

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, some of our Nation's heroes never made it home. Others returned bearing the scars of captivity, both visible and unseen. Behind every prisoner of war and missing soldier is a story of sacrifice, of family left waiting, and a nation with a solemn duty to remember.

Today, I rise in honor of National Prisoner of War/Missing in Action Recognition Day to remember the more than 500,000 POWs who endured the horrors of enemy captivity. We also honor the tens of thousands still missing in action.

These patriots and their loved ones deserve more than a single day of remembrance. They deserve a permanent place of honor. That is why I have introduced legislation to designate the POW/MIA Memorial Museum at Cecil Field in northeast Florida, just outside of Jacksonville, as a national landmark.

Mr. Speaker, on this day, with grateful hearts, we, the people, reaffirm our promise to account for every missing hero. May we never forget.

EDESIA NUTRITION

(Mr. MAGAZINER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the 42nd time to call on the Trump administration to restore lifesaving food aid for starving children. Edesia Nutrition, an organization in my district, manufactures Plumpy'Nut, a nutritional supplement that helps starving children get back to health.

Their production has been largely shut down since the Trump administration froze the program in January. I have been speaking out on this floor for months, calling on that program to be restored.

We have had an interesting challenge that we have been trying to figure out which is: When do we declare victory? I think that every day I come up here might be my last. Time after time, the Trump administration has said they will restore the program. They put in purchase orders. They put out RFPs. They have tweeted. They have posted. They have testified this program will be restarted. Yet, thousands of boxes remain stuck in a warehouse in Rhode Island, instead of getting to the children who need it.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to speak on this floor every day until those boxes move because promises and intentions are not enough to save the lives of starving children.

GEORGIAN DREAM PARTY SABOTAGED TRUMP

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is revealing that the cor-

rupt Georgian Dream party of the Republic of Georgia canceled a proposed Trump Tower project in Batumi, which Donald Trump had personally announced in 2012.

Elections were rigged in Georgia last October. The illegitimate Georgian Dream party Putinist conspirator, Ivanishvili, has ridiculed Trump as a trickster. It is clear the illegitimate Georgian Dream party sabotaged President Donald Trump, while it has given its port on the Black Sea to the Chinese Communist Party.

America supports the freedom-loving Georgian people and rejects the current Georgian Dream regime. The United States House of Representatives voted 349–42 for fair elections in Georgia. The tyrannical regime is ruthlessly arresting political opposition. President Salome Zourabichvili, who is the legitimate President, is courageous as a champion for the people of Georgia.

In conclusion, God bless our troops as the global war on terrorism continues. Trump is reinstituting peace through strength, revealing war criminal Putin lies, insulting and mocking Trump, as Putin invaded Poland last week with 19 drones and 100 miles, reminiscent of Stalin joining Hitler invading Poland on September 17, 1939, 86 years ago this week to kill 69,000 Poles in 5 weeks.

SICKLE CELL AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. FIGURES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FIGURES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge that September is Sickle Cell Awareness Month. It is a time to recognize the challenges faced by those living with this debilitating genetic disease.

This disease is one that disproportionately affects Black people who make up 90 percent of those diagnosed with this terrible condition. One person is a young man that I had the opportunity to meet down in Mobile, Alabama, my hometown. He is a 5-year-old gentleman named Dakota Williams. He is a student at Council Traditional School of which I am a proud alum myself.

The only known cure for sickle cell is a bone marrow or stem cell transplant. It is risky, and it is often inaccessible, especially in certain communities. That is why urgent investment in research, treatment, and equitable care is critical.

That is why we need to pass the Sickle Cell Disease Comprehensive Care Act, introduced by my Republican colleague out of Florida, Representative NEAL DUNN. I am a proud cosponsor, and I thank him for his leadership on this issue.

We need this so we can better understand and improve how we track and understand care for patients like Dakota and so we can better identify where resources and support are most needed.

Mr. Speaker, this month and every month, we must stand with those living with sickle cell disease and fight for a future where they have hope and health.

