

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Madam 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 will be postponed.

ELECTRIC SUPPLY CHAIN ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam 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. 3638.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 936 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3638.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Guam (Mr. MOYLAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1844

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3638) to direct the Secretary of Energy to prepare periodic assessments and submit reports on the supply chain for the generation and transmission of electricity, and for other purposes, with Mr. MOYLAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 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. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3638, the Electric Supply Chain Act, sponsored by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

This legislation directs the Department of Energy to conduct ongoing assessments and report to Congress on the components and infrastructure supply chain needed to secure the reli-

ability and affordability of our bulk power system.

It is no secret that we find ourselves in the middle of an electric reliability crisis that is threatening the integrity of our bulk power systems and an affordability crisis that burdens households with higher energy bills.

Unfortunately, 4 years of the Biden-Harris administration and excessive litigation, permitting delays, and far-left regulatory decisions to attack baseload power sources in favor of expensive and unreliable wind and solar have handicapped the ability of our bulk power systems to respond to growing demands for energy.

Historic projections of increasing electricity demand from domestic manufacturing, onshoring, and AI data centers have exposed systemic challenges facing our electric sector and the supply chain for components and infrastructure needed to power the system.

Meanwhile, our overreliance on China for manufacturing and critical minerals has created a reliance on our own strategic adversary for our supply chain needs.

Our electric grid is an essential tool for the national and economic security of our Nation. Simply put, we need to work with the Trump administration to make it easier to build in our country so that free-market investment for the electric supply chain flow into communities across the country, driving economic growth and creating good-paying jobs for households.

That is why the Electric Supply Chain Act will ensure that our Federal Government remains in a proactive posture to assess, identify, and address any challenges to our supply chain grid for grid components. H.R. 3638 takes a comprehensive look at the supply chain for our electric grid and appropriately incorporates the advice and views of experts spanning the power sector.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3638 requires the Department of Energy to conduct an assessment and draft periodic reports on the state of the electric supply chain.

I understand that our electric supply chain is important for national security and grid reliability, but I have to question the Republicans' seriousness in making this request and the ability of the Department of Energy to conduct these assessments and draft the periodic reports.

President Trump has decimated and undermined our Federal agencies and dedicated civil servants who fulfill their missions while also stealing Federal funds promised to local communities all across the Nation. He has created constant uncertainty for businesses with the administration's ever-changing tariff regime.

Mr. Chair, as we consider this bill, it is important that we consider the con-

text in which it will be implemented, if enacted into law.

This bill is asking the Department of Energy to do more with less. Elon Musk and the DOGE minions decimated the Department of Energy, purging more than 3,500 dedicated and hard-working Department staff. On top of that, just a few weeks ago, Secretary Wright unveiled a reorganization of the agency that eliminated key offices, including the Office of Manufacturing and Energy Supply Chains, which would have been tasked with carrying out the very report required by this bill.

□ 1850

Back in October, DOE canceled over \$7 billion in energy project awards throughout the Nation, including nearly \$1 billion from projects funded through the then Office of Manufacturing and Energy Supply Chains. My office heard from numerous awardees who were left confused and frustrated by the complete lack of communication from DOE on this matter. Many of these grantees heard about their grant cancellation by reading stories in the media, and some still have not received any formal communication from the Department of Energy.

If the Department of Energy doesn't even have the capacity to communicate with grantees who were promised Federal support that has now been stolen away, one really has to wonder if the Trump DOE would prioritize staff time for the development of this report.

After all, the Trump Department of Energy does not respond to inquiries from Congress. We have reached out to Secretary Wright on several occasions, demanding answers about the staffing cuts and project cancellations, and to date we have received zero response.

Mr. Chairman, this is entirely unacceptable. We need straightforward answers from DOE on how these cuts have impacted the Department's ability to do its job.

My opposition to this bill is common sense. We need to understand the Department of Energy's current capacity constraints before we assign the agency more work. Committee Democrats offered amendments during the subcommittee and full committee mark-ups of this bill to that effect, which were voted down by committee Republicans.

While I agree that it is important to understand the vulnerabilities in our electric supply chain, we must first understand the vulnerabilities and constraints of the agency that is tasked with completing the report.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), the sponsor of this bill and the distinguished chairman of the Energy Subcommittee.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my legislation, H.R. 3638, the Electric Supply Chain Act.

