

development of the 10-02 area of ANWR.”

H.J. Res. 131 responds to the wishes of the local people who call ANWR home and unleashes the region’s bountiful natural resources for the benefit of U.S. energy security and the economic well-being of local communities.

I again urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. 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.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT RELATING TO “NATIONAL PETROLEUM RESERVE IN ALASKA INTEGRATED ACTIVITY PLAN RECORD OF DECISION”

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 879, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 80) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to “National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Integrated Activity Plan Record of Decision”, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 80

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to “National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Integrated Activity Plan Record of Decision” (issued April 25, 2022, as a record of decision, and a letter of opinion from the Government Accountability Office dated July 24, 2025, printed in the Congressional Record on July 28, 2025, on pages S4768–S4770, concluding that such record of decision is a rule under the Congressional Review Act), and such rule shall have no force or effect.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution 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 gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair now 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 to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S.J. Res. 80.

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 in support of S.J. Res. 80, which repeals the Biden administration’s 2022 Integrated Activity Plan, or IAP, for the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, also known as the NPR-A.

Under the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976, the approximately 23-million-acre NPR-A was designated by Congress due to its vast energy resources. In 1980, Congress amended the act and directed the Secretary of the Interior to conduct “an expeditious program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska.”

In 2020, in President Trump’s first administration, the Bureau of Land Management released its IAP for the NPR-A. The 2020 IAP listened to local voices and opened up access to over 18.5 million acres of the NPR-A for oil and gas leasing. Over 13 million acres were made available for new infrastructure development.

Nagruk Harcharek, president of the Voice of the Arctic Inupiat, stated in a September 2023 Natural Resources Committee hearing that: “We also felt heard when BLM released an NPR-A Integrated Activity Plan (IAP) in June 2020 that considered the interests of our communities, including future community infrastructure needs.”

The IAP outlining management activities for natural resources throughout the NPR-A was thoughtfully crafted by the first Trump administration, taking into account the voices of local indigenous Tribal communities.

Regrettably, in 2022, the Biden administration replaced the 2020 IAP with a new one, reducing the available acreage for oil and gas leasing by 37 percent and reducing areas available to new infrastructure by over 2.3 million acres.

In November 2023, during another hearing on the matter, we heard from Commissioner John Boyle of the Alaska Department of Natural Resources,

who expressed concerns about the Biden administration’s NPR-A rule-making process. “The process to date has been confusingly deficient as the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has scheduled and canceled public meetings on short notice, avoided consultation obligations, and attempted to avoid procedural safeguards that are meant to keep rulemakings of enormous public cost and consequence from being hastily and arbitrarily implemented. Neither comprehensive environmental nor economic reviews have been completed for a proposal that will dramatically change environmental and economic management in what may be the largest Federal petroleum asset in the country.”

□ 1750

In that same hearing, Mr. Harcharek shared:

“This decision, coupled with further ‘protections’ for NPR-A, will undoubtedly shrink the economic opportunities available to the North Slope. It virtually guarantees to set us back on our journey toward self-determination by requiring further reliance on the Federal and State government to provide for the basic needs of the people on the North Slope.”

Ultimately, the Biden administration stymied energy production within the NPR-A and failed to offer leases in a manner that would boost revenue and provide economic stability to the region and the State.

The most recent lease sale in the NPR-A took place in 2019, when the BLM leased over 1 million acres, generating more than \$11 million, including roughly \$5.6 million for the State of Alaska.

Revenue from developing these resources is essential to the livelihoods of all Alaskans. For example, in fiscal year 2022, Alaskan oil and natural gas production, largely driven by the consequences of the pro-energy policies of the first Trump administration, generated \$4.5 billion in State and local revenue and supported over 69,250 direct and indirect jobs.

Alaska’s role as a leader in unleashing American energy dominance will continue. In the Working Families Tax Cut Act, Congress highlighted the importance of the NPR-A and required five lease sales to be held in the area over the next 10 years.

To ensure our energy independence, we must unleash American energy and ensure access to our own resources here at home. This legislation is an important step in doing just that.

I thank Representative BEGICH and Senator SULLIVAN for their work to bring S.J. Res. 80 to the House floor so that we can nullify yet another misguided Biden-era action and take another step to put our Nation’s energy policy back on the right track.

