

locking up of kids, more depriving people of due process, and strip searches for young children are not the answer. We would be wise to listen to the American people.

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

□ 1520

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

Mr. Speaker, today, we have an opportunity to take seriously the deficiencies in our UAC Program that have been exposed in the last 4 years of the Biden-Harris administration. Kids who are gang members in their country of origin are allowed to go to a sponsor.

Instead of doing background checks on the kids or checking for tattoos, we give them papier-mache projects and ask them to identify their gender if they feel comfortable talking about it. These are things that actually happened with Walter Javier Martinez.

Rather than take that money that the American people have given to the U.S. Treasury to spend for their safety, we are doing these ridiculous things instead of actually vetting a gang member from El Salvador.

Why don't we do it a little bit better in this country? Why can't we be a little bit smarter in this country?

Mr. Speaker, I will concede very easily that most kids are probably innocent. I have no problem with that, but for the ones that aren't, why are we putting them on our streets? Why are we not conducting adequate background checks on their pasts?

It took, in this case, a local cop in Maryland calling his country of origin to find out, after Kayla was murdered, that he had a criminal past. Why wouldn't we do that on the front end before we have a Kayla Hamilton?

On the flip side of this, I think this is just common sense, that if the law says that sponsors should undergo background checks before we release a kid, sure. Under the last administration, they were too busy pushing kids to sponsors at a record pace that they never even allowed those background checks of the sponsors to come back. They pushed kids into homes before we even knew what the sponsor was like, who they were, or what kind of background they had.

Mr. Speaker, that is reckless endangerment of a child. If we have, all of a sudden, the care and custody of an unaccompanied alien child, maybe we should make sure that the person we send them to isn't a criminal themselves, isn't engaged in sexual exploitation, and isn't engaged in human trafficking.

That is common sense, but what I have heard is that we are going to keep repeating the same tired lies, the same tired fabrications of what actually is going on in this country. Let's be a little bit smarter about the way that we do business.

We can protect kids with this bill. We can also protect our citizens to make

sure that Kayla Hamiltons don't happen in every community in our country.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 951, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Stansbury of New Mexico moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4371 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The material previously referred to by Ms. STANSBURY is as follows:

Ms. Stansbury moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4371 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 5, line 15, strike "shall—".

Page 5, line 16, strike "(i) contact the" and insert "shall contact the".

Page 5, line 22, strike "child; and" and insert "child."

Page 5, strike line 23 and all that follows through line 2 on page 6.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. STANSBURY. 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.

POWER PLANT RELIABILITY ACT OF 2025

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, Pursuant to House Resolution 951, I call up the bill (H.R. 3632) to amend the Federal Power Act to adjust the requirements for orders, rules, and regulations relating to furnishing adequate service, to require owners or operators of generating facilities to provide notice of planned retirements of certain electric generating units, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 951, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3632

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 "Power Plant Reliability Act of 2025".

SEC. 2. FURNISHING OF ADEQUATE SERVICE; ADVANCE NOTICE OF PLANNED RETIREMENTS.

Section 207 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824f) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 207. FURNISHING OF ADEQUATE SERVICE; ADVANCE NOTICE OF PLANNED RETIREMENTS.

“(a) FURNISHING OF ADEQUATE SERVICE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the Commission, upon complaint of a State commission or a Transmission Organization, after notice to each State commission and public utility affected, and after opportunity for hearing within 90 days of receipt of such complaint, finds that any interstate service of any public utility is inadequate or insufficient, or is likely to become inadequate or insufficient within 5 years of receiving such complaint, the Commission shall determine the proper, adequate, or sufficient service to be furnished, and shall fix the same by issuing an order, rule, or regulation.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Commission, in an order, rule, or regulation issued under paragraph (1)—

“(A) may not—

“(i) compel the enlargement of generating facilities; or

“(ii) compel the public utility to sell or exchange electric energy when to do so would impair its ability to render proper, adequate, or sufficient service to its customers;

“(B) may require—

“(i) continuing the operation of an electric generating unit; and

“(ii) any affected State commission, Transmission Organization, or public utility to develop and implement a long-term plan for the planning, construction, and operation of interstate transmission facilities that may be necessary for the public utility to provide adequate and sufficient interstate service; and

“(C) shall determine—

“(i) any rate or charge necessary to provide compensation for the additional costs of the proper, adequate, or sufficient service to be furnished, including compensation to an owner or operator of an electric generating unit that is required to continue to operate under such order, rule, or regulation; and

“(ii) the cost allocation of any rate or charge.

“(3) TERM LENGTH.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), an order, rule, or regulation issued under paragraph (1) shall terminate on the date that the Commission determines appropriate, which may not be later than 5 years after the date on which the Commission issues such order, rule, or regulation.