My legislation would direct the Department of Energy to conduct ongoing assessments and report to Congress on all matters affecting the supply chain for the power sector.

The Electric Supply Chain Act will seek to uncover risks, vulnerabilities, and security considerations in the availability of manufactured grid components that are necessary to maintain and expand our electric infrastructure.

As part of the comprehensive evaluation of supply chains, the Secretary would maintain discretion over the appropriate office in DOE with the right expertise necessary to complete the assessment.

In addition, the legislation will leverage power sector experts spanning the industry to improve DOE's understanding and strengthen supply chains that are essential to meet the growing needs of our bulk power system.

During my tenure in Congress, I have remained focused on the security of the bulk power system and have championed efforts to enhance the resilience of our systems, particularly for small and rural utilities.

The Electric Supply Chain Act will boost these efforts by putting DOE in the driver's seat to attentively monitor emerging threats and allow the Department to utilize their existing authorities to address vulnerabilities.

In recent years, we have seen how supply chain constraints and bottlenecks for key grid components, such as distribution transformers and natural gas turbines, can stifle infrastructure development.

By establishing periodic assessments under this legislation, the Department will remain in a proactive posture to identify and address matters affecting our power sector supply chain as they arise. In fact, in the last 2 months, DOE has taken 52 actions to secure our grid and lower energy prices.

It is clear that our Nation is on the precipice of great technological advancements that are straining our electricity supplies, primarily driven by energy-intensive users such as data centers and domestic manufacturing.

The timing of projected demands is occurring as historic levels of baseload power are leaving the system due to a confluence of State and Federal actions that have attacked fossil fuels and subsidized preferred sources of intermittent generation.

In fact, while 115 gigawatts of baseload power is expected to retire over the next few years, U.S. electricity demand is projected to increase by over 170 gigawatts.

These job-creating industries remain vital to economic prosperity and our national security. We cannot sit idly by while our adversaries seek to gain competitive advantage to control the next-generation economy.

This legislation takes an important step to prepare our Federal agencies against supply chain constraints that could occur as our Nation seeks to address timely development of electric

generation and transmission infrastructure.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3638.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN).

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Chair, I rise today to oppose H.R. 3638, which places an unnecessary burden on an already understaffed Department of Energy and does nothing of substance to support and secure America's electric supply chain.

The Electric Supply Chain Act must be examined in the broader context of this administration's reckless workforce reductions and funding cuts at the Department of Energy and surging electric prices across the Nation. Already, as a result of DOGE buyouts or early retirements, the slashing of our workforce has forced over 3,500 Department of Energy staff out of office.

In fact, the key offices responsible for implementing this very bill have lost a significant portion of their staff. The Office of Manufacturing and Energy Supply Chains has lost about two-thirds of its staff and was eliminated from the Department of Energy's organizational chart altogether. The Loan Programs Office has similarly lost a significant number of staff and was further gutted under the Republicans' big, ugly bill.

The effects of these cuts have far-reaching implications on the Department of Energy's ability to perform and meet expectations. Across the country, businesses and community partners are waiting to hear from the Department of Energy about critical contracts and access to funding. Congressional offices inquiring on their behalf are still waiting for answers.

My office has heard that in some cases the Department of Energy can't even determine who is responsible for certain projects because too many experienced staff have been pushed out of office. With the Department of Energy already struggling to meet its current obligations, how can we pretend that it is business as usual and justify piling on additional duties when there is no one to perform them?

Unfortunately, this bill represents much of the same failed energy policy that we have seen this year from our Republican colleagues. It adds busywork to the Department of Energy's already overfilled plate in the name of shoring up America's electric supply chain while doing nothing to address the active harm done to that very same supply chain by Republican attacks on clean energy, the cancellation—authorized by the big, ugly bill—of grants and programs that invest in American energy and tariff policies that make it difficult to complete some projects.

If Republicans were serious about supporting and protecting our energy supply chain, they would not have canceled \$8 billion worth of grants to over 300 energy projects across the country.

They would not have decimated the 45X Advanced Manufacturing Production Credit, which sought to encourage more domestic manufacturing and production of clean energy components.

