

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I have heard story after story of people seeking care from crisis pregnancy centers only to be provided with misleading or deceptive medical information or services that endanger their health.

That is why during last week's markup on this bill, I introduced a responsible amendment that would have prohibited fraudulent centers from receiving TANF funds funded by taxpayer dollars.

Republicans regularly talk about rooting out government waste, fraud, and abuse, but not a single one supported my amendment.

It's clear that Republicans have no interest in addressing fraud if it conflicts with their dogmatic ideology even at the cost of their constituents' health.

Republicans are outraged at the idea of simply holding crisis pregnancy centers to the same medical standards as licensed health facilities.

Why are Republicans willing to categorically turn a blind eye to the countless horror stories happening at these sham health clinics?

It is because for Republicans, when it comes to women's health, accountability isn't required.

This bill defines pregnancy centers as organizations that support "protecting the life of the mother and the unborn child," but Republican's commitment to funneling taxpayer dollars to medical grifters endangers both.

I urge my colleagues to vote No on this irresponsible bill.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1009, 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. MOORE of Wisconsin. 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. Moore of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6945 to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. MOORE of Wisconsin. 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.

□ 1510

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT RELATING TO PUBLIC LAND ORDER NO. 7917 FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LANDS; COOK, LAKE, AND SAINT LOUIS COUNTIES, MN

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1009, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 140) 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 Public Land Order No. 7917 for Withdrawal of Federal Lands; Cook, Lake, and Saint Louis Counties, MN, 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 1009, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 140

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 of the Department of the Interior relating to Public Land Order No. 7917 for Withdrawal of Federal Lands; Cook, Lake, and Saint Louis Counties, MN (88 Fed. Reg. 6308 (January 31, 2023)), 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 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 include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 140.

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 this Congressional Review Act resolution, which would overturn the Biden administration's reckless withdrawal of more than 225,000 acres in the Superior National Forest from mineral exploration and development.

Mr. Speaker, at issue is the Duluth Complex in northern Minnesota, one of the largest mineral deposits on the planet, including the world's largest copper-nickel deposit.

The Federal Government routinely granted and renewed mineral leases to these deposits beginning in the 1960s. Decades of planning, exploration, investment, and environmental reviews have gone into the region, and with good reason.

The minerals in the Duluth Complex include copper, nickel, and cobalt. They are the ones that make up the 21st century economy and help it run. They are the essential inputs for telecommunications devices, cutting-edge defense systems, and much more.

As we are all keenly aware, the Chinese Communist Party has a stranglehold on far too many mineral supply chains. Mining in the Duluth Complex was poised to change that. It was going to help usher in a new era of American mineral dominance and create and support thousands of American jobs. It was going to help end our dependence on foreign adversaries and reorder the entire global mineral market, positioning the United States at the center and driving our rivals to the margins.

When President Biden abruptly closed off 225,000 acres of Federal land in the Duluth Complex for mineral development, he threw a future of American abundance, security, and global leadership into chaos. The decision undermined America's economic, military, and strategic interests and those of our allies.

The minerals in the Duluth Complex are called "critical" for a reason. We need them. The whole world needs them. Nations, businesses, militaries, and individual consumers are going to acquire these minerals. The only question is whether they will be mined here in the United States by American workers, protected by American labor laws, and with the strongest environmental standards and most advanced mining techniques, or not.

The Duluth Complex is also home to a world-class helium reserve, which has attracted investment from investors. Specifically, the withdrawal itself locks up roughly 11,000 acres for helium exploration, blocking development of one of the largest and most concentrated helium deposits in the entire world.

Don't let the rhetoric around this issue confuse what is at stake here. The resolution before us today is about more than just one project. There are two options, Mr. Speaker: mineral dominance or mineral dependence. There isn't a third option, and it is long past time for the Federal Government to act like it.

Our global allies rely on America's leadership. If we are to remain a leader in the global economy, then domestic mineral abundance is a strategic necessity, not a political football.

The resolution before us does not mandate projects, mining sites, firms, or schedules. It simply reverses the Biden administration's unilateral short-circuiting of the normal permitting process.

