

## MILITARY FAMILIES MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize November as Military Families Month. With more than 5.2 million military families in the United States, this month is necessary to acknowledge the tremendous sacrifices our military families make.

These families are the unseen strength behind our Nation's military. While the focus is often on those in uniform, we must never overlook loved ones who carry the weight of their absence, move wherever duty calls, and keep life steady even when things around them feel uncertain.

In times of peace and conflict, these families stand as pillars of strength embodying the values of courage, dedication, and selflessness. Let's recognize the sacrifices they make—the birthdays, the holidays, and the milestones missed.

Let's thank them for their support and commitment to our country, and let's promise them our own support in return.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking our veterans, servicemembers, and military families for their service and sacrifice to our country.

May God bless our military families, our servicemembers, and our great country.

## CONGRATULATING LOS ANGELES DODGERS

(Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the World Series champion Los Angeles Dodgers.

Last month, to most baseball fans' delight, our Dodgers completed a gentleman's sweep to defeat the New York Yankees in the World Series.

This season was nothing short of remarkable.

Shohei Ohtani's contract broke records, and he continued to break more in the Dodger blue.

Ohtani became the first MLB player to record at least 50 home runs and 50 steals in a season and broke Shawn Green's team home run record.

Just wait until he can pitch for us.

From Ohtani and Freddie Freeman playing through injuries to Walker Buehler's improbable return, this team battled and defied the odds to make history.

We are celebrating this team from L.A. to Korea to the Dominican Republic to Japan.

Haters can talk trash all they want, but there is no COVID season asterisk next to this one.

The L.A. Dodgers are your World Series champions, and we will run it back next year.

## HONORING BRADEN DREILING

(Mr. LATURNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LATURNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the pride of Hays, America, a dedicated staffer of 7 years, my longest-serving staffer, and my real life friend, Braden Dreiling.

Braden and I met when I was a State senator and he was a front desk staffer for the majority leader.

Our professional relationship rose from a Cracker Barrel lunch and grew into a true partnership. He has been my chief and my most trusted confidante. He is also always the first and the last in the room, always wanting and expecting the best from me. He always has a level head regardless of circumstances.

Braden and his wife have two beautiful daughters, and although his service in Washington is coming to a close, I know that he will make his friends and family proud as his service to Kansas will continue on.

## INFLATION CRUSHES AMERICANS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the irresponsible policies of Biden and HARRIS have cost American families \$13,000 a year.

However, with the return of President Donald Trump partnered with Speaker MIKE JOHNSON and Senator leader JOHN THUNE, Republicans will drive down prices and increase jobs for American families.

Due to Kamalaflation, prices have risen over 20 percent—22 percent in South Carolina alone. Americans are spending more on everyday necessities compared to President Trump just 3 years ago. Eggs are up 69 percent. Gasoline is up 38 percent or more. Baby food and formula is up 31 percent. Chicken is up 25 percent.

Leading the Trump-Vance innovations will be the talented Elon Musk and Vivek Ramaswamy co-leading the newly created Department of Government Efficiency.

In conclusion, God bless our troops as the global war on terrorism continues. Open borders for dictators put all Americans at risk of more 9/11 attacks imminent, as warned by the FBI. Trump will reinstate the existing laws to protect American families with peace through strength.

## FEMA MUST PROVIDE AID TO EVERYONE IN NEED

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss for a moment a recent report of a FEMA supervisor—and maybe

there is more than one—instructing workers to skip over certain homes with particular political signs or affiliations at their house. It really shouldn't matter what your political affiliation may be, but the idea of skipping over certain homes in a hurricane-ravaged zone or any other disaster is pretty offensive.

What we are hearing is that at least 20 people in this example in Florida—20 different homes—missed out on critical aid they should have gotten just the same as anybody else.

We know FEMA's mission is to assist any American that has been in a declared disaster area and help them through that difficult time regardless of any political affiliation or any other type of affiliation.

Under the Biden administration, the agency's priorities, at least with some staff, have shifted away from disaster preparedness and instead has shifted toward political discrimination.

We need to focus FEMA once again—and they have done a lot of good work on a lot of things, but if this is happening under an organization, not only should resignations or firings happen, but those that do such a thing should be prosecuted for this kind of discrimination. That needs to happen because people need to have confidence that FEMA is doing the right thing.

## CRITICAL MINERAL CONSISTENCY ACT OF 2024

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1568, I call up the bill (H.R. 8446) to amend the Energy Act of 2020 to include critical materials in the definition of critical mineral, 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 1568, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 8446

*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 "Critical Mineral Consistency Act of 2024".*

**SEC. 2. CRITICAL MATERIALS INCLUDED AS CRITICAL MINERALS.**

*Section 7002 of the Energy Act of 2020 (30 U.S.C. 1606) is amended—*

*(1) in subsection (a)(3)(A), to read as follows: "(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'critical mineral' means—*

*"(i) any mineral, element, substance, or material designated as critical by the Secretary under subsection (c); and*

*"(ii) a critical material as determined by the Secretary of Energy under paragraph (2)(A)."; and*

*(2) in subsection (c)(5), by adding at the end the following:*

“(C) INCLUSION OF CRITICAL MATERIALS.—Not later than 45 days after the date on which the Secretary of Energy determines a non-fuel mineral, element, substance, or material to be a critical material under subsection (a)(2)(A), the Secretary shall update the list of critical minerals published under paragraph (3) to include such critical material.”.

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

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 8446.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 8446, the Critical Mineral Consistency Act of 2024.

H.R. 8446 introduced by Representative CISCOMANI would amend the Energy Act of 2020 to add critical materials from the Department of Energy Critical Materials List to the United States Geological Survey's critical minerals list.

Currently, each agency uses different metrics when constructing their respective lists.

DOE's methodology for critical material determination is forward-looking. It accounts for international demand scenarios and growth trajectories specifically for energy technologies.

On the other hand, currently USGS' process only uses historic data to determine supply risk to the U.S. economy and national security.

By law, all the minerals on USGS' list are automatically included in DOE's Critical Materials List. H.R. 8446 would enable the process to work in the other direction by placing critical materials on the critical minerals list.

The Critical Mineral Consistency Act is a straightforward solution that enables each agency to retain responsibility for reviewing minerals under their respective purviews while clarifying persistent confusion over critical minerals versus critical materials. As you can see, even speaking about it on the floor, it is easy to get the two confused.

