

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 If these reckless resolutions pass, these places will be locked into outdated plans that fail to account for changes in community needs, industry needs, and, yes, climate-driven impacts.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;

Whereas on July 14, 2025, a different former romantic partner of Representative CORY MILLS, who was apparently in a relationship with Representative MILLS from November 2021 to February 2025, reported to authorities in Florida that Representative MILLS threatened to release nude images and other intimate videos of her and threatened to harm her future romantic partners in retaliation for her decision to end a relationship with Representative MILLS after seeing the public reports described above concerning the alleged February 2025 physical assault;

Whereas on October 14, 2025, the Circuit Court of the Third Judicial Circuit in Columbia County, Florida, issued a Final Judgment of Injunction for Protection Against Dating Violence against Representative CORY MILLS, based on a finding that his former romantic partner was a victim of dating violence or had reasonable cause to believe she was in imminent danger of becoming a victim of an act of dating violence;

Whereas in August 2024, the Office of Congressional Conduct adopted and transmitted to the Committee on Ethics of the House of Representatives a report indicating that there was substantial reason to believe that Representative CORY MILLS may have omitted or misrepresented required information in his financial disclosure statements, accepted excessive contributions to his campaign committee in the form of personal loans and contributions that may not have derived from Representative CORY MILLS' personal funds, entered into, held, or enjoyed contracts with federal agencies while he was a Member of Congress, and may have accepted through his campaign committee in-kind contributions or other contributions not lawfully made;

Whereas individuals who served with Representative CORY MILLS have called into question the veracity of the account of events which formed the basis of a recommendation that Representative CORY MILLS receive an award of a Bronze Star, bestowed in 2021, for his service under enemy fire in Iraq in 2003;

Whereas in August 2024, Representative CORY MILLS provided the Daytona Beach News with documents purporting to prove that he earned a Bronze Star with heroism, including a Department of the Army Form 638 recommending Representative CORY MILLS for a Bronze Star which includes a signature from then-Army Brigade Commander Arnold N. Gordon-Bray; however, Retired Brigadier General Bray told the Daytona Beach News-Journal in August 2024 that he did not sign a Bronze Star recommendation for Representative CORY MILLS;

Whereas five people who served with Representative CORY MILLS, including two men who were reported as having been personally saved by Representative CORY MILLS at great risk to his own life as a basis for the recommendation for his Bronze Star in the Depart-

ment of the Army Form 638, disputed that Representative CORY MILLS was involved in their rescue or provided life-saving care;

Whereas one Private First Class cited as having been involved in one of the listed achievements on Representative CORY MILLS's Army Form 638 recommending him for a Bronze Star denied that Representative CORY MILLS provided him any aid and also denied that his injuries were life threatening;

Whereas one Sergeant cited as having been involved in one of the listed achievements on Representative CORY MILLS's Army Form 638 recommending him for a Bronze Star called the account a "fabrication" and claimed that he "was not involved in any claims that CORY MILLS makes about me"; and

Whereas despite the numerous available contradictions of the accounts forming the basis of the recommendation for his Bronze Star, Representative CORY MILLS described the legitimate factual disputes raised by individuals he purportedly served with and rescued as "slander and defamation" in a statement to the Daytona Beach News Journal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) Representative CORY MILLS be censured;

(2) Representative CORY MILLS forthwith present himself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure;

(3) Representative CORY MILLS be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker; and

(4) Representative CORY MILLS is hereby removed from the following standing committee of the House of Representatives: the Committee on Armed Services.

□ 1820

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution by the gentlewoman from New York will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this time determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2016

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) at 8 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.

REQUESTING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO AUTHORIZE UNIQUE AND ONE-TIME DISPLAYS ON THE NATIONAL MALL AND WASHINGTON MONUMENT BEGINNING DECEMBER 31, 2025, AND ENDING JANUARY 5, 2026

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 133) requesting the Secretary of the Interior to authorize unique and one-time arrangements for displays on the National Mall and the Washington Monument during the period beginning on December 31, 2025, and ending on January 5, 2026, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 133

Whereas the Second Continental Congress unanimously agreed to adopt the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, in which the Second Continental Congress declared a complete break with Britain and the king and claimed the powers of an independent country;

Whereas the founding of the United States represented a historic world event that has improved the lives of the people of the United States and the people of other nations in profound ways for centuries;

Whereas the ideas of the founding fathers, including representative government, guaranteed rights, and national sovereignty, inspire all people of the United States to this day;

Whereas, on July 4, 2026, the 250th anniversary of the independence and founding of the United States will be commemorated and celebrated;

Whereas Congress enacted the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 (36 U.S.C. note prec. 101; Public Law 114-196) to plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate the commemoration of the history of the United States leading up to the 250th anniversary of the founding of the United States;

Whereas the United States Semiquincentennial Commission has planned, coordinated, and inspired celebrations of the 250th anniversary across the United States to mark the occasion;

Whereas New Year's Eve in 2025 marks the boundary between the 249th and 250th year of the United States, will bring the people of the United States together, and will be a fitting date to initiate celebrations of the 250th anniversary of the United States in earnest;

Whereas Congress explored lighting the Washington Monument and other capital monuments at night during calendar year 1976 to celebrate the bicentennial of the United States;