This resolution is a step toward balance and the rule of law. It is a step toward the mineral abundance that the American people deserve and that Washington has denied them for too long.

I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) for introducing this resolution and for his tireless work on behalf of his constituents.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 140, a resolution that would threaten America's beloved Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness in northern Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, Boundary Waters draws more visitors than any other wilderness in the country. Millions of Americans have paddled, fished, swum, and found solace among its pristine lakes and forests. It supports a multibillion-dollar outdoor economy, thousands of jobs, and a way of life that has been passed down for generations.

It is an area that Presidents, reaching back to Teddy Roosevelt, and Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have long recognized in terms of its value, and we have protected it as part of our American heritage.

Yet, the Boundary Waters have been under threat for years. Twin Metals, owned by Antofagasta, a Chilean mining company with close ties to China, has been lobbying for years to set up a mine just outside the wilderness area, along the banks of waters that flow north, directly into the wilderness.

The type of mining that Twin Metals has proposed has a 100 percent track record of toxic pollution. There has never been a mine of this kind that did not leach toxic pollution.

Despite what the other side of the aisle might say, there is no guarantee that the precious minerals that were just talked about produced from this mine would actually stay in the U.S. and benefit the American economy or American national security at all.

Antofagasta sends most of its minerals to China, where they are then sold on the global market, likely the same fate for these minerals if this mine is allowed to happen.

All of this is why, nearly 3 years ago, Secretary of the Interior Deb Haaland protected the lands surrounding the Boundary Waters and its headwaters from mining for 20 years through a public land order, a standard tool and process backed by peer-reviewed science and extensive public engagement.

The Congressional Review Act resolution on the floor today would overturn those protections, once again putting our beloved Boundary Waters at risk of toxic pollution from a foreign-owned mine.

If that weren't enough to convince my colleagues that this resolution is a terrible idea, I will briefly touch on the

abuse of the Congressional Review Act itself that this resolution represents.

The Congressional Review Act, or CRA, has been used to overturn rules finalized by administrations of both parties since it was signed into law in 1996.

This Congress, the Trump administration and Republicans in both Chambers have been using the CRA to overturn public lands protections that have never been considered rules in the past. In an entirely unprecedented move, they are moving forward, even though the Government Accountability Office hasn't yet ruled on whether they believe this public land order constitutes a rule that would be subject to the CRA.

This administration and its allies in Congress have just unilaterally decided that they can do this, despite the fact that the Department of the Interior has never before considered a land withdrawal like this to be a rule.

Congress received notice of this withdrawal 3 years ago. If the resolution's sponsor wanted to pursue a CRA, he should have inquired then.

If this CRA succeeds, it won't just open the Boundary Waters to pollution but would set a terrible and dangerous precedent for Congress to roll back protections for any of our treasured public lands with little oversight or notice, just because Republicans have decided they would rather pillage them for profit.

Some places are just worth protecting, and this pristine, one-of-a-kind place is one of those incredible places.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on this backdoor attempt to open our public lands to foreign mining, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1520

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

Facts can be stubborn things. There are some things that we all can agree on. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area is a wonderful place, but the Boundary Waters Canoe Area has been protected, is currently protected, and will be protected even after this CRA is passed.

The Congresses that came long before us made sure this was the case, long before the Obama administration ever did a lease withdrawal in the area. They established the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. Then, they set a buffer zone around the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, and they said this other part of the Superior National Forest could be used to develop mining and also used for forestry purposes.

Any deposits that we are talking about are not inside the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. They are not inside the buffer zone to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. They are out in the forest that the Biden administration said can't be developed anymore, even after Congress had already said this was the case.

I think what we are doing today is we are exercising our Article I power where an administration abused it and tried to make rules. The Government Accountability Office said this bill or this rule is subject to the Congressional Review Act, so here we are, to right the wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources and the lead sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 140, to reverse Public Land Order 7917, which enacted the Biden administration's dangerous mining ban in northern Minnesota.

The district I am proud to represent, Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District, is blessed with an abundance of mineral wealth. On the Iron Range in northern Minnesota, we have been responsibly mining for 145 years. We mined the iron ore that won us two world wars and currently mine the taconite that is used to make 80 percent of this country's domestically produced steel.

