

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 yeas 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. 824o(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

described in subparagraph (A) is submitted to the Commission; and

(iii) to provide regular reporting to the Commission on the state of grid reliability and grid resilience, including reporting on any actions taken pursuant to this Act.

(b) COMMISSION APPROVAL.—To ensure timely responses to grid reliability concerns, not later than 60 days after a proposal is submitted pursuant to subsection (a)(2), the Commission shall—

(1) review the proposal; and

(2) approve or deny the proposal.

(c) DEADLINE FOR FINAL RULE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall promulgate final regulations to complete the rulemaking initiated under subsection (a).

(d) PERIODIC REVIEW.—Not less frequently than once every 5 years, the Commission shall review and, if necessary, update the regulations promulgated under this section to ensure that those regulations remain effective and relevant to evolving grid reliability and grid resilience challenges.

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.

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 insert extraneous material on H.R. 1047.

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 H.R. 1047, the GRID Power Act, sponsored by my colleague, Representative TROY BALDERSON of Ohio's 12th District.

This legislation would ensure that grid operators have the tools they need to secure the reliability of the electricity grid in the event there is a capacity shortfall.

Across two-thirds of the country, grid operators are charged with ensuring that the lights stay on when you flip a switch. Reliability isn't a luxury. It is a critical necessity to our way of life and one of the reasons our economy is the greatest in the world.

Unfortunately, decisions made by the last administration favoring intermittent, unreliable sources, often at the expense of on-demand, dispatchable resources like fossil fuels, have made the grid operators' jobs nearly impossible.

We know that baseload and dispatchable power resources provide the essential reliability services necessary to maintain the stability of the electric system at an affordable price. This legislation provides a pathway for grid operators to bring these resources online quickly if there is a demonstrated need.

Importantly, this bill does not alter the existing interconnection process and will work in tandem with reforms made in FERC order number 2023 to alleviate some of the backlogs we have witnessed over the past several years.

If we fail to build the dispatchable resources needed to power next-generation industries, we will cede American leadership on the world stage to Communist regimes such as China and raise costs on consumers along the way.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation as it will make our grid more reliable and lower America's electricity bills.

Mr. Speaker, 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 this bill.

After their big, ugly bill made energy more expensive for American families already struggling to make ends meet, Republicans are attempting to finish the job by further continuing their nonsensical attack on clean energy.

This bill would aim to make it harder to hook clean power up to the electric grid and would remove safeguards intended to ensure that the entities in charge of our power grid can't discriminate against clean energy.

While the regulatory processes that power grid operators use to hook power plants up to the grid does not make for riveting television time, it is still very important, especially at a time when power demand is rising and we must get more clean energy onto the electric grid.

If you listen to Republicans, they will tell you that the main point of this bill is to allow grid operators to prioritize resources they can get on the grid as quickly as possible, yet they are conveniently ignoring the fact that grid operators can already do that.

This isn't some hypothetical power. Grid operators from the mid-Atlantic, the Midwest, and the Great Plains have this year all made tweaks to the processes they use to hook power plants up to the grid.

In reality, the point of this bill, in my opinion, is to prioritize fossil fuel plants by allowing them to jump to the front of the line ahead of wind, solar, and battery storage.

This is really preposterous when you consider that 94 percent of proposed power generation waiting to be interconnected is zero-carbon clean energy.

Republicans want grid operators to be able to discriminate against renewable power, continuing Trump's war against clean, cheap energy, and Republicans are trying to kill off the only realistic source of electricity growth and of our Nation. That is clean energy. There is nothing here more complicated than that. That is what they are trying to do, kill clean energy.

It is a real shame because we do need to find ways to add more energy to the grid. Prices have skyrocketed in my home State of New Jersey, largely be-

cause of decisions that the PJM, our grid operator, made 5 to 10 years ago that created a clogged queue for power plants waiting to hook up to the grid.

It has been a disaster.

While recent rules from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission have helped, we have to do more. Instead of focusing on picking winners and losers in the interconnection queue, we should focus instead on speeding up the processing of the entire queue so power plants can get online as quickly as possible because we need more power from all sources.

We should focus on making it easier to build the necessary grid infrastructure upgrades so power can get online. We should do it all in a way that is fair to American families paying the bills.

This bill does none of that. It simply gives a fast pass to Big Oil and Gas, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON), my good friend and sponsor of this legislation, who is a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the GRID Power Act.

This legislation is critical to ensure our Nation has the dispatchable baseload power needed to meet historic demand growth and guarantee that the lights turn on when our constituents flip the switch.