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

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

I oppose S.J. Res. 80, which would overturn the BLM's 2022 Integrated Activity Plan Record of Decision for the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska, more commonly referred to as "NPR-A."

Now the name National Petroleum Reserve is more than a little misleading. This is not some industrial sacrifice zone. It is not some untapped oil field just waiting to be developed. On the contrary, the NPR-A is the largest contiguous unit of public lands in the United States. It spans 23 million acres, and this area of the western Arctic is home to a diverse ecosystem, where iconic species like wolves, polar bears, and caribou roam. Beluga and bowhead whales shelter in its coastal waters. Millions of migratory birds rely on this intact landscape and the critical waters and wetlands that are the NPR-A.

The legislation before us today would withdraw a smart and well-thought-out plan to balance conservation and development in the NPR-A. The 2022 NPR-A plan was developed over more than a decade of engagement with a variety of stakeholders: scientists, experts, indigenous communities, NGOs, and industry.

It aimed to limit the disruption and ecological harm from existing oil and gas development while also designating special areas to protect habitat for the many species that call this amazing place home.

I respect that there are a variety of views on how to manage our Nation's public lands, but it won't be possible for future administrations to incorporate feedback and comments on proposed actions in the NPR-A if Congress approves the resolution before us today.

The CRA, as we have said several times in the course of this debate, is a blunt instrument. It would prevent BLM from ever issuing a substantially similar replacement, and so this path would strip local land managers of the ability to respond to on-the-ground changes and needs for the future of the NPR-A.

My friends across the aisle don't need to do this. There are already processes in place for administrations to propose new management decisions if they don't like this plan. The Trump administration is doing just that already: pursuing updates to the land management plans that we have been debating here using the standard, inclusive mechanisms that allow for public input.

Interior Secretary Burgum withdrew conservation protections for the NPR-A in July. Just last week, the Interior Department finalized a new rule that overturned the previous plan.

The Congressional Review Act is simply the wrong tool to address any changes to management of these lands, and it is not even necessary.

Why do my Republican colleagues need to take up our valuable floor time here debating a rule that their friends

in the administration have already rescinded? They just returned from a 53-day, taxpayer-funded vacation, canceled 5 weeks of votes, and still have a long to-do list before the end of the year. That list, I hope, includes figuring out how to avoid another government shutdown in January.

You may wonder if my colleagues are spending time on polluter giveaways to maybe distract from something; maybe something like the fact that President Trump has been mentioned more than 1,000 times in the Epstein emails.

President Trump and House Republicans continue to push their drill, baby, drill agenda even though it makes no sense for people, for the planet, or for our pocketbooks.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this distraction, this S.J. Res. 80, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I point out that, while the current administration did recently rescind the 2024 rule this month, passage of a CRA is still necessary to prevent a future administration from, again, weaponizing IAPs similar to this one that ignore congressional intent. By replacing the 2022 IAP, BLM wouldn't be left in limbo. They would revert back to the initial IAP finalized under the first Trump administration, which did take into account Native Tribal voices, and it is consistent with the requirements included in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the lead sponsor of the House companion to this legislation.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S.J. Res. 80, legislation to disapprove of the Bureau of Land Management's 2022 Integrated Activity Plan for the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska.

Let me be very clear. This is not an abstract policy debate for the people of Alaska. This is about whether the Federal Government will honor both the law and its commitments to the people who call Alaska home and whether America will choose energy independence over energy uncertainty.

The National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, an area the size of Indiana, was set aside more than a century ago to ensure that the United States had a strategic domestic energy supply. Congress reaffirmed that purpose in the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act, directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an "expeditious program of competitive leasing" in the NPR-A, but the 2022 Integrated Activity Plan issued in the final stretch of the last administration turned that congressional mandate on its head.

It shut the door on 48 percent of the reserve, reducing available acreage from 18.6 million acres to just 11.8 million acres, and restricted infrastructure corridors across millions more. In effect, the plan attempted to create a wilderness area in a petroleum reserve,

and it did so without listening to the people who actually live there.

Alaska is asking us to act.