MAKING HOMELESSNESS A NATIONAL PRIORITY

(Mr. SUBRAMANYAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SUBRAMANYAM. Mr. Speaker, America is the richest country in the world. Yet, we have 700,000 homeless people including tens of thousands of veterans. Getting Americans housing and mental health services needs to be a national priority.

It is alarming to hear that instead of solving the problem there are some rightwing media commentators who want to execute mentally ill homeless people. I think the words they said were to just kill them. This was followed by a lackluster apology. It makes me think that maybe they meant it.

I don't think this is the position of the rightwing or the Republican Party. What this administration is doing is banning encampments with no long-term strategy and cutting funding for community services to those individuals.

Out of sight and out of mind is not a solution to homelessness. We cannot sweep homelessness and the homelessness crisis under the rug. We have been talking about violent rhetoric recently. Let's apply that to homeless people, as well.

Since these comments, there were two mass shootings at Minnesota homeless encampments. Our words do matter. We need to come together to solve the homelessness crisis in our country and not incite violence against them.

Mr. Speaker, let's work together in a bipartisan way instead of continuing that kind of rhetoric.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1245

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama) at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

PROMOTING CROSS-BORDER ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 707, I call up

the bill (H.R. 3062) to establish a more uniform, transparent, and modern process to authorize the construction, connection, operation, and maintenance of international border-crossing facilities for the import and export of oil and natural gas and the transmission of electricity, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3062

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Promoting Cross-border Energy Infrastructure Act”.

SEC. 2. STRENGTHENING NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS AT AN INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3) and subsection (e), no person may construct, connect, operate, or maintain a border-crossing facility for the import or export of oil or natural gas, or the transmission of electricity, across an international border of the United States without obtaining a certificate of crossing for the border-crossing facility under this subsection.

(2) CERTIFICATE OF CROSSING.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 120 days after final action is taken, by the relevant official or agency identified under subparagraph (B), under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) with respect to a border-crossing facility for which a person requests a certificate of crossing under this subsection, the relevant official or agency, in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, shall issue a certificate of crossing for the border-crossing facility unless the relevant official or agency finds that the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of the border-crossing facility is not in the public interest of the United States.

(B) RELEVANT OFFICIAL OR AGENCY.—The relevant official or agency referred to in subparagraph (A) is—

(i) the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with respect to border-crossing facilities consisting of oil or natural gas pipelines; and

(ii) the Secretary of Energy with respect to border-crossing facilities consisting of electric transmission facilities.

(C) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION FACILITIES.—In the case of a request for a certificate of crossing for a border-crossing facility consisting of an electric transmission facility, the Secretary of Energy shall require, as a condition of issuing the certificate of crossing under subparagraph (A), that the border-crossing facility be constructed, connected, operated, or maintained consistent with all applicable policies and standards of—

(i) the Electric Reliability Organization and the applicable regional entity; and

(ii) any Regional Transmission Organization or Independent System Operator with operational or functional control over the border-crossing facility.

(3) EXCLUSIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to any construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of a border-crossing facility

for the import or export of oil or natural gas, or the transmission of electricity—

(A) if the border-crossing facility is operating for such import, export, or transmission as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) if a Presidential permit (or similar permit) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance has been issued pursuant to any provision of law or Executive order; or

(C) if an application for a Presidential permit (or similar permit) for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, until the earlier of—

(i) the date on which such application is denied; or

(ii) two years after the date of enactment of this Act, if such a permit has not been issued by such date of enactment.

(4) EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.—

(A) APPLICATION TO PROJECTS.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (e) shall affect the application of any other Federal statute to a project for which a certificate of crossing for a border-crossing facility is requested under this subsection.

(B) NATURAL GAS ACT.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (e) shall affect the requirement to obtain approval or authorization under sections 3 and 7 of the Natural Gas Act for the siting, construction, or operation of any facility to import or export natural gas.

(C) OIL PIPELINES.—Nothing in this subsection or subsection (e) shall affect the authority of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with respect to oil pipelines under section 60502 of title 49, United States Code.

(b) IMPORTATION OR EXPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “In the case of an application for the importation of natural gas from, or the exportation of natural gas to, Canada or Mexico, the Commission shall grant the application not later than 30 days after the date on which the Commission receives the complete application.”.

