTRICTION ON DEI OFFICIALS.**

None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to hire any diversity, equity, and inclusion officials or conduct training on diversity, equity, and inclusion.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment. Secretary Buttigieg and President Biden's DEI initiatives which hire and promote people based on their physical characteristics over their merits and qualifications violate Title VII and the Constitution.

In critical public safety roles such as air traffic control, it is essential to have the best possible candidate based strictly on professional qualifications and merit. Efforts by the Biden administration to factor race, gender, and sexual orientation into hiring and promotion decisions puts the traveling public at risk and deepens the staffing shortages we have seen throughout the FAA.

Under this administration, we saw the first national ground stoppage since September 11. My constituents regularly face delays caused by shortages in air traffic control staffing, delays that I am sure many of my colleagues have also experienced.

We must roll back the Biden administration's woke DEI policies and put the needs of our public aviation system before the far left's political agenda.

I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I would say that this amendment which prohibits funds from this Act being used to hire any diversity, equity, and inclusion officials or conduct DEI training is unnecessary, inappropriate, and failing our system.

It is interesting that it follows the amendment that would look into and suggest that Secretary Buttigieg has done something wrong.

As our Nation works toward long-term economic recovery, it is critical the educational and career opportunities in the aerospace industry be available and accessible to all Americans. It doesn't say that people who aren't the most qualified would get hired. DEI just says people would get opportunities which they may not have had in the past, and there might be systems in place that do not allow people who are diverse, who need to be included, inclusive, and gives them an opportunity and equitably get the job just because of their appearance. It means that they don't get discriminated against.

The U.S. aerospace industry is taking initial steps to diversify its workforce through the creation of flight training academies, apprenticeships, and other career pathway programs, but more can be done.

The underlying bill robustly invests in the FAA's aviation workforce development programs to support the education and recruitment of aviation jobs, including for communities underrepresented in the aviation industry.

I represent the Ninth Congressional District in Tennessee, which is a minority-majority district. A lot of minorities are not in aviation jobs. They can perform those jobs and do great jobs, they just haven't been given the opportunity over the years, and they need to have opportunities to see that this is a place that they can look to to be a pilot and to earn a good living and to have a good job. DEI programs would help.

This amendment ties the hands of the FAA and its outgoing educational, recruiting, and retention plans by prohibiting the hiring of a DEI officer or conducting DEI training, regardless of whether the FAA believes that this will result in the best possible results for the aviation workforce.

Again, I oppose this amendment. I urge a "no" vote, and hope that all Americans can have an opportunity to get good-paying jobs.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, I would just continue to urge a "no" vote. You don't have to be woke. You just don't have to be asleep.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois will be postponed.

□ 1600

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. OBERNOLTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 67 printed in part A of House Report 118-147.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 129, after line 25, insert the following:
(7) Put in place a system that ensures available resources so that applicants can schedule airman practical tests not more than 14 calendar days after requested.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Chair, the FAA is responsible for administrating and certifying pilots in the United States. The certification of these pilots takes place in the form of written tests administered at a test center, but also in the form of practical tests that are usually administered in an aircraft or in a simulator.

These practical tests are conducted by either FAA examiners or, more usually, designated pilot examiners. This is a system that has worked well for decades, but a recent problem has arisen where pilots who are applying for certification, who need practical tests are encountering large and unacceptable delays in the scheduling of those tests.

In fact, some of the pilots that I have spoken to in the preparation of this amendment had to wait over 12 months for the scheduling of a practical test. I think we can all agree that that is unacceptable.

It is not fair to the airmen, it is not fair to the FAA, it is not fair to the pilot community, and it is detrimental to the advancement of the aviation industry.

This amendment is a very simple fix to that problem: It would direct the FAA to implement an accountability program to ensure that no applicant has to wait more than 2 weeks for the administration of a practical test.

I think this is a commonsense solution. It works for the FAA and for the applicants, and I would urge its adoption.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MOYLAN). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I rise in opposition to this amendment, which requires the FAA to ensure that pilots can schedule a practical test within 14 calendar days of requesting a test.

What this amendment fails to consider is that the FAA does not schedule these tests. These are independent individuals who have decided to take on this responsibility as a personal choice. They work around their own schedules—birthday parties, weddings, and doctors' appointments.

This amendment would actually add additional bureaucracy and would, therefore, be counterproductive and an administrative nightmare.

Moreover, the underlying bill contains several provisions to assist with expediting pilot certification. For instance, the base language already increases accountability and transparency for scheduling these tests and even includes a web-based scheduling tool to assist pilots.

The committee developed a solution on a bipartisan basis to help with this specific problem of delays in pilot testing. Therefore, I oppose this counterproductive and burdensome amendment.

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

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Chair, I would strongly object to the characterization of this amendment as burdensome. If you want an example of burdensome, think about a student pilot who has applied to get their pilot's license.

Mr. Chair, I have been a certified flight instructor for almost 30 years. This is a situation that I have experienced. When you are a student pilot, you don't know exactly when you are going to reach the level of proficiency required by the Federal aviation regulations, so you train and you train and you train and you sweat and you work, and finally your instructor says you are ready to take the test.

Now, imagine a student in that position applying for a test and being told it is going to be months before they can be examined.

Mr. Chair, I can tell you from personal experience that flight proficiency is a perishable commodity. You cannot go several months without flying, hop into a cockpit, and expect to be at the same level of proficiency that you were.

We are adding burdensome regulation on our student pilots when we expect them to maintain their proficiency for however long it takes the FAA to schedule that exam.

To be clear, this amendment does not direct the FAA to make its inspectors available; it directs the FAA to make the resources available to implement an accountability program to make sure we have a sufficient number of pilot examiners to make this situation better.

Two weeks is an industry standard consensus. The FAA has agreed that

that is a reasonable period of time. This just makes sense.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, for the party that eschews regulations, we now have more regulations being proposed, and these regulations are unnecessary in this case.

Again, it is up to the particular applicant to schedule the test for themselves. If they delay in doing so, then, of course, why would we want to punish the Federal Government by forcing the Federal Government to offer them a test in 14 days that they could have scheduled themselves had they been more efficient with their scheduling?

Let's continue to rely on personal responsibility in this regard, and let's make sure that the onus remains on the applicant to schedule the testing.

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

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, to be clear: This is not a scheduling problem on the part of the applicant. The applicant doesn't know exactly when they are going to be ready. The applicant doesn't know when the weather is going to cooperate. Particularly for the base level of pilots' licenses, you need good weather to be able to take the test.

This is just talking about the amount of time after an applicant says I am ready before which a designated pilot examiner can administer that exam. I think we can all agree that that should not be a year.

This is a commonsense amendment that would solve that problem, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an app on my phone and I can look out for at least 10 days and determine what the weather will be projected to be in a particular location. That technology is available to all. All should use it, particularly those who are looking to fly the public or fly themselves or their families. They are charged with personal responsibility to make sure that they schedule a test in accordance with their own particular schedule. Their schedule is up to them.