Instead, my colleagues across the aisle should have invested more in developing domestic sources of clean energy, invested more in domestic manufacturing, and invested more in producing and refining rare earth minerals, either domestically or with our close allies.

What we have before us today is an empty messaging bill with unfunded mandates for busywork that will not provide the clarity and direction that we need to support and protect America's clean energy supply chain.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and refocus on efforts that will actually strengthen our energy supply chain and reduce energy costs for our families.

I implore the Members of Congress to stand up for the Federal workforce that has been traumatized and decimated this year, while we continue to put bills forward that put more work on the backs of those that are left and ignore the fact that there is not a sufficient workforce to do any of the work that we have in these bills that keep coming to the floor. It is lunacy, and we need to get back to reality.

□ 1900

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), the vice chairman of the Energy Subcommittee of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chair, the things that make America great are the things that America makes.

How do we do that?

We have an electric grid, Mr. Chair, and that electric grid is under real pressure. Demand is climbing fast and driven by manufacturing, by technology, and the needs for a modern economy while large amounts of dependable thermal generation are scheduled to retire.

Mr. Chair, when you put those two trends together, you get a grid that must work harder than ever and cannot afford any weak links. That is exactly why the Electric Supply Chain Act is on this floor this day.

The bill directs the Department of Energy to regularly assess the supply chains for the components that keep our bulk power system running—not after a crisis, not after a breakdown, but proactively.

We know the risks are real, Mr. Chair. Our Nation's electric grid is the largest machine ever built, and it depends on thousands of specialized parts: transformers, inverters, control systems, many of which have long lead times or limited manufacturers.

Any bottleneck, any shortage, any compromised component puts reliability at risk and drives costs higher for families and businesses.

This legislation strengthens our posture. It gives us the visibility we need

to stay ahead of threats, support domestic production, and ensure Americans have access to secure, dispatchable, and reliable power.

The things that America makes are the things that make America great. We do this with dispatchable power.

Mr. Chair, this is exactly the kind of forward-looking policy Congress should be doing. I thank Chairman LATTA and Chairman GUTHRIE for their leadership.

Mr. Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to support the Electric Supply Chain Act now.

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

Mr. Chair, I find it deeply ironic that congressional Republicans are supportive of a study to assess matters impacting the supply chain for the power sector, yet remain completely silent on the Trump administration policies that are currently negatively impacting the electric supply chain.

Let's look at Trump's disastrous tariffs on steel and aluminum. These materials are essential components in our electric infrastructure from power lines to transformers. Slapping a hefty tariff on steel and aluminum only exacerbates current supply chain issues and could cause grid infrastructure costs to skyrocket.

For example, we know that there is already a shortage of transformers, which are crucial to our electric system as they transport energy to our homes and businesses. Yet President Trump's tariffs on steel are only serving to complicate an already fragile supply chain that is already complicated by long lead times.

These additional costs from tariffs could also be passed on to consumers, which is especially concerning at a time when electricity prices are up 13 percent across the country. While I appreciate the intent of the bill to understand the current state of our electric supply chain, I will just point out that if Republicans are asking DOE to study these issues while also failing to call out the Trump administration for continuing to enact policies that only make the problem worse—including the mass firings at the Department of Energy, the haphazard recent reorganization of DOE that seemingly eliminated the very offices that would carry out this study, and Secretary Wright's problematic project cancellations impacting dozens of grant recipients—if my Republican colleagues are serious about assessing and addressing vulnerabilities in our electric supply chain, it is time they speak out against harmful Trump administration policies that threaten our electric supply chain.

Mr. Chair, I also urge President Trump and my Republican colleagues to stop turning a blind eye to the affordability crisis.

American families are struggling, and President Trump and congressional Republicans are to blame. Yet, they continue to bring forth bills that will do nothing to meaningfully address the issue of affordability in this country.

Don't be mistaken, they have no real plans to address it.

Just last week, President Trump called the affordability crisis a con job crafted by the Democrats. Even FOX News reported that 76 percent of Americans view the economy negatively. That is how truly out of touch President Trump is with the alarming reality millions of American families are facing.

Let me help paint the picture for President Trump and his Republican accomplices: Utility bills are skyrocketing across the country, grocery prices are up, and the cost of buying a new home feels out of reach for far too many Americans. This is all exacerbated by the fact that millions of Americans are facing the sobering reality that their healthcare premiums are surging because Trump and congressional Republicans refuse to extend the premium tax credits to help keep costs down for millions of families.