(c) TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY TO CANADA AND MEXICO.—

(1) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO SECURE ORDER.—Section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(e)) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) STATE REGULATIONS.—Section 202(f) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(f)) is amended by striking “insofar as such State regulation does not conflict with the exercise of the Commission’s powers under or relating to subsection 202(e)”.

(B) SEASONAL DIVERSITY ELECTRICITY EXCHANGE.—Section 602(b) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 824a-4(b)) is amended by striking “the Commission has conducted hearings and made the findings required under section 202(e) of the Federal Power Act” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “the Secretary has conducted hearings and finds that the proposed transmission facilities would not impair the sufficiency of electric supply within the United States or would not impede or tend to impede the coordination in the public interest of facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary.”.

(d) NO PRESIDENTIAL PERMIT REQUIRED.—No Presidential permit (or similar permit) shall be required pursuant to any provision of law or Executive order for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility, or any border-crossing facility thereof.

(e) MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROJECTS.—No certificate of crossing under subsection (a), or Presidential permit (or similar permit), shall be required for a modification to—

(1) an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is operating for the import or export of oil or natural gas or the

transmission of electricity as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility for which a Presidential permit (or similar permit) has been issued pursuant to any provision of law or Executive order; or

(3) a border-crossing facility for which a certificate of crossing has previously been issued under subsection (a).

(f) PROHIBITION ON REVOCATION OF PRESIDENTIAL PERMITS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not revoke a Presidential permit (or similar permit) issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 13337 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), Executive Order No. 11423 (3 U.S.C. 301 note), Executive Order No. 12038 (42 U.S.C. 7151 note), Executive Order No. 10485 (15 U.S.C. 717b note), or any other Executive order for the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility, or any border-crossing facility thereof, unless such revocation is authorized by an Act of Congress.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE; RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (a) through (e), and the amendments made by such subsections, shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) RULEMAKING DEADLINES.—Each relevant official or agency described in subsection (a)(2)(B) shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register notice of a proposed rulemaking to carry out the applicable requirements of subsection (a); and

(B) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, publish in the Federal Register a final rule to carry out the applicable requirements of subsection (a).

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BORDER-CROSSING FACILITY.—The term “border-crossing facility” means the portion of an oil or natural gas pipeline or electric transmission facility that is located within 1,000 feet of the international boundary of the United States, measured from the point at which the facility crosses such boundary into the United States.

(2) MODIFICATION.—The term “modification” includes a reversal of flow direction, change in ownership, change in flow volume, addition or removal of an interconnection, or an adjustment to maintain flow (such as a reduction or increase in the number of pump or compressor stations).

(3) NATURAL GAS.—The term “natural gas” has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717a).

(4) OIL.—The term “oil” means petroleum or a petroleum product.

(5) ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION; REGIONAL ENTITY.—The terms “Electric Reliability Organization” and “regional entity” have the meanings given those terms in section 215 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o).

(6) INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR; REGIONAL TRANSMISSION ORGANIZATION.—The terms “Independent System Operator” and “Regional Transmission Organization” have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3062.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, North America has grown to be an energy superpower due to the robust trade of oil, gas, and electricity. As energy demand is projected to increase in staggering numbers over the coming years, the expansion of cross-border energy infrastructure throughout this integrated market will be important.

One challenge confronting the expansion of energy trade with Mexico and Canada is that Congress has not asserted authority to establish procedures for permitting cross-border infrastructure.

Cross-border infrastructure, especially oil and natural gas pipelines and electrical transmission lines, is essential to American communities across the Nation.

Instead of a clear statutory process, a myriad of executive orders over decades have provided the legal context for permitting procedures of cross-border energy infrastructure.

Under this permitting regime that has been cobbled together, the Secretary of State has the authority to issue Presidential permits for cross-border liquid pipelines; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, for cross-border natural gas pipelines; and the Department of Energy for cross-border electric transmission facilities.

Unfortunately, this regime has subjected infrastructure permitting processes to the political whims of an administration, as we saw for 12 of the last 16 years under Presidents Obama and Biden. This can severely curtail America's energy.