We need to allow the FAA to work within its means to schedule testing on a first-come-first-served basis, and it is up to the applicant to make sure they get in where they fit in.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. OBERNOLTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in part A of House Report 118-147.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Chair, I have a further amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 309, line 14, strike "or".

Page 309, line 18, strike the period at the end and insert "; or".

Page 309, after line 18, insert the following:

(4) prevent an airport or any retail fuel seller at such airport from making available for purchase and resale an unleaded aviation gasoline that has been approved by the Federal Aviation Administration and has an industry consensus standard for use in lieu of leaded aviation gasoline if such unleaded aviation gasoline is certified for use in all aircraft spark ignition piston engine models.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Chair, aviation fuel is one of the few fuels remaining that still contains lead. It has been universally acknowledged that lead is not good for our environment. It is not good for our children. It is not good for human ingestion. It causes serious health problems.

The industry has conducted a decades-long study and process to try to develop an alternative fuel that takes the lead out of aviation fuel. However, this has become a very, very troublesome and difficult task because the only suitable solutions would have to be suitable for all types of aviation engines and some aircraft feature engines that are higher horsepower and higher compression that depend on the presence of lead to be able to operate safely.

Finally, we are approaching a consensus standard on an unleaded replacement for aviation gas; however, there is a problem that has arisen. Airports accept grant funds from the Airport Improvement Program, and in return, they give the FAA grant assurances that they will keep their airports open.

In 2018, when FAA was reauthorized, it was agreed by this body that an airport should not be able to withdraw the sale of fuel completely and that that would be a violation of its FAA AIP grant assurances.

I think that that is still true, and I hope we all still feel that way. However, most airports only have a single infrastructure for the delivery of avgas. If an airport seeks to switch from this current standard, which is 100 low lead to an unleaded replacement, a question has arisen as to whether or not that would be a violation of its grant assurances.

This amendment clarifies that situation and states that when an industry standard consensus fuel emerges that it is not a violation of grant assurance for an airport to switch from leaded aviation fuel to unleaded aviation fuel.

I think that this protects the interests of our airports, of our pilot community, and also protects our environment at the same time.

Mr. Chair, I urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, aviation is the only segment of transportation still using leaded fuels. The health impacts of leaded fuels are well-documented up to this point and the aviation industry writ large has been making a good-faith effort to transition to unleaded fuels.

The FAA closely regulates the availability of fuels at public airports because it is a critical element to flight safety.

The underlying bill text, as well as the manager's amendment offered by Chairman GRAVES and the ranking member, clarifies the fuel availability requirements at airports in line with the aviation industry timeline for transitioning away from leaded fuels.

This amendment is confusingly written, and it is unnecessary. Unlike what the summary claims, it would reduce airports' flexibility to meet the FAA's requirements for fuel availability. Specifically, it would narrow the types of unleaded fuels that airports are required to provide under the bill.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment and urge all Members to do the same. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Chair, I hope there has been no confusion here. We are all on the same team. We want to get the lead out of aviation fuel. This amendment allows us to do that. The current situation is that when an industry standard consensus fuel emerges that airports will not be able to switch over to it because if you only have a single infrastructure, a single fuel truck, or a single fuel tank, the current grant assurances require you to continue offering the leaded fuel.

Airports will be faced with an impossible choice: The choice between maintaining a leaded fuel, even though an unleaded replacement is available, or buying an entirely different infrastructure for the delivery of the unleaded fuel.

I think we can all agree that makes no sense. This is just a commonsense solution to that problem. We have worked with committee staff on this. We have worked with industry on this. I think this is something that everyone should be able to get behind.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I believe that we are trying to achieve the same goals here and I appreciate the gentleman's approach, but I do believe that it is restrictive; maybe not intentionally so, but as a matter of consequence. That is why I am going to continue to oppose this amendment.

Not every airport has the flexibility to do what Representative OBERNOLTE suggests that is available to them. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

□ 1615

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Chair, to be clear, we are trying to give airports the option of a transition to an unleaded aviation fuel when that option becomes available to them. Some language is needed to do this because airports are confused about whether or not doing this is a violation of their FAA grant assurances. This amendment clarifies that it is not. An amendment, to be clear, is needed to clarify this situation.

Mr. Chair, I respectfully urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, again, not all companies have unleaded fuel that meets the standards that the gentleman suggests.

I wish I could read this writing here. I would present a more eloquent rebuttal. Unfortunately, I can't read the scribble.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 69 printed in part A of House Report 118-147.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 609, line 14, strike "social and".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on my amendment, which strikes "social" from the scope of factors examined under the FAA's BEYOND program expansion.

Mr. Chair, this is a commonsense amendment that simply seeks to allow the FAA to focus on its core mission. The FAA's BEYOND program was crafted to yield the best outcomes for unmanned aircraft systems, not to promote garbage and irrelevant woke ideology.

The FAA BEYOND program is innovative, because it was designed to understand the potential benefits of drone

use and the processes for drone integration. There is no room for any sort of liberal agenda in this program nor in this legislation.

My amendment removes the reference to social impacts examined under the BEYOND program expansion, which goes undefined in the bill, and could, therefore, be used to advance woke considerations. Expanding the scope of the BEYOND program to include social factors distracts from BEYOND's mission of making beyond visual line of sight operations repeatable, scaleable, and viable.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment that would remove the requirement for the FAA to study the social impacts of unmanned aircraft systems, or UAS, in the expansion of FAA's BEYOND program.

The BEYOND program is vital for evaluating the safe integration of beyond visual line of sight and other advanced UAS operations.

There are many potential societal benefits of UAS that are already being tested by the BEYOND program. UAS technology can be used for remote sensing to make our power systems more resilient to deliver medical supplies to underserved communities or to assist first responders in disaster response and relief efforts.

For example, Dominion Energy used drones to inspect more than 40 power generation facilities, allowing them to conduct more frequent and efficient inspections.

The expansion of the BEYOND program in the underlying bill will allow for testing of other new and emerging aviation concepts and technologies, such as more autonomous aircraft.

As part of this testing, the program should consider societal impacts such as potential emissions, noise, and other community priorities.

Mr. Chair, for these reasons, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I would agree with my colleague that this program is vital. It is vital for the future of aviation and for medicine and for all sorts of applications. What it shouldn't be used for is a woke agenda.

The BEYOND program expansion is supposed to enable testing of new emerging aviation concepts and technologies to inform policies, rule-making, and guidance needed to enable these new concepts and technologies, again, not to be leveraged for wokeness.

The government should not stick their nose into Americans' lifestyle, well-being, and societal preferences by use or leveraging the BEYOND program, and that is exactly what my colleague is encouraging.

Mr. Chair, let us not allow the Biden administration to shift attention away from the real problems that Americans face every day to his administration's radical leftist agenda, which they try to creep into every aspect of our lives.

I urge adoption of this very commonsense amendment, which focuses on the underlying bill, the true mission of the FAA, which is aviation and safety in our skies, not wokeness.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), the ranking member on the full committee.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, on the committee, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, we like to pride ourselves on being boring. We like to let folks know if they want excitement in Congress, there are other committees to attend or go to. The T&I Committee is not one of those. We like to think that we are focused on the transportation and infrastructure of the United States and on the things that we need to do to ensure its safety and building it out.