Before Biden's mining ban, we had the opportunity to mine the copper, nickel, cobalt, and other critical minerals that are necessary for this country to compete and win in the 21st century. That is because northern Minnesota is home to the Duluth Complex, the largest untapped copper-nickel deposit in the entire world. It is home to one-third of our country's copper reserves, 95 percent of our nickel reserves, 88 percent of our cobalt reserves, and 75 percent of our other platinum group metals.

Public Land Order 7917 locked up the Duluth Complex and ended this opportunity that we had. This PLO withdrew 225,504 acres—that is nearly a quarter of a million acres—in the Superior National Forest, which is a working industrial forest where timber harvesting and mining are desired activities. This ban was a 20-year ban, where, I will note, again, the Forest Service plan states mining and timber harvesting are desired activities.

This PLO sacrificed thousands of good-paying union jobs that would support families for generations, along with billions of dollars of revenue for our schools, State and Federal governments, and, most importantly, our Nation's mineral security.

It didn't only block our access to precious critical minerals, Mr. Speaker, it also cut us off from one of the largest and most concentrated deposits of helium, a gas that is necessary in everything from medical and manufacturing equipment to state-of-the-art defense systems. Just like our critical minerals, we are blocked from responsibly accessing the helium, making the United States more dependent on foreign imports and increasing Russia's share of global helium markets.

When issuing this ban, the Biden administration even went so far as to

state that its purpose was to prevent mineral and geothermal exploration and development. When former Secretary of the Interior Deb Haaland testified before the Committee on Appropriations following the withdrawal, she stated: I didn't think there were any critical minerals there.

The Secretary of the Interior had no idea that the biggest copper-nickel find in the world was in northeastern Minnesota, where she banned mining. It was a dangerous, purely political decision that disregarded the science and the facts.

Under the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act, or FLPMA, the Department of the Interior is required to notify Congress of public land orders impacting in excess of 5,000 acres. The Biden administration failed to properly transmit Public Land Order 7917 to Congress when it was finalized in January 2023.

Public Land Order 7917 implemented a broad policy that hinders access to American resources and is wholly detrimental to our Nation's national and mineral security. It is exactly the kind of action Congress intended to review under the Congressional Review Act.

H.J. Res. 140 would overturn this mining ban under the CRA and allow important proposed mining and helium development projects to continue through the regulatory and permitting process, which they will have to complete at both the State and Federal levels before moving forward.

Mr. Speaker, this CRA will not green-light any proposed project. All it does is remove the dangerous, misguided ban that stops us from considering any project. This ban disregarded the science. It disregarded the facts. Lifting this ban will simply allow the science and the facts to prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 140, and I include in the RECORD a copy of Public Land Order No. 7917.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLES960000.L14400000.ET0000.234; MNES-059784]

PUBLIC LAND ORDER NO. 7917 FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LANDS; COOK, LAKE, AND SAINT LOUIS COUNTIES, MN

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management.

ACTION: Public Land Order.

SUMMARY: This Order withdraws approximately 225,504 acres of National Forest System lands in Cook, Lake, and Saint Louis counties, Minnesota, from disposition under the United States mineral and geothermal leasing laws, for a period of 20 years, subject to valid existing rights, to protect and preserve the fragile and vital social and natural resources, ecological integrity, and wilderness values in the Rainy River Watershed, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW), the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Mining Protection Area (MPA), and the 1854 Ceded Territory of the Lake Superior Chippewa in northeastern Minnesota from the potential adverse effects of mineral and geothermal exploration and development.

DATES: This Order takes effect on [Insert Date of Publication in the Federal Register]

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: F. David Radford, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Eastern States Office, during regular business hours, 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. Individuals in the United States who are deaf, deafblind, hard of hearing, or have a speech disability may dial 711 (TTY, TDD, or TeleBraille) to access telecommunications relay services. Individuals outside the United States should use the relay services offered within their country to make international calls to the point of contact in the United States.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Forest System Lands described in this Order are within Lake, Cook, and Saint Louis counties, Minnesota. This Order does not apply to non-Federal interests within the boundaries of the area described herein. If the non-Federal interests within the boundaries of the area described in this Order are subsequently acquired by the United States, the non-Federal interests will become subject to this withdrawal.

