

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

may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3015.

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, I rise in support of the National Coal Council Reestablishment Act, introduced by my colleague from Ohio's Sixth District (Mr. RULLI).

This legislation would codify the National Coal Council, an important advisory committee that had aided our Federal Government for 37 years with expertise and technical reports on all matters affecting the coal industry and its workers.

The reestablishment of the National Coal Council couldn't come at a better time. It is no secret that our energy demands are rising. If the demand isn't met with sufficient supply, we risk ceding leadership in the next-generation economy to China, while raising costs on American households along the way.

We are seeing the demand for reliable electricity affect nearly every industry. At the end of the day, electricity policy is technology policy, and electricity policy is manufacturing policy.

There is one source of reliable electricity that has been powering American industry for many years. Coal-powered generation is a key baseload resource that even today can protect against upward price pressures and provide the right type of energy to fuel American innovation and the next-generation industries.

Unfortunately, the previous administration sought to deliberately undermine the financial viability of coal while subsidizing preferred sources like wind, solar, and batteries.

Instead of regulating one industry and subsidizing another to make it competitive, we need to get back to making things affordable in the first place.

The National Coal Council plays a critical role in developing a cohesive national energy strategy that will unleash American energy dominance to lower costs for hardworking households.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3015, 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 opposition to H.R. 3015. This bill would require the Department of Energy to reestablish the National Coal Council, something that President Trump already did 3 months ago.

It goes further than that. House Republicans don't just want to reestablish the National Coal Council. They want it to play by different rules than the 27 other advisory councils that the Department of Energy maintains by making it permanent.

Of course, they offer no justification as to why this council and only this council is special. There isn't one.

I also want to point out that among DOE's other 27 advisory councils, not a single one is focused on clean energy. There is no solar council, no wind council, no battery council, and not even a geothermal energy council. All of those could be very useful.

Instead of using their floor time to prompt the Department to develop a council for some of our cheaper, cleaner energy, Republicans are focused on giving coal special treatment. Frankly, it is ridiculous. I think it is a waste of time.

Mr. Speaker, the country is in turmoil. We are facing a national healthcare crisis. Republicans are actively taking healthcare away from millions of Americans. Meanwhile, millions more are about to watch their healthcare premiums skyrocket and their local hospitals close, not to mention the astronomical cost of living that is rising more and more each day, thanks to Trump's tariffs.

Rather than addressing one of these real crises, Republicans have us wasting time on a bill that would order the DOE to do something it has already done.

Republicans could be using the floor time to ensure millions of Americans don't get priced out of their healthcare plans. They are not doing that.

Republicans could use floor time to rein in Trump's tariffs, which are projected to cost hardworking families thousands of dollars each year. They are not going to do that.

Republicans could use floor time to pass an energy policy that would bring electricity bills down. Clearly, they are not doing that.

The reason is simple. Republicans care more about signaling their love of coal than they care about fighting for hardworking families struggling to make ends meet. They don't care about the hardworking families who are trying to make ends meet. They are just signaling that they love coal.

That is particularly shameful when we consider coal consumption has declined by nearly two-thirds since its peak in 2007. Instead of celebrating the newer sources of cleaner and cheaper energy, Republicans are frantically trying to turn back the clock and ignore Americans' pleas for real and meaningful help in the process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this bill and to this massive waste of time. It is completely meaningless. I hope they will do something else.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are absolutely concerned about families making ends meet through cheaper electricity. There are also hardworking families in my Commonwealth of Kentucky who work in the coal industry and have been really hurt by the policies that came out of the prior administration.

This has been reinstated by the Trump Presidency. This ensures a fu-

ture President can't again undo what we experienced in the last 4 years. That is the difference in where we are. That is why it is important that we are doing it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RULLI), the sponsor of this legislation. He is a new member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and I am proud to have him on the committee.

Mr. RULLI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chair LATTA for his leadership, and I rise in support of H.R. 3015, the National Coal Council Reestablishment Act.

Mr. Speaker, for decades, the National Coal Council was a powerful voice for coal and a timeless champion for American workers and American communities. Coal fueled the factories, powered our homes, and helped build the greatest economy this world has ever known. It is ridiculous to neglect this.