“(4) EXTENSION.—

“(A) REQUEST FOR EXTENSION.—Not earlier than the date that is 180 days prior to the date on which an order, rule, or regulation terminates, as determined under paragraph (3), and not later than 60 days prior to such termination date, any affected State commission, Transmission Organization, or public utility may submit to the Commission a request to extend such order, rule, or regulation.

“(B) DEADLINE.—With respect to a request submitted under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall—

“(i) not later than 14 days after the date on which the Commission receives the request, notify each affected State commission, Transmission Organization, and public utility of the request;

“(ii) provide an opportunity for a hearing on the request before accepting or denying the request under clause (iii); and

“(iii) not later than 60 days after the date on which the Commission receives the request—

“(I) accept the request and extend the applicable order, rule, or regulation; or

“(II) deny the request.

“(C) TERM LENGTH.—An order, rule, or regulation extended under subparagraph (B) shall terminate on the date that the Commission determines appropriate, which may not be later than 5 years after the date on which the Commission extended such order, rule, or regulation.

“(5) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN ACTIONS.—To the extent an omission or action taken by a party, that is necessary to comply with an order, rule, or regulation issued or extended under this subsection, including any omission or action taken to voluntarily comply with such order, rule, or regulation, results in noncompliance with, or causes such party to not comply with, any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, such omission or action shall not be considered a violation of such environmental law or regulation, or subject such party to any requirement, civil or criminal liability, or a citizen suit under such environmental law or regulation.

“(b) ADVANCE NOTICE OF PLANNED RETIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If an owner or operator of a generating facility plans to retire an electric generating unit that is a component of such facility, such owner or operator shall submit to the Commission and any affected State commission or Transmission Organization a notice of such plan at least 5 years before the date on which such owner or operator plans to retire such electric generating unit.

“(2) UNPLANNED RETIREMENTS.—An owner or operator of a generating facility that retires an electric generating unit due to an unplanned catastrophe, emergency, disaster, or similar event that renders such electric generating unit inoperable is not subject to the notice requirement described in paragraph (1).

“(3) PUBLICLY AVAILABLE.—The Commission shall make publicly available each notice submitted under paragraph (1).

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) BULK-POWER SYSTEM.—The term ‘bulk-power system’ has the meaning given such term in section 215(a).

“(2) ELECTRIC GENERATING UNIT.—The term ‘electric generating unit’ means an electric energy producing unit that—

“(A) is a component of a generating facility;

“(B) has a power production capacity of not less than 5 megawatts; and

“(C) is interconnected to the bulk-power system.

“(3) RETIRE.—The term ‘retire’, with respect to an electric generating unit, means to, for an indefinite period of time—

“(A) idle the electric generating unit;

“(B) disconnect the electric generating unit from the bulk-power system; or

“(C) otherwise make unavailable for sale all electric energy that is generated by the electric generating unit.”.

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

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3632.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3632, the Power Plant Reliability Act, sponsored by my colleague from Virginia's Ninth Congressional District (Mr. GRIFFITH).

This legislation improves existing tools under the Federal Power Act to keep the lights on for households and ensures more effective long-term planning for our generation resources.

In the event that a power plant closure creates a shortage of available electricity, H.R. 3632 equips States and grid operators with an opportunity to seek relief from FERC until replacement capacity comes online.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a reliability and affordability crisis because of the Biden-Harris administration and blue States who took a hatchet to our baseload capacity resources, while making it impossible to build the necessary energy infrastructure to replace it.

These policies were designed to achieve environmental goals that were unrelated to reliability, affordability, or stability of the bulk-power system. Nothing can be more destructive to our communities than a blackout.

When a State seeks to close a power plant without identifying a sufficient replacement, there is little recourse for effective households in neighboring States that need the power. The Power Plant Reliability Act solves this by providing a bridge solution to maintain generating resources until sufficient capacity can come online to fill the gap.

The numbers are staggering. Over the last decade, 115 gigawatts of power are expected to go offline, while 150 gigawatts of demand are expected to come online. The Department of Energy finds that the current pace of retirements and generation growth could increase the risk of outages over 100 times in just 4 short years.

Making matters worse, our adversaries are close on our heels to securing leadership positions in the next-generation economy. There is little time to waste.

Importantly, significant investment is flowing in growing our base of dispatchable resources. The Trump administration is working tirelessly to reverse unnecessary barriers to generation development and fuel innovation and baseload power like advanced nuclear. Yet, before these policies can take root, we must ensure that States and grid operators are equipped with

the necessary tools to maintain reliability of the bulk-power system.

This legislation is another step to securing the grid and improving long-term planning needed to lead the next-generation economy. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3632.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3632. It is a bill that will raise energy prices for American families by forcing them to pay for outdated polluting plants that are poisoning their air and water.

A reliable and affordable energy supply is vital to our way of life. Unfortunately, this bill and Republican policies are making electricity less reliable and less affordable. Mr. Speaker, electricity bills are up about 13 percent on average across America this year. They are higher in many places.