The Inupiat people who live in the area have spoken, and they could not have been clearer. Through the North Slope Regional Trilateral—the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope, the North Slope Borough, and the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, we have heard that the Biden administration's 2022 plan imposed "sweeping restrictions that curtail responsible development, undermine congressional intent, and disregard the well-being of the people who depend on these lands for both subsistence and livelihoods."

These communities are located in an area nearly the size of Minnesota with no highway connections, extreme transportation costs, and a cost of living among the highest in the Nation. Oil and gas development funds their schools, their public safety, their utilities, their clinics, basic services that most Americans assume that their local government can provide. On the North Slope, that stability exists because responsible development exists, and we have a duty to ensure that it continues.

Alaska's business community stands with them. The Alaska Support Industry Alliance, representing 547 companies and 35,000 Alaskan workers, warned that the 2022 plan jeopardizes the jobs and investment that their families depend on. National organizations from the National Federation of Independent Businesses to the American Exploration & Production Council to the American Petroleum Institute have also voiced their support for reversing this restrictive rule, and the administration itself has made clear that restoring access to the NPR-A is a priority.

President Trump's Executive Order No. 14153, Unleashing Alaska's Extraordinary Resource Potential, directs the Secretary of the Interior to review and rescind the 2022 decision and reestablish a balanced framework consistent with the 2020 plan.

□ 1800

This statement of administration policy strongly supports this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, Alaska is ready to power America. We are ready to help lower energy costs for families and small businesses. We are ready to strengthen national security by reducing our reliance on foreign nations. The people who live in Alaska's Far North, the people whose ancestors have called the region home for 10,000 years, are asking us to restore the balanced, lawful management framework that they helped shape.

S.J. Res. 80 does exactly that. It restores congressional intent. It restores certainty for Alaska's communities. It restores America's strategic energy reserve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S.J. Res. 80, and

to stand with Alaska, with energy workers, with the Inupiat people of the North Slope, and with an American future grounded in abundant, affordable, secure energy.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope, ICAS, the North Slope Borough, and the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, ASRC, that specifically states BLM failed to engage in meaningful government-to-government consultation with ASRC, the Borough, and ICAS.

This admission contradicts Federal consultation requirements and disregards the voices of the very communities most affected. Our leadership has consistently raised concerns about this process and its outcome, yet those concerns were ignored.

OCTOBER 3, 2025.

Re Support for S.J. Res. 80 and H.J. Res. 124—Congressional Review Act Disapproval of the BLM NPR-A Integrated Activity Plan (IAP) Record of Decision (ROD).

Hon. LISA MURKOWSKI,  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

Hon. DAN SULLIVAN,  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

Hon. NICHOLAS BEGICH III,  
*U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATORS MURKOWSKI, SULLIVAN, AND REPRESENTATIVE BEGICH: On behalf of the North Slope Inupiat leadership—including Arctic Slope Regional Corporation (ASRC), the North Slope Borough (Borough), and the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope (ICAS)—we write in strong support of S.J. Res. 80, introduced by Senators Sullivan and Murkowski, and H.J. Res. 124 in the House, each providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to the “National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Integrated Activity Plan Record of Decision.”

#### BACKGROUND

The North Slope Inupiat have called the Arctic home for over 10,000 years. We are proud of our self-determination efforts to ensure future generations of Inupiat continue to reside in our communities and have access to essential services. Without a stable economy, our communities will suffer, along with our ability to fully engage in and sustain our Inupiat cultural traditions, including our vital subsistence way of life.

The North Slope of Alaska spans an area nearly the size of the state of Minnesota and, within that expansive area, there are eight Inupiat communities—Anaktuvuk Pass, Atkasuk, Kaktovik, Nuiqsut, Point Hope, Point Lay, Utqiagvik, and Wainwright. None of our communities are connected by a permanent road system; all supplies must be flown or barged in, making the cost of living extremely high and economic opportunities generally low.

Over fifty years ago, the Federal Government directed Alaska Native people to organize into a new structure of indigenous representation. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 (ANCSA) was a dramatically different and transformative approach by the Federal Government to federal Indian policy. The fact that our ancestral lands were claimed by the Federal Government before our people had a right to settle aboriginal land claims should inform every decision the Federal Government makes in managing those lands.