Electricity costs are now up 13 percent, as I mentioned. That figure is even higher in some parts of the country, and more than 80 million Americans are struggling to pay their utility bills. In fact, since 2023, household utility debt has risen over 30 percent.

This should be a red flag to President Trump and Republicans that this is, in fact, not a con job—affordability—devised by the Democrats, but a frightening and worsening reality.

These rising costs are debilitating to American families, and the Republican response is a slate of bills that assign busywork to an already thinly stretched agency and a bad-faith attack on the deployment of clean energy and battery storage.

I have said before, but it bears repeating: The Trump administration only cares about addressing affordability for their fossil fuel friends. It is time for Republicans to come to the table to work with Democrats on the solution to this affordability crisis for the sake of American families.

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

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

Mr. Chair, I appreciate my friend bringing up the enhanced or COVID-era premium tax credits that are expiring at the end of this month. Since we are talking energy tonight, we need to understand that they were set to expire, without a single Republican vote, to expire them in the Inflation Reduction Act, which was spent money on the Green New Deal.

So when you put in context what President Trump said—when the premium tax credits were set to expire, we had a hearing on that and we were talking about it. We asked: Why in the world did the Democrats set them to expire? They said: We thought the price of insurance was going to go down at the end of 5 years. That is what somebody said in the committee. The price of insurance has gone up because of the policies they put in place.

The price of energy has gone up because of policies put in their place.

What President Trump was talking about—I don't know if it was that exact speech that was referred to, Mr. Chair, but a speech where he had a chart up to show where high energy prices are. They are in States with general assemblies that have progressive ideas on energy that have put restraints on energy that have driven up the price.

Unfortunately, we have friends across the Atlantic we can look at. They put these kind of policies in place, and Europe has three times the energy prices that we have. What we are saying over here is that we need to have policies that lower the prices for everybody, not raise the cost and just subsidize it, but to lower the cost for everybody. That is what we are trying to do. That is what we are working to do.

What frustrates President Trump is when we are trying to fix the problems that were created by the policies of the previous administration. They say we are not addressing affordability when they created the affordability crisis, when they made the premium tax credits expire. They didn't deal with the fact that health insurance premiums are continuing to rise. Here we are dealing with it and trying to get it right for the American people.

When you say that wind and solar is cheaper and then complain because you took away the tax—people aren't doing it because you take away the tax credits and subsidies. If it is cheaper and more reliable, then you don't have to subsidize it.

Those are the kind of frustrating things in the context of what President Trump was trying to say. Since States have a lot of influence in this, what we are doing here in the first bill is ensuring that States focus on how do you make it reliable and affordable, particularly in States like Colorado where my colleague, Mr. EVANS, who put the bill forward, is from. Their rates continue to go up because of policies of their general assembly in their State. He just wants to ensure that their State factors in affordability when they make those kinds of decisions. That is what we are here to talk about.

Then, in order to build again after years of delaying building, we have a supply chain that has to get reinvigorated. You can sit down and talk to AI companies and people that need data and need energy.

I am one for every electron on the grid we can put on the grid, whether it comes from a solar panel or wind or hydrocarbons, as long as it is not subsidized. We need it all.

□ 1910

My friend from Ohio has a bill saying that we know that it takes too long to get a generator, takes too long to get a transformer, takes too long to get turbine blades, and that we have to make sure our supply chain is in place, and

also make sure that the Department of Energy is focused on it. I know they are. Secretary Wright is focused on it to make sure there is a statute that we have Congress saying the supply chain is important.

Delivering energy at an affordable price is a priority. That is what these two bills today do. That is what this bill does, and I recommend that my colleagues vote for this bill.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The bill is considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3638

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 “Electric Supply Chain Act”.

