

The Commission also set out minimum service standards for Lifeline-supported services to ensure maximum value for the universal service dollar, and established a National Eligibility Verifier to make independent subscriber eligibility determinations.

Lifeline enables the most vulnerable among us to be participating members of our society; cutting wireless services could prevent individuals from being able to, among other things: receive a communication about a child's illness at school while they are at work; summon medical help in a car accident; speak with their employers about additional work shifts while commuting by public transit; or

alert first-responders of public emergencies (such as a fast-moving fire, a flooded road, or a violent attack) that pose a threat to the larger community.

Today, 9.8 million Americans depend on the Lifeline program to stay connected using mobile phones.

The legislation comes on the heels of real enforcement by the FCC to crack down on carriers that have abused the program, including a \$51 million fine against Total Call Mobile announced in April.

Even more, this shameful bill was not considered under regular order and has not been considered by any committee.

If the critics of the Lifeline program sincerely think the costs of the program are a problem, they should work with Democrats to address inequality, to close the gender pay gap, to raise the minimum wage, and to put more people to work through universal broadband infrastructure projects.

The Lifeline Program is working in my state of Texas.

Texans are eligible for lifeline cell phone service if they receive benefits from any of the following programs:

National School Lunch (free program only);
Federal Public Housing Assistance / Section 8;

Health Benefit Coverage under Children's Health Insurance Plan (CHIP);

Low Income Home Energy Assistance (LIHEAP)

Medicaid;
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (Food Stamps);

Supplemental Security Income (SSI);
Bureau of Indian Affairs General Assistance;
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families;
Tribally-Administered Temporary Assistance for Needy Families;

Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations;

You may also qualify for lifeline service in Texas if your Total Household Income is at or under 150 percent of the Federal Poverty Guidelines.

For these reasons I join the NAACP in strongly opposing H.R. 5525, because it will do real damage to our national effort to expand indispensable access to telephone and cellphone service.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 5525.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5525.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

AUTHORIZING USE OF PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES FROM ONE AIRPORT AT A PREVIOUSLY ASSOCIATED AIRPORT

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4369) to authorize the use of passenger facility charges at an airport previously associated with the airport at which the charges are collected.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4369

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

SECTION 1. USE OF PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES FROM ONE AIRPORT AT A PREVIOUSLY ASSOCIATED AIRPORT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On December 22, 2015, the Los Angeles City Council, the Los Angeles Board of Airport Commissioners, the Los Angeles World Airports, the Ontario City Council, and the Ontario International Airport Authority agreed to transfer ownership and control of Ontario International Airport from the city of Los Angeles and Los Angeles World Airports to the Ontario International Airport Authority, a local joint powers authority established by and between the county of San Bernardino and the city of Ontario.

(2) Pursuant to the agreement, the Ontario International Airport Authority intends to use between \$70,000,000 and \$120,000,000 in passenger facility charges collected at Ontario International Airport to finance eligible projects at Los Angeles International Airport, as compensation for passenger facility charges collected, consistent with section 40117(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, at Los Angeles International Airport for use at Ontario International Airport in the 1990s, when both airports were controlled by Los Angeles World Airports.

(3) The amendment made by subsection (b) applies exclusively to Ontario International Airport, allowing passenger facility charges to be used for eligible projects at Los Angeles International Airport while making no other changes to passenger facility charges eligibility requirements.

(4) No additional appropriations are required to implement the agreement described in paragraph (1) or the amendment made by subsection (b).

(b) PASSENGER FACILITY CHARGES.—Section 40117(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) USE OF PFC REVENUES AT PREVIOUSLY ASSOCIATED AIRPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the requirements of paragraph (1) and subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may authorize use of a passenger facility charge to finance an eligible airport-related project if—

“(i) the eligible agency seeking to impose the new charge controls an airport where a \$2 passenger facility charge became effective on January 1, 2013; and

“(ii) the airport described in clause (i) and the airport at which the project will be carried out were under the control of the same eligible agency on October 1, 2015.

“(B) LIMITATION.—Not more than \$120,000,000 in passenger facility charges collected under subparagraph (A) may be used to carry out an eligible airport-related project described in that subparagraph.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4369.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4369, a bill that will provide regulatory relief to Los Angeles International Airport and Ontario International Airport and facilitate a transfer of Ontario International Airport to a new airport authority.

I want to thank Mr. CALVERT, the sponsor of the bill, for introducing this legislation and for his leadership on this issue.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4369.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4369, as you heard, is a bipartisan, narrowly tailored bill to address a time-sensitive issue in southern California that impacts the Ontario and Los Angeles International Airports, both of which serve my district in southern Nevada.

This bill has the support of my colleagues from southern California, and I appreciate them coming to the floor today to speak about its importance to their districts.

Mr. Speaker, when one airport authority takes ownership of an airport from another authority, there needs to be a process by which that new authority can repay the passenger facility charges that were collected up to that point. This bill would provide such a mechanism.

There is urgency in addressing this issue, as the current transfer authority between these two airports is set to expire at the end of this year. I support that, but I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the fact that, while we stand on the floor today discussing this urgent matter affecting our aviation system, we are mere weeks away from