I am confused by this amendment, that it exists at all, because what the amendment is doing is taking out a word, "social," that the proponent is defining as something that is not in any way defined by the committee in the way he is defining it.

Think about what we are talking about when we talk about the BEYOND program and what we would like to do beyond just looking at economic factors of drones. We want to look at how medical supplies can be delivered to rural areas. That is not an economic factor to look at. That is a social factor to look at, the ability to get healthcare to rural areas. The ability to assist law enforcement with things like search and rescue, that is not an economic factor. It is a social factor to ensure safer communities.

Assisting wildfire responders as they fight wildfires, that is not an economic factor. That is a social issue to protect wildfire responders as well as the communities that are impacted by wildfires.

I am just really confused. If this amendment had been in our committee and had been discussed, we would have never brought this up because it just doesn't live between our ears on the committee—this debate about the problem that people have with social factors. We would have realized these social factors are really about the things that I am talking about here, like how do we use the BEYOND program to ensure that we can use drones or uncrewed aerial systems, unmanned aerial systems, in order to provide factors that are beyond just the economic factors, how do they help the economy grow? They have uses beyond just helping the economy grow. The BEYOND program should be used to help us look at those issues.

I would just ask folks to please let us do a bill that is actually trying to move aviation forward instead of bogging us down in some of these debates that frankly are better left, perhaps, in other committees but not in the T&I Committee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I do appreciate the intent of my colleague, but I think it should be noted that this serves as a back door for a woke agency if it chooses to be so. When we leave these back doors open, what we have seen is a weaponized FBI against American citizens. We have seen a weaponized IRS against American citizens. We have seen a weaponized Justice Department against American citizens.

This does nothing more than open the door for the FAA to become weaponized on the social, woke agenda. Enough is enough. Yes, it is just a word, and that word should be stricken.

Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of my amendment. It is commonsense, it is conservative, it is the right thing to do, and it says no more wokeness in our country when it comes to the government and how it rules.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, it is ironic that today we talk about wokeness, and we talk about including a word, "social," in the impacts that would be studied by the BEYOND program.

The truth of the matter is that the BEYOND program is a Trump administration program, and the language that the gentleman seeks to eliminate from this authorization bill is the same language that was proposed, introduced, and passed under the Trump administration. There was no harm then, but now we have got a problem, because everybody is anti-woke.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in part A of House Report 118-147.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 1148(b)(5)(A), strike "climate change" and insert "weather".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, the FAA reauthorization bill has a section requiring the FAA to conduct research and development to mitigate the impact of turbulence.

As part of this, it requires the agency to conduct R&D to understand the impacts of climate change and other factors on the nature of turbulence.

My amendment changes this requirement to focus on the impacts of weather rather than climate change. Weather patterns are a common cause of turbulence. Jet streams, storms, and the movement of warm fronts and cold fronts can all cause it.

Mr. Chair, this is, again, a commonsense amendment. I urge adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, this amendment would direct the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to ignore climate change as it studies the impacts of weather on the nature of turbulence.

To deny the existence of climate change is to deny reality. There are copious amounts of data to show that climate change has been happening for decades.

Recently, we have all experienced consecutive days of 90-plus-degree heat here in Washington, D.C., as well as we have seen sustained increases in temperatures across the country. In fact, June 2023 was the hottest June ever recorded on the planet, according to NASA.

The scientific definition of weather refers to short-term atmospheric conditions, while climate change refers to long-term patterns and shifts in our climate.

□ 1630

The dramatic shifts caused by climate change are not merely weather, and to limit NOAA's ability to study climate change would neglect our responsibility for ensuring safe air travel.

Studying these long-term patterns and understanding how they impact turbulence is critical for putting the best safety practices in place, as well as understanding how to mitigate the impacts of turbulence.

NOAA must have the authority to gather the data we need to help keep Americans safe in the air, reduce flight delays, and improve our understanding of changing atmospheric conditions. Let us not force NOAA to put its head in the ground while climate change is happening all around us.

Mr. Chair, if my colleagues are with me, they will oppose this amendment, and I encourage more of my colleagues to do so.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, as indicated by my colleague, the definition of climate change is a long-term event. A flight and turbulence would be a short-term occurrence.

What we are talking about is weather in a moment on a duration of a flight and how it impacts said flight. It is changing weather, not climate change, that is to blame on your flight to and from D.C.

We don't measure climate change over a duration of a flight, but this is what we are talking about—the duration of a flight—and turbulence that impacts flights while they are in the air.

As we develop a better understanding of how the weather impacts turbulence, people may better understand how instances of turbulence might differ under different times.

Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to say is let us not allow agendas to slip into the mission.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment. This is common sense, and I thank my colleague for his comments.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FLOOD). The Chair reminds Members and staff not to traffic the well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, long-term weather patterns affect turbulence, and that is what we need to study. We should not deny that there will be long-term effects of climate change. We should not ignore the fact that climate change is real and is happening today.

To force our government to not look at these weather patterns in the long term is very shortsighted. Let's plan for this turbulence as we come to grips with climate change.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time, and I am ready to close.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his comments. I emphasize that if we allow or encourage the FAA to study climate change, if it were, it is going to lead to a boondoggle. The FAA is busy enough. They have enough on their hands. It makes sense to study weather patterns and turbulence. It does not make sense to allow woke ideologies to slip into the mission statement of an agency whose primary charter is to keep those in the air safe.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, safe travel in the future depends on the FAA's ability to predict long-term weather patterns, and that requires us to study the effects of climate change. That is what we need to do now. We need to do it to protect ourselves, our wives, our husbands, our children, our grandparents. We don't want any of our loved ones to die.

Let's do the studying that we need in order to mitigate the effects of our previous ignoring of climate change as a

phenomenon. Let's study it and come to grips with it and make things safer for the traveling public as we proceed forward. That is what we are doing under this FAA reauthorization bill.

Mr. Chair, this amendment hurts that process. For that reason, I oppose it and ask my colleagues to do the same.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. OWENS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 71 printed in part A of House Report 118-147.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VIII, add the following:
SEC. —. SLOT EXEMPTIONS FOR RONALD REAGAN WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 41718 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(i) ADDITIONAL SLOT EXEMPTIONS.—

“(1) GENERAL SLOT EXEMPTIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall grant, by order, 14 exemptions from—

“(A) the application of sections 49104(a)(5), 49109, and 41714 of this title; and

“(B) the requirements of subparts K and S of part 93, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(2) EXEMPTION CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall grant such exemptions to non-limited incumbent and limited incumbent air carriers serving Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport as of the date of enactment of this subsection to operate limited frequencies of aircraft on routes between Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and other airports.