Unlike the Lower 48 model of indigenous representation where tribal governments typically administer the delivery of services such as healthcare, public safety, education, land management, and economic development, the passage of ANCSA created a shared system of Alaska Native representation and delivery of services. Our region has a multitude of Alaska Native entities that work together to effectively serve, provide for, and enrich the lives of the North Slope Inupiat we represent. Our three regional entities, the ICAS, the Borough, and ASRC are three of those entities. While our roles differ, our constituencies overlap, which is why we work closely together to protect the cultural and economic interests of the North Slope Inupiat.

While our leaders over fifty years ago were initially wary of any development on our lands, our Inupiat leaders have spent decades prioritizing open communication and transparency in planning with industry. We have exercised true self-determination through a unique framework of Alaska Native governance—a framework that relies on our tribal governments, municipal governments, and Alaska Native corporations established by Congress to serve our indigenous constituents. For millennia, Inupiat ingenuity has transformed our relationship with industry into a partnership that has both protected our environment and our way of life and has brought significant economic benefits to the region that would have otherwise been absent. Our North Slope residents are keenly aware that advances in our communities—running water, local schools, health care, public safety, electricity, and more—have come because of the coordination and cooperation of Alaska Native leaders and entities across the region.

#### ICAS

Established in 1971, the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope is the federally recognized regional tribal government for the North Slope and represents over 14,000 Inupiat tribal members. The mission of ICAS is to exercise its sovereign rights and powers for the benefit of tribal members, to conserve and retain tribal lands and resources including subsistence. For millennia Inupiat ingenuity has transformed our relationship with industry into a partnership that has both protected our environment and our way of life and has brought significant economic benefits to the region that would have otherwise been absent. Our North Slope residents are keenly aware that advances in our communities—running water, local schools, health care, public safety, electricity, and more—have come because of the coordination and cooperation of Alaska Native leaders and entities across the region.

#### Borough

The Borough is a home rule government located above the Arctic Circle that represents roughly 10,000 residents. The Borough’s jurisdiction includes the entire National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska (NPR-A) and the eight villages within it. In 1972, the North Slope Inupiat formed the Borough, in part, to ensure our communities would benefit from oil and gas development on their ancestral homelands. It was the first time Alaska Natives took control of their destiny using a regional municipal government. The Borough exercises its powers of taxation, property assessment, education, and planning and zoning services to serve our communities. Taxes levied on oil and gas infrastructure, not development, have enabled the Borough to invest in public infrastructure and utilities, support education, and provide police, fire, emergency, health, and other services. Elsewhere in rural Alaska, these services are typically provided primarily by the State or Federal Government, or both.

#### ASRC

ASRC is a for-profit, land-owning Alaska Native regional corporation formed pursuant to ANCSA. ASRC represents the same region as the Borough and ICAS, and the same eight villages whose residents are predominantly Inupiat, and who comprise many of our over 14,000 Alaska Native shareholders. ASRC holds the title to approximately five million acres of land on the North Slope, including both surface and subsurface lands. These lands—the ancestral lands of the North Slope Inupiat—were conveyed to ASRC by the United States pursuant to ANCSA to provide for the economic and cultural well-being of our Inupiat shareholders.

ASRC is committed to both providing sound financial returns to our shareholders, through jobs and dividends, and to preserving our Inupiat way of life, culture, and traditions, including the ability to maintain a subsistence lifestyle that supports our communities. In furtherance of this congressionally mandated mission to provide benefits to our shareholders, ASRC conducts and continues to invest in a variety of activities related to infrastructure and natural resource development and other economic initiatives.

ASRC’s perspective is based on the dual realities that our Inupiat culture and communities depend on a healthy ecosystem and subsistence resources, as well as infrastructure and resource development as the foundation of sustainable North Slope communities.

#### DISAPPROVAL OF THE 2022 NPR-A IAP ROD

The NPR-A lies entirely within the homelands of the North Slope Inupiat. Congress established the NPR-A with a clear purpose: to ensure energy security for the Nation while respecting the needs of Alaska Natives. Instead, the 2022 Record of Decision (ROD) issued by BLM has imposed sweeping restrictions that curtail responsible development, undermine congressional intent, and disregard the well-being of the people who depend on these lands for both subsistence and livelihoods.