SEC. 2. ASSESSMENT AND REPORT ON THE SUPPLY CHAIN FOR THE GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION OF ELECTRICITY.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—In carrying out the requirements of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), the Secretary shall, for purposes of monitoring the supply chain for the generation and transmission of electricity and in consultation with relevant stakeholders, prepare periodic assessments on such supply chain that—

(1) include information on—

(A) efforts and opportunities to strengthen, secure, and expand such supply chain;

(B) any trends, risks, and vulnerabilities in the supply, demand, and availability of components for or related to generating or transmitting electricity, including components that are necessary for the construction or deployment of facilities that generate or transmit electricity;

(C) national security and energy security considerations for strengthening, securing, and expanding such supply chain;

(D) barriers to expanding the capacity to—
(i) manufacture components for or related to generating or transmitting electricity in the United States; and

(ii) process critical materials in the United States;

(E) domestic policies that deter or otherwise inhibit greater investment into such supply chain;

(F) the effects of any reliance of the United States on any foreign entity of concern for—

(i) components for or related to generating or transmitting electricity; and

(ii) the exploration, development, or production of critical materials necessary for manufacturing such components; and

(G) workforce challenges affecting such supply chain;

(2) identify emerging issues in such supply chain; and

(3) include recommendations to—

(A) address any emerging issues identified under paragraph (2); and

(B) secure and expand such supply chain.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, and periodically thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the most recent assessment prepared under subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) CRITICAL MATERIAL.—The term “critical material” has the meaning given such term in section 7002(a) of the Energy Act of 2020 (30 U.S.C. 1606(a)).

(3) ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION.—The term “Electric Reliability Organization” has the meaning given such term in section 215(a) of the Federal Power Act (42 U.S.C. 824o(a)).

(4) ELECTRIC UTILITY.—The term “electric utility” has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796).

(5) FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.—The term “foreign entity of concern” has the meaning given such term in section 40207(a) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 1874i(a)).

(6) RELEVANT STAKEHOLDER.—The term “relevant stakeholder”—

(A) means a stakeholder that is involved in—

(i) the generation, storage, transmission, or distribution of electricity; or

(ii) the supply chain for such generation, storage, transmission, or distribution; and

(B) includes an electric utility, an electric grid component manufacturer, a person who constructs an electric generating facility, an electric power system cybersecurity expert, the Electric Reliability Organization, a ratepayer advocacy stakeholder, and any other related private sector stakeholder.

(7) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part C of House Report 119-399. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 119-399.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 21, strike “and” at the end.

Page 4, line 23, strike “chain;” and insert “chain; and”.

Page 4, after line 23, insert the following:

(H) any vulnerabilities from the employment of any non-United States citizen at a facility located in the United States that generates or transmits electricity;

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 936, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Chairman, energy security is national security. As the 119th Congress

works to protect and strengthen America’s energy backbone, we have a responsibility to ensure our decisions are informed, transparent, and grounded in vigorous oversight.

The American people expect us to safeguard the systems that power their homes, businesses, and daily lives.

My amendment is straightforward and common sense. It directs the Secretary of Energy to identify any vulnerabilities to our domestic energy grid that may arise from noncitizens’ access to U.S. facilities that generate or transmit electricity. That is it. It creates no prohibition, no hiring restrictions, and no burdens on industry. It simply asks for information, information Congress needs to do its job.

The numbers alone underscore the importance of this issue. According to the report, the Department of Energy’s 2024 Energy Employment by State report, my great State of Arizona employs more than 135,000 energy workers, including 25,000 in power generation and another 25,000 in transmission. Comparably, in Texas, 1 million Americans work in the energy sector. These are enormous workforces operating critical infrastructure that keeps our country moving.

Under Article I, Section 8, Congress has clear constitutional authority under the Commerce Clause to regulate interstate and interregional commerce. Electricity, the last time I looked, doesn’t stop at State lines.

Earlier this year, the House passed H.R. 3062, the Proposing Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act, to streamline energy transmission across our international borders.

As we take steps to expand and modernize our energy systems, we must ensure our oversight keeps pace. By requiring the Secretary of Energy to periodically review access to critical facilities and notify Congress if any of these vulnerabilities are found, my amendment enhances that oversight. If risks exist, we address them. If they don’t, the Department of Energy can focus its efforts on more pressing threats from our adversaries like China and Russia.

Mr. Chair, this is responsible governance. It strengthens transparency, fortifies national security, and ensures Congress remains fully informed about potential threats to the grid.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the amendment because it peddles in gross xenophobia and fear of immigrants that has become the calling card of Republicans during the Trump years.