“(3) CONSIDERATIONS.—In granting exemptions under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider the extent to which the exemptions will—

“(A) have a positive impact on the overall level of competition in the markets that will be served as a result of such exemptions;

“(B) produce competitive benefits, including the likelihood that the service to airports will result in lower fares or improved service options for aviation consumers;

“(C) not result in a significant increase in delays at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport;

“(D) ensure that travel options between Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and airports located within the perimeter described in section 49104 will not be reduced;

“(E) benefit underserved markets; and

“(F) not reduce runway safety at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

“(4) SCHEDULING OF SLOT EXEMPTIONS.—In granting exemptions under this subsection, the Secretary shall, in coordination with the

Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration and to the greatest extent practicable, seek to work with air carriers to schedule such exemptions—

“(A) at times during which operations are typically lower than the peak hourly capacity of Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport; and

“(B) at times and in a manner that will minimize the potential for additional delays.

“(5) RESTRICTION.—An exemption may not be granted under this subsection with respect to any aircraft—

“(A) that is not a Stage 4 aircraft (as defined by the Secretary) if the exemption is for an arrival or departure between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.; or

“(B) that is not a Stage 5 aircraft (as defined by the Secretary) if the exemption is for an arrival or departure between the hours of—

“(i) 6:00 a.m. and 6:59 a.m.; or

“(ii) 10:01 p.m. and 11:00 p.m.

“(6) AIR CARRIER LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) EXEMPTIONS PER AIR CARRIER.—Of the exemptions described in paragraph (1), no air carrier may operate more than 2 of such exemptions.

“(B) LIMITATION ON AIRCRAFT SIZE.—An air carrier may not operate a multi-aisle or widebody aircraft under an exemption issued under this subsection.

“(C) PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER OF RIGHTS.—An air carrier granted an exemption under this subsection is prohibited from transferring the rights to its slot exemptions pursuant to section 41714(j).

“(7) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to—

“(A) allow for conversion of existing slots allocated to air carriers to serve communities located inside the perimeter described in section 49109 to fulfill the exemptions granted in paragraph (1); and

“(B) enable the reduction of nonstop travel to communities located within the perimeter described in section 49109.”

(b) INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS.—Section 44501(b) of title 49, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) a list of projects or programs necessary to improve capacity, reliability, and efficiency for Level 2 schedule facilitated and Level 3 slot-controlled airports.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment No. 71.

Mr. Chair, for 60 years, the federally imposed perimeter rule has limited access and increased costs for Americans flying into Washington's Reagan Airport.

My amendment is simple. It adds seven new routes, one for each airline currently operating out of DCA, while preserving all existing flight routes.

Congress is long overdue to modernize this arbitrary, protectionist Federal policy put in place for the economic protection of one airport and one airline.

Deliberate misinformation has been circulating wildly among my colleagues, and I want to be clear: Our effort is not about benefiting one airport, one airline, or any one Member of Congress. It is about empowering American consumers by providing more op-

tions and greater convenience for people traveling to and from Washington, D.C.

For those who have benefited from the monopoly created by the perimeter rule 60 years ago, the message is clear: America, your choices will remain limited and your ticket prices will remain high.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment to help DCA fly into the 21st century.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment falsely advertised as a compromise.

Nobody asked our regional delegation about this, and we are united against adding more air traffic in DCA. DCA is way over capacity. It is the busiest runway in America and one of the shortest. There were 25 million people served last year in an airport designed for 14 million.

Mr. Chair, 20 percent of the flights are already more than an hour late, and this will only make it worse. This is a congested, complex airspace—think Capitol, White House, and Pentagon. It is the third highest in aborted takeoffs and landings. These safety concerns will only be magnified.

It is not true that this amendment will lower ticket prices. The last time that the perimeter-plus slots were added, prices went up at both Dulles and DCA. If you use Reagan National now, count on spending many more hours lost on the tarmac or at the gate.

Mr. Chair, why would you ever vote to make your commute worse? I urge my friends to vote “no” on the amendment.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in agreement with this amendment. It is a commonsense compromise. I rise in support of it, and I thank the gentleman for his hard work on this amendment.

This amendment would simply increase the average number of flight departures from Reagan National Airport from 400 average per day to 407 flights departing per day, not anything more than that.

For those who oppose this, the only reasons why airlines are opposing this is that they want to limit competition, and they want ticket prices to remain the highest in the Nation for flying in and out of Washington, D.C.

When we allow more flights into Washington, D.C., and out of Washington, D.C., we allow more families to come in from west of the Mississippi to visit the Nation's Capital. We enable

more people to come in and work and be more efficient.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment that would increase safety risks, delays, cancellations, diversions, and noise at National Airport, all for the personal convenience of some Members of Congress.

The Federal Aviation Administration and the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority that manages Reagan National and Dulles Airports have both concluded that increasing the slot and perimeter rules would be harmful to the flying public.

The slot and perimeter rules at National Airport exist to ensure operational viability for both National and Dulles International Airports. National and Dulles work as an integrated airport system to meet the needs of the traveling public.

Dulles has the operational capacity, space, and infrastructure to handle larger, long-distance flights and more flights per day than National Airport. National Airport already has the busiest runway in the Nation, was built as a small regional airport, and was never meant to manage flights from across the country.

Mr. Chair, I urge the Members to oppose this amendment.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Texas delegation from San Antonio—Mr. JOAQUIN CASTRO, Mr. CHIP ROY, Mr. GREG CASAR, and Mr. TONY GONZALES—for all working together, along with the Senators.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment to add seven slots to the Ronald Reagan National Airport.

Right now, cities like San Antonio cannot get direct flights. The slots added in this amendment will allow more cities like San Antonio to have a direct flight.

With a population of 1.4 million, San Antonio is the seventh largest city in the U.S. San Antonio is known as Military Town USA and has over 80,000 Active-Duty members and 159,000 veterans. Joint Base San Antonio trains more soldiers than any other place in the country, and it is home to the Department of Defense's largest military hospital.

We have to do this for the veterans. We have to do this for the soldiers.

Mr. Chair, for Military Town USA, along with the San Antonio delegation, I ask that we pass this amendment.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

I have serious concerns about the existing congestion and limited resources at DCA at this time.

An additional 14 flights—7 slots, but 14 flights—certainly stretch resources even further. Over the last 16 months, DCA has had the fifth most ground delay and stop counts in the country. The runway at DCA is also the busiest runway in the entire country.

I understand wanting additional flights to DCA, but I am concerned that the amount of space and time in the day is limited. I have serious concerns about how it will negatively affect my constituents.

Finally, I also am disappointed that there is no requirement that, before any additional flights, the Secretary must certify that they wouldn't reduce services to small and medium hub airports, strain the current landside and airside capacity at Reagan National Airport, and, as a result, increase travel time.

Mr. Chair, I stand in opposition.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Utah for leading this amendment, and I thank my friends in the San Antonio delegation for standing up for the people of San Antonio, who are on the outside looking in.

San Antonio is a city of 1.5 million people. It is the seventh largest city, Joint Base San Antonio. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle just smirk it off and say: Oh, no, don't disrupt my flights. Don't disrupt my ability to get to my local airports.

Do you know what? The next time you come to San Antonio, explain that to the men and women in uniform serving their country who can't take a flight to Reagan because you guys got something in 1966, and now it is a protectionist racket to hold onto something for yourselves.