In Florida, they just approved the largest rate increase in the history of the country. They approved \$7 billion in rate hikes for Florida Power & Light. Tampa Electric and Duke Energy in my neck of the woods also hiked rates this year. For TECO customers, we are paying 82 percent more than 5 years ago, or \$939 more than we were.

Electricity prices are climbing more than twice as fast as the rate of inflation. Why is this happening? It is because of Republican policies. It is the chaos and dysfunction. Let's go ahead and get into this.

Why are electricity prices so high?

What is driving the cost increases?

First, there are the arbitrary Trump tariffs. They are now at the highest levels than they have been since the 1930s. Estimates are that the average household is going to pay at least \$1,000 more because of tariffs. When we talk about energy, we are talking, as well, about how we modernize the grid, power poles, wires, and everything that goes into an electrical system. The utilities are passing that on to hard-working families.

Then we have the big, ugly bill that Republicans forced through here last summer. Predictions were when we take a hatchet to cleaner, cheaper energy poised to come onto the grid, when we rip away tax credits and rebates for consumers to keep their electricity bills low, prices are going to go up. That is what we are seeing now, too.

The big, ugly bill is estimated to raise electricity prices by a staggering 61 percent over the next decade, particularly as a result of Republicans declaring war on clean, cheap energy and crippling the American clean energy industry.

I don't know, Mr. Speaker. Did you see the jobs report that came out this morning? It doesn't look good. In today's jobs report, the number of manufacturing jobs continues to slide. November was the seventh straight

month of monthly decline. A lot of that goes back to the big, ugly bill and what the Trump administration has done over the past year in canceling clean energy projects.

My colleagues have heard all about them. An offshore wind project might be approved, permitted, and ready to come online. He says: No, we are not going to do that.

Mr. Speaker, that has an impact on the bottom line for our families. We might have another project coming online that is ready to go. It is cleaner energy. Everyone knows that solar power with storage and wind power with storage is the cheapest energy online. The Trump administration and Republican policies said no.

When our constituents open up that electric bill, I want them to understand that all of this has a cost and that they deserve so much better than the chaos and dysfunction, the distraction of tearing down the East Wing to build a ballroom, and the parties with dancing girls at Mar-a-Lago. Why don't my colleagues focus on people's cost of living for a change?

We would think that folks in Congress would come here to help solve problems.

Is there going to be an answer for higher healthcare costs? In Florida, 4.7 million of my neighbors rely on the Affordable Care Act tax credits.

Do Republicans have any answer for the 20 million families here during the holiday season who can't buy holiday gifts they want to put under the tree for their families? No, they will have to pinch every penny to pay for their healthcare. Many will go without.

Mr. Speaker, think about the cancer patients now who are looking at the new year and how they are going to afford their treatment.

It is electricity costs. It is groceries. It is healthcare costs. Then my Republican colleagues will waste our time with a bill that is another in the line of special treatment for polluters at the expense of hardworking American families today.

This bill would give the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission broad authority to force utilities to keep expensive and polluting fossil fuel power plants operating for extended periods, up to 5 years. What that does is it locks customers into paying billions of dollars more for power plants that were slated for retirement, despite the volatile fuel costs and the environmental harm.

They want to continue to block cleaner and cheaper energy, which is the cheapest energy coming onto the grid right now. I think they are living 20 to 30 years ago. Electricity generated by coal is on the decline. While it was about 50 percent of the electricity generation in America in the year 2000, here we are, 25 years later, and it is only 20 percent of electricity generation.

The main reason for that is simple. Coal is more expensive than a lot of the

other options we have today. In almost every case today, it is actually cheaper to build new renewables than to keep existing coal plants running. Coal is only getting more expensive. Three-quarters of coal plants saw costs rising faster than inflation just over the past few years.

This bill is anticonsumer. Frankly, it is anti-American. People deserve better. If we want to lower electricity bills, I would ask my colleagues to march down to the White House because the President is the only one arbitrarily taking energy generation offline and hiking electricity costs.

During the last administration, the number of utility-scale electric power plants actually increased by over 2,000. We produced more energy than ever before. We have a commitment to serve the people that send us here and to help them lower their bills through rebates, through energy efficiency, through help for their pocketbooks, not the bottom line of polluters who have all too much power here on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Energy already has the authority under the Federal Power Act to prevent power plants from retiring if doing so would cause reliability problems. Republicans want to go further. This bill requires States to file reliability complaints 5 years before a generator retires. It is almost impossible to predict the impact of a plant retirement that far ahead.

This bill gives polluting plants a pass to ignore Federal, State, and local environmental laws. As we have already seen multiple times just this year, these plants aren't even reliable.

□ 1540

Mr. Speaker, we will have a whole lot more to say on this, but I really wish we would not waste people's time by coming here and making their lives more expensive at a time when they are clamoring for help on their groceries, on their healthcare, and on their electricity bills. Republicans brought a bill that actually hikes electricity and utility costs. They deserve so much better.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in 2024, the FERC Commissioner, Mark Christie, testified before us in the Energy and Commerce Committee. He was referring to the severe impact that the Biden administration EPA's power plant rule, commonly known as the Clean Power Plan 2.0, was having.