The amendment would require the Department of Energy to add to its

study vulnerabilities from the employment of non-U.S. citizens at generation or transmission facilities.

Now, I agree with the gentleman that our electric system needs to be secure, but I do not agree with him that every electrical engineer who comes to this country for a better life needs to live in fear of ICE and DOE showing up and harassing them at their place of work.

There are enough real threats to our grid. Congress does not need to concern itself with imaginary threats as well.

Mr. Chair, I urge opposition to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I think the gentleman is suffering from power phobia, but this is a report. That is all it is, a report. I think the old wives' tale actually says it best: "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." This is a report. It has nothing to do with immigration or immigration-like actions. It is a simple report. If you do your oversight right, you better be following these reports. You better be finding where those little glitches may be, and this is one of those aspects.

Mr. Chair, I ask that everyone vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 119-399.

Mr. MIN. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of Ms. HOULAHAN, and I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 21, strike "and".

Page 4, line 23, strike "chain;" and insert "chain; and".

Page 4, after line 23, insert the following:

(H) opportunities to expand participation in the workforce supporting such supply chain by veterans, transitioning servicemembers, and military spouses, including any barriers to entry in such workforce and opportunities for enhanced Federal coordination;

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 936, the gentleman from California (Mr. MIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MIN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this straightforward amendment to the Electric Supply Chain Act, an amendment that strengthens our workforce, supports veterans, and helps ensure the reliability and security of our Nation's energy supply.

As a Representative of California, I know how essential it is that we shore up the workforce powering our electric supply chain. Manufacturers in California and across the country consistently tell us the same thing: Workforce

shortages are slowing down projects, driving up costs, and ultimately are a major contributor to higher prices for working families.

The data is clear: Nearly 10,000 electricians retire each year, while only about 7,000 new entrants come in each year, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Goldman Sachs has estimated the United States will need roughly 510,000 new workers just to meet rising power demand over the next decade. Annually, we have more than 200,000 servicemembers who transition out of the military, many with exactly the same technical skills, discipline, and mission-focused mindset that our energy system needs and that employers are looking for.

This amendment would simply direct the Department of Energy to regularly assess how to expand veteran, servicemember, and military spouse participation in this workforce, what barriers are preventing entry into these fields, and where improved Federal coordination can better coordinate this talent to areas of real need.

Strengthening supply chains means strengthening the people behind them. Few are better prepared for these careers than our veterans and military families, and this is an important transition for them, as well.

This is a practical improvement to the underlying bill, which promotes national security, energy resilience, and economic opportunity for those who have served.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I am not opposed to it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment from my colleague, Representative HOULIHAN from Pennsylvania.

This amendment requires DOE to evaluate the potential role transitioning military servicemembers could play in meeting the workforce needs for the electric supply chain.

□ 1920

Mr. Chair, while our efforts to reshore domestic manufacturing facilities bolster our national security, it is also important to recognize the economic benefits of attracting new opportunities for job-creating industries.

Growing investments in the manufacturing sector create stable and good-paying jobs for households and drive economic growth in communities across our country. Our men and women seeking new employment after transitioning back to civilian life bring

incredible skill sets and expertise to the table that could benefit companies of all kinds.

By incorporating new consideration for DOE to evaluate the potential for transitioning servicemembers into the workforce as part of H.R. 3638, we can ensure our veterans have access to good-paying jobs.

Mr. Chair, having served in the military, I know in the military we get specific skills. We can be diesel mechanics. We can be all these different things we learn in the military. Sometimes they directly translate actually, but some others don't. It creates the opportunity to reach out and find military members who are leaving the military and who have specific skills for these opportunities.

Mr. Chair, I support this amendment. I was meeting with some people the other day in this kind of industry. They said if they advertise \$120,000 a year for MBAs, they get a flood of applications. If they advertise \$120,000 a year for skilled truck drivers, they barely get enough. They don't get enough applications.

There are opportunities for people to make a good living and have a career. It is not just a wage but a wage that produces for their families and will let them—he or she—be extremely successful. I support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, since we are talking military, I must say: Go Army. Beat Navy on Saturday.