H.R. 3062, introduced by the gentlewoman from North Dakota (Mrs. FEDORCHAK), would remedy these permitting inconsistencies by establishing a uniform process for authorizing energy infrastructure construction that crosses U.S. boundaries. Instead of the complex existing process, projects would simply be required to receive a certificate of crossing from the relevant agency for the border-crossing segment.

Nothing in this legislation alters additional permitting requirements of other statutes, like the National Environmental Policy Act or Clean Water Act.

It is past time for Congress to assert its authority and establish a modern and transparent process for cross-border energy infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative FEDORCHAK for her leadership. I urge my colleagues to support this legisla-

tion, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this trio of pro-polluter bills that we are debating today. These bills just double down on the Trump administration's commitment to raising American electricity prices by discriminating against clean, cheap energy. They prove that Republicans have never been for an all-of-the-above energy strategy and that they don't care about fixing the insanely high cost of living that is crushing families across this country right now.

□ 1250

The only thing Republicans care about is making their fossil fuel friends even richer.

All of this comes a few months after Republicans passed their big, ugly bill. That law will cause Americans' utility bills to go up by about nearly \$300 per year. That is on top of the nearly \$29 billion in electricity bill rate hikes that utilities have requested just since the start of President Trump's term. All this from a President who promised to cut Americans' electricity bills in half. That is just one of President Trump's broken promises.

President Trump and House Republicans also claim to care about China, particularly about beating China in the artificial intelligence race. That requires getting as much power on to the grid as quickly as possible, but the big, ugly bill will do the opposite. It will instead cause electricity capacity to decrease by more than 2½ times the size of the entire Midwestern electric grid, and Trump's law will render the United States unable to meet growing power demand or to compete with China.

All this doesn't factor in the enormous toll that Trump's tariffs will take on America's energy bills. A recent analysis found that Trump's tariffs will cost your average American family \$2,300 each year. That is \$2,300 that families need to pay rent, to buy groceries, and to afford clothes and school supplies for their kids. Trump decided to make everything more expensive, even the energy we buy.

The inconvenient truth that Republicans don't want to acknowledge is that clean energy can compete with fossil fuels. They don't like that. They are trying to put their thumb on the scale, and that is where this week's bills come into play.

The first bill we are discussing right now, H.R. 3062, the cross-border energy bill, was first proposed way back in 2013 to respond to the energy politics of the 2010s. It is simply irrelevant in this day and age. The Keystone Pipeline has been dead for 4 years. The Canadians are not interested in building energy infrastructure connecting our two nations thanks to Trump's tariffs, yet this bill would gut the Federal Government's ability to review the environmental impact of oil and gas pipelines that cross into Canada and Mexico.

Currently, the Federal Government reviews the entirety of a cross-border oil pipeline, but under this bill, the review would be limited to only 1,000 feet crossing the border. There would be virtually no Federal review for natural gas pipelines running from Texas to Mexico. This will make it easier to export American natural gas to liquid natural gas facilities in Mexico, which, again, will drive up utility prices here at home in the United States.

Finally, the bill creates a massive loophole allowing any existing cross-border facility to expand without any review whatsoever. A pipeline could be expanded by 10 times, dramatically increasing its environmental impact, and there would still be no review.

If Republicans want to get serious about permitting reform, they need to work with Democrats to advance policies that will fix the way we permit and plan our Nation's grid.

Later today, we are going to consider another bill, H.R. 3015, that would reestablish the National Coal Council, something that Energy Secretary Wright has already done. Instead of using floor time on anything important, like maybe trying to fix the affordability crisis that is strangling middle-class America, Republicans are wasting time passing a bill to do something that has already happened.

Then after that, the third bill, H.R. 1047, the GRID Power Act, would require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to allow electric grid operators to prioritize connecting fossil fuel plants to the grid over connecting clean energy power plants to the grid.

Now, this is just another way Republicans are tipping the scales toward fossil fuels over wind and solar energy.