The bill cuts across jurisdictional red tape while preserving each agency's discretion and expertise in adding items to its list.

Both critical minerals and critical materials are just that, critical. With-

out reliable access to essential materials such as cobalt and lithium for batteries and copper and aluminum for transmission lines, the U.S. risks failing to meet future economic and energy demands. Such a situation would lead to increased dependence on the market decisions of adversarial nations for critical minerals and materials.

H.R. 8446 passed out of the Natural Resources Committee on a bipartisan vote because both sides of the aisle understand the importance of critical minerals and materials.

I encourage my colleagues to once again come together to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 8446. This bill has a fairly innocuous seeming purpose on its face. It would amend the Energy Act of 2020 to add critical minerals as designated by the Department of Energy to the USGS, which is the agency that handles minerals issues for the United States, to a list of critical minerals.

□ 1215

My colleagues across the aisle will argue that this bill is simply for consistency and to streamline, that we have too many lists to manage critical minerals and materials, which, of course, are so important to our country, so it is important to harmonize these lists and make sure that we are operating the Federal Government in a streamlined manner.

It is critical that the American people understand that this is not the full story. In fact, this bill is the direct result of years of heavy lobbying and influence on the critical minerals list because, as you see, the critical minerals list is defined as all nonfuel minerals that are used as essential materials for national security or that may pose a supply chain vulnerability to disruption. The critical minerals list is designed to focus attention and vital resources on the most essential and at-risk mineral supply chains.

USGS' critical minerals list and DOE's Critical Materials List may sound similar, but they have different purposes because of the differences in how these lists are used and the Federal mandates for these agencies. They have different purposes that are not interchangeable.

The Energy Act of 2020 directed USGS to update the list of critical minerals to guide its use for infrastructure investments under the legislation that we passed here in 2021. As directed by a separate provision in the Energy Act of 2020, the Department of Energy undertook its own assessment of critical materials that were specific to energy needs because that is what the Department of Energy focuses on.

USGS is the agency that has existed since the 19th century here in the

United States to take stock of, identify, and support the Federal Government in understanding our geology and minerals and what we do with them.

It affects the entire economy. It may sound very simple to streamline and combine these lists, but not only do they have different purposes, they have far-ranging consequences. The importance of the USGS critical minerals list cannot be overstated. This list drives billions of dollars in Federal investment and permitting decisions.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you a little bit about what happens if you get placed on the USGS list, which does not apply to the DOE list. It means that companies are eligible for millions of dollars in tax credits and grants under various bills that Congress has passed, including the Inflation Reduction Act, the CHIPS and Science Act, and many others. It also allows for permit streamlining under previous legislation that Congress has passed.

What that essentially translates into is expedited reviews. Folks at home may be saying, well, isn't that a good thing? If you look at the environmental, social, and cultural impacts of mines and how they affect communities, you need a Federal process that makes it possible for our communities to weigh in.

There is a public comment process so that you can go and say that we don't want this mine in this place. For our Tribes, it puts into place a Federal consulting process so that our Tribes can protect their sacred and ancestral lands. For communities, they can comment on the environmental and water impacts of potential mine operations. For our public lands, it means we can protect the sites that are used for recreation for fishing and the values that we hold dear for both environmental and recreational purposes.

Importantly, it also affects the impact of whether or not, after mines go in, there is liability and legal remedy for the pollution that mines cause.

If our public is not able to comment on mines during the permitting process, they will not have judicial standing if these mines are abandoned or there is not appropriate care taken in the aftermath of the mine operations and efforts to close the mine down and remediate the lands. That means that the public taxpayers and the people are left holding the bag, not the multinational mining corporations that are seeking to open these lands for mining.

When you look at it in its totality, the very seemingly simple act of just saying let's harmonize these two lists and put it all under the rubric of the Department of Energy's list may seem like a simple no-brainer. What it amounts to, in its totality, is a massive multimillion-dollar giveaway to multinational corporations that are seeking to mine public lands in the United States.

It should be no surprise that it is industry lobbyists that have been working to get this change in the law for

years. We have seen many different incarnations of this bill, some of which have been very explicit about copper, in particular, being added to the list, and some of which are a little more opaque like the bill we see in front of us today.

It is very clear that the copper industry is driving this bill in front of us today. We have to be realistic. Copper is an incredibly important resource. It is used in everything from our transmission lines to our electronics, consumer products, and cars and trucks. Even though it is designated as a critical material for energy purposes under the DOE list, it is not currently on the USGS list because it is not at risk of supply chain disruption.

In fact, the United States is a net exporter of copper. Let me repeat that. Copper is not at risk of supply chain disruption. We are exporting our copper.

So why is industry pushing so hard to open new mines on our public lands? Well, guess what? There is a lot of money to be made, and it turns out that the major holder of the two companies that are pushing for this bill is the Chinese Government. How ironic is that?

In fact, we know that over 10 percent of one of the largest copper mining multinational companies in the world that is seeking to open a copper mine in Arizona is pushing for this bill to expedite the permitting, reduce the timelines, and make sure that the public and Tribes cannot comment on whether or not they want the mine there.

We know that there are mine sites that have been identified that would be on sacred lands, and we know that it would have devastating impacts for the water supply of the State of Arizona and the entire Southwest.

In addition to that, copper mining is an incredibly disruptive activity. It is pollution heavy. It impacts the landscape. Smelters are notorious for emitting air pollutants. In Arizona, arsenic levels have been recorded at 150 times higher than State health guidelines, posing higher cancer risks to communities. We know the well-known impacts to water and to acid mine drainage in our communities.

On top of all of this—and I think this is the part that should raise all of our concerns—is that the copper industry is trying to use its influence through lobbying and through campaign donations to our colleagues.

It should be of no surprise that the primary sponsor of this bill and the other bills like it come from the very State where these mine companies are seeking to mine are on sites that have already been identified as unsuitable for copper mining. They are Tribal sacred sites, in a number of cases.

There have literally been decades of effort from the copper industry because there are high-quality copper deposits in many of these places, including in Oak Flat, which is a place that has

been held sacred by the Apache people since time immemorial.