I won't take this flight, for the most part, unless I am going back to San Antonio. I have a direct flight because Austin was exempted, like 10 other cities were exempted. This is seven slots. It is less than 2 percent of the total. Stop the protectionist racket. Open it up to competition, seven airlines, seven slots.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct remarks to the Chair.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

□ 1645

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It is not a racket.

This amendment would add 14 flights per day at the already heavily congested Ronald Reagan National Airport.

It already has 820 flight operations per day. It is not a racket. The addition of 14 flights per day would further exacerbate an already stressed airport operation.

It is not a racket. With limited gates and physical capacity, DCA doesn't have the space to safely process addi-

tional flight operations, often resulting in planes sitting on the tarmac waiting.

It is not a racket.

Not only does Ronald Reagan National Airport not have the capacity to support this extension, there are no protections against negative impacts on other complementary flights or other airports in the region: Dulles International Airport, Richmond, Roanoke, and Norfolk.

Historically, slot expansions and perimeter exemptions at Ronald Reagan National Airport have come at the expense of fewer flights from other Virginia airports. It is not a racket. It is not a racket.

Without protections ensuring the safety and sustainability at Ronald Reagan National Airport and the stability of other regional airports, this amendment will only hinder the current system.

It is not a racket.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I urge this Congress to support amendment No. 71 to H.R. 3935.

My city of San Antonio is known as Military City USA. It is home to tens of thousands of soldiers, airmen, intelligence professionals, and cybersecurity experts who need direct access to Washington, D.C.

I hope that Members will support this amendment and support our airmen and our soldiers and support national security.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Utah has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, all this amendment is doing is adding seven flights, because in 1966, we went with an overregulated approach, and the citizens of the Western United States need to be able to come to the Nation's Capitol. It is the most expensive place to travel to.

All we are trying to do is lower prices and increase competition. Traditionally, these are very conservative principles that we all should be able to support.

We all support the free market. We have to be able to look and say: Things were different in 1966 than they are now. Planes are more quiet.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. This is not a safety issue.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. This is simply special interests playing over here. Let the free market decide.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is no longer recognized.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Chair, this is not only an issue that evokes passion among Members, it is also very bipartisan. It is going to be bipartisan in opposition and bipartisan in support.

We expected that on the committee, which is why we had asked for the Rules Committee to put something in order on the floor so we could have this debate and let the will of the House take its course.

I would just note, though, in my informal survey of Members on my side of the aisle, the seven slot pairs have been committed only 36 times already.

The point is: There is a lot of over-promising taking place about which cities are going to be served by this deal.

The problem with that is that one is too many and 100 is not enough, but the supply of runway at DCA is so small that it can't handle what it is taking now much less what increased demand will bring to it.

Mr. Chair, it is a difficult issue. Members are going to be voting for and against on both sides, and I look forward to that vote.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, I rise to oppose this amendment, which would risk flight safety and increase delays at National Airport, in the strongest terms possible. I will not, cannot support this bill if this amendment is adopted.

This amendment violates every Congressional courtesy we try to extend to one another as colleagues who know our districts best. One of my first local government appointments was to the Fairfax County Airports Advisory Committee. I subsequently spent 14 years in local government helping maintain the delicate regional balance between the 2 major airports in Northern Virginia, National Airport and Dulles International Airport. I also led the effort to connect our nation's capital to Dulles via rail with the recently completed Silver Line extension of the DC Metro.

So let me introduce my colleagues to National Airport. It has the busiest runway in America. The busiest in America. The airport is designed to serve 15 million passengers annually. Last year, it served 24 million. That is 9 million passengers or 60 percent over capacity. The airport has the 3rd highest flight cancellation rate in the country, and 1 in every 5 flights is delayed by more than an hour.

The FAA has certified that more flights would make those delays worse. This amendment, which would force even more flights out of National Airport, is reckless.

The amendment, if adopted, would increase delays, exacerbate pilot and flight crew ex-

haustion, and risk the safety of flights in and out of National Airport.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 73 printed in part A of House Report 118-147.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 1132 of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes the section that allows the administration to consider expanding the CLEEN Program.

Now, as a reminder, in the CLEEN Program, the FAA provides awards to industry to develop and integrate technology that will reduce noise, emissions, and fuel burn.

Now, looking over some of the projects, some of them aren't completely useless: improvements to wing performance and thermal efficiency for turbines may well contribute to cost savings. But that actually begs the question: Why can't these projects be funded by private industry alone?

Surely, if they improve fuel efficiency, that is a clear profit-driven motive to invest in new technologies.

The program also funds the development of "alternative" jet fuels which is just another facet of the left's crusade to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to meet completely arbitrary and unscientific targets.

The administration aims to achieve "net zero" greenhouse gas emissions from the aviation sector by 2050.

Mr. Chairman, I want you to think about that because you won't be flying when that happens.

The so-called sustainable aviation fuel is critical to achieving this foolhardy goal.

However, this fuel doesn't change the physics of an engine. The engine still emits carbon dioxide. Instead, emissions are actually produced out of waste products cooking oil and agricultural waste instead of fossil fuels, and then the engine burns that. That is

what you are paying for, Mr. Chairman. The program makes taxpayers pay for that fuel.

These fuels are extremely expensive and not widely adopted, as low as 0.1 percent at last counting. The CLEEN Program acknowledges these shortcomings.

Phase II simply furthered the understanding of key biofuel properties in demonstrating the viability of them. So it acknowledges it is actually not really changing anything, but we are just spending a lot of money burning cooking oil in an aviation engine.

There is absolutely no reason we should actually be expanding this program that is pouring taxpayer dollars into technologies into which the public sector is unwilling to invest.

They are unwilling to invest because there is no money in this. The only way it works is if the taxpayers pour all their money into it.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, this amendment would strike the requirement that the FAA administrator consider expanding the CLEEN Program, which stands for continuous lower energy, emission, and noise program, to new entrants.

Now, I want to be clear. It doesn't necessarily mean new technologies or different kinds of technologies as much as it can also mean new companies that are looking to do the same thing but do it better. To ensure that the FAA administrator is not continually approving grants to existing companies that are already in the program who may not be succeeding, we want to be sure the FAA administrator is looking beyond the current slate of companies that are applying.

In addition to that, of course, there are new entrants in the airspace. There is more projected use of even electronic aircraft. In the future, hydrogen is being looked at as a fuel for aviation—not tomorrow and maybe not in 5 years, but certainly within the next 10 to 15 years.

Doing some of the early work in this field is very important, so the FAA administrator needs the authority and the freedom to do just that.

This amendment is pulling back on some of the innovation that we, frankly, can only look to the government to do, so that it builds a foundation for the private sector to build upon and sometimes in this industry to take off as well.

Mr. Chair, so I would ask Members to oppose this amendment. Let the administrator continue to administer the CLEEN Program but send a clear message that they need to be looking beyond the regular sort of entrants that they are getting into this program and look to the future of aviation when they look at the CLEEN Program.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, my friend on the other side of the aisle is a good man. He is just, I think, misdirected on this occasion.