Taken together, Mr. Speaker, these three bills will only continue to raise America's energy bills and, in some cases, do so while also removing the guardrails that keep our communities safe and healthy.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge opposition to all three bills, including the one we are debating right now, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I introduce my next speaker, I will make clear that tariffs don't affect these products. USMCA-qualifying products, which is crude oil, natural gas, refined petroleum products, and biofuels, are tariff-free. Additionally, this legislation does not remove permitting requirements. All environmental and regulatory reviews of this infrastructure would continue. It is not accurate to say that we would go around any of the qualifying. The other side talks about us tipping the scales toward fossil fuel energy and dispatchable power, but theirs tips the scale toward wind and solar. I think we need all of the above, but when you say we are going to subsidize a more expensive power, that doesn't make power cheaper. Maybe in the short-term, but certainly not in the long run, and that is where we need to focus.

We do need to work together, as he said, to make sure we can do permit reform and produce the energy this country needs for AI and other things.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Dakota (Mrs. FEDORCHAK), my good friend and the sponsor of this bill and a viable member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. FEDORCHAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GUTHRIE for his leadership on this issue, on all energy issues, and for the entire Energy and Commerce Committee. He provides the exact type of leadership we need at this time in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act and in strong opposition to what my colleague from New Jersey just said about this bill, much of which is just simply not true.

Energy is the foundation of everything we do. It powers our homes, fuels our farms, and drives our economy. If we want to stay a global leader, we must build the pipelines and power lines that move energy from where it is produced to where it is needed. That is much more challenging than it needs to be under current law in our country. I know many of my colleagues across the aisle want to change that through permitting reform. My legislation begins to address that and is a step in the right direction.

This bill is about strengthening American energy security, protecting good-paying jobs, and restoring common sense to a process bogged down by bureaucratic delays and partisan politics.

For far too long, energy developers have faced an outdated and unpredictable permitting process that has delayed and even canceled critical infrastructure projects, costing taxpayers millions of dollars, and weakening American energy security.

Right now, if you want to build a pipeline or a power transmission line between the U.S. and Canada or the U.S. and Mexico, you are stuck navigating a patchwork of executive orders, undefined agency processes, and shifting political winds. That is no way to build long-term infrastructure in our country.

We need a cross-border permitting process that is transparent, predictable, and durable, a process that can't be undone with the stroke of a pen. The Keystone XL Pipeline should have been a wake-up call. It would have carried 800,000 barrels of oil each day from Canada to refineries in the Midwest and Texas. It would have meant real opportunity for North Dakota communities: more jobs, more tax revenue, and more energy produced for the entire Nation.

After a decade of delays, protests, and litigation, Keystone XL was finally approved in 2017 by President Trump, but on day one of the Biden administration, that permit was canceled. It wasn't canceled because the project

wasn't needed or because it wasn't safe, but to appease radical activists.

With that single decision, the Biden administration cost the U.S. more than \$3 billion in GDP and thousands of jobs, including many in my State of North Dakota.

This uncertainty has created a chilling effect on investment in the infrastructure we desperately need for American energy dominance.

That is why I introduced the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act. This legislation will help fix this problem. This bill requires Congress to approve the reversal of a cross-border project, no more unilateral decisions based on politics.

This bill would also replace the outdated Presidential permitting process with a clear statutory framework: the certificate of crossing.

This process will be overseen by FERC for oil and gas projects and by the Department of Energy for electricity. It establishes firm timelines for reviewing applications and puts subject matter experts, not politicians, in charge of decisions.

By creating a consistent statutory framework that protects all existing requirements and environmental reviews, we can provide the regulatory certainty energy developers need to invest, hire, and build. Most importantly, this strengthens America's role as a global energy leader.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and stand with American energy dominance.

□ 1300

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the ranking member of our Energy Subcommittee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, here we are 9 months into the Trump administration and Republicans in Congress, despite their promises, have done nothing to lower energy costs. In fact, costs keep going up, up, and up, and the GOP policies are making it worse. I have to say that Americans deserve a whole lot better.

We understand that the impact of the big, ugly bill passed a couple months ago is going to raise the cost of living on hardworking families across the country. There has been a lot of attention on healthcare costs in the State of Florida because the Republicans would not reinstate the cost-saving and life-saving tax credits. Millions of Floridians, like many more across America, are facing higher healthcare costs.