The impacts of the 2022 ROD are especially severe for the North Slope. Oil and gas development in the NPR-A funds the Borough’s schools, emergency services, and infrastructure. It supports jobs for Inupiat shareholders and residents. It underwrites the continuation of our communities, even as we maintain our subsistence way of life. By arbitrarily locking away vast portions of the NPR-A, BLM’s rule threatens these essential services and imposes disproportionate burdens on our people.

Equally concerning, BLM failed to engage in meaningful government-to-government consultation with ASRC, the Borough, and ICAS. This omission contradicts federal consultation requirements and disregards the voices of the very communities most affected. Our leadership has consistently raised concerns about this process and its outcomes, yet those concerns were ignored.

The 2022 ROD ignores congressional intent under ANCSA, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA), the National Petroleum Reserve Production Act of 1976 (NPRPA), and the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1980. The 2022 ROD also disregards the economic needs of North Slope communities, and creates unnecessary obstacles to infrastructure, energy, and community health across the North Slope of Alaska.

#### SUPPORT FOR S.J. RES 80 AND H.J. RES. 124

For these reasons, our trilateral organizations strongly support passage of S.J. Res. 80 and H.J. Res. 124 to disapprove the 2022 NPR-A IAP ROD. Overturning this rule is necessary to restore balance to federal policy,

reaffirm Congress's intent for the NPR-A, and uphold the economic, cultural, and subsistence well-being of the North Slope Iñupiat.

Our identity, resilience, and survival are deeply rooted in our traditional lands that the NPR-A boundaries encompass. We take great pride in our ongoing efforts toward self-determination, focused on securing a future where future generations of Iñupiat can continue to live in our communities with access to the essential services they need to thrive. We thank you for your leadership on this important resolution and look forward to continued collaboration to ensure that federal policies in the NPR-A reflect both national priorities and the needs of the people who call the Arctic home.

Sincerely,

NICOLE WOJCIECHOWSKI,  
*President, Iñupiat  
Community of the  
Arctic Slope.*

JOSHUA PATKOTAK,  
*Mayor, North Slope  
Borough.*

REX A. ROCK SR.,  
*President and CEO,  
Arctic Slope Re-  
gional Corporation.*

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

Mr. Speaker, again, the plan that this resolution targets for disapproval is not in place. It has been rescinded by the Trump administration. If ever there is a case for a misapplication of the CRA, it would be this right here.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is an important time for us to step back and consider why using a CRA for any, frankly, public land management plan, but certainly for one that has already been rescinded, is just a recipe for uncertainty and conflict and litigation.

Nearly a third of our Nation's land mass, 640 million acres, is managed by the Federal Government. The Forest Service manages 193 million acres. BLM manages 244 million in addition to 713 million acres of Federal minerals.

For nearly 50 years, BLM and the Forest Service have managed these lands under management plans required by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and the National Forest Management Act. These plans, known as resource management plans, or RMPs, establish safeguards for watersheds and recreation areas. They facilitate energy development and grazing and logging and other commercial activities and provide a mechanism for harmonizing the needs of local communities with our national goals and perspectives.

Now, just a few months ago, we debated some other CRA resolutions targeting management plans, and we explained at that time how unprecedented that was. We still don't know the extent of chaos that is going to result from these actions that have already been taken, but we do know this: Under the CRA rules and "rules" is a technical term of art here, normally cannot go into effect unless they are submitted for congressional review.

Here is the problem, BLM and the Forest Service have never considered

RMPs to be rules that they would submit to Congress. They have just never done that, and that has long been the case under both Democratic and Republican Presidents with precedence being set by those Presidents.

Now that Congress has decided apparently to disapprove of individual RMPs, what does that mean for every other plan that is in place that wasn't submitted to Congress? What does that mean for the small businesses, the local communities, and other public land stakeholders who depend on a stable and predictable land use planning process? If the validity of these land use plans is challenged, then leases, permits, and other authorizations that depend on those plans could be called into question.

This is already creating uncertainty and delays, making it nearly impossible for new projects to proceed on time.