I feel today is a Paul Revere moment, where we are calling to everyone to realize that the meltdown is coming. What I mean by that is the grid is going to melt down. Simply, all one has to do is go back in time three Christmases ago, when the American grid pretty much was hours away from melting down.

Mr. Speaker, look at California and Texas. Look at the meltdowns that have happened there. The grid is not stable.

□ 1330

The grid needs to be redone, and every coal plant that I toured in Ohio said three Christmases ago, the call was: We need more generated power, and we need it right now, and there was no more to give.

All we have to do is look at is the opposition party wants to celebrate the European Union, and what does the European Union do?

They look for power from countries like Russia, like China, and like India to use their coal-powered, generated plants to support their grid. However, in America, we cannot wait to put coal factories out of business. Just like in my district, with the Sammis factory, Joe Biden couldn't wait to celebrate putting 800 jobs in the garbage and putting our grid at jeopardy.

Paul Revere would be turning in his grave if he saw the jeopardy that these people are putting our country through by putting the grid up against the wall.

We have to take into consideration what could come in the future. I do want to take a moment, and I want to thank President Trump and his executive order that he knows that this bipartisan committee for coal was established over the last 30 years, and it was a bipartisan approach to make sure that national security, which is our grid, because if our grid melts down, there is no security.

Particular to my district, I have seven or eight investors who, right now, want to invest in new coal. They

want to make sure that the artificial intelligence companies and the data mining companies come to Ohio. However, if there is no energy, then nobody is coming to Ohio.

Today, more than ever, let's worry about national security, let's worry that we can keep these lights on, and let's worry that this grid is protected for our grandchildren who are not even born yet, so when they say that this is a meaningless bill, it couldn't be further from the truth.

This is the bill for national security. This is the bill that President Trump signed into executive order. Today is the day that we codify this into law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues today to have a "yes" vote.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3015.

This bears repeating again: Here we are, 9 months into the new administration and a new Congress, and Republicans have not brought one bill to the floor of the House that will help tackle the cost-of-living squeeze and the affordability crisis.

Folks back home really need help. They are paying more on their groceries despite all the promises, more on their electricity, and now are facing huge increases to the cost of healthcare. It is really not fair.

Now, let's get back to household electricity. Prices are up 10 percent this year. One in three households is cutting back on basic necessities just to pay their rising electric bill. People are very concerned, and they should be, because over 100 gas and electric utilities are proposing higher rates this year.

Mr. Speaker, you know very well that we are grappling in Florida where the largest utility has requested what looks like the largest rate increase in the history of the country. I hear my good friend, the chairman of the committee, talk about this. They care a lot about consumer costs, but their rhetoric does not match their record.

Example number one is the big, ugly bill. I will offer for the RECORD an analysis by Energy Innovation of the big, ugly bill where they say, "The bill will reduce additions of new cost-effective electricity capacity, raising power prices for consumers, and decreasing U.S. GDP . . ." which will hamper development of domestic electricity generation capacity, and by 2035, we forecast a 340 gigawatt decrease in generation capacity due to the bill. As a result, this bill will make it more expensive to meet growing demand in the next 5 critical years in the global artificial intelligence race damaging U.S. competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, the links for this analysis and two other analyses are as follows:

<https://energyinnovation.org/wp-content/uploads/One-Big-Beautiful-Bill-Senate-Reconciliation-Analysis-July-2025.pdf>

https://earthjustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/grid-strategies_cost-of-federal-mandates-to-retain-fossil-burning-power-plants.pdf

<https://energyinnovation.org/wp-content/uploads/Coal-Cost-Update.pdf>

Mr. Speaker, we cannot win the AI race of the 21st century with energy policies from the 20th century. Not only is it bad policy, but it is soul crushingly expensive to do so.

Hardworking American families are just looking up here to Washington and saying: Can you all please focus on solutions and not cater to the polluters and the folks who have all too much power here in the Halls of Congress? It is not fair.