I will be clear. I don't want the administrator to be spending time approving this contract or that contract. I don't want him doing any of it.

As far as hydrogen, I marvel at this premise that somehow the government is the only one that can figure this out. Somehow this country figured out and invented the internal combustion engine, the lightbulb, the airplane, and went to space.

But heaven forbid we figure this out without the government and without these taxpayers being forced to pay for it.

The third phase of the CLEEN Program is awarding more than \$100 million for aircraft and engine companies to develop and demonstrate aircraft technologies that reduce fuel use, emissions, and noise. Relating to sustainable aviation gas, CLEEN funds are trying to research higher blends of biofuels to petroleum-based fuels which can affect seal performance.

On average, this fuel costs three to five times more than conventional jet fuel. We already have the jet fuel. It is already efficient. It is already clean. We have already reduced emissions more than all the other countries combined. We already met the Paris climate accords requirements without being in the accord.

Now, other barriers to adoption include risks related to adoption, including safety.

Mr. Chairman, as a person who has sat behind the stick and who has been up in the air, I can tell you the pucker factor is pretty high when the engine quits. I don't know about you, but I don't want to be experimenting with fuel while I am up in the air, and I don't want the pilots up front to be forced to experiment with it because the government says so.

We have something that works. The private sector can figure this out. They can invest in it, they can pay for it, and they can perfect it.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, there is a race on. There is a race on aviation, a race to implement and use new fuels that are more efficient and that are also cleaner. There is a race on, and other countries and regions of the world are investing in that race, putting their companies at a competitive advantage over the U.S.-based companies. The CLEEN Program is one of our tools to participate in that race.

The CLEEN Program also helps us invest in fuel efficiency. The fuel efficiency of aviation has helped reduce aviation fuel burn in this country.

There is a direct relationship between the goodness of the taxpayer investment in the CLEEN Program to

the new fuel-efficient airplanes that we see being used today and the fuel-efficient engines that we see being used today.

The next version of that, the next step of that race is sustainable aviation fuel. It is in electric propulsion, and in the future it is hydrogen propulsion. There is quite a bit of private-sector investment going on in the use of hydrogen as a fuel to move things, including airplanes.

Now, we are not quite there yet in this country in the private sector, but no one else is either. I want to win that race, and part of winning that race is ensuring that the Federal Government is a partner in winning that race. Winning that race in aviation is ensuring that FAA has tools like CLEEN to be sure that it is a partner with airlines, with entrepreneurs, and with innovators who want us to participate in this race.

Mr. Chair, I ask Members to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, we don't need to provide more subsidies to support this climate smart agriculture practice and production of aviation biofuel feedstocks.

It actually makes your food more expensive because we are burning your fuel in an aircraft instead of pumping it out of the ground where the fuel has come from and has worked very, very well.

There are up to \$3 billion in DOE loan guarantees. I want to win the race, too, but the Federal Government picking winners and losers ensures that we probably will lose the race because we are going to pick the wrong one, as the Federal Government normally does.

Once again, this is an absurd policy. If it were viable at all, the private sector would invest in it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if going to the Moon in 1969 was viable at all, the private sector would have done it. It didn't. We did it. America did it, and America did it with investment.

I am not making a wild claim like going to the Moon is exactly this kind of race that we are faced with, but there is a clear role for the Federal Government to play in a partnership with innovators and entrepreneurs to ensure that the next generation of innovation and aviation happens in the United States and not elsewhere.

I ask folks to support the CLEEN program, to not limit its use, and to oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 74 printed in part A of House Report 118-147.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 11, line 14, strike "4,000,000,000" and insert "3,800,000,000".

Page 11, line 15, strike "4,000,000,000" and insert "3,800,000,000".

Page 11, line 16, strike "4,000,000,000" and insert "3,800,000,000".

Page 11, line 17, strike "4,000,000,000" and insert "3,800,000,000".

Page 11, line 18, strike "4,000,000,000" and insert "3,800,000,000".

Page 12, line 24, strike "12,730,000,000" and insert "12,037,000,000".

Page 12, line 25, strike "13,035,000,000" and insert "12,337,000,000".

Page 13, line 1, strike "13,334,000,000" and insert "12,637,000,000".

Page 13, line 3, strike "13,640,000,000" and insert "12,937,000,000".

Page 13, line 5, strike "13,954,000,000" and insert "13,237,000,000".

Page 818, line 1, strike "255,130,000" and insert "220,000,000".

Page 818, line 2, strike "261,000,000" and insert "223,000,000".

Page 818, line 3, strike "267,000,000" and insert "226,000,000".

Page 818, line 4, strike "273,000,000" and insert "229,000,000".

Page 818, line 5, strike "279,000,000" and insert "232,000,000".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just like the last amendment, this amendment recognizes the fact that our country is out of money. We are borrowing money to pay our bills, and we are paying for things that we can't afford. We are paying for things that these folks can't afford.

Mr. Chair, this amendment reduces the authorization levels in section 101, which is airport planning; section 103, which is operations; and section 1111, which is research and development.

The authorization levels in the underlying bill represent a significant increase from the levels set by Congress in the 2018 reauthorization bill.

For example, the underlying bill raises the authorizations by significant

amounts from FY 2023 to FY 2024: 101 by \$650 million, 103 by \$1.2 billion, and 1111 by \$41 million.

This amendment reduces the growth of these authorization levels while still increasing the funds authorized for FAA, resulting in a net savings of nearly \$5 billion.

If we are going to raise the level, understanding and recognizing inflation caused by out-of-control spending in this place, we are going to recognize and understand that the FAA still has to continue to operate, but we are not going to raise it so much.

Our national debt is out of control, and it is this mindless, rapid growth of spending in Washington that has put our Nation on the brink of catastrophe.

Moreover, this massive increase in funding is not resulting in a safer or more efficient FAA mission. That is their mission: safety, more efficiency. It instead represents a significant misallocation of resources to woke and green missions at the expense of safety and financial sanity.

We must reorient the FAA back to its original mission and ensure the funding we provide to them is appropriate to meet the moment while not wasting taxpayer resources.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment which would slash funding authorization levels for the Airport Improvement Program, the AIP, FAA operations and maintenance, and research and development efforts.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee overwhelmingly agreed that AIP funding must be increased to \$4 billion annually in order to fund critical programs across the FAA and invest in our aviation industry.

This amendment would slash that funding level and impede the full funding of grants and projects to address the pressing infrastructure needs of airports across the country.

It would also significantly decrease FAA operations and maintenance funding, which jeopardizes the effectiveness of the agency amidst growing demands placed upon the aviation industry.

Finally, this amendment cuts agreed-upon funding for the FAA's research and development activities on aircraft safety, on environmental impact mitigation, on airport infrastructure, and on human factors and new airspace entrants, among other important issues.

Cutting this critical funding would undermine U.S. aerospace innovation and our relationship in the global sector. Moreover, it would put public safety at risk.

For those reasons, I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from the other side of the aisle, but I want to clarify. It is not a cut. We are actually increasing the spend; just not as much.