ORDER

By virtue of the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by Section 204(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. 1714(c), it is ordered as follows:

1. Subject to valid existing rights, the National Forest System lands, and all non-Federal lands that are subsequently acquired by the Federal government, within the Townships identified below, as depicted in the attached map, are hereby withdrawn from disposition under the United States mineral and geothermal leasing laws, including the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 18 *et seq.*, as amended), the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 *et seq.*), the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands of 1947 (30 U.S.C. 351 *et seq.*, as amended), Section 402 of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946, 16 U.S.C. 520, and 16 U.S.C. 508b, in order to protect and preserve the fragile and vital social and natural resources, ecological integrity, and wilderness values in the Rainy River Watershed, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, the Mining Protection Area, and the 1854 Ceded Territory of the Chippewa Bands in northeastern Minnesota from adverse effects of mineral and geothermal exploration and development. The purpose of the withdrawal is also to protect the health, traditional cultural values, and subsistence-based lifestyle of the Tribes that rely on resources in the region, such as wild rice, which are particularly susceptible to adverse impacts associated with mineral exploration and development. The Federal lands would remain subject to laws authorizing the disposal of mineral materials, as defined by 36 CFR 228, subpart C.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LANDS—SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST

Fourth Principal Meridian, Minnesota; Tps. 61 and 62 N., R. 5 W.; Tps. 60 to 62 N., R. 6 W.; Tps. 59 to 61 N., R. 7 W.; Tps. 59 to 61 N., R. 8 W.; Tps. 58 to 61 N., R. 9 W.; Tps. 57 to 62 N., R. 10 W.; Tps. 57 to 63 N., R. 11 W.; Tp. 59 N., R. 12 W.; Tps. 61 to 63 N., R. 12 W.; Tps. 61 to 63 N., R. 13 W.

Further information on the project is available at BLM's ePlanning site at <https://eplanning.blm.gov/eplanning-ui/project/2022642/510> or at the USFS Superior National Forest, Duluth, Minnesota.

2. The withdrawal made by this Order does not alter the applicability of laws governing the use of National Forest System lands other than the geothermal and mineral leasing laws.

3. This withdrawal will expire 20 years from the effective date of this order unless, as a result of a review conducted before the

expiration date pursuant to Section 204(f) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. 1714(f), the Secretary determines that the withdrawal shall be extended.

(Authority: 43 CFR 2310)

DEB HAALAND
Secretary of the Interior.

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

Mr. Speaker, to the claim that Secretary Haaland failed to notify Congress as required by law, I am holding the notification that went out 3 years ago to the gentleman from Minnesota, personally, from the Secretary of the Interior. Maybe there is a misunderstanding there, but we have the receipts on that one.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation, which risks polluting the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, as has been stated, our Nation's most visited wilderness.

If this resolution passes and the mineral withdrawal is overturned, toxic sulfide-ore copper mining will contaminate the water and the habitat in this priceless wilderness.

The BWCA is a huge reserve of the most pristine water in the United States, so clean you can directly drink from its lakes or streams. This water is under threat once again.

In 2017, the Obama administration applied for a mineral withdrawal of the Rainy River Watershed—the watershed is up here—which is the headwaters that flows into the Boundary Waters Wilderness and Voyageurs National Park. It started a 2-year environmental study, which included extensive public input and scientific review.

While the Rainy River Watershed was being studied, Paradise Valley in Montana and Methow Valley in Washington State were going through the same exact process. All three of those watersheds were threatened by sulfide-ore mining.

In Montana and Washington, those studies were able to be completed, and their mineral withdrawals happened in 2018, protecting their waters, but the Rainy River Watershed was left unfinished.

When President Trump took office, his administration initially promised to complete the study. Instead, President Trump honored his promise from a campaign rally and did not protect the watershed. His administration canceled the study for Minnesota's watershed without releasing any of the scientific findings.

This is what we received in the committee instead, and it is an entirely redacted study—no information, nothing scientific in it, nothing, all blank. Now, I serve on the Defense Committee. If we needed to go in a SCIF, I would have been happy to go in the SCIF and get this if it was so classified

it had to be redacted. The protection of the headwaters of the BWCA was abandoned.