This bill is an example of not only is it a waste of time, because here is the secret: This bill is asking for a coal council. I think the ranking member already went to it. The President has already established a coal council, so we don't really even need that.

The real impact is going to be on the bottom line, and let's look at one example of why this is going to cost everybody more. In May, just days before the J.H. Campbell coal-fired power plant was set to close, the Trump administration issued a last-minute order to force the plant to stay open.

We won't even talk about how the Trump administration has pulled permits of fully permitted and almost fully constructed offshore wind projects. We will put that aside. However, to keep the Campbell plant open, the administration cited a so-called grid reliability emergency, but they produced no actual evidence of any kind of emergency. Since their order, the Department hasn't appointed to a single instance where the plant was needed to keep the lights on.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, nobody was asking for this. The company that owns and runs the plant wanted to close it and shift to a mix of energy sources. The plant is losing money, and the administration is now forcing the company to spend nearly \$1 million a day to keep it open.

Who will pay the cost of that?

It will be these families across the Midwest, and the Trump administration looks to force the old, uneconomical fossil fuel plants to continue operating past their plan retirement dates nationwide. We estimate that this looks like the cost to the consumer could reach \$3 billion a year by 2028.

People can't afford that, and they don't deserve that. Don't forget, Mr. Speaker, the big, ugly bill. If you add what they are doing by enforcing uneconomical plants to stay online so consumers pay the cost, with the big, ugly bill, you are taking away clean energy incentives, cheaper and cheaper energy, and you are asking consumers to pay the cost of what utilities are.

Everyone is grappling with these arbitrary Trump tariffs.

This is not fair, and Republicans say we need to keep coal plants online so that the so-called dispatchable resources to meet growing electricity demands will help with the artificial intelligence race with China. However, they are clearly confused about the difference between reliable and dispatchable power. Reliability is not just about being dispatchable. It is about delivering performance under stress.

Here is the truth: Coal-fired power plants are not reliable. They are inflexible. They are outdated. It is outdated technology that actually threatens grid reliability and resilience.

Most of our coal fleet was built in the 1970s and eighties, and years of use has led to a rise in unplanned outages. PJM has capacity accreditation of coal plants at just 83 percent. The Colstrip Coal Mine in Montana is accredited at only 54 percent. That means it is effectively unavailable nearly one-half of the time that it is needed.

As noted by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, large voltage-sensitive loads like data centers require flexible, responsible grid solutions, not slow-ramping generators that can take up to 12 or more hours to come online. Coal plants are inherently inflexible, and that worsens grid congestion. By forcing coal plants to stay online, we are occupying our limited transmission capacity with inflexible generation. That prevents cheaper and cleaner resources from being delivered.

This is a real concern. Independent market monitors in the Midwest have found that congestion-related market distortions have cost customers over \$1 billion a year.

That is not fair. This is the United States of America. We are about innovation. We are about modern technology. We are not about looking backwards. If Republicans were serious about meeting energy demand and keeping customer bills low, empowering artificial intelligence, then they would look to real solutions, energy efficiency, virtual power plants, grid-enhancing technologies, batteries, and more.

However, Mr. Speaker, if you keep looking backwards, then we simply will not be able to meet the moment and meet the growing demand that is forecast.

American businesses should not be left holding the bag with higher bills because the majority refuses to march forward in the 21st century on what we need to do on power production and tapping the great innovators across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this very costly bill. This entire package is another cost raiser for families back home that they don't deserve. Please vote "no."

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that over the next decade, we are going to

need 152 gigawatts of power. A gigawatt of power is about what is needed to power the city of Seattle, so 152 Seattles over the next decade is what is estimated.

We are also slated to close 112 gigawatts of power, so we need 152 gigawatts of power in the next decade. It takes years to get any project approved. Hopefully we can speed that up through permitting reform that hopefully we all can work on. However, when you need that much power and you have existing power, then why take it offline?

□ 1340

My understanding—I have had a couple of people bring this coal plant up that was just mentioned—is that the grid needed it for the summer because they were afraid they were not going to have enough power to get through the summer. It wasn't just that the Federal Government forced them to keep it open. The Federal Government allowed them to keep it open.