PJM, the largest grid operator in the Nation and sole grid operator for my home State of Ohio, has announced that they expect to lose about 40 gigawatts of generation by 2030. That is 21 percent of PJM's total capacity, and new power generation is not coming online quickly enough to offset the risk posed by retiring resources.

□ 1410

Between 2022 and 2023 alone, PJM saw over 11,000 megawatts of generation deactivated while only adding 4,000 megawatts of new generation to the grid. It doesn't take an expert to see that retiring power plants outpacing new generation is a problem.

This is especially concerning for my district and central Ohio, which has become a national hub for data center construction. These new facilities are at the heart of powering the AI revolution, but we must now figure out how we can power them while ensuring our constituents have access to reliable and affordable energy.

We saw how close we were to power scarcity in Ohio over the summer, as utilities warned Ohio residents to reduce energy power during peak demand to help prevent rolling power outages. Ohio families should not have to face a power emergency for running their air conditioning.

We have the natural resources needed. We have the ability to build more

power generation. This is clearly a public policy failure, and we can fix it by addressing the broken interconnection process.

Interconnection queues are lists maintained by transmission system operators—such as independent system operators, regional transmission organizations, or transmission providers—that track pending requests for new generation facilities to connect to the grid.

Right now, our Nation's interconnection queues are buckling under their own weight. The growing backlog of projects is adding years to an already slow process and prevents shovel-ready projects from being built and connected.

According to the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab, almost 2,600 gigawatts of generation projects are sitting in interconnection queues across the country. That is more than double the amount of the existing generation currently on the grid. The median wait time for projects has now stretched to 5 years.

With demand growth accelerating and retirements mounting in Ohio and across the country, we cannot afford to wait 5 years or more, and we certainly cannot afford to keep delaying critical projects.

The GRID Power Act addresses this by requiring FERC to develop rules that allow grid operators to fast-track critical generation needed to ensure reliability and meet demand, bypassing the years-long wait in the interconnection queue.

The bill also promotes transparency by requiring that grid operators provide opportunities for public comment and stakeholder engagement before submitting proposals to FERC. Operators must also provide regular reports to FERC on the state of grid reliability and actions taken under this bill.

Finally, FERC must review and, if necessary, update its regulations to ensure they remain effective in addressing evolving challenges to grid reliability and resiliency.

Let me be clear: This bill is fuel-neutral. Nowhere in the text does it single out fossil fuels or renewables. Instead, it establishes a process to fast-track projects based on their ability to enhance the reliability and resiliency of the electric grid.

As we face a looming electricity shortfall, we must recognize that weather-dependent, intermittent resources alone cannot meet the challenge. Grid operators across the Nation have been clear over the last several years that we need more dispatchable power to come online to protect us from rolling blackouts.

If we want to keep American businesses running and ensure uninterrupted power for our constituents, we must fix the broken interconnection queue.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense bill that equips our grid operators with the tools they need to do their job. I would like to end by

thanking Chairman GUTHRIE, Subcommittee Chairman LATTA, and the Energy and Commerce Committee staff for all their hard work in getting this bill to the floor.

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 ranking member for yielding the time.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1047. It is a bill that will give polluting gas plants an unfair and costly shortcut to the electric grid while doing nothing to protect working families from rising energy costs.

This is an unfortunate theme this Congress. Despite the promises of the President and my Republican colleagues in Congress, they haven't brought any bill that will help address the affordability squeeze. Right now, as we debate this package of energy bills, there is a big discussion going on about the Republican budget that is coming to the floor likely tomorrow, and Democrats are here to say we are going to fight to protect Americans' pocketbooks. We want lower costs.

We know the impact of the big, ugly bill was to raise healthcare costs and to raise energy bills. It is really time that the average working American get a break for a change. We want to cancel the cuts of the ACA. The Affordable Care Act tax credits are a pathway to affordability and lifesaving care, and it appears that the Republicans are going to refuse to reinstate those tax credits. We want to fight to lower costs, to protect Medicaid, to save healthcare. This is the larger context of this debate on energy bills, as well.

This bill is a good example. You can peer into Congress and say, okay, who is fighting for me. This GRID Power Act is unnecessary. What has been happening is that cleaner, cheaper sources of energy are waiting to come onto the grid, and the Trump administration and Republicans in Congress now are throwing up as many barriers as possible because they are on the side of the polluters.