Why are our friends across the aisle trying to advance a lobbying bill on behalf of a multinational set of corporations, which are held, in part, by Chinese Government inholdings on American lands that would violate the basic human, cultural, and religious rights of our indigenous communities? I will let the American people decide why they think that is happening, but it is certain that we just came out of an election, isn't it?

I think it is crucial that people understand this isn't a simple streamlining bill. This isn't about just harmonizing this list with that list. This is about foreign influence on the mining industry, on the copper industry, here in the United States.

I ask my colleagues across the aisle who have voted time and time again on this very floor to prevent foreign companies held by our adversaries, including China, from buying American lands, from trying to take American water rights, why on Earth would you be advancing a bill that would literally give away mining concessions to companies that are held by foreign adversaries? Why would you do it when we know that our communities have already resoundingly said that they do not want these mines in our communities, that they will harm our cultures, communities, waters, and public lands?

I look forward to hopefully getting some answers to these questions, but the American people should understand what this bill actually is, and I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 8446.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. There were a lot of claims made from my friends across the aisle about what this bill does or what its intent and purpose are. I think I need to clarify some of this.

First off, I heard the claim that this bill would cost billions and billions of dollars to the taxpayer. I am not going to ask to submit that for the record because it is already part of the record. It is the CBO score for this bill that says, at most, it is a \$2 million cost to administer the program, which actually seems high to me, but it is far from billions of dollars of handouts to anyone. That is what the Congressional Budget Office said. That is what I am repeating here.

Also, a claim was made that we are exporting copper. I include in the RECORD the link from the U.S. Geological Survey's "Mineral Commodity Summaries 2024," which shows that we import 46 percent of the copper that comes into the country. That is on page 64 of that report. <https://pubs.usgs.gov/periodicals/mcs2024/mcs2024.pdf>

Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned about the demand for copper, and I do agree with that. We have an insatiable de-

mand for copper. A lot of that is created by some of the massive spending programs that our friends across the aisle passed a few years ago.

There are estimates that say we need to mine more copper than we have mined in the history of the world in the next 20 to 30 years. There is a big demand for copper, and we are blessed in the United States because we have that copper here that we can use to create jobs, grow our economy, and help national security.

This bill is not about copper, but if we want to talk about copper, I think we have a very strong position on our side of the aisle on how we see copper and how copper can play an important role in the economy going forward.

Also, there was talk about DOE's list and USGS' list. I want to clarify that the critical minerals on USGS' list automatically go into DOE's Critical Materials List. This bill would take DOE's Critical Materials List and make it synonymous with USGS' critical minerals list.

By the way, USGS supports this legislation. You would think if this administration's USGS had a problem with doing that, they wouldn't have supported the bill.

I know there were a lot of claims made, but I think it is important that we get the facts out here in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CISCOMANI), the author of this bill.

□ 1230

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WESTERMAN for yielding me time and for clarifying a series of those points that were expressed by our friends on the other side of the aisle that he clarified so well.

I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 8446, the Critical Mineral Consistency Act. This bill, which passed with bipartisan support through the House Committee on Natural Resources and was recently introduced in the Senate, also with bipartisan co-leads, would require the U.S. Geological Survey to incorporate critical materials identified by the Department of Energy into the USGS critical minerals list.

Under the Energy Act of 2020, items appearing on the USGS critical minerals list are automatically included on the DOE's Critical Materials List. However, items on the DOE list are not reciprocated to the USGS list. This discrepancy is confusing to mineral producers and makes it unclear which minerals are critical to the United States' mission.

In addition to creating unnecessary confusion, the disconnect between the two lists puts our domestic supply chain at risk. Other countries like China and Peru have specifically articulated and invested in the minerals they deem critical. Meanwhile, here in the United States, several minerals are indisputably essential to our national security and clean energy economy, such as copper, electrical steel,

flourine, silicon, and silicon carbide. They are all listed as critical materials and not critical minerals, making them ineligible for expedited permitting processes and other benefits.

This legislation would create some consistency within our agencies and signal to the world that we are taking seriously the importance of domestic production for our critical minerals like copper.

In Arizona, copper is one of the State's five Cs, alongside climate, cattle, cotton, and citrus. Copper mining is embedded in our State's history, and today Arizona remains a leader in copper production, providing the Nation and the world with the copper it needs to operate.

Despite Arizona being a leader in copper production, dozens of potential copper mines in America remain untapped due to the burdensome regulations by the Federal Government. Handicapping our own domestic mineral production and relying on imports from foreign countries not only harms our national security and economy but it also hurts the environment because we know when we mine in America, we do it safer and we do it cleaner than just about anywhere else in the world.

According to various reports, the world is expected to need around 50 million metric tons of copper annually by 2035 due to the growing energy demands. Another recent study found that without increased domestic production, the U.S. will be 60 percent reliant on imports of copper by 2035. That is alarming.

In a world where foreign wars have created massive instability in the global economy, we should not be reliant on other countries for critical minerals that are used in everything from military vehicles to our electrical grid infrastructure.

It is high time we take tangible steps to onshore mineral production, and this legislation does just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

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

I think this is a really important debate for the American people to hear. I want to first address the comments that were made about these companies, which are seeking to get access to public lands for copper and other minerals, as being confused.

Let's talk about the specific corporations that have been lobbying for this bill and variations of this bill for years. Freeport, which is one of the largest copper mining companies in the United States, is worth \$61 billion. Rio Tinto, an international conglomerate, the very one that is held by Chinese Government holdings, is worth \$159 billion.

I ask my friends across the aisle: Do you really believe that a multinational corporation that is worth \$159 billion in multiple countries and continents is confused about permitting? I don't think so. Mr. Speaker, \$159 billion is 18

times the annual budget of the State of Arizona.

Come on, guys. We are not fools. These companies have spent decades lobbying to open public lands and specifically the sites that they are looking to mine on in Arizona. In fact, it is why places like Oak Flat were set aside, because they are cultural, sacred lands of Tribes. The copper industry, 100 years ago, had tried to mine on those lands, but we recognized as a Nation that we don't want to mine on every single inch of American lands because there are places where it is not suitable. It is not suitable for cultural reasons. It is not suitable for environmental reasons. It is not suitable because we don't want to look at a giant hole miles across in our backyards.