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

Mr. MIN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCGUIRE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part C of House Report 119-399.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 3, insert " , including efforts of any foreign entity of concern to exploit supply chain disruptions for the purposes of undermining United States leadership in artificial intelligence development" after "chain".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 936, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCGUIRE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment, H.R. 3638, which adds essential language to address the threat posed by foreign entities of concern seeking to disrupt supply chains and undermine United States leadership in artificial intelligence development.

The United States is in a race with the Chinese Communist Party to be the

global leader in the development and deployment of artificial intelligence. Maintaining that leadership requires vigilance against supply chain vulnerabilities that foreign adversaries can exploit. Our Nation has already faced significant challenges in scaling artificial intelligence infrastructure. We cannot allow foreign manipulation or interference to add to these challenges.

Disruptions to the artificial intelligence supply chain will not just weaken our country in our race against China but will have a significant, negative impact on our economy, our ability to defend ourselves, and our capacity to innovate.

This amendment recognizes that protecting the artificial intelligence supply chain is both a defensive measure and a strategic investment in our infrastructure. Establishing periodic assessments of vulnerabilities in the artificial intelligence supply chain that foreign entities of concern could exploit helps ensure our country maintains stable access to necessary components, boosting domestic manufacturing and innovation.

To remain at the forefront of the next generation of technology, we must thoroughly assess and protect our supply chain. Any disruption threatens not only our progress but also our national security, our economic strength, and our global position in the artificial intelligence race.

This amendment strengthens our ability to safeguard America's advancements in artificial intelligence by ensuring we identify, monitor, and address vulnerabilities that foreign adversaries could exploit to the detriment of our national interests. It reinforces our commitment to securing the technologies that will define the next century and ensures the United States remains the world leader in artificial intelligence. This is a commonsense idea, and I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, while I have grave concerns about the Department of Energy's ability to carry out and execute on the studies and reports required by this bill, if we are going to ask them to do those studies, then I think this addition is harmless.

I would point out that, while the gentleman's amendment focuses explicitly on efforts by foreign entities of concern to exploit supply chain disruptions to undermine our leadership in the field of AI, I am concerned about any effort by foreign entities of concern to exploit energy supply chain disruptions. That is why I have been dismayed at the fact that President Trump and the

Republican Party have totally dismantled the infrastructure that we built up to strengthen our energy supply chains.

The reality is that there are more threats to our energy supply chains today than there were a year ago because of the big, ugly bill and the sledgehammer that DOGE and Secretary Wright took to the Department of Energy. That is a large reason why I oppose the overall bill. But this amendment isn't about that.

While I still oppose the underlying bill, I do not oppose the amendment, even though I think it is too narrow.

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

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Chair, talking about DOGE is a thinly veiled attempt to score political points by changing the topic of the conversation from this amendment, which protects our national security from foreign entities of concern, and turning it into something political.

The previous actions of DOGE do not bear any weight or relevance to this amendment. The Department of Energy is adequately staffed by very bright and talented individuals who have the capacity to monitor vulnerabilities in our supply chain that the Chinese Communist Party or other foreign adversaries could exploit to halt our progress in the artificial intelligence sphere.

This amendment is not political. It is common sense. Disruptions by foreign entities of concern to our supply chain threaten our national security, which is a cause of concern for all Americans, regardless of their political affiliation.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman has the only time remaining.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, in closing, this is a commonsense amendment. The United States is in a race with the Chinese Communist Party to be the global leader in the development and deployment of artificial intelligence and other capabilities such as quantum computers. Any vulnerabilities in our supply chain that our adversaries can exploit not only threaten our global standing in the artificial intelligence space, but it also threatens our national security.

This amendment protects all Americans from a significant and growing threat. I, again, encourage adoption of this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCGUIRE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MIN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part C of House Report 119-399.

Mr. MIN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 18, before the semicolon at the end, insert “, including with respect to overcoming obstacles to broader deployment of advanced transmission technologies, including advanced conductors and other technologies that can be installed to increase the transfer capacity, efficiency, affordability, reliability, or resiliency of transmission infrastructure”

Page 3, line 24, before the semicolon at the end, insert “or can support advanced transmission technologies, including advanced conductors and other technologies that can be installed to increase the transfer capacity, efficiency, affordability, reliability, or resiliency of transmission infrastructure”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 936, the gentleman from California (Mr. MIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MIN. Mr. Chair, my amendment to the Electric Supply Chain Act would expand the periodic reports required under this bill to include a critical assessment of advanced transmission technologies.