He stated this: "If the EPA's new power plant rule survives court challenge, it will force the retirements of nearly all remaining coal generation plants and will prevent the construction of vitally needed new combined-cycle baseload . . . generation."

This loss of this dispatchable generation resources will be, in his words, "catastrophic"—"catastrophic."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), from the First District.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Power Plant Reliability Act of 2025.

H.R. 3632 will help keep baseload power plants running for up to 5 years while allowing FERC the time to address State concerns about the impacts of shutting down certain power plants. This bill will allow State grid operators to contest the closure of power plants if the closure will create a reliability problem in their State.

As we work to lower electricity costs across the Nation, we do not need to be closing power plants with little to no notice. Americans deserve affordable electricity prices, and this legislation will do just that.

Democrats, under President Biden, spent 4 years trying to dismantle affordable baseload generation in favor of green new scam policies that have done nothing but raise prices for Americans.

This bill will allow us to plan for the future when thinking about our energy sources. It is an essential tool for maintaining a reliable, efficient grid that works for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor Congressman GRIFFITH's Power Plant Reliability Act of 2025, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the ranking member of the Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Power Plant Reliability Act. At a time of rapidly rising energy costs, this is yet another bill that Republicans are trying to stick our constituents with.

This legislation would force old, expensive power plants to stay online for up to 5 years after their scheduled retirement date. There are already existing tools in the Federal Power Act to ensure that an electricity generator shutting down will not lead to a reliability issue.

Sometimes there are legitimate reasons to have these facilities stay online for a short time period while another project can be completed. Yet even with these more limited existing authorities, we have witnessed troubling examples of how these types of must-run orders can be abused.

For example, the Trump administration has issued numerous 90-day orders that would force the continued operation of a coal-fired power plant in Michigan. There was a reason it was shutting down. It was simply too expensive to continue to run, especially compared to alternatives.

The power plant's owner and the regional grid operator, MISO, do not feel

there is any reliability need for this plant to continue running. Yet still President Trump has compelled it to continue to operate, and the people of Michigan and other States covered by MISO are footing the bill. It has been estimated that these people have paid more than \$80 million from May 23 through September 30 due to this action.

We wonder why everyone has seen their utility bills skyrocket under President Trump. It is thoughtless decisions like this one that prioritize subsidizing the coal industry instead of actually addressing legitimate reliability and affordability issues facing our electricity system.

Mr. Speaker, they paid \$80 million in a matter of a few months. Imagine if that power plant was forced to run not for 90-day increments but for 5 years, as proposed by this bill.

At the end of the day, we, as Members of Congress, have an important decision to make: Are we going to protect our constituents from rising energy bills, or are we going to protect coal companies that desperately need someone to keep buying and burning their product, even when it is no longer needed? Our constituents simply cannot afford another giveaway to coal companies at the expense of their wallets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members who care about energy reliability and, yes, affordability, the keyword these days, to come together on solutions that will actually improve the lives of our constituents, not just declaring fake emergencies as a pretense to extract more money from people who simply cannot afford it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this bill.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON), from the 12th District.

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman LATTA for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the Power Plant Reliability Act is a commonsense step to ensure that the power plant retirements do not undermine the reliability of our electric grid.

This legislation requires power plant owners to provide 5 years' advance notice before retiring a facility, giving grid operators, regulators, and States the time that they need to plan for replacements and prevent power shortfalls.

Under current law, FERC has limited authority to address reliability problems caused by plant retirements, including the ability, under certain circumstances, to order a plant to remain online.

This bill enhances the authority by allowing grid operators and States to formally contest a retirement when it would threaten the reliability.

In order to keep the lights on, strengthen our electric system, and help to lower Americans' electricity

costs, we have to ensure that we have enough baseload power online. This legislation does just that.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I had a raised smile when I saw that poster, "House Republicans are Strengthening the Electric Grid," because it is such a canard. It was just a few months ago where the Trump administration canceled hundreds of millions of dollars to modernize America's electric grid in red States and blue States. It was a complicated system of wires and transmission.

Mr. Speaker, you would think that, in a country such as ours, where we know electricity demand is going up, that one thing we could agree on investing in is modernizing our electric grid, but no. The Trump administration, just like they have taken a hatchet to cleaner, cheaper energy, has taken a hatchet to those hardworking people and the folks who keep the lights on for us.

Grid modernization is important, so the last thing Republicans and this administration are doing is strengthening the grid.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. SCHOLTEN).

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3632 and in favor of addressing the affordability crisis that is crippling the American Dream.

Passing this bill would keep costly, outdated power plants running and stick hardworking American families with the bill.