You can see, we had a coal bill. This is a gas bill. What about the cleaner, cheaper energy that is waiting right now to come onto the queue? They are throwing barriers up to getting those cost savings to hardworking families. This does nothing to ensure a reliable grid, which is so vitally important at a time of more extreme events.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has the power already to approve changes to the interconnection queue process. That is a funny term for how we bring sources of energy onto the grid, this disjointed grid across the country. FERC can prioritize what power sources come onto the grid when it deems necessary. You don't need to give an unfair costly shortcut to gas plants.

These kind of decisions on how we are going to power our lives and con-

nect resources to the grid, these are very complex decisions, and you want robust analysis. You want an independent FERC fully staffed with experts to make these decisions in partnership with local grid operators, clearly, because FERC already has the authority to do a lot of this as long as it is supported by evidence.

This Republican bill says: Forget the evidence. We are just going to give this fast-pass to gas companies. It allows them to cut in line, and that is unfair. What they should be doing is speeding the cleaner, cheaper resources to the grid, giving them a fair shot to do it.

We had a committee meeting in the Energy Subcommittee this week, and we had the acting general counsel from the Department of Energy appear before us. Just to show you the fast-pass that polluters and gas companies are getting, we asked him about the Energy Secretary's trip overseas to try to sell more natural gas from Americans. I asked him: Well, have you done any analysis on this to show that that is not going to raise costs on American ratepayers and consumers?

He said: No, not that I know of.

If you keep pushing exports of our energy resources, what happens to the costs for hardworking families here, and what happens to domestic businesses as those resources go elsewhere, as well?

One of FERC's responsibilities is to keep prices affordable. That is made possible by competition. You want this resource to be as resource neutral as much as possible. If you don't believe in neutrality, what you are going to do? You are going to stifle American innovation and entrepreneurship.

□ 1420

When you talk about reliability, it isn't a description of an individual generator, but rather it is an attribute that applies to the entire grid across the country. It is not a given that additional dispatchable resources aid reliability themselves. You have to rely on a mix of generation, different fuels, and wires to make sure everyone can get the power they need all the time.

When you put your finger on the scale of a certain power source and then put barriers to others, especially cleaner, cheaper sources, that is just a recipe for higher costs for businesses and consumers alike.

When this bill came before our committee, I had an answer to a lot of this dysfunction about how we expedite resources to the grid. My amendment said that for any projects that are prioritized in the interconnection queue by this bill, if you are going to expedite them, then we want to see proof that they are coming online within 4 years.

My Republican colleagues didn't want to shine the light on the gas plants that can't come online in 4 years, and they all voted down my amendment.

If they are genuinely concerned about meeting demand growth in the

next 4 years and genuinely believe that gas is going to do that, they could have agreed to this amendment, but everyone voted it down.

Here is the dirty little secret that everyone in the energy industry knows right now, but Republicans are glossing over: There is a critical shortage of gas turbines. That means the cost of gas plants is already facing inflationary pressures. Those inflationary pressures, who are they passed on to? They are passed on to consumers back home, to hardworking American families. If you haven't ordered your gas turbine now, you are not getting it this decade.

The only way we are going to meet growing electricity demand in the next few years is through cleaner, cheaper power that is waiting to come onto the grid—wind, batteries, distributed energy sources, demand response, grid-enhancing technologies, and other solutions.

This is an incoherent energy policy from the Trump administration. You say you want more power. We need more power. We have AI data centers, but let's kill the offshore wind projects. Let's create barriers to getting sources of energy onto the grid that are ready to come onto the grid, and let's make life more expensive for hardworking people because we are going to say, no, only gas plants get that fast pass, but we don't have the turbines and the infrastructure to get them on the grid.

That is incoherent. That means that it is going to be costly, and that is the last thing that our neighbors need back home. They want people working together on solutions.

Ripping healthcare away, making healthcare coverage more expensive, and making electric bills more expensive, all of these policies are unpopular. I wish we could get back to working together on real solutions for the American people. I believe they need relief from the cost of living, and we should be working together to get there.

Mr. Speaker, let's reject this bill and get back to working on those solutions together.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), who is a good friend of mine and a leader in Congress in energy policies and national security policies and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1047, the GRID Power Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative BALDERSON for leading on this bill and Energy and Commerce Chair BRETT GUTHRIE and his staff for their incredible work on this. I thank the chairman for all of his efforts to make sure that we have the energy grid that we need for the future.

Mr. Speaker, we know where the demands are coming from. We know that we have to have the additional high-

performance data capability if we are going to lead in artificial intelligence. We know we are in a race with China. We know that, for the future of this Nation, for the future of our children, we want to make sure that we are on the right path. We know that we will use AI for the right purposes. I don't think anybody believes that China is going to use AI for the right purposes.