What wasn't covered as much in the big, ugly bill and its impact is what it is going to do to drive up people's electric bill. Already, this year, household electricity prices are up 10 percent. One in three households is cutting back on necessities, like groceries, to afford their energy bills.

Three in four Americans are concerned with their utility bills increas-

ing, and they should be because at least 102 gas and electric utilities have either raised or proposed higher rates that will go into effect next year.

Here is the proof. Here is a report from September of this year: "Residents in at Least 41 States and Washington, D.C., Are Facing Increased Electric and Natural Gas Bills."

"Utilities are increasing prices for customers across the country." Including all the way through to 2028, monthly residential bill impacts are going to be rough.

Here is another from PowerLines from July 2025: "'Utility bills are rising.' Q2 2025 Update."

"Utility rate increases requested and approved totaled \$9 billion in Q2 2025 and \$29 billion in the first half of 2025, making 2025 a record year for utility rate increases."

In my home State of Florida, the largest power provider has requested the largest rate hike in history—\$10 billion for most of the counties in the State.

Here is an article I will submit for the RECORD from this month from the Energy & Policy Institute: "Key decisions loom in Florida Power and Light's historic bid to raise rates by \$10 billion."

I include the links to these three items in the RECORD:

https://powerlines.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/0709_PowerLines_Rising-Utility-Bills-Q2-Update-2.pdf

<https://energyandpolicy.org/key-decisions-loom-in-fpl-historic-bid-to-raise-rates>

<https://www.americanprogress.org/article/residents-in-at-least-41-states-and-washington-d-c-are-facing-increased-electric-and-natural-gas-bills>

Mr. Speaker, the big, ugly bill is having a very harsh impact on the bottom lines of hardworking families, and now Republicans want to offer a package of bills that is going to make it worse, add insult to injury.

They just can't stop providing solace for polluters. They have already gutted a lot of the tools that make energy more affordable, like clean energy tax credits, like trying to save on energy efficiency and things like that. However, what also adds insult to injury is—and I don't know why, but if Republicans are talking about they believe in fairness, they believe in permitting, they believe that we need all of the power generation we possibly can make, why do they stand idly by while the Trump administration wages war on a clean energy power source? Many of them are already permitted and constructed.

In April, the administration issued a stop-work order for the Empire Wind offshore wind project surrounding New York. Even though the order was lifted in May, that delay cost the developer \$955 million.

The President is actively trying to revoke permits for the Revolution Wind project, which was fully permitted and 80 percent complete, supporting more than 2,500 U.S. jobs across

construction, operations, shipbuilding, manufacturing. The project was just steps away from powering more than 350,000 homes in Rhode Island and Connecticut, but now that is at risk, so they are facing much higher bills.

Just last week, the Interior Department asked a judge to cancel approval of the Maryland Offshore Wind project, a project over a decade in the making that had received all of its final permits from multiple Federal agencies and was expected to power over 700,000 homes.

This just doesn't make sense to bring a package of bills and say: Oh, we are really concerned. They are not concerned. Rates are going up. They are canceling projects. They are throwing wrenches into cleaner, cheaper energy. This is really a giveaway to the fossil fuel companies. What other explanation can there be to sock it to hard-working people who need a break?

They need a break. Groceries are too high. Their healthcare is being taken away, and now they are raising the rates of their utility bills.

Mr. Speaker, I am all for cutting red tape, but what is happening here is detrimental to the folks we represent back home. It is not fair. It is not right. We need to do everything we can. These bills, this bill doesn't meet the moment. It is going to keep electricity bills going up, up, and up. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and get back to work on serious solutions for people's pocketbooks.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the vice chair of our Communications and Technology Subcommittee.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, our chairman, for yielding this time. I rise today in support of H.R. 3062, the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act.

Mr. Speaker, our hardworking energy developers need a clear framework to expand America's energy footprint, not more bureaucracy and uncertainty.

My colleague talked about energy prices. Well, just look at the gas pump. I mean, the gas pump is down substantially.

Here is the problem: With your baseload energy production, the past administration threw it into total chaos because we know that baseload is the only way that we can reliably produce the electricity and the demand in the future that we are going to need to expand this economy.