There is a lot of bluster here in Washington, so let's break this down. What is happening with this bill?

H.R. 3632 gives the Federal Government the power to force power plants to stay open even when local utilities and State regulators themselves have decided that it makes more sense, financially and in terms of efficiency and power, to close them.

It also requires utilities to give years of notice before closing a power plant, giving bureaucrats in Washington and special interests even more chances to step in and overrule local decisions.

When utilities decide to close a power plant, they don't do so on a whim. These decisions come after years of study to make sure that power stays reliable and the bills can stay as low as possible.

H.R. 3632 removes that decision-making power, taking it away from the experts and putting it back to bureaucrats in Washington. Instead of trusting local experts, this bill puts decisions in the hands of Washington officials who are far away from their communities.

□ 1550

Utilities are forced to keep running their plants that cost more to operate,

and those extra costs are passed on to families and small businesses. Communities should not be told that Washington knows better, especially when the result is more paperwork and higher bills for American families.

We are not talking about hypotheticals here, Mr. Speaker. We have seen this happen firsthand back home in west Michigan. We know what happens when the Federal Government steps in. The J.H. Campbell coal power plant back home in west Michigan was set to close after years of careful planning. I visited the plant. There were just days of coal supply left. They had already had plans for alternative, more efficient power outsourcing to support the grid with a fraction of the size and an even smaller fraction of the pollution and impact on our environment. Everyone was happy until the Trump administration stepped in and said, no, you are going to reopen, and sent our community scrambling.

The plan to close this plant and defuse the power to other cleaner sources would have saved Michigan families \$600 million on their power bills. Instead, those savings disappeared, and hardworking Michiganders are paying more every single month.

The President may call the affordability crisis a hoax, but I invite him to come to west Michigan and talk to people who are paying more every single month in their utility bills because of this plan.

H.R. 3632 would make this kind of outcome more common. It allows Federal officials to keep power plants running for years, even when they cost more and even when local leaders say it is not the right choice.

This is not a balanced energy plan. It is a top-down order that raises costs and ignores systems that already work to keep power reliable and affordable.

At a time when families are struggling to pay for groceries, healthcare, and housing, they cannot afford higher energy bills caused by decisions like this from the administration.

For that reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. If the House rules allowed, I would have offered a motion with an amendment that does one simple thing. It would stop this bill from taking effect if it raises costs for everyday Americans.

Think about that. Wouldn't my Republican colleagues across the aisle agree that we shouldn't be introducing these bills until we know if they raise costs? What are we so afraid of?

Allow this amendment because if a bill raises electricity costs, it is the wrong bill. I founded the Lowering Costs Caucus here in Congress to fight against policies like this.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the text of this amendment immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY).

Mr. FRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3632, the Power Plant Reliability Act, introduced by my colleague from the Ninth District of Virginia.

This legislation enhances existing authorities under Federal law to provide targeted and temporary relief when premature plant closures create a shortage of electricity until sufficient replacements can come online.

Throughout the year, the Committee on Energy and Commerce has held several hearings with grid operators, utilities, co-ops, and experts across the energy sector. Without fail, these witnesses have stated that our Nation is shutting down too much generation and not replacing it with adequate alternatives.

Don't take my word for it. Last month, NERC, the very entity that Congress charged with protecting reliability, called the reliability crisis a "five-alarm fire."

South Carolina has seen this, where Federal regulations under Obama and Biden made the operation of baseload power plants so expensive that they had no choice but to shut down.

House Republicans are listening to the experts and advancing the Power Plant Reliability Act to expand the toolbox for States and grid operators to secure the grid and improve long-term planning for our generation resources.

I will say, as a practical matter, we can see the results of this play out on the world stage. When we look to our ally, Taiwan, which is shutting down power plants and trying to replace them with wind and solar, what is the practical effect of that happening? Brownouts throughout the island. If we are shutting down power but not replacing it, what is going to happen to our country? I think the lesson that we can learn is, let's not repeat what is happening in other parts of the world. Let's do our own thing and make sure that we have adequate generation.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I simply must call out some of the hypocrisy coming from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

We have watched over the past few months as electricity costs for hard-working Americans have gone up. People are asking why this is happening. We talked about the impact of the arbitrary tariffs that are raising the cost of living on everyone. The Republican policies in the big, ugly bill have taken a hatchet to cleaner, cheaper energy coming onto the grid.

When that is married up with the very significant project cancellations

of the Department of Energy and across the administration, it comes to lost or delayed private investments of \$53 billion; 324 projects canceled or delayed, or layoffs; over 24,000 megawatts lost that could have been coming onto the grid to keep prices lower. That adds up to over 13 million homes that could have had cleaner, cheaper energy powering them.

There is so much hypocrisy here in Washington right now. For decades, Republicans claimed to be the party of free markets and of business and competition. This bill is anti-competition. I remember a day when Republicans actually championed competition in the electricity sector. Those days are over, and that means that our neighbors back home are going to pay higher prices.