Across the First Congressional District in the Commonwealth of Virginia, I hear from my constituents about the rising costs of energy, whether it is at the gas pump or their power bills.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill, H.R. 1047, because policies like this ensure a supply of reliable, affordable electricity generation. In turn, we want to do everything we can to lower costs for American households while providing necessary energy.

We have challenges now. The demand is going to increase precipitously in the years to come. How do we make sure we meet that demand? How do we make sure we have not just the generation sources in place but also the transmission systems that work together to make sure that we are working against any sort of large-scale failure scenarios that make a problem for us in the long term? We have to address those problems now.

To achieve this, we have to give our regional transmission organizations and our independent systems operators the necessary authority to prioritize projects that increase interconnectivity, to make sure these systems interconnect so that if there is a problem somewhere, we can bring power back in.

That is what makes our grid today so incredibly important. If there is a breakdown in transmission somewhere, we can find other ways to bring power to people's homes. If there is a breakdown there with generation, we can find other ways to bring power to people's homes, bring power to people's businesses. That is why maintaining and increasing that reliability in the future is key.

Resiliency in that grid is key, too. How do we do that? We make sure that we do even more to empower the decisionmakers to have maximum flexibility to make sure that they can put new improvements to our grid in place to make sure that every bit of power generation capacity and every bit of transmission capacity is ensured so that it gets power to the consumer, to our families, and to our businesses. They rely on that.

We know the interruption that it has. If you have power that goes out at your home or power that goes out at your business, that is a major inconvenience and, in some instances, a major interruption in your business. It can be a major safety factor, too, for families that rely on that power for things that are critical to people's well-being at their homes.

We have to make sure that we are doing everything we can to make this

happen. By expediting the resources necessary to advance this reliability, increase the reliability, and increase the resiliency in the grid, we know that this legislation will help achieve that.

We know that this will help us unleash American energy production in vast, new, improved ways. Again, modernize the grid and increase reliability. Those things are key.

We want to make sure that we are doing that because that brings down the cost of living and brings down the cost of power. When things are more reliable, we have more opportunities to provide power in many different ways. That brings down costs. This bill will allow us to do that.

It also helps us restore American energy dominance, where we are using all of the above. We want to use every asset at our avail, both our energy itself, with what we produce there on the grid, and the transmission within the grid.

We know that this is key for our working families and our small businesses. That is the foundation of strong communities, and it starts with making sure that we have a grid that has maximum reliability and maximum resiliency. This bill achieves that.

In closing, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank Chairman GUTHRIE for his leadership and Representative BALDERSON for introducing this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over a number of issues, including energy, but we also have jurisdiction over the FCC. Beyond that, this House, in my opinion, and the Members of this House have an obligation to guarantee free speech in our democracy at all times.

Yesterday, FCC Chairman Carr used his position to launch a swift and decisive campaign to remove Jimmy Kimmel from the Nation's airwaves.

Let's not kid ourselves about what happened. President Trump has been openly trying to get Jimmy Kimmel fired since his first term. Press reports detail White House staff calls to Disney as far back as 2018 to complain about Kimmel's jokes, but now, President Trump has a willing partner at the FCC with Chairman Carr.

An agency that once prized its independence is now overtly being used as the personal speech police of the President of the United States, a cudgel against dissent.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, Chairman Carr issued a public threat to Disney, ABC. He said: "We can do this the easy way or the hard way. These companies can find ways to change conduct and take action, frankly, on Kimmel, or there is going to be additional work for the FCC ahead."

Given that the FCC licenses all ABC stations, both stations owned and operated by Disney and third-party-owned

ABC affiliates, this threat carried real weight. Licenses can be revoked by the agency, wrecking a company.

The threat sparked Nexstar and Sinclair, two affiliate owners, to preempt Kimmel's show from the ABC programming stream and leaving Disney with no other choice but to suspend Jimmy Kimmel indefinitely. It is no surprise that these affiliate companies also seek regulatory favor from the FCC.

Mr. Speaker, there was a time when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would be outraged by this government overreach. They would not condone this assault on free speech. There was a time when companies, particularly American broadcasters, would hold the line and assert their constitutional rights for all of us.

Apparently, that time is over. It is a dark day indeed. We need to be clear about two things: One, all Jimmy Kimmel did was speak. Two, it is not freedom when a private company decides to shut down speech to avoid punishment from the government.