Here are a couple of examples for consideration. What would happen to the White River oil and gas resource management plan in Colorado, which authorizes 15,000 oil and gas wells? What about the Rosemont Copper plan amendment for Forest Service lands in Arizona, approving a 5,000-acre open pit mine in the Coronado National Forest? What about the TransWest Express and Gateway South RMP amendments for three transmission lines through Wyoming, Idaho, Nevada, and Utah?

Does Interior now need to go back and submit all of those RMP amendments to Congress for approval under this new Republican interpretation of the CRA? Is Congress prepared to take on day-to-day management of public lands and minerals, thousands of miles from Washington, D.C.?

I don't think so, but I am not the only one who has concerns about this treadmill of litigation and conflict and uncertainty that is being created here.

Let me read a quote from Kathleen Sgamma, President Trump's first nominee for director of BLM. She said: "There are some additional legal risks that can arise from the CRA. It's uncharted ground, and if not used wisely, there could be some legal risks introduced and some bad legal precedent."

Just a few months ago, the House passed several other CRA resolutions, overturning land management plans. As we said at the time, that was unprecedented. These resolutions before us continue to chart unprecedented ground, and I don't think anyone, including my colleagues across the aisle, have thought a heck of a lot about where it leads.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would submit that a recipe for disaster is when an administration goes out on their own, goes around the laws that Congress passed, and implements bad rules on their way out the door and expects no repercussions from that.

I would say a recipe for good governance is when Congress acts within their

power to disapprove of these rules, and that is exactly what we are doing with the CRA to make sure that these rules are followed.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will point out that we have heard a number of times now that more drilling is necessary in the name of energy independence. I want to remind my colleagues that the United States is already the number one producer of oil in the world and the number one producer and exporter of gas in the world, but you would sure never know it when you look at the energy bills that are facing families all over this country.

It is abundantly clear that the drill, baby, drill agenda is not working for everyday Americans. As long as we are dependent on the fossil fuel roller coaster, American consumers will be at the whim of the global oil and gas market, but if we want energy independence and if we want lower utility bills, we need to get back on track with the transition to clean energy.

It is cheaper. It is safer. It is generated entirely here at home instead of being at the mercy of global price shocks like oil and gas just inherently are. Instead, this legislation would make us more reliant on fossil fuels and more entangled with the price effects of this fossil fuel roller coaster. Plus, oil from America's Arctic will not come online for many, many years.

The Willow project, for example, won't start until 2029. Meanwhile, the Arctic is warming four times faster than the rest of the world. Even at the Willow project, developer ConocoPhillips will use artificial chillers to freeze melting permafrost before drilling for oil. That is the kind of complexity and additional cost that is inherent in drilling in these remote pristine parts of the Arctic.

The project itself will release nearly 300 million metric tons of carbon pollution into the atmosphere over its lifetime, the equivalent of at least 66 coal-fired power plants.

Again, Mr. Speaker, if we want true energy independence and security, we need to combat the climate crisis and transition to clean, renewable energy.

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

□ 1810

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I strongly oppose this resolution.

The three Congressional Review Act resolutions that we have been considering here today are going to strip local land managers of the ability to respond to future challenges, changes,

and needs in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, the NPR-A, and the Powder River Basin. If these reckless resolutions pass, these places will be locked into outdated plans that fail to account for changes in community needs, industry needs, and, yes, climate-driven impacts.

These CRA resolutions are completely unnecessary because the Trump administration has already acted on their own to replace these plans.

Even oil and gas industry experts across the political spectrum agree that the use of the CRA on land use plans creates regulatory and legal ambiguity. In fact, Kathleen Sgamma, as I just told you, President Trump's former nominee to lead the BLM, recently said—and it is a quote worth repeating—“There could be some legal risks introduced and some bad legal precedent” when using CRAs in this manner. Yet, apparently, my friends across the aisle are just going to do it anyway.

Sgamma led the Western Energy Alliance, an oil and gas industry trade association. She has testified for the House Committee on Natural Resources majority many times.

This misuse of the CRA will create regulatory chaos for everyone, including the industry, so I ask my colleagues across the aisle: Why pursue it?

House Republicans are continuing to lock the American people into higher energy costs by pushing their fossil fuel playbook and sabotaging clean, renewable energy.