Today's bill has nothing to do with free markets. Instead, it is government intervention into the electricity sector that would make a Soviet planner blush. Instead of letting power plants compete to see who can deliver reliable power at lower costs, Republicans would instead establish a 5-year plan to mandate which power plants stay online and forcing Americans to pay the bill. This bill has more in common with Karl Marx and Chairman Mao than it does with the pre-Donald Trump Republican Party.

Mr. Speaker, we can't take our eye off the ball here. The reality is that the President promised to cut Americans' electricity bills. He promised that he would cut them in half by the time he was 1 year into his term.

Here we are, at the end of the year, and energy bills are up, way up, over 13 percent in many places. I think that is a failing grade. I think it speaks to the weakness of these arguments, as they try to paper over the struggles of American families and like to pretend that they are doing something, while we watch healthcare costs go way up and the costs of groceries weigh people down.

They want free markets when it means well for their fossil fuel allies, but they want government intervention and socialized costs the moment consumers might actually benefit from lower prices.

The hypocrisy here is just staggering.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in strong support of the Power Plant Reliability Act.

Last week, my State Planning for Reliability and Affordability Act passed the House with bipartisan support, and today's bill is yet another critical component in the fight to restore sanity when it comes to energy policy in States like Colorado.

In recent years, ruling Democrats have been pushing to shut down all coal-fired power plants in Colorado by

2030, including two by the end of this year, to meet arbitrary climate goals and without regard for reliability or affordability. This has spiked costs in Colorado 24 percent under Biden and our own Democrat Governor.

I will remind our friends that higher costs increase poverty, which also increases negative health outcomes.

□ 1600

This is especially troubling when we consider that these two closures in Colorado represent more than 10 percent of the baseload, dispatchable power being retired nationwide, even though Colorado only accounts for 1.3 percent of total U.S. energy production.

Now, the Democrat-appointed director of the Colorado Energy Office, Will Toor, is backtracking his own coal plant closure plans because he knows closing them is going to spike rates and result in more blackouts.

This is a threat my district is aware of now more than ever because just last night, thousands of my constituents received a notice from their utility that beginning today they may have weather-related blackouts lasting anywhere from a couple hours to several days.

This bill today helps us combat misguided energy policies by allowing States and grid operators to contest the closure of power plants in neighboring States if there is an impact to reliability. This is a commonsense enhancement that is critical to ensuring Americans in States with reasonable energy policies don't suffer because of States like Colorado.

House Republicans are committed to lowering energy costs for working families by championing policies that ensure energy dominance. I am proud to support this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting "yes."

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mrs. FEDORCHAK).

Mrs. FEDORCHAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my good friend Morgan Griffith's bill, H.R. 3632, the Power Plant Reliability Act.

If you ask Americans to define "common sense," I am quite certain that they would all agree that it is simply common sense to stop retiring reliable resources to generate power before you have adequate resources to replace them. The number one thing we need in this country is reliable power. More than anything else, people must have it for their safety and for our economy.

Yet, our grid is facing a serious reliability crisis. How do we know that?

Because the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, NERC, the one organization responsible for looking at the grid and ensuring its reliability, is saying we have a five-alarm fire, for good reason.

We are seeing record demand for electricity at the same time that misguided policies are forcing reliable baseload power off the grid. That is a

dangerous mismatch, and it is why we must pass H.R. 3632. It requires that if a power plant retirement would create a shortage of reliable electricity, States provide 5 years' advance notice. That is it, 5 years. That is just common sense.

That transparency is critical for grid operators. You cannot plan transmission, build replacement generation, or ensure grid reliability without adequate time.

We have gone too fast. The truth is, reliable power is affordable power. This map shows it. It just came out. The most affordable State on there is North Dakota, my home State. We still invest in reliable, clean coal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from North Dakota.

Mrs. FEDORCHAK. Mr. Speaker, for affordable and reliable energy and a grid Americans can count on, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), who represents Alabama's Sixth District.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3632, the Power Plant Reliability Act, sponsored by my colleague Mr. GRIFFITH from Virginia's Ninth Congressional District.

H.R. 3632 enhances existing authority under the Federal Power Act to protect the bulk-power system from premature retirements of baseload power and ensures more effective long-term planning for our generating resources.

It is no secret that we find ourselves in a reliability and affordability crisis driven by irresponsible decisions to shutter reliable and affordable baseload power plants.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim their positions are based on science, but the problem is their science is political science that will lead to higher energy costs and less reliability.

Even the head of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, who is charged with protecting the reliability of our Nation's bulk-power system, recently called the reliability crisis a five-alarm fire.

This is the path that was laid out by the Biden administration and Congressional Democrats, pushing their misguided and dangerous political science.

Making a bad situation worse, we need significant energy resources to compete in the artificial intelligence arms race. With adversarial nations like China, whoever wins the AI arms race will not be a superpower. They will be the superpower.