Now, we need mining and we need minerals, but let's be clear: These companies are not confused. They spend millions of dollars every year lobbying the United States Congress and giving campaign donations to our friends who are running for Congress. This is not confusion. This is influence. Let's be very clear about what we are talking about.

Now, I want to also address the claim that this is not about copper. Well, last night I went onto Congress.gov. The American people can go do this. There are like six different variations of this same bill. Some of them actually specifically name copper and some do not. Guess what? It is the same sponsors, literally the same sponsors of this bill.

I can appreciate and I always try to take my friends at face value. Okay. You are saying this has nothing to do with copper, but I encourage the American people to actually go do their own search because this same bill has many iterations.

Now, let's talk a little bit about the statutory and the cost considerations of this bill. Again, we heard the claim this is just about streamlining definitions, no big deal. Let me repeat: The USGS list not only confers the benefit of billions of dollars in potential tax subsidies and grants under many different Federal programs, which the Department of Energy list does not, but it will permit actual streamlining and reduction of timelines, public review, and judicial review of mining operations, which effectively means for all of you out there who are listening, you don't get a say if this multinational corporation, which the Chinese Government partially holds, gets to put a mine in your backyard.

My friends across the aisle are always asking us to have common sense. Does this make common sense to you out there? Of course not.

The public has a right to comment. The public has a right to be participants in decisions that the Federal Government makes on our public lands.

Tribes have a fundamental right, under the Constitution, treaty, and trust responsibilities, to help inform and decide whether or not we mine our

Tribal lands, or lands that are important to our Tribes.

The public has a right to say we don't want this because it is going to impact our future livelihoods.

Our friends claim that, oh, this is just a simple definitional change and streamlining.

It is really about taking away fundamental rights.

Now, I think it is instructive that we had a lot of conversation before the election about Project 2025, and our friends across the aisle kept trying to distance themselves from it and say, oh, we are not actually planning to do that.

However, we printed out some of Project 2025 today, and I want to point you to some of the choice sections on page 376. They want to pursue critical minerals. Oh, yeah, that is right. On page 537, there is a whole section in Project 2025 about opening Tribal lands to critical minerals mining.

Does that sound familiar?

Ironically, also, on page 725 of Project 2025, there is an extensive discussion about how the Chinese Government is plundering mines and critical minerals here in the United States.

It sure does make you wonder why my friends are pushing this in the final hours of this Congress as we are headed toward the closure of this Congress.

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

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

Again, we are talking about copper. So let's talk about copper a little bit. This chart shows that in 1995, we produced 2.3 million tons of copper, and China produced 0.7 million tons. That is about three times more copper that we produced in the United States in 1995.

In 2020, China was up to 9.8 million tons a year, and we were at 0.9 million tons. You can see our overall production actually went down; China's skyrocketed. In 2020, they were producing 11 times more copper than we produced here in the United States. It is not because we don't have copper deposits in the United States, it is because people don't want copper mining and production in their backyard. However, if you are building a copper mine, you don't get to choose where the copper is located. It has long ago been determined that the copper in these places, sometimes it is on Federal lands, sometimes it is on private land.

The reason our production has gone down is because we can't permit new copper mines. We also can't permit copper refineries. The other side of this story is we have 2 copper refineries in the United States today and China has over 50.

With estimates that we need to produce more copper going forward in the next couple of decades than has been produced in the history of the world, you can see where that production is going to come from unless we

decide to mine the copper in our country, unless we decide to build responsible mines where there aren't human rights violations, where there aren't environmental violations, where we do things better, safer, and more efficient than anywhere else in the world.

Someone who knows how critical these minerals are to our defense and to our way of life here in America is the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Critical Mineral Consistency Act. This measure is an essential step forward to secure our supply chains, and in so doing to protect our national security and economic competitiveness.

Today, critical minerals like lithium, cobalt, and graphite are the building blocks of everything from advanced weapons systems to consumer electronics. Every advanced economy depends on these resources, but the challenge we face is that these minerals are in limited supply and overwhelmingly sourced from China.

Our dependence on the Chinese Communist Party for these materials puts our energy independence, technological leadership, and national security at risk. China has deliberately developed its control over these supply chains to build leverage against Western economies. It has been developing these capacities for decades, and it is already using it.

China placed export controls on gallium, germanium, and graphite just last year, and it announced new controls on antimony in August. They will continue to put us at risk unless we act.

Currently, the United States Geological Survey and Department of Energy each maintain separate lists of critical minerals leading to inconsistency in policy and program funding. These lists used different standards to determine what made a mineral or material critical, and this misalignment led to crucial elements like copper being listed by one agency while being ignored by the other.

This bill is a simple but significant step forward to streamline interagency coordination, improve efficiency, and ensure that Federal efforts to stockpile, recycle, and develop alternative supplies of these minerals are focused on the same priorities.

We must ensure that our Nation has the resources it needs to remain a global leader in defense, energy, and innovation. We cannot be at the mercy of China that uses forced labor and destroys environments around the world. My colleagues would like for China to continue to use forced labor. They would like for us to continue to see them increase the production of copper. They would like to see us continue to advocate for human rights violations and using forced labor and also to make sure, too, that they are destroying environments.

Thank you to the folks on the other side of the aisle for your stand on human rights, not so much.

□ 1245

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as I may consume. To my colleagues across the aisle: Absolutely. You are so right. We do want to prevent our foreign adversaries like China from working to out-compete us and to make sure that they do not have access to control our supply chain. This makes it particularly confusing that the bill you are trying to advance today is about copper. I want the public to know that they said that it is not about copper, but they just happen to have all the talking points about copper right there printed out ready to talk about copper.

It is about copper. This is about the copper industry, who has been lobbying for this bill for decades; and, in particular, several large multinational conglomerates, including Rio Tinto, which is one of the largest in the world, which is held, in part, by the Chinese Communist Party who would like to mine on specific sites in the State of Arizona that have already been identified as unsuitable, unsuitable for cultural reasons, unsuitable for Tribal reasons, unsuitable for water reasons, and unsuitable for public lands reasons.

They can say that this is just about harmonizing lists, but the Department of Energy does not have purview over permitting on our public lands. The Department of Energy's legislative mandate as created by this body is to oversee our Nation's energy systems.

The Department of the Interior, where USGS sits, who manages our public minerals and our understanding of them, is the Federal agency that makes the permitting decisions, the legal decisions, the executive decisions, and the Tribal consultations that affect when, where, and how minerals are accessed on our public lands.