The first thing we can do to help our fight against China—that is what it is all about. We know either we have the scaling data centers here, or China is going to dominate. That is the only choice.

Europe can't do it. We know what happens if you overregulate and don't produce the energy. That is a good example right there from Europe.

We know we need the power or we are going to lose the great battle of our time of who is going to control AI and supercomputing, eventually quantum computing.

The very first thing we can do to really bridge that power gap is not take power offline. I think it is reasonable to do. I think it is the right thing to do, and I think that it is absolutely what we should do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3015, the National Coal Council Reestablishment Act.

I have often said that coal is the energy of the future, and under the leadership of President Trump and this Congress, coal is rightfully back in favor in Washington, D.C.

Coal produced 16 percent of the electricity in this country last year, and it is one of the most reliable and affordable forms of energy that we have. It is imperative that we increase domestic production in order to meet our ever-increasing demand.

My home State of Wyoming is responsible for about 40 percent of the Nation's coal, producing 191 million tons of coal and shipping 171 million tons to 26 different States in 2024.

It is estimated that Wyoming has more than 165 billion tons of economically recoverable coal with over 1.4 trillion tons of total coal reserves.

Power demand is expected to increase by nearly 21 percent by 2030, and the AI

sector will need 50 gigawatts of new electric capacity by 2028. Producing coal is the only way to meet this demand.

Federal policy must be designed to meet these new challenges, which is why reestablishing the National Coal Council within the Department of Energy is more important than ever.

Unfortunately, this longstanding Federal advisory committee was shuttered by the Biden administration in response to lawsuits filed by the very environmentalist NGOs spearheading the full-scale campaign against coal.

My colleague on the other side decries the cost of energy and states that it is because of coal and policies from the Republicans that are causing that increase. The increase in the cost of energy is solely the responsibility of the Democrats and their failed policies. They are the ones that have caused the increase in the electric rates by requiring the electric companies to include unreliable and unaffordable energy resources in their mix.

While they claim coal is an energy of the past, clearly that is not the case. Coal-fired power plants are the most reliable and cost-effective form of available energy that we have.

I will just give one example near Colorado Springs. The coal-fired power plant is approximately 300 acres in size. Across the highway is a solar field that is approximately 1,500 acres. The coal-fired power plant is 80 percent efficient. The solar field is approximately 20 percent efficient. The coal-fired power plant produces more than double the energy and the electricity that the solar field produces.

Luckily, the Trump administration restored the council in June of this year, and I applaud the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RULLI) for offering this bill to reaffirm President Trump's actions.

We need more coal, not less. But coal policy can be complex. Coal production falls within the jurisdiction of numerous oversight agencies, and it is governed by a series of mining and energy laws, regulatory agencies, and permitting requirements.

The National Coal Council will provide much-needed expertise, advice, and guidance related to effective coal policies.

An example of the council's importance can be found in the report that it issued in 2018 titled: "Advancing U.S. Coal Exports."

Although environmental NGOs have worked to reduce domestic coal production and use, our allies in Asia have an increasing demand for coal, confirming that export markets present a significant opportunity for States like Wyoming.

I again thank Mr. RULLI for his sponsorship and Chairman GUTHRIE for his committee leadership promoting strong energy policies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this bill and to support the coal industry.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the

gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), who is the ranking member of our Subcommittee on Communications and Technology.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 3015. Coal is the dirtiest form of energy and also one of the most expensive.

Coal-fired power plants spew toxic pollutants into the air, including sulfur dioxide, mercury, lead, soot, and arsenic. These pollutants are disastrous for human health, causing neurological damage, lung cancer, and even premature death.

No one wants to breathe this stuff. That is why we closed all of the coal plants in California. You might remember acid rain. That was caused by coal plants. Acid rain didn't magically go away. We put in place regulations that limited basic toxic pollutants from coal, and that is what stopped acid rain.

The Trump administration even acknowledges this. Secretary Kennedy has spent his career railing against the coal energy and its pollution.

The Trump administration's "Make America Healthy Again" report celebrates the progress we have made in reducing toxic air pollution, progress we made in part by regulating coal mines.