Manufacturing, industrial processing, and AI data centers all require affordable and abundant electricity that only comes from baseload and dispatchable resources. If these energy-intensive in-

dustries could run on wind and solar, they would already be doing so.

The Power Plant Reliability Act is another tool in the reliability toolbox for States and grid operators to keep the lights on for households and to fuel the next-generation economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, this is a really tough time for the folks we represent back home. It is made worse by Trump's unfolding energy crisis. It is an affordability crisis.

Looking ahead, looking in the years ahead, I think my colleagues had a point: We are going to need more energy. So it makes no sense at all for Republicans in Congress and the Trump administration to take a hatchet to cleaner, cheaper energy that is poised to come on the grid, cancel projects, and throw people out of jobs.

I pointed out earlier that if you looked at the jobs report that came out this morning, manufacturing jobs were on their seventh month of decline. Part of that is because the Trump administration went into this year saying that we don't believe in solar power and wind power and storage and everything that makes your power more efficient. At the same time, they passed the big, ugly bill that rips away all sorts of cost-savers, like for families back home that are going to replace their heating and cooling system, a little bit of help in their pocketbook to do it in an affordable way.

Meanwhile, the President, what did he promise? He said: I am going to make life more affordable. But everything that they have done, whether it is arbitrary tariffs, canceling projects, killing jobs, now trying to pass bills that heap costs on our families back home, everything they have done has raised the cost of living.

I was flabbergasted when the President said: This whole affordability thing, it is a hoax. You tell that to the hardworking people back home going into the grocery store or the people now looking at their health insurance bill that this Congress refuses to solve. Then you bring a bill to the floor to add insult to injury, to make life even more expensive by making their utility bills more expensive? They are already up 13 percent on average across the country.

Ever since Republicans took the majority here, we have been waiting for one bill to lower the cost of living. We have nothing. Just this year, utilities have asked for \$34 billion worth of rate increases. American families have each spent \$1,200 more this year to fund Trump's tariffs. Electricity prices are up by 13 percent. Natural gas prices are up by 8 percent, and the big, ugly bill will increase electricity prices by 61 percent. American families simply cannot afford the weight of all of this any longer, and they deserve so much better.

What do the Republicans want to do today? They want to pass another bill that will increase prices by up to \$6 billion each year. This is not a hoax. This is not a hoax. Instead, they offer a Christmas gift to the Nation's largest polluters.

But I guess Republicans in Congress just believe what the President said: Affordability is a hoax; nothing to see here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear to all Americans. I don't care if you are a Democrat, a Republican, or Independent, how you are registered, we are going to stand up for you. We are going to fight back at every turn. We are going to fight for your pocketbook. We are not going to let them get away with this. We are actually going to do something about it because we know you deserve better. This is not a hoax.

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

□ 1610

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, this chart tells it all. We talked about it the other day.

Mr. Speaker, look at the top 12 States that are having problems. California is at the top. Then look at the New England States: Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont. Their Governors earlier this year stated that their citizens are paying 40 percent more for fuel this winter. Why is that?

Well, if they don't allow pipelines, they don't allow energy to get into their area, and they rely on somebody else to do it for them, then it is going to happen.

If the people want to know who is causing the prices to go up, then they had better go home and talk to their State's legislators and their Governors and find out why, because these numbers don't lie. They do not lie.

We are going to take off 115 gigawatts of generation alone in this country when we are supposed to be putting on 155 gigawatts of power.

Earlier this year, the RTOs and the ISOs, those are the folks who manage the wholesale electricity markets and transmission in this country, all testified for us in committee and said this: We need more power not less, more power not less.

They also said this: And we can't take off any generation. If you want to see prices go up, just keep taking that generation offline because that is what is going to happen.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia's Ninth Congressional District for sponsoring this important legislation.

This bill provides a critical tool for States and grid operators to secure the grid until new generation comes online and ensures long-term effective planning by improving our understanding of our available generation resources.

There is nothing more expensive than a blackout, and this bill will ensure processes are in place to keep the lights—the lights—on for all Americans and to make their utility bills more affordable.

H.R. 3632 has broad support from America's Power, the National Hydro-power Association, Americans for Prosperity, and the National Mining Association.