I mean, we are in a race in AI with China. We have to produce more electricity. There was a war on baseload electricity, an absolute war. These people did not know if they were going to survive this war. Here is the deal: If you don't provide more baseload, your price is going to go up. We have to grow baseload in this country. The only way to reduce energy prices is competition and more energy.

Every Member in this Chamber and the American people have witnessed

the drastic consequence of this antidomestic energy policy championed by the previous administration, which led to record-high gas prices, severe job loss, and dependence on foreign oil.

We have to fix this. We have a solution. You have got to fix these problems. I mean, I am really tired of having to fix all the problems that they created. We have got to do this if we are going to survive this thing.

Under this House majority and administration, it is just no longer the American way. We promised the American people energy dominance. We had that just 6 years ago. Can you imagine? We were energy dominant. We set the price of a barrel of oil just 6 years ago.

What happened?

The bill before us today is a necessary, much-needed solution to ensure in the future we do not face the brunt of reckless executive actions like the cancellation of the Keystone XL pipeline.

We have already heard about the horrible results of that, including the amount of money that was put forward, and now the developer is not going forward. That project would have provided a safe and reliable way to transport energy resources between the United States and our neighbor to the north, Canada. It would have created tens of thousands of jobs, as my colleague earlier said, strengthening our energy security and generating billions of revenue to boost economic growth.

Don't listen to this chatter out here. Talk to the folks in the energy business. Let's give this back to the people in the energy business. They know how to produce energy. They are in business to produce energy. They know we have to have baseload.

I am for all-in energy. Let's do it all. I think every one of us, we have to have more energy.

□ 1310

All of this progress that we made was cut short by the stroke of a pen just 4 years ago, leading the developer to abandon the XL pipeline, as I mentioned earlier. We cannot allow that to happen again.

H.R. 3062 would require the President to receive congressional approval before revoking any previously issued permits related to the construction, connection, operation, or maintenance of oil or natural gas pipelines. We cannot let an administration put us in this position ever again.

It would also streamline the permitting process for projects that connect U.S. energy resources with international markets, establishing a clear regulatory framework so energy developers can tackle projects with confidence and certainty.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have supported the Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act in the Energy and Commerce Committee and look forward to getting it passed by the full House. I strongly urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN), who is a member of the committee.

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3062, the Promoting Cross-border Energy Infrastructure Act.

My concern is that this bill is going to be bad for our national security interests, in addition to leading to rising costs that will ultimately harm consumers.

Currently, the State Department must sign off on all cross-border energy pipelines and power lines. However, this bill would remove that requirement so that FERC and the Department of Energy would have the final say on pipelines and power lines, respectively.

While FERC and DOE could consult with other appropriate Federal agencies, such consultation is optional.

If there is a disagreement between the State Department and the Department of Energy or the State Department and FERC, this bill says that our national security and diplomatic interests will take a back seat, and at the end of the day, FERC and DOE will make the final call on critical decisions that could impact international relations and national security issues.

It is disconcerting to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle call national security and diplomatic interests political, as the committees of jurisdiction have traditionally taken great pains to keep politics out of those agencies. More importantly, FERC and DOE simply are not equipped to have the final say on national security and diplomatic decisions.

As we have heard, this bill could also drive up costs for consumers at a time when many Americans are already facing rising costs and struggling to make ends meet.

It will allow modifications to projects without any need for a permit or environmental review. This means a developer can radically expand a cross-border pipeline without any Federal review.

It also specifically curtails the Federal review for pipelines from Texas to Mexico that carry natural gas to Mexican LNG facilities.

These provisions would facilitate increasing LNG exports, which have been shown to drive up prices for American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our consumers, our national security interests, and the future of our planet, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 3062.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this does not replace any need for permits, so the idea that there would be no environmental review or any review for a

cross-border project approved by FERC or the State Department is just not accurate. That is not what the bill does.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on what the gentleman from Georgia said. I know he is not here. I don't like to comment on people when they are not here, but I am not really being critical personally, just substantively.