However, now President Trump and Republicans are rolling back regulations on coal plants, preventing old coal plants from retiring and reestablishing the National Coal Council. They even gave a tax break to coal mining.

It is not just dangerous. It is expensive. Coal power is now 28 percent more expensive than it was just 4 years ago. In fact, it is often cheaper to build an entirely new solar power plant than it is just to keep a coal plant running. That is why nearly 800 coal power plants have been retired in the last 25 years. They are just too expensive, and we have cheaper, cleaner options.

I really thought that President Trump and Republicans campaigned on lowering costs. Well, more coal power means higher electric bills. I don't know about you, but I think Americans are already paying too much for electricity.

Once again, Republicans are selling out their own constituents to boost the profits of big, polluting corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MCGARVEY).

Mr. MCGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. This is my first time to publicly congratulate him on the House floor on assuming the chairmanship of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

What I can tell you about Mr. GUTHRIE, having known him for a long time, is he has always acted and led with civility, kindness, and respect, going all the way back to the time in the State Senate in Kentucky.

I have never served a day of my life in the majority. It might go without saying I was sort of hoping that Mr. PALLONE would be the chairman this year. But if the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee can't sit on this side of the House, I am certainly glad it is a gentleman from Kentucky.

□ 1350

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill not just because it is a waste of our time. It is also a wasted opportunity to, for once, do something for coal miners instead of coal companies.

As Ranking Member PALLONE said, the President has already reestablished the National Coal Council. It is a waste of our time to focus on something that already exists just days before the government runs out of funding and mere weeks before people receive notice of their health insurance premiums going up by thousands of dollars next year, unless the House Republicans extend healthcare tax credits for working families.

Most importantly, it is a wasted opportunity to spend 1 hour of precious floor time in service of Republicans' obsession with removing coal from the ground while doing nothing for the men and women who work the mines.

The House has not spent 1 minute debating an increase in black lung benefits. Current levels are totally inadequate to cover the cost of living for miners with black lung or their survivors after their death.

The House has not spent 1 minute on improving the long-term solvency of the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund.

The House has not spent 1 minute on the Trump administration's efforts to delay the life- and limb-saving proximity and silica dust rules. These are delays which the United Mine Workers of America president has called "a death sentence for more miners."

The House has not spent 1 single minute on stopping Trump's cuts to the Coal Workers' Health Surveillance Program, the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health's black lung research programs, or black lung screenings. These are cuts that are taking place at a moment when this disease is killing coal miners at the highest rates this century.

The Republicans have made clear that they are for coal, but I am for the men and women who mine the coal: the coal miners. We must do better for them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have heard my colleagues on the other side talk about

how long it takes to bring energy plants or energy sources online. I have heard about the suggestion that the Democrats are trying to close fossil fuel plants.

President Trump is a President who, in the 8 months now since he has been President, has proceeded to try to cut off almost any source of clean energy. Just a few weeks ago, he announced that he was going to stop the offshore wind projects that were over 90 percent constructed in Rhode Island. He has done the same throughout the eastern seaboard.

I think it was the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) who said that it takes a long time to build these energy facilities, and either the gentleman or one of the other Republicans today said that Republicans favor all of the above, which means that the majority favors fossil fuels, would like to see clean energy, and would like to see nuclear energy, presumably.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what we are getting. That is not what we are getting from the Trump administration. That is not what we are getting with these bills. Everything favors fossil fuels. Every effort is being made by this President to cut off clean energy, not only windmills but also solar, et cetera.

The bottom line is that everything is being done to prioritize dirty fuels, in particular, whether it is coal, oil, or whatever it is, at the expense of clean energy.

Clean energy is cheaper. Even if my colleagues didn't believe that, we need more energy, regardless of the source. Why would Republicans want to just cut off offshore windmills in Rhode Island that are over 90 percent complete? It makes no sense unless they are trying to favor the oil and gas and the fossil fuel interests.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans say that they want to save the coal industry. Secretary Wright recently implied that he doesn't want a single fossil fuel plant to close.