This is about a lobbying effort by multinational corporations to move the list in such a manner that it will open up public lands to mining on sites they have already identified in which the public has, in various ways, already said no, no thank you, or they want a process for the public to actually weigh in on.

I hope that my friends across the aisle, because it does sound like we have a lot in agreement, will agree that the Chinese Communist Party is buying up minerals and mining projects around the world. In fact, the Chinese Government has been stockpiling critical minerals for years which has created a crisis for the United States.

Yes, while they are mining copper in their land, we have to ask ourselves: Why is a multinational company that the Chinese Government is massively bought into and trying to open copper mines in the United States getting a free pass by U.S. Congressmen on the House floor?

Mr. Speaker, I really would like to know why this is happening.

I hope that we can agree that we should not be allowing that kind of foreign influence in our permitting decisions.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason, and at the appropriate time, I would like to offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee.

It was noted a moment ago that USGS supported this bill. I want to tell you all that we contacted USGS last night based on the testimony that they submitted. While they said that they agreed with concepts in the bill, that it needed technical changes in order for them to actually support it.

If the House rules permitted, I would have offered a motion with an important amendment to this bill.

My amendment, my motion to recommit, is common sense. It would prohibit any Federal benefits associated with being on the critical minerals list, what this bill is trying to accomplish, from going to our foreign adversaries, including companies they own and the subsidiaries of these companies.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit so that we can protect our Nation's natural resources and our supply chain from our economic adversaries abroad.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am going to read directly from USGS's testimony on this bill in committee: "As a possible way to manage the two lists, the USGS supports this bill."

That is verbatim from their testimony in committee.

Also, we can talk about copper for a long time because it is the poster child of misguided principles and misguided regulations in our country. However, there is more on the list than just copper.

Let's talk about electrical steel. Electrical steel goes into transformers.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to build new transmission lines and transmission systems, then you have to have transformers. You can't build transformers without electrical steel. It is not on the critical minerals list, but it is on the Critical Materials List.

What about fluorine?

Nuclear reactors and electronics depend on fluorine. It is on the Critical Materials List. It is not on the critical minerals list.

Here is a good one: silicon carbide. Congress passed this massive bill to subsidize semiconductor companies to build chips factories here in the United States. Actually it was called the CHIPS bill. We are going to build chips facilities in the United States, but we can't produce the silicon carbide needed to put into those chips facilities.

It is about a lot more than copper, but copper is the big material that is out there that should be obvious to everyone that if we are going to have a more electrified economy, if we are going to build more electronics, and if we are going to have more renewable energy systems and transmission lines, then copper is absolutely critical to it, and that is why there is such a large projected demand for copper.

Fortunately, we actually have copper in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) who has I believe the largest copper deposit and largest cobalt and nickel deposits in the world located in his district, but decades of permitting and we are still not producing copper, cobalt, or nickel from those mines. Also I believe they have platinum and palladium.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, hailing from the great State of Minnesota, Minnesota has the most mineral wealth of any State in our Nation with the exception of Alaska.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about how they support mining. I disagree that they support mining.

Do you know why, Mr. Speaker?

It is because this administration, Mr. Speaker, hasn't opened up one mine and, again, not one mine in the United States of America under the Biden administration. They say they support mining so long as it never happens.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, any mining done in the United States of America must follow our environmental standards and our labor standards.

It was mentioned moments ago about the Chinese Communist Party. I want to bring one more mineral. It is antimony. One month ago, the Communist country of China stopped exporting antimony to the United States, antimony that is made for semiconductors, antimony that is used in our explosive devices for our military, antimony that is used for our medical instrument devices manufactured here in the United States.

We have antimony mines in the United States potentially if we are allowed to mine them.

Furthermore, in the Inflation Reduction Act, the \$7.4 billion, Mr. Speaker, that was put toward electric charging stations, we have got 11 of them. The government has actually installed 11 charging stations for EV vehicles across this Nation. They were \$7.4 billion.

Furthermore, the Democrats and this administration have removed the Buy American requirements for those charging stations.

Do you know why, Mr. Speaker?

It is because they won't let us mine here, and the percentage of minerals needed to meet the IRA demands can't be met unless we mine here in the United States of America.

Mining is our past, our present, and our future. Mr. Speaker, not only has this administration stopped mining in Minnesota, but they have stopped it in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, New Mexico, California, and Pennsylvania. The list goes on and on.

This is the most antimining administration in the history of this country, and we are going to suffer for it. Right now, we need antimony to replenish our ammunition. We are struggling right now. That is why the Biden administration's USGS supports this H.R. 8446, the Critical Mineral Consistency Act introduced by my good friend, Mr. CISCOMANI from Arizona. He understands.

We have to have the political will in this country, Mr. Speaker, to be able to mine here safely under our regulations. We need permitting reform, which is going to allow us to mine here, process here, and manufacture here, right here in America using our jobs, our economy, and our workers, which is going to benefit our economy, our communities, and our strategic national security.

Why would anybody not want to mine in this country using the best environmental standards and the best labor standards in the world?

They are caving to the radical left, the antimining stance of their party. On January 20, the Americans are going to see a different attitude toward extracting these minerals that we are blessed with in this great country. We are blessed with these minerals.

No other country is like us, no other country. If we have the political will to meet these needs, then we can do it.

Mr. Speaker, I stand strongly in support of H.R. 8446. I stand strongly in support of domestic mining.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind you and others this is the most antimining administration in the history of this country, and it is going to end. We have to hold our strategic national security in the palm of our own hands. I will be doggone if I am going to allow China to control our destiny or other foreign nations.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I stand here, once again, today to oppose H.R. 8446, a bill that ignores science, ignores the facts, and would add copper to the critical minerals list to help wealthy multinational corporations, some of which are held by our foreign adversaries, to gain critical benefits, Federal tax breaks, and access to our Federal lands and Tribal sacred sites.

There have been some claims today about the Department of the Interior and the USGS's stance on this bill. I want to be clear that while the USGS did respond to the bill and share information about how to harmonize the list, they identified specific issues with the bill about its scientific integrity.

Let's be clear. USGS scientists used peer-reviewed methodology to determine whether or not copper or any other mineral here in the United States should be considered a critical mineral and be given the benefits that come along with being included on that list.