Now, I know in Washington, oh, my goodness, who knew the request was up to \$4 billion? I imagine they would take more than \$4 billion if we gave it to them.

We are broke. Hello, America. Wake up, everybody. I have a news flash for you. We don't have anymore money. We are borrowing money to pay the bills. We are borrowing money to pay for things that we can't afford. That is what we are trying to fix here.

If you want to save some money somewhere else and spend it here, I am all ears. Let's talk about it. Something has to give. These people can't afford any more. They are not getting more out of this.

I have been in the room. I used to sit on appropriations in the State House. I know how it goes. Well, we spent this much this year or last year. We are just going to add some more this year.

Nobody goes through line by line and says, oh, well, this costs this much more because concrete costs X and labor costs Y. Nobody does that. They just add money to it.

It is all arbitrary, and we know it. Everybody in this place knows it. That is why we should spend less because we don't have the money to spend.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, if we have the money to shore up our nuclear defense capability, more and more nuclear weapons, we certainly have the ability to keep these people up here safe as they fly in and out of Washington, D.C.

Our families, businesspeople, the flying public deserves Congress to fully fund what the consensus has arrived at.

This is what Americans want us to do. They want us to arrive at a consensus. This FAA reauthorization bill is a bipartisan effort, and all of the figures were arrived at in a bipartisan way, and we present this to the American people for their protection and for their safety.

I agree that there may be cuts that may be necessary, but not to this particular program. I respectfully disagree with my friend on the other side of the aisle, and I will ask my colleagues to join me in being opposed to this amendment.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, since my good friend brought it up, it was a bipartisan agreement. So the world knows that it was a bipartisan agreement here, known in Congress as what

is called a four-corners deal: two on their side, two on our side.

There are 435 Members of Congress. I wasn't involved. I wasn't one of the four. You weren't one of the four. Nobody else here was one of the four.

They decided to spend all these billions of dollars. They didn't come to me and say, well, we need this much for concrete and this much for research, because they decided, and this is what is in the bill. Heaven forbid anybody challenge it.

Mr. Chair, we do not have the money. We should reduce the authorization. It is still an increase, just not as much, and it recognizes the fact that our country is broke.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank you for the indulgence here. The fact is, we have the money, and we need to spend this money to promote the public welfare and the public safety. That is what we are doing with this expenditure, with this authorization for that expenditure, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting public safety and the safety of the flying public.

We have the best aviation system in the world. We need to keep it that way. We have to invest in it. That is what this is all about. We don't need to divest and put our public at risk.

Mr. Chair, I ask that my colleagues vote to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 75 printed in part A of House Report 118-147.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 257, strike lines 11 and 12 and insert the following (and adjust the margin of the subsequent text accordingly):

“(9) ‘heliport’ means an area of land, water, or

Page 257, line 15, strike “and” and insert closing quotation marks and a semicolon.

Page 257, strike line 16.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 597, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes the word "vertiport" from the definition of "helicopter" for the purposes of AIP funding, the same funding that the gentleman on the other side of the aisle just mentioned that we need so much of.

As a helicopter pilot, I am very interested in the funding for heliports, but vertiports are going to use some of that funding; meanwhile, not paying anything in.

Let me tell you, Mr. Chair. Vertiports exist for the purpose of advanced air mobility and electric vertical takeoff and landing or eVTOL vehicles, which only exist in prototype and other nascent stages.

Mr. Chair, eVTOL is so immature in its development that there is a reality index that actually exists—an Advanced Air Mobility Reality Index.

The reality index ranks companies and essentially determines whether there is a reality that these things are ever going to even come to the market, be produced, and be viable. Is that something we should be investing in?

These are ranked and combined to describe the likelihood of the aircraft certification and production on scale. Again, this is a ranking of the likelihood that these things even get produced, much less used.

Furthermore, if these vehicles become the norm, Jetson style like their proponents envision, allowing AAM vehicles to receive the benefits of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund without paying into it, evokes the same debate we are currently having about the government-mandated transition to electric automobiles which don't pay into the highway fund. They don't pay in, but they use it.

The same thing here. These vehicles want to use it, but they don't want to pay into it. They are robbing from everybody else that has to use it that actually currently exists and are used.

I haven't even gotten into the drawbacks of the potential vehicles, but how about being concerned about adequate storage for hazardous materials to respond to lithium and other critical mineral-related fires?

The fires are challenging enough for firefighters to address on the ground or at sea, let alone having them occur between skyscrapers.

If you wonder, do these fires actually exist, you can just search the internet. It is widely known. You can see the electric vehicles burning at the charger, burning people's garages, burning and burning and burning. There is a problem because they are unstable.

If you want to get in the air and fly in one of these things, God bless you, but your money is going to be transferred to deal with these things that don't pay into the fund. They don't pay anything in, yet they are going to draw money out.

This system works when the users pay into it. That is how it works. Otherwise, these folks up here are going to have to pay extra because there is not

going to be enough money in the fund to pay for all of it.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I speak in opposition to the amendment. My friend on the other side is well intentioned on this. However, we may be putting the cart before the horse.

This bill would strike the requirement in the underlying bill for the FAA to update the definitions in regulation to classify vertiports as a subset of heliports.

The term "vertiport" is already being used in the advanced air mobility, AAM, industry to describe points at which these advanced aircraft can safely take off and land.

□ 1715

The updated definition in the underlying bill will help to create a unified system for vertical aviation infrastructure, including for electric aircraft, and provides necessary regulatory certainty for this emerging sector to grow in the United States and also sets the stage for the assessment of revenue by which we can continue to keep the system upgraded and available for all, including these aircraft that will use the vertiport.

This is about planning for the future, laying in the regulatory groundwork for the future. For the reason that we need to do this, I oppose this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the clarification, and I marvel at the fact that we can include the definition and the term in preparation for something that right now doesn't really exist practically. It is in people's minds, and it is on a computer. There are prototypes out there.

We can do that, but we can't find any way to charge and make sure they are paying their fair share into the fund that they are going to use the infrastructure of, right? The infrastructure is created by the fund, and they are going to use it, but they ain't going to pay. We can't figure that out, but we sure can make sure that they have access to everything else that everyone is paying for.

Ladies and gentlemen, in Washington, D.C., this is how things go awry. This is how you go broke. This is how you can't afford things that you need to do, like pay for your highways, filled now with electric vehicles that are not paying into the system, paying nothing for the roads that they are on, weighing thousands of pounds in excess of most of the regular cars that are using the road now and are paying the fee.

Do you know what we are going to do because we are so brilliant and because that is working so well? We are going to double down and do it in the air, as well. That is awesome.

It is not awesome, ladies and gentlemen. Do you know what else is not awesome? Most of the materials sourced in this stuff come from the Communist Chinese, made by slave labor, whether it is the actual slave labor in concentration camps in east Turkistan or whether it is the child slave labor in the Congo feeding the Chinese machine, feeding the machine here so we can virtue signal that we are doing everything clean, that we are electrified and are not going to charge anybody for it. Somebody is going to pay.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, sometimes we do need to raise revenue, and I look forward to supporting any proposals that my friend on the other side would propose, out of fairness, I think. I mean, no one segment should be able to get a free ride, so I would appreciate that.