This is ridiculous for several reasons, the most important being that keeping these plants open is more expensive than building new sources of clean energy. The proof is really in the pudding here. The Trump Department of Energy recently forced two fossil fuel plants that were days away from retiring to remain open and is directly forcing homeowners hundreds of miles away from these plants to pay to keep the plants online.

The Consumers coal plant in Michigan was slated to close and save Michigan residents \$600 million on their power bills, but Donald Trump pulled the rug out from everyone and, instead, is increasing families' power bills.

The administration pulled the same trick with the Eddystone oil and gas plant in Pennsylvania, where two units that were nearly 60 years old were set to expire. Pennsylvania's grid operator determined that taking the plants out of service would not impact grid reli-

ability, but President Trump didn't care. The Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission chairman noted that "the price tag for consumers could grow quickly."

Consumers aren't getting a say in this process. President Trump dictates that a coal plant stays online, and homeowners have to pay for it.

A recent study by Grid Strategies found that, if the administration refused to let a single fossil fuel plant close, Americans would be on the hook for \$6 billion per year and increased costs by the end of the Trump administration.

Republicans' obsession with coal is going to cost Americans billions of dollars and pollute our air and water for nothing except some additional cash for Republicans' friends in the coal industry. It is really a rotten deal for the average American.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say in opposition to this bill that Republicans claim that the National Coal Council is so important that it demands floor time in the House of Representatives, even though the President has already reestablished it. We could be passing legislation to lower energy costs or avoid a spike in health insurance premiums instead.

If Republicans believed that the National Coal Council is such a priority, then surely the Trump administration does, as well. Yet, the Trump administration has let the National Coal Council languish for 3 months. They reestablished it back in June. It hasn't met. No one has been appointed to lead the council. Remember, those positions don't require a Senate confirmation or even consultation with the Office of Presidential Personnel.

There are no meetings scheduled. It should at least have some members if Republicans think that it is important. Unfortunately, none of those things has happened.

If you look on the website for the National Coal Council, it says that all of this is coming soon: members, meetings, or whatever. That is like the neighborhood coffee shop not quite ready to open to visitors. They put up a "coming soon" sign.

The reality is that all of this is a charade. Republicans can try to sell to donors that they are rescuing the coal industry, but in fact, they are doing nothing, not even with the National Coal Council.

It is not like it was that great under the previous Trump administration, either. The National Coal Council operated in the previous Trump administration as some kind of bizarre organization that was intertwined with a trade association that went by the same name, funded by private contributions from companies that made up the real government coal council.

It got so bad that a Federal judge found that the shadowy trade association was the alter ego of the real coal council, with no clear lines of separation between the Federal entity and its mirror image.

Official Coal Council events were funded by the trade association. At a meeting of the government's Coal Council, a speaker called upon members to become dues-paying members of the trade association.

You can't make this stuff up. You really can't. This idea that the National Coal Council will be important and that anyone really cares about it is just a joke. The Trump administration obviously doesn't think the National Coal Council is important. The last time it existed, it didn't even seem to do anything.

I don't understand the point of advancing a bill to reconstitute it without adding guardrails to prohibit the mixing of industry priorities with legitimate research. This is what the court pointed out to us.

I only mention these things because I am trying to emphasize that this bill is a complete waste of time and a disservice to our constituents that we are even here talking about it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Congressman RULLI, for sponsoring this legislation. It is important. We don't want this to be unestablished. I know it is getting reestablished.

The reason President Trump is having to reestablish it and it is coming soon is because it got unestablished. That is what we are trying to prevent in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MCGARVEY), my friend and colleague, were still here because I would thank the gentleman for the kind words. He is a good friend with kind words.

I will say that I wish that he were in here just a couple of years ago when he said we haven't spent 1 minute or any time helping the coal miners. There are more retired union coal miners in Kentucky and the surrounding areas than there are current coal miners. Their entire pension system and their healthcare system were based on a time when there were always new people coming in and fewer people going out.

