FAA reauthorization bill, which I expect the House may try to take up this week.

In fiscal year 2010, the FAA's major programs were funded at approximately $16 billion. H.R. 658, the FAA Reauthorization and Reform Act of 2011, is a 4-year reauthorization that would reduce the FAA's annual funding to approximately 2008 appropriation levels, $14.9 billion, for the remainder of 2011 and then each year through fiscal year 2014. H.R. 658 would effectively cut, roughly, $1 billion annually and almost $4 billion total below current funding levels for FAA's budget over the next 4 years. These proposed cuts will have dire consequences on our Nation's infrastructure, jobs, and the economy.

Mr. Speaker, in February, the House Aviation Subcommittee held a hearing for industry stakeholders to testify about FAA reauthorization. In response to a question that I posed, witnesses representing the aerospace industry, general aviation manufacturers, general aviation pilots, airports, air traffic controllers, and FAA managers all testified that Congress could not cut $1 billion annually from the FAA's budget without harming safety-sensitive programs or hampering the industry. At the same hearing, Ms. Marion Blakey, the FAA administrator under President George W. Bush, stated: ''The prospect is really devastating to jobs and to our future.''

Every $1 billion of Federal investment in infrastructure creates or sustains approximately 35,000 jobs. Yet H.R. 658 would cut the airport improvement grants for runway construction and safety enhancements by almost $2 billion. Cuts to airport improvement grants alone would cost the Nation 70,000 jobs.

□ 1420

So let's be clear about one thing: The FAA reauthorization bill that we will consider later this week will not create jobs; it will destroy them. Although much work is ahead of us, I'm optimistic that Congress will be able to enact a long-term bill and we will not be considering a 19th short-term extension this summer. For the present, however, this particular extension, this bill before us today, I support, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. I would just like to observe to my colleague, we will have plenty of opportunity to defend and debate the overall reauthorization later this week. The reauthorization bill is broadly supported by the industry affected. We may differ on some portions of it, but one of the major features of the reauthorization is to put in place a strengthened framework and benchmarks for NextGen; and as that new technology is deployed, almost every expert we've had testifying before the committee has said it will markedly increase the efficiency and safety of the aviation industry and reduce fuel use by some 25 percent, helping the environment and our import situation as well.

In any event, I would like to mention that the current reauthorization extension, the short-term extension before us, has bipartisan support. I would urge my colleagues in both parties to support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1079.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 839 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE HAMP TERMINATION ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 170 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 839.

□ 1425

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 839) to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to terminate the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to provide new assistance under the Home Affordable Modification Program, while preserving assistance to homeowners who were already extended an offer to participate in the Program, either on a trial or permanent basis, with Mr. POE of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 839, the Home Affordable Modification Program, or HAMP, Termination Act and commend my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) for introducing this bill.

H.R. 839, the HAMP Termination Act, would put an end to the poster child for failed Federal foreclosure programs. Announced by the administration in February 2009 and launched in March 2009, the program has languished for 2 years, hurt hundreds of thousands of homeowners, and must come to an end.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill would save $1.4 billion over 10 years. To date, the HAMP program has already consumed $840 million of the more than $30 billion of TARP funds that were set aside for the program. For this extraordinary investment, the administration predicted that 3 to 4 million homeowners would receive help.

Sadly, for many American homeowners, the program has been an abysmal failure. In fact, HAMP has hurt more homeowners than it has helped. The program has completed about 540,000 mortgage modifications. Another 740,000 unlucky homeowners had the rug pulled out from under them: their modifications were cancelled. Even the Government Accountability Office, GAO, commented that ''more borrowers have had their trial modifications cancelled than have received permanent modifications.''

Earlier this month, on March 2, the Financial Services Subcommittee on Insurance, Housing, and Community Opportunity received testimony from the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, SIGTARP, Neil Barofsky. He exposed the most hazardous failing of the program, noting that ''there have been countless published reports on HAMP participants who end up worse off for having engaged in a futile attempt to obtain the sustainable relief that the program promised. Failed trial modifications often leave borrowers with more principal outstanding on their loans, less home equity, depleted savings, and worse credit scores.'' He continued by saying that ''worst of all, even in circumstances where they never missed a payment, they may face back payments, penalties, and even late fees that suddenly become due on their 'modified' mortgages and that they are unable to pay, thus resulting in the very loss of their homes that HAMP was meant to prevent.''

Mr. Chairman, many of my own constituents, like homeowners around the country, were lured into HAMP with the promise of relief. In the end, these misled homeowners ended up with no permanent modification, tens of thousands of dollars deeper in debt. One of my constituents reported that after many, many months under a trial modification, he was rejected from the program and immediately handed a bill for $42,000 in back payments, penalties, and late fees. How is that an effective foreclosure protection?