Now, while copper and many of the minerals discussed here are important to our economy, they are important to our national security, and they are important to the future of this Nation, they do not currently have the same supply chain vulnerabilities that other minerals on that list have and, therefore, do not qualify for the permitting and subsidy benefits that come with being included on that list.

I think that the American people would agree with all of the things that my colleagues said, that we should not be giving giveaways to our foreign adversaries who are trying to stockpile these minerals right now.

Why on Earth would we advance a bill that would give companies that the Chinese Government holds financial interest in access to copper and other critical minerals here in the United States?

It is crazy.

Designating copper as a critical mineral will divert precious resources and attention away from other critical supply chains that need it critically right now. It will open permitting, environmental review processes, and Tribal consultation. We know from history because it has told us in every chapter and every generation that it is our most vulnerable communities without power, influence, and money who will suffer the consequences, and, in this case, particularly our Tribal communities who have sacred lands that they have protected for countless generations.

While my colleagues may claim that this bill is necessary to support and build up our domestic supply chain, we have already seen how foreign influence is trying to grab a hold of U.S. copper. There are no safeguards in this bill, and I cannot emphasize it enough: This bill will allow foreign actors through their financial holdings, including our adversaries, to benefit from the U.S. public lands and resources and materials that they are trying to take and stockpile, and it will leave our communities with pollution and devastation.

□ 1300

We just heard an argument that everything is going to change on January 20. If my colleagues don't know, January 20 is Inauguration Day.

Project 2025, it turned out, was real: critical minerals, opening public lands,

opening Tribal lands, not protecting sites that we already knew were precious for sacred and other reasons.

We just heard it right here on the floor: It is all going to change on January 20.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues: Who is going to benefit? At what cost to our communities? At what cost to the American people?

Mr. Speaker, there were claims made on this floor today about Democrats not caring about our supply chain and about our people. We have one of the largest copper mines in the United States in New Mexico. We support our miners. We support our laborers.

I would not be standing here on the House floor if my mother had not been one of the first women operating engineers to work at a coal-fired power plant in New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I do not appreciate the assertions that we have heard here today that we are trying to attack workers, that we are trying to attack American sovereignty and national security, and that we don't care about our economy and supply chain because we are here fighting for the people. We are fighting for our communities. We are fighting for our Tribal nations.

Mr. Speaker, we will see changes on January 20. That is why we have to stop this bill, so that it doesn't give carte blanche to Chinese financial holdings to mine with impunity on our public lands.

That is why I oppose this bill.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, what do we know about copper? It is extremely important to move forward with any of the technology that Americans are going to require, or certainly what government is likely to require, on electric vehicles and electrification of everything.

At a time when the demand for copper is going to skyrocket to be exponentially more, the U.S. is actually producing less copper than it has been.

If my colleagues want to talk about a process of trying to get more copper on line in this country, if it takes over two decades to get a mine from an idea to operating and to get through the permit process, certainly it is not like China or someone else is going to come in and just run roughshod over people to get the permit process done because it is hard to get a copper mine open in this country.

If that can't get done, then how in the heck are we going to meet any of these standards for electrification or CO<sub>2</sub> reduction by 2045 or 2050 if it takes over two decades? We have already missed the target on just producing the copper if it takes that long to open a copper mine.

Simply harmonizing two lists—we are not even talking about the same bill—between DOI and DOE, it is crazy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOPEZ). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, to harmonize these two lists on whether copper is important or not between DOI and DOE, it is silly. We are not even talking about the same thing here. This is a simple bill to at least get the copper into the conversation so we can meet these extreme environmental goals people seem to want in California and on the other side of the aisle. It is crazy to not at least harmonize that and have a better conversation about how to produce copper in this country.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have thoroughly debated the merits and significant impacts of this bill on the American economy and national security, as well as our communities. I point out that my colleague started this debate by saying this is not about copper and ended this debate showing us it is, indeed, about copper and the companies that own them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the spirited debate. I hope we will protect our national security. I hope we will pass my motion to recommit. I hope we will stop this bill and the devastating impacts that it will bring.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. In closing, I go back to this idea of what mining in America could mean to America. We know that it has national security implications. We know that it has critical implications on being able to grow our energy sector, to grow our economy.

I want to look at just strictly the mining and manufacturing component from mining. I have already submitted this report for the record, page 4, which USGS, along with Commerce, puts out every year. It shows how much material we mine in the U.S., how much we export, and how much we import. The net value last year was \$129.7 billion. Of all the ore that we mined and the exports and imports, it was worth \$129.7 billion.

That is a lot of wealth, but it pales in comparison to the amount of wealth that is generated when that raw material is converted into a metal. That material was worth \$890 billion when it was refined into metal.

When we talk about generating wealth, we are generating income for local communities and American workers not just by mining that ore but by processing it into metal, where we can increase it by eight or nine times the value, which means income for rural Americans.

This same report shows us that \$890 billion worth of value created from this material, along with another \$102 billion worth of material that we had to import, created an impact on our economy of \$3.9 trillion. Think about that.

When we use the resources that we have, it creates jobs in extracting those resources and in processing and refining those resources, and it creates jobs throughout our economy on manufacturing the goods and products that come from those resources.

I don't want it to be lost on anyone that, historically, and this year is no exception, the U.S. Treasury receives about 16.5 percent of the GDP in tax revenue. When we look at budget issues in America, for every trillion dollars we grow our economy, we are creating another \$165 billion going to the side of the ledger that we want it to go to, the income side, to help out with our budget.

At the same time, when we are promoting things that create high-paying jobs, we are taking money off of the other side of the ledger through social welfare programs. President Reagan said it best: The greatest social welfare program ever invented was a job.

It is time that we have these jobs in America, using American resources, refining those resources, and manufacturing products from them.

That takes me back to H.R. 8446. Both lists aim to identify vital minerals susceptible to supply shocks. With this bill, each agency will continue to review minerals and materials for redesignation regularly, just as Congress intended.

It was mentioned that there is no science behind this. We are trusting these agencies, USGS and DOE, to go through the same processes they have always gone through, but to put these lists together to have a comprehensive list.

These lists were not meant to be static snapshots of siloed industries. They are meant to be flexible tools that foster collaboration between sectors and agencies to promote the well-being of our ever-changing supply chain.