That needs to end now, and that means that Chairman Carr should resign. I urge my colleagues to keep in mind that the First Amendment is the most important amendment and probably the most important part of our Constitution to guarantee free speech.

Not only does this need to end now, but we have to continue to speak out when we see violations of free speech, both by the President, by the FCC, or by anyone else, frankly, who we have jurisdiction over. I feel very strongly about this, but I do want to go back to the energy issue in the bill that is before us today.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle claim they are for all of the above. I have heard that over and over again from the Republicans. They are for all of the above with regard to energy consumption.

The bills today show that is simply not true. It is not accurate when they say that. I have to thank Secretary of Energy Chris Wright for being honest about this. At a Committee on Energy and Commerce hearing in June, he was very blunt. He said: "These companies can find ways to change conduct and take action, frankly, on Kimmel, or there is going to be additional work for the FCC ahead."

Mr. Speaker, there we have it. The Trump administration is staunchly against all of the above. That makes sense because their actions at least match their rhetoric. They are doing everything they can to put their thumb on the scale for dirty energy and cancel every clean energy project they possibly can, no matter how helpful it might be to keep electricity bills down or keep the lights on.

We have a duty to ensure that our power grid can keep the lights on. Even if Republicans don't like to admit it, that means adding clean energy to the grid. It is the quickest source of energy to add to the grid, given the current multiyear gas turbine shortage.

Grid reliability regulators have been clear that renewable energy and batteries were critical in allowing the grid to endure multiple heat waves this summer. That is why Texas added more solar and wind energy to their power grid than any other State in the country in the wake of the blackouts during Winter Storm Uri 4 years ago. Solar and wind helps keep the lights on.

Unfortunately, Republicans seem uninterested in acknowledging the basic reality that solar and wind, partnered with batteries, can be an essential part of a reliable power grid. Instead, they have done everything they can to increase the costs for these technologies and make it harder to add clean energy to the grid.

Mr. Speaker, between this bill and the big, ugly bill, every time Americans open their power bill or see their lights flicker, Republicans are responsible. I think the American people will hold them accountable.

For all these reasons, I oppose this bill, as I oppose the other two energy bills today. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman BALDERSON for sponsoring the GRID Power Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is part of the strategy we all have to do to produce more power so we can have cheaper power. Demand is rising. We need supply to rise. We need supply of dispatchable power to rise.

I do believe in all of the above. I also believe it is also the best of the above. Dispatchable power is important, and I encourage a "yes" vote.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1519

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ELLZEY) at 3 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CHARLES "CHARLIE" JAMES KIRK

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 722, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 719) honoring the life and legacy of Charles "Charlie" James Kirk, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 722, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 719

Whereas Charles "Charlie" James Kirk, born October 14, 1993, was a courageous American patriot, whose life was tragically and unjustly cut short in an act of political violence on September 10, 2025, at Utah Valley University;

Whereas Charlie Kirk was a devoted Christian, who boldly lived out his faith with conviction, courage, and compassion;

Whereas Charlie Kirk was a dedicated husband to his beloved wife, Erika Kirk, and a loving father to their daughter and son, exemplifying the virtues of faith, fidelity, and fatherhood;

Whereas Charlie Kirk was a fierce defender of the American founding and its timeless principles of life, liberty, limited government, and individual responsibility;

Whereas Charlie Kirk, at 18 years old, founded Turning Point USA in 2012, a student movement with the mission to "identify, educate, train, and organize students to promote the principles of fiscal responsibility, free markets, and limited government";

Whereas Charlie Kirk became one of the most prominent voices in America, engaging in respectful, civil discourse across college campuses, media platforms, and national forums, always seeking to elevate truth, foster understanding, and strengthen the Republic;

Whereas Charlie Kirk personified the values of the First Amendment, exercising his God-given right to speak freely, challenge prevailing narratives, and did so with honor, courage, and respect for his fellow Americans;

Whereas Charlie Kirk's commitment to civil discussion and debate stood as a model for young Americans across the political spectrum, and he worked tirelessly to promote unity without compromising on conviction;

Whereas the assassination of Charlie Kirk was not only a heinous act of violence, but a sobering reminder of the growing threat posed by political extremism and hatred in our society;

Whereas such acts of politically motivated violence are antithetical to the principles of a free republic, in which differences of opinion are to be debated—not silenced—with civility, reason, and mutual respect;

Whereas the rise in targeted violence against individuals for their political beliefs undermines the very fabric of our constitutional democracy and chills the free exchange of ideas essential to a healthy civic society;