The gentleman from Georgia and my colleagues on the other side keep talking about how they are going to use this legislation to address another pipeline from Canada. References were made to Keystone. Keystone is dead.

There is no reason to believe in any way that the Canadians are looking to work with us to build a pipeline and export more fossil fuels to the United States. Right now, we barely have a relationship with Canada because of the tariffs.

The fact of the matter is that there is a tariff on Canadian exports. The bottom line, I guess, is the only way that we could get Canada to maybe send us more oil or gas is if we did what President Trump says and annex them and make them the 51st State. I am not an advocate for that. I don't think that is going to happen.

It is unrealistic right now to talk about any kind of additional oil or gas coming to the United States through a Canadian pipeline. That is just not going to happen.

What I think is really happening here is that there is going to be an effort, because of the way the bill reads, to double, triple, or even 10 times the amount of gas that would go from the United States to Mexico, because the bill doesn't have any review with regard to that. If you have an existing pipeline, you can just double, triple, or quadruple it, or whatever, and send American gas to Mexico, where it is going to be made into LNG and shipped throughout the world.

That is only going to increase our gas prices here in the United States. That is what is going to happen here.

Again, we on the Democratic side have been stressing the fact that when it comes to energy prices, they are going through the roof. The Republicans don't seem to care at all about dealing with the issue. All they want to do is make it possible for more of our gas to go abroad.

The way this bill is tailored, there would be basically no review, other than, I think, for 1,000 feet, or something, into the other country. The suggestion that somehow there is still going to be some significant review here before these pipelines are permitted is simply not the case, based on what this legislation says.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I ask my colleagues to vote in opposition to this bill.

I will talk more about the two that are following, but the same is true:

They are not helpful to Americans. They are going to increase energy prices. They are another indication that the Trump administration and House Republicans don't care at all about the increased costs of energy for the American consumer.

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here and be here with my friend. Hopefully, we are going to be able to work on a lot of issues because we do care about the cost of electricity. I know they know we care about the cost of electricity.

If the Keystone pipeline is not going to happen, which by Presidential fiat didn't happen, we have to worry about future situations when we are in Congress. We don't just legislate about the past. We have to legislate for the future as well, and this is important.

Also, I am a big believer that we have to continue to have economic development and growth, and work in a fair way to make sure our products are being traded fairly as well with Canada and Mexico. This is an opportunity to do so.

In America, the one thing we have is ample natural gas. As a matter of fact, the price of gas is historically low now because of the oil development in the Permian Basin. An offshoot of it is natural gas. Because it has driven the price of gas so low, we have ample natural gas.

What we need to do and really need to work on—hopefully, we can work on together—is if you want to lower the price of electricity, which I assume we all do, is that the way you do that is by taking the natural gas that we have, converting it to electrons, and transmitting it out so people can have access to the electricity.

□ 1320

Mr. Speaker, that is where the expense is, not being able to permit, to move. To create electrons and then to move them is an expense, as well, as much as it is permitting the pipelines that we are talking about.

We are in a battle of our time. We are in a battle where we can choose to follow the regulatory state of Europe. We can't out-regulate Europe. We need to out-innovate China.

Mr. Speaker, this is the beginning of a series of bills. Hopefully, we can find a series of bills we can work on together. It needs to be all of us, together, focused on defeating China in terms of delivering the energy we need to do so. I encourage my colleagues to vote for this bill, and I thank Representative FEDORCHAK for bringing it forward.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FINE). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 707, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to 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 question will be postponed.

NATIONAL COAL COUNCIL REESTABLISHMENT ACT

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 707, I call up the bill (H.R. 3015) to reestablish the National Coal Council in the Department of Energy to provide advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy on matters related to coal and the coal industry, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 707, any amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill, would be adopted. There being none, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3015

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Coal Council Reestablishment Act”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL COAL COUNCIL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy shall reestablish in the Department of Energy the National Coal Council, in accordance with the charter for the National Coal Council that was in effect on November 19, 2021.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code, (commonly referred to as the “Federal Advisory Committee Act”) and section 552b(c) of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to the National Coal Council.

(2) TERMINATION.—Section 1013 of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply to the National Coal Council.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members