H.R. 8446 allows each agency the latitude to perform its own independent analysis. For example, DOE's most recent iteration of the Critical Materials List contains copper, electrical steel flooring, silicon, and silicon carbide. USGS' critical mineral list does not contain those. These materials are used in power generation, electrical wiring, semiconductors, solar panels, transformers, defense applications, really all over and all throughout our society.

We must continue to find ways to release China's stranglehold on our critical mineral supply chain. They have exploited their position on multiple occasions by instigating commodity dumping to make U.S. and our allied nations' critical mineral production uneconomical.

H.R. 8446 will provide the Federal Government with a clearer and more holistic snapshot of the materials we need to safeguard our economy, energy, and national security.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank Mr. CISCOMANI for all of his work on this

legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support from the following organizations: the National Association of Manufacturers, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Mint Innovation, and the Copper Development Association.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION  
OF MANUFACTURERS,  
Washington, DC, November 13, 2024.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Association of Manufacturers, the largest manufacturing trade association in the United States, representing manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states, I respectfully urge you to vote "yes" on H.R. #8446, the Critical Minerals Consistency Act.

Manufacturers need robust, secure and reliable access to critical minerals and materials (including lithium, cobalt, copper, nickel and silicon) to make innovative products that power modern life, such as computer electronics and cell phones, batteries for storage, solar panels and household appliances. The U.S. has enormous mineral wealth, including some of the world's largest deposits of lithium and copper, and this legislation will help America remain a natural resources superpower.

Under the Energy Act of 2020, Congress directed the Department of the Interior (DOI) to identify and maintain a list of critical minerals to be routinely updated by the U.S. Geological Service (USGS). Unfortunately, the items that appeared on this list did not align with a separate critical materials list that was established under the same law to be maintained by the Department of Energy (DOE). This is causing confusion among producers because eligibility for certain grant programs, tax credits, loan guarantees or improved permitting processes are only granted to items on the DOI list.

This legislation is a priority for manufacturers to shore up supply chains of key minerals and materials by adding copper, electrical steel, silicone and silicone carbide to the national critical minerals list. These are materials that are irreplaceable in crucial energy, technology and national security applications from electrical equipment and batteries to grid transformers and semiconductors. American manufacturing is too often reliant on foreign sources of raw and refined inputs of these materials, when we can and must be doing more to produce them domestically.

H.R. 8446 provides necessary clarity by creating parity between the DOE critical materials list and the DOI critical minerals list and ensures that key minerals to America's national and energy security, like copper, electrical steel and silicone, are not left out.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

CHRIS NETRAM,  
Managing Vice President, Policy.

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE  
GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, November 14, 2024.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce strongly supports H.R. #8446, the Critical Mineral Consistency Act of 2024, a to streamline interagency operations and eliminate the disparity in benefits available to critical materials and critical minerals by the Federal government. The Chamber will consider including votes related to this legislation in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

Currently, the United States Geological Survey (USGS) and the Department of En-

ergy (DOE) develop separate lists of what qualifies as critical minerals and materials. Critical materials that are only on the DOE list are not eligible for the more extensive benefits granted to the critical minerals listed by the USGS. Reconciling the two lists would lead to expanded access to critical materials like copper, and would simplify and streamline interagency coordination efforts to determine which elements and minerals are critical to U.S. national and economic security.

Rapidly increasing demand for critical minerals coupled with mounting geopolitical instability makes developing a strong, reliable, domestic critical minerals supply chain vital to America's future. Our current attempts to secure the mineral supply chain rely too heavily on foreign sources while slowing or halting completely the ability to expand domestic mining. To bolster domestic supply chains and ensure stable long term economic growth, we must invest in, rather than constrain by bureaucracy, the responsible development of our abundant natural resources.

We applaud the work of the House Committee on Natural Resources to develop this legislation and we urge you to vote in favor when this bill comes to the House floor.

Sincerely,

RODNEY DAVIS,  
Senior Vice President, Government  
Affairs,  
U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

MINT INNOVATION,  
November 13, 2024.

Hon. BRUCE WESTERMAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,  
House of Representatives, Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WESTERMAN: On behalf of Mint Innovation, an electronic waste recycling and biotechnology company for metals recovery founded in New Zealand in 2016 with a commercial facility located in Sydney, Australia that will this week announce plans to build its first domestic operation in Longview, Texas, we write to you to endorse H.R. 8446, the Critical Mineral Consistency Act of 2024.

Mint Innovation is a clean biotechnology pioneer transforming waste into value to empower a resilient future. Mint's proprietary low-carbon, local and circular solution recovers critical metals and materials from electronic waste, such as printed circuit boards. Mint's technology uses a combination of naturally occurring biomass and smart chemistry to recover high value and critical metals, namely gold and copper.

As we establish a network of domestic facilities here in America, we will also be able to recover Tin and Silver as well as Praseodymium, Neodymium, Terbium, Dysprosium and Tantalum from our byproducts. As we further develop the technology to recycle black mass in lithium-ion batteries, we will add Lithium, Cobalt, Nickel and Graphite to our list of recovered metals. We do this in a low-impact, cost-effective way, strengthening and securing local supply chains.

As national critical mineral security concerns grow and natural reserves dwindle, solutions that recover critical metals close to the source make more sense than ever, and key policies and legislation, such as H.R. 8446, the Critical Minerals Consistency Act of 2024, will allow emerging technologies to break new ground in critical mineral production and electronic waste processing.

We applaud the work of Reps. Ciscomani, Newhouse, Crane, Biggs, Lesko and Curtis for their work to ensure parity between Critical Materials, as defined by the Department of Energy (DOE), and Critical Minerals, as

defined by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS).

Thank you,

JASON PRICE,  
Chief Operating Officer, Mint Innovation.

COPPER DEVELOPMENT

ASSOCIATION INC.,

June 11, 2024.

Hon. BRUCE WESTERMAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,  
House of Representatives, Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WESTERMAN: I write to you on behalf of the Copper Development Association (CDA) to share our strong endorsement and support of HR 8446, the Critical Mineral Consistency Act of 2024. CDA is the U.S.-based not-for-profit association of the global copper industry, bringing the value of copper and its alloys to society to solve the challenges of today and tomorrow. We influence the use of copper and copper alloys through research, development, and education, as well as technical and end-user support. We are the voice of the copper industry.