□ 1400

It is upside down now. If my friend had been here, he would have seen in the Longworth Cafeteria or the Rayburn Cafeteria, day in and day out, people with their coal hats on, their miner hats on, their shirts, and a lot of them from Kentucky saying, what am I going to do? This is something I had depended on.

I will tell you, we all worked on it. I will have to say that his constituent, our colleague on the other side of the bill and the leader at the time, Leader MCCONNELL, took that as his issue. I will tell you, if you ask any coal miner, retired coal miner in Kentucky with a pension, a union benefit, retired union

benefit, they will tell you who spent time on that issue, who was the leader on that issue.

Leader MCCONNELL used to go around Kentucky when he was campaigning and say things like, Kentucky punches above its weight, and we absolutely did on that. He threw the right punch on that.

Our retired union coal miners have the benefits they have today because in an omnibus or spending bill—I can't remember, probably both together—he put in a provision that preserved their benefits.

When you say we hadn't spent a minute on it, maybe he is talking about right now, but I can tell you we have here in this Congress, the leader absolutely did, and I commend him for that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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.

GUARANTEEING RELIABILITY THROUGH THE INTERCONNECTION OF DISPATCHABLE POWER ACT

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 707, I call up the bill (H.R. 1047) to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to reform the interconnection queue process for the prioritization and approval of certain projects, 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 (Mr. MORAN). Pursuant to House Resolution 707, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119-9 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

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 "Guaranteeing Reliability through the Interconnection of

Dispatchable Power Act" or the "GRID Power Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **BULK-POWER SYSTEM.**—The term "bulk-power system" has the meaning given the term in section 215(a) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824(a)).

(2) **COMMISSION.**—The term "Commission" means the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

(3) **DISPATCHABLE POWER.**—The term "dispatchable power" means an electric energy generation resource capable of providing known and forecastable electric supply in time intervals necessary to ensure grid reliability.

(4) **GRID RELIABILITY.**—The term "grid reliability" means the ability of the electric grid to deliver an adequate, secure, and stable flow of electricity in the quantity and with the quality demanded by users, taking into account the ability of the bulk-power system to withstand sudden disturbances.

(5) **GRID RESILIENCE.**—The term "grid resilience" means the ability of the electric grid to adapt to changing physical conditions and withstand and rapidly recover from significant disturbances, including natural disasters, cyberattacks, and other unforeseen events.

(6) **INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR.**—The term "Independent System Operator" has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

(7) **REGIONAL TRANSMISSION ORGANIZATION.**—The term "Regional Transmission Organization" has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

(8) **RESOURCE ADEQUACY.**—The term "resource adequacy" means the ability of the electric system to meet the aggregate electrical demand and energy requirements of end-use customers at all times, accounting for scheduled and reasonably expected unscheduled outages of bulk-power system components.

(9) **TRANSMISSION PROVIDER.**—The term "transmission provider" means—

(A) a public utility (as defined in section 201(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824(e))) that owns, operates, or controls 1 or more transmission facilities;

(B) an Independent System Operator; and

(C) a Regional Transmission Organization.

SEC. 3. RULEMAKING TO IMPROVE INTERCONNECTION QUEUE FLEXIBILITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall initiate a rulemaking—

(1) to address the inefficiencies and ineffectiveness of existing procedures for processing interconnection requests to ensure that new dispatchable power projects that improve grid reliability and resource adequacy can interconnect to the electric grid quickly, cost-effectively, and reliably; and

(2) to amend the pro forma Large Generator Interconnection Procedures and, as appropriate, the pro forma Large Generator Interconnection Agreement, promulgated pursuant to section 35.28(f) of title 18, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)—

(A) to authorize transmission providers to submit proposals to the Commission to adjust the interconnection queue of the transmission provider to prioritize new dispatchable power projects that will improve grid reliability and resource adequacy by assigning those projects higher positions in the interconnection queue; and

(B) to require transmission providers—

(i) to provide in any proposal described in subparagraph (A)—

(I) a demonstration of need for prioritization of the relevant projects; and

(II) a description of how the prioritization of those projects will improve grid reliability or grid resilience;

(ii) to provide a process for public comment and stakeholder engagement before a proposal