Our constituents deserve better. They deserve a future with clean and affordable energy, where utility bills aren't skyrocketing and where we know our lands and waters won't suffer as a result.

That is why I oppose this resolution and urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting “no.”

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it has been stated that gas and energy prices won't be reduced by passing this CRA, and I contend that they will because overturning these rules would incentivize much-needed investment throughout the State or the entire North Slope.

The regional impacts of increased energy production in Alaska cannot be overstated. Refineries in the region, including California and Washington, are equipped to handle Alaskan oil, and the refinery in Kenai produces most of the State of Alaska's gasoline. The North Pole refinery provides jet fuel for our military, amongst other aviation fuels. Two other refineries located in Valdez and near Fairbanks also produce diesel and heating fuels.

Let me point out that 3 out of 10 State households in Alaska rely on fuel oil, kerosene, or propane for home heating. You may ask why they would rely on these fuels that are traditionally more expensive when Alaska has

trillions of cubic feet of natural gas. That is because that natural gas is on the North Slope, and even in the city of Anchorage, they are running out of natural gas because they can't move the gas from the North Slope and can't develop infrastructure. Not only can they not meet their own needs with that gas, they certainly can't export it to our allies.

As many have shared, the NPR-A is essential to unleashing American energy dominance and sustaining economies throughout Alaska.

Congress must also act to undo the harm that the previous administration imposed, and we must work to unlock the estimated 8.7 billion barrels of oil and 25 trillion cubic feet of natural gas the NPR-A holds.

By repealing this decision, we can help uphold Tribal voices and revert to the 2020 IAP that considered their meaningful input.

Letting these plans to shut down energy production in the NPR-A linger would be devastating to Alaskans, especially the Native communities on the North Slope. Without jobs, people may leave these communities, jeopardizing the culture and social fabric of the region. We cannot afford to let this happen. We must pass S.J. Res. 80.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support passage of this important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of Utah). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 879, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. 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.

#### NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Censuring Representative CORY MILLS.

Whereas Representative CORY MILLS has on several occasions conducted

himself in a manner that reflects discredit upon the House of Representatives;

Whereas on February 19, 2025, Washington, DC, Metropolitan Police Department officers were called to resolve a private matter at Representative CORY MILLS' residence, where officers were called to the 1300 block of Maryland Avenue, Southwest around 1:15 p.m. for the report of an assault;

Whereas police reports obtained by NBC4 Washington confirmed that the Washington, DC, Metropolitan Police Department was investigating Representative CORY MILLS for an alleged assault of a 27-year old woman that took place on February 19, 2025, at the residence of Representative CORY MILLS;

Whereas the first police report, provided to NBC4 Washington by a source and confirmed by a second source familiar with the investigation, said that the 27-year-old woman accused her significant other for over a year of having grabbed her, shoved her, and pushed her out of the door, and also said that the woman involved showed the officer “bruises on her arm which appeared fresh”;

Whereas NBC4 Washington also reported that the Metropolitan Police Department identified Representative CORY MILLS as the significant other of the alleged victim of assault—which alleged victim was a 27-year-old woman who was not the wife of Representative CORY MILLS—and that the alleged victim “let officers hear Subject 1 [now identified by MPD as MILLS] instruct her to lie about the origin of her bruises . . . Eventually, Subject 1 made contact with police and admitted that the situation escalated from verbal to physical, but it was severe enough to create bruising”;

Whereas on February 21, 2025, the Washington post also confirmed two DC police officials said that the alleged victim of assault initially told a 911 operator and police that she had been assaulted and that officers said she also had what seemed to be visible injuries, and that while a supervisor initially classified the offense internally as a family disturbance, police commanders later learned of the incident, reviewed the reports and body camera footage from the responding officers, and reclassified the case as a domestic violence assault;

Whereas on February 21, 2025, NBC4 Washington also reported that the Metropolitan Police Department determined that probable cause to arrest Representative CORY MILLS for misdemeanor assault existed and sent an arrest warrant for Representative CORY MILLS to the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia; however, then-Acting United States Attorney for the District of Columbia Ed Martin refused to sign the arrest warrant for Representative CORY MILLS and instead returned the case to the Metropolitan Police Department for further investigation;