Today, the U.S. copper industry supports more than 395,000 direct, indirect, and induced jobs and more than \$160 billion in economic output. The U.S. copper industry is a key national driver contributing mightily to the economic success and national security of the United States. Copper is also referred to as the "metal of electrification" because of its high electrical conductivity and use across all energy transition applications including EV batteries and storage, wind energy, solar photovoltaics, transmission and distribution, and other low-carbon energies such as hydrogen.

These characteristics and the projected doubling in demand for copper by 2035 are some of the reasons why the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) added copper to their Critical Materials list last year. While this recognition is certainly welcome, exclusion from the USGS Critical Minerals list has kept copper from being eligible for benefits, include DOE Title 17 financing, FAST-41 permitting support, and others. HR 8446 eliminates this disadvantage by adding copper and other important clean energy materials to the USGS list.

HR 8446 not only has our support, but several bipartisan energy and electrification groups in Washington also favor the legislation. These include:

Zero-Emission Transportation Association (ZETA), National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA), Business Council on Sustainable Energy (BCSE), and Transformer Manufacturers Association of America (TMAA).

We are also heartened by the fact that USGS themselves in their written testimony to the House Committee on Natural Resources supports HR 8446 as they wrote "As a possible way to manage the two lists, the USGS supports this bill."

Given the support for the legislation by us and others, including USGS themselves, we are hopeful the Committee will vote favorably to support HR 8446.

Regards,

ADAM ESTELLE,  
President & CEO.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I also note for the record the support of the following organizations: the Business Council for Sustainable Energy, the National Electrical Manufacturing Association, the Zero Emission Transportation Association, the Transformer Manufacturing Association of America, and the National Mining Association.

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



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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1568, 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. 8446 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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

Ms. Stansbury moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8446 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

**SEC. 3. NO FEDERAL BENEFITS TO FOREIGN ADVERSARIES FOR CRITICAL MINERAL PROJECTS.**

(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal Government may not provide any critical mineral related Federal benefit to an entity that—

- (1) is a foreign entity of concern; or
- (2) is a subsidiary of a foreign entity of concern.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED NATION.—The term “covered nation” has the meaning given such term in section 2533c(d) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) CRITICAL MINERAL RELATED FEDERAL BENEFIT.—The term “critical mineral related Federal benefit” means any tax credit, grant, loan, loan guarantee, or expedited permitting that is available on the basis of the designation of a mineral, element, substance, or material as critical pursuant to section 7002 of the Energy Act of 2020 (30 U.S.C. 1606).

(3) FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.—The term “foreign entity of concern” has the meaning given such term in section 40207(a)(5) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 18741(a)(5)).

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.

**HARNESSING ENERGY AT THERMAL SOURCES ACT**

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1568, I call up the bill (H.R. 7409) to amend the

Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 to waive the requirement for a Federal drilling permit for certain activities, to exempt certain activities from the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 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 1568, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7409

*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 “Harnessing Energy At Thermal Sources Act” or the “HEATS Act”.

**SEC. 2. NO FEDERAL PERMIT REQUIRED FOR GEOTHERMAL ACTIVITIES ON CERTAIN LAND.**

The Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 30. NO FEDERAL PERMIT REQUIRED FOR GEOTHERMAL ACTIVITIES ON CERTAIN LAND.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not require an operator to obtain a Federal drilling permit for geothermal exploration and production activities conducted on a non-Federal surface estate, provided that—

“(1) the United States holds an ownership interest of less than 50 percent of the subsurface geothermal estate to be accessed by the proposed action; and

“(2) the operator submits to the Secretary a State permit to conduct geothermal exploration and production activities on the non-Federal surface estate.

“(b) NO FEDERAL ACTION.—A geothermal exploration and production activity carried out under subsection (a)—

“(1) shall not be considered a major Federal action for the purposes of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969;

“(2) shall require no additional Federal action;

“(3) may commence 30 days after submission of the State permit to the Secretary;

“(4) shall not be subject to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973; and

“(5) shall only be considered an undertaking under division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ‘National Historic Preservation Act’), if, with respect to the State in which the activity occurs, there is no State law in effect that addresses the preservation of historic properties in such State.

“(c) ROYALTIES AND PRODUCTION ACCOUNTABILITY.—(1) Nothing in this section shall affect the amount of royalties due to the United States under this Act from the production of electricity using geothermal resources (other than direct use of geothermal resources) or the production of any byproducts.

“(2) The Secretary may conduct onsite reviews and inspections to ensure proper accountability, measurement, and reporting of the production described in subsection (a), and payment of royalties.

“(d) EXCEPTIONS.—This section shall not apply to actions on Indian lands or resources managed in trust for the benefit of Indian Tribes.

“(e) INDIAN LAND.—In this section, the term ‘Indian land’ means—

“(1) any land located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancharia; and

“(2) any land not located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancharia, the title to which is held—

“(A) in trust by the United States for the benefit of an Indian tribe or an individual Indian;

“(B) by an Indian tribe or an individual Indian, subject to restriction against alienation under laws of the United States; or

“(C) by a dependent Indian community.”

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 Natural Resources or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 7409.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7409, the Harnessing Energy At Thermal Sources Act, or the HEATS Act.

First, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM), my friend, for being a leader on this issue and working with my staff and me to bring this bipartisan bill to the floor.

H.R. 7409, the HEATS Act, is a commonsense bill that would expedite the development of geothermal energy on non-Federal lands containing Federal minerals.

Currently, geothermal operators on non-Federal land producing any amount of Federal resources must abide by all Federal laws and permitting processes, even if the share of Federal minerals is minuscule.

Under this bill, such projects would still undergo a rigorous State permitting process but would not be bogged down by duplicative and burdensome Federal permitting processes.

H.R. 7409 stipulates that geothermal wells on non-Federal lands are not subject to NEPA, ESA, or NHPA if the United States holds an ownership interest of less than 50 percent of the geothermal estate and the operator receives a drilling permit from the respective State.

Notably, the bill would not impact the royalty paid to the Federal Government. Therefore, it would not reduce the Federal revenues generated by geothermal production. In fact, it would actually increase Federal revenues by reducing the administrative responsibilities of Federal agencies and expediting the permitting process for geothermal development.