Democrats like to talk about affordability, but electricity prices went up over 25 percent—25 percent—during the Biden administration. House Republicans are taking action with legislation like H.R. 3632, to help lower Americans' utility bills.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Power Reliability Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 951, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Scholten of Michigan moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3632 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SCHOLTEN is as follows:

Ms. Scholten moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3632 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not take effect until the Secretary of Energy certifies that this Act and amendments made by this Act will not expose American families to the risk of higher power bills by paying for outdated, uneconomic coal-fired power plants to stay online longer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. SCHOLTEN. 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 will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motion to recommit H.R. 4371;
Passage of H.R. 4371, if ordered;

Motion to recommit H.R. 3632; and,
Passage of H.R. 3632, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

KAYLA HAMILTON ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 4371) to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to enhance efforts to combat the trafficking of children, offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 218, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

YEAS—208

Adams	Figures	McBride
Aguilar	Fletcher	McClain Delaney
Amo	Foster	McClellan
Ansari	Foushee	McCollum
Auchincloss	Frankel, Lois	McDonald Rivet
Balint	Friedman	McGarvey
Barragán	Frost	McGovern
Beatty	Garamendi	McIver
Bell	Garcia (CA)	Meeks
Bera	Garcia (IL)	Menendez
Beyer	Gillen	Meng
Bishop	Golden (ME)	Mfume
Bonamici	Goldman (NY)	Min
Boyle (PA)	Gomez	Moore (WI)
Brown	Gonzalez, V.	Moralle
Brownley	Goodlander	Morrison
Budzinski	Gottheimer	Moskowitz
Bynum	Gray	Moulton
Carbajal	Green, Al (TX)	Mrvan
Carson	Grijalva	Mullin
Carter (LA)	Harder (CA)	Neal
Case	Hayes	Neguse
Casten	Himes	Norcross
Castor (FL)	Horsford	Ocasio-Cortez
Castro (TX)	Houlahan	Olshewski
Cherfilus-	Hoyer	Omar
McCormick	Hoyle (OR)	Pallone
Chu	Huffman	Panetta
Cisneros	Ivey	Pappas
Clark (MA)	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Clarke (NY)	Jacobs	Perez
Cleaver	Jayapal	Peters
Clyburn	Jeffries	Petterson
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Pingree
Conaway	Johnson (TX)	Pocan
Correa	Kamlager-Dove	Pou
Costa	Kaptur	Pressley
Craig	Keating	Quigley
Crockett	Kelly (IL)	Ramirez
Crow	Kennedy (NY)	Randall
Cuellar	Khanna	Raskin
Davids (KS)	Krishnamoorthi	Riley (NY)
Davis (IL)	Landsman	Rivas
Davis (NC)	Larsen (WA)	Ross
Dean (PA)	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
DeGette	Latimer	Ryan
DeLauro	Lee (NV)	Salinas
DelBene	Lee (PA)	Sánchez
Deluzio	Leger Fernandez	Scanlon
DeSaulnier	Levin	Schakowsky
Dexter	Liccardo	Schneider
Dingell	Lieu	Scholten
Doggett	Lofgren	Schrier
Elfreth	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Escobar	Magaziner	Scott, David
Espallat	Mannion	Sewell
Evans (PA)	Matsui	Sherman
Fields	McBath	Simon

Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozi
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas

Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Walkinshaw
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—218

Aderholt	Miller (OH)
Alford	Miller (WV)
Allen	Miller-Meeks
Amodei (NV)	Mills
Arrington	Moolenaar
Babin	Moore (AL)
Bacon	Moore (NC)
Baird	Moore (UT)
Balderson	Moore (WV)
Barr	Moran
Barrett	Nehls
Baumgartner	Newhouse
Bean (FL)	Norman
Begich	Nunn (IA)
Bentz	Overholte
Bergman	Ogles
Bice	Onder
Biggs (AZ)	Owens
Biggs (SC)	Palmer
Bilirakis	Patronis
Boebert	Perry
Bost	Plfinger
Brecheen	Reschenthaler
Bresnahan	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Rogers (KY)
Burchett	Rose
Burlison	Rouzer
Calvert	Roy
Cammack	Rulli
Carey	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Salazar
Carter (TX)	Scalise
Ciscomani	Schmidt
Cline	Schweikert
Cloud	Scott, Austin
Clyde	Self
Cole	Kean
Collins	Sessions
Comer	Shreve
Crane	Simpson
Crank	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Smith (NJ)
Davidson	Smucker
De La Cruz	Spartz
DesJarlais	Staub
Diaz-Balart	Stefanik
Donalds	Stell
Downing	Steube
Dunn (FL)	Strong
Edwards	Stutzman
Ellzey	Taylor
Emmer	Tenney
Estes	Thompson (PA)
Evans (CO)	Tiffany
Ezell	Timmons
Fallon	Turner (OH)
Fedorchak	Valadao
Feenstra	Van Drew
Fine	Van Dyne
Finstad	Van Epps
Fischbach	Van Orden
Fitzgerald	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	Walberg
Fleischmann	Webster (FL)
Flood	Westerman
Fong	Wied
Fox	Williams (TX)
Franklin, Scott	Wilson (SC)
Fry	Wittman
Fulcher	Womack
Garbarino	Yakym
Gill (TX)	Zinke

NOT VOTING—7

Casas	Murphy	Weber (TX)
Courtney	Nadler	
Garcia (TX)	Swalwell	

□ 1647

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Ms. MALOY, Messrs. FLOOD, SHREVE, BACON, CARTER of Texas,