In my district and across the country, families are seeing soaring energy costs brought on by load growth and extreme weather, including wildfires. An aging and inefficient grid is bottlenecking the growing demand for new and reliable power, causing prices to go up and limiting the electrons that can reach areas that need this electricity.

We must meet this challenge, grow our economy, and bring down the energy bills that are rising so quickly and crushing so many of our constituents today. To do that, we need to build more transmission infrastructure.

□ 1930

We also need to leverage innovation that we have to maximize our current electric transmission rights-of-way. Advanced transmission technologies like high-performance conductors present a unique opportunity to upgrade the electric grid we already have and ensure that new infrastructure is more efficient and affordable.

According to the Department of Energy, using advanced conductors can double the capacity of existing transmission lines, and over 100,000 miles of lines can currently benefit from these technologies.

Importantly, these technologies have minimal land use impacts, can be installed without the decades-long permitting timelines required for new lines, and increase the resiliency of the grid against wildfires helping keep districts like mine safe from the growing threats of these natural disasters that are often under severe fire risk.

It is why major utilities in California are building their lines with advanced

conductors and why States across the country are passing new laws to promote their adoption.

I am proud to actually represent two of the largest manufacturers of advanced transmission conductors in my district: CTC Global and TS Conductor. These companies are extraordinary examples of American innovation and manufacturing which is helping pioneer the grid of the future and create high-skilled domestic jobs in the process.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend from California for offering this amendment.

This amendment would incorporate advanced transmission technologies into the supply chain considerations that the Department of Energy would also need to assess, as part of their responsibilities in this bill. In certain circumstances, advanced transmission technologies can help get more resources out of our current system by expanding the grid's electric load-carrying capacity.

However, these are not one-size-fits-all technology, and there are important engineering complexities to consider to ensure the system operates efficiently. We must ensure they are implemented, when it is appropriate, and cost-effective so we can secure the grid without burdening ratepayers with unnecessary investments.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MIN. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SELF

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part C of House Report 119-399.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 6, insert “, deliver, and install” after “manufacture”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 936, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3638. The bill requires DOE to assess supply chain vulnerabilities for the generation

and transmission of electricity, including barriers to expanding capacity here in the United States.

My amendment makes a simple clarification. It ensures that DOE evaluates barriers not only to manufacturing components, but also to their delivery and installation. In the real world, grid reliability depends on whether critical equipment can actually reach the job site and be installed on time.

If we want a serious assessment and serious recommendations, then we cannot stop at the factory gate.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment recognizes that it is not enough for us to manufacture critical grid and supply chain components, they must be able to be actually delivered and installed on the grid. This is a worthwhile addition to the bill.

However, I lament that while my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can recognize the equal importance of manufacturing supply chain components and transporting and delivering them, they are unable to recognize the same when it comes to electricity. To do anyone any good, electricity must not only be generated, it must be carried to its destination on the grid.

However, House Republicans, especially those on the Energy and Commerce Committee, have been completely unwilling to acknowledge the role that expanding the grid must play in any serious, bipartisan conversation on permitting.

The bills this week and next week aren't a serious attempt at permitting reform, far from it. One of them tells us that, despite Democrats talking for the last 3 years about the need to strengthen the grid in the face of rising demand, Republicans have still failed to acknowledge that need or that reality for that matter.

Again, I think this is a bad bill. I think the Department of Energy has not made clear to us that it has the resources or the ability to carry out this bill. I think that instead of trying to get the DOE to maybe write us a report telling us what we already know, we should focus on concrete actions that could shore up our supply chain: restoring the Office of Manufacturing and Energy Supply Chains, and restoring the incentives to build in America that were killed by the big, ugly bill. All these things are really what we need to do.

However, Republicans are not willing to do that, so I don't know what else to say.

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

Mr. SELF. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SELF).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCDOWELL) having assumed the chair, Mr. MOYLAN, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3638) to direct the Secretary of Energy to prepare periodic assessments and submit reports on the supply chain for the generation and transmission of electricity, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 936, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 the 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.

INCREASING INVESTOR OPPORTUNITIES ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WAGNER. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 936 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3383.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Guam (Mr. MOYLAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.