The fact of the matter is that most of my friends on the other side of the aisle have already signed on to the Grover Norquist no new tax pledge, so for years, they have neglected to raise revenues where appropriate, and they will continue to abide by the pledge that they have given.

So far, I don't see any yield in that trajectory, but the fact is we are going to have to raise some revenue as we move forward, and I look forward to working with the gentleman in that endeavor.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Missouri) having assumed the chair, Mr. FLOOD, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3935) to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize and improve the Federal Aviation Administration and other civil

aviation programs, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-56)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, under which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13863 of March 15, 2019, is to continue in effect beyond July 24, 2023.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations have reached such scope and gravity that they threaten the stability of international political and economic systems. Such organizations are becoming increasingly sophisticated and dangerous to the United States; they are increasingly entrenched in the operations of foreign governments and the international financial system, thereby weakening democratic institutions, degrading the rule of law, and undermining economic markets. These organizations facilitate and aggravate violent civil conflicts and increasingly facilitate the activities of other dangerous persons.

Significant transnational criminal organizations continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations declared in Executive Order 13581.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.,
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 19, 2023.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 9 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 3941; and

Passage of H.R. 3941, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

SCHOOLS NOT SHELTERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 3941) to prohibit the use of the facilities of a public elementary school, a public secondary school, or an institution of higher education to provide shelter for aliens who have not been admitted into the United States, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. VASQUEZ), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 200, nays 212, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

YEAS—200

Adams	Clyburn	Green, Al (TX)
Aguiar	Connolly	Grijalva
Allred	Correa	Harder (CA)
Auchincloss	Costa	Hayes
Balint	Courtney	Higgins (NY)
Barragán	Craig	Himes
Beatty	Crockett	Horsford
Bera	Crow	Houlahan
Beyer	Cuellar	Hoyer
Bishop (GA)	Davids (KS)	Hoyle (OR)
Blumenauer	Davis (IL)	Huffman
Blunt Rochester	Dean (PA)	Ivey
Bonamici	DeGette	Jackson (IL)
Bowman	DelBene	Jackson (NC)
Boyle (PA)	Deluzio	Jackson Lee
Brown	DeSaulnier	Jacobs
Brownley	Dingell	Jayapal
Budzinski	Doggett	Jeffries
Bush	Escobar	Keating
Caraveo	Eshoo	Kelly (IL)
Carbajal	Espallat	Khanna
Cárdenas	Evans	Kildee
Carson	Fletcher	Kilmer
Cartwright	Foster	Kim (NJ)
Casar	Foushee	Krishnamoorthi
Case	Frankel, Lois	Kuster
Casten	Frost	Landman
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	Larsen (WA)
Castro (TX)	García (IL)	Larson (CT)
Cherfilus-	García (TX)	Lee (CA)
McCormick	García, Robert	Lee (NV)
Chu	Golden (ME)	Lee (PA)
Clark (MA)	Goldman (NY)	Levin
Clarke (NY)	Gomez	Lieu
Cleaver	Gottheimer	Lofgren

Lynch	Peters	Stansbury
Magaziner	Pettersen	Stanton
Manning	Phillips	Stevens
Matsui	Pingree	Strickland
McBath	Pocan	Swalwell
McClellan	Porter	Sykes
McCollum	Pressley	Takano
McGarvey	Quigley	Thanedar
Meeks	Ramirez	Thompson (CA)
Menendez	Raskin	Thompson (MS)
Meng	Ross	Titus
Mfume	Ruiz	Tlaib
Moore (WI)	Ruppersberger	Tokuda
Morelle	Ryan	Tonko
Moskowitz	Salinas	Torres (CA)
Moulton	Sánchez	Torres (NY)
Mrvan	Sarbanes	Trahan
Mullin	Scanlon	Trone
Nadler	Schakowsky	Underwood
Napolitano	Schiff	Vargas
Neal	Schneider	Vasquez
Neguse	Scholten	Veasey
Nickel	Schrier	Velázquez
Norcross	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Ocasio-Cortez	Scott, David	Schultz
Omar	Sewell	Waters
Pallone	Sherman	Watson Coleman
Panetta	Sherrill	Wexton
Pappas	Slotkin	Wild
Pascrell	Smith (WA)	Williams (GA)
Pelosi	Sorensen	Wilson (FL)
Peltola	Soto	
Perez	Spanberger	

NAYS—212

Aderholt	Fitzpatrick	Malliotakis
Alford	Flood	Mann
Allen	Fox	Massie
Amodei	Franklin, C.	Mast
Armstrong	Scott	McCarthy
Babin	Fry	McCaul
Bacon	Fulcher	McClain
Baird	Gaetz	McClintock
Balderson	Gallagher	McCormick
Banks	Garcia, Mike	McHenry
Barr	Gimenez	Miller (IL)
Bean (FL)	Gonzales, Tony	Miller (OH)
Bentz	Good (VA)	Miller (WV)
Bergman	Gooden (TX)	Miller-Meeks
Bice	Gosar	Mills
Biggs	Graves (LA)	Molinaro
Billirakis	Graves (MO)	Moolenaar
Bishop (NC)	Green (TN)	Mooney
Boebert	Greene (GA)	Moore (AL)
Bost	Griffith	Moore (UT)
Brecheen	Grothman	Moran
Buchanan	Guest	Murphy
Buck	Guthrie	Nehls
Bucshon	Hageman	Newhouse
Burchett	Harris	Norman
Burgess	Harshbarger	Nunn (IA)
Burlison	Hern	Oberholte
Calvert	Higgins (LA)	Ogles
Cammack	Hill	Owens
Carey	Hinson	Palmer
Carl	Houchin	Pence
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Perry
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Pfuger
Chavez-DeRemer	Hunt	Posey
Ciscomani	Issa	Reschenthaler
Cline	Jackson (TX)	Rodgers (WA)
Cloud	James	Rogers (AL)
Clyde	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rose
Collins	Johnson (SD)	Rosendale
Comer	Jordan	Rouzer
Crane	Joyce (PA)	Roy
Crawford	Kean (NJ)	Rutherford
Curtis	Kelly (MS)	Salazar
D'Esposito	Kelly (PA)	Santos
Davidson	Kiggans (VA)	Scalise
De La Cruz	Kiley	Schweikert
DesJarlais	Kim (CA)	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff	Self
Donalds	LaHood	Sessions
Duarte	LaLota	Simpson
Duncan	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Dunn (FL)	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Edwards	Langworthy	Smith (NJ)
Ellzey	Latta	Smucker
Emmer	LaTurner	Spartz
Estes	Larson	Staub
Ezell	Lesko	Steel
Fallon	Letlow	Stefanik
Feenstra	Loudermilk	Steil
Ferguson	Lucas	Steube
Finstad	Luetkemeyer	Strong
Fischbach	Luna	Tenney
Fitzgerald	Luttrell	Thompson (PA)