The Biden administration decided to finish the study, and they followed the scientific recommendations and the public input. In 2022, a comprehensive environmental assessment was finally completed. The Forest Service recommended a mineral withdrawal to protect the Boundary Waters of Minnesota, just as it had for the waters in Montana and Washington.

□ 1530

Currently, we have 17 years left of a 20-year mineral withdrawal that is protecting and preserving this water, but today Republicans want to overturn those protections using, in my opinion, a legislative stunt.

In January 2023, almost 3 years ago, the mineral withdrawal was completed. It was noticed under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. The law was followed. The Department of the Interior notified the Congress of the withdrawal on January 26, 2023, and as my colleague, the ranking member from the committee, just pointed out, we all received those letters. I received one. Mr. STAUBER received one. The chair of the committee received one. Everybody got a letter.

Then Congress had 90 days to adopt a resolution of disapproval. Republicans have tried to disapprove of the withdrawal, but they weren't able to bring it to the floor. Congress didn't ask, and the window of disapproval closed.

Now they are trying to use the Congressional Review Act to get a do-over. The CRA wasn't created to overturn a public land order, especially one that is nearly 3 years old. CRA resolutions are for rules, which public land orders are not, and they are to be used within 60 days of the congressional notice, not 3 years later.

Let me point out another, in my opinion, falsehood about this legislation. I am the ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. There is no immediate national security interest that would be advanced by mining in this watershed.

How do we know this? We know this because Antofagasta, as has been pointed out, is a Chilean mining company who owns Twin Metals. It is lobbying to undo the current mineral withdrawal and restore their leases to extract the copper. Here is what Antofagasta does with the extracted copper, and we can't say this enough: They send it to China where it is smelted and then it is sold on the open market or it is used for its own defense weapons.

This resolution is not about national security. This is about water, the world's most critical natural resource, and it must be protected not only for today but for future generations. We have a responsibility to future generations to have water available.

Also, in my opinion, some places are just too precious to mine. I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, before I do that, I would like to enter the following documents into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: The January 2023 notification to Congress, the letter we all received; the redacted environmental assessment; and the complete environmental assessment. The links are as follows:

The combined letter notification to Congress can be found at: mccollum.house.gov/sites/evo-subsites/mccollum.house.gov/files/evo-media-document/blm-correspondence_rep-westerman_rainy-river-withdrawal-combined.pdf.

The redacted environmental assessment can be found at: mccollum.house.gov/sites/evo-subsites/mccollum.house.gov/files/evo-media-document/sept-2018_fs-ea_fully-redacted.pdf.

The complete environmental assessment can be found at: mccollum.house.gov/sites/evo-subsites/mccollum.house.gov/files/evo-media-document/02-rainy-river-withdrawal-ea.pdf.

Mr. Speaker, I also include two letters. The first letter is a letter dated January 16, 2026, from a group of hunters and anglers opposing this legislation; and the second letter is a letter dated January 20, 2026, from a group of environmental organizations opposing this legislation.

JANUARY 16, 2026.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON, LEADER JEFFRIES, AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: On behalf of the 80 undersigned organizations and their millions of members, we respectfully urge you to vote NO on House Joint Resolution 140, which would revoke critical protections for the watershed of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness—one of the nation's most visited and expansive wilderness areas.

The Boundary Waters and downstream Voyageurs National Park are currently protected by Public Land Order 7917, the 20-year mineral withdrawal banning copper mining on federal public lands in the headwaters of these beloved wild lands. This mineral withdrawal was based on the U.S. Forest Service's comprehensive Environmental Assessment, which concluded that sulfide-ore copper mining near the Boundary Waters would cause irreversible harm to the ecosystem and downstream Voyageurs National Park. The analysis completed by the Forest Service in 2022 included 675,000 public comments, over 95% of which favored protecting the Boundary Waters and Voyageurs from sulfide-ore copper mining.

In early January, this Public Land Order (7917) was challenged under the Congressional Review Act (CRA), despite Public Land Orders having never been deemed a rule subject to the law. Instead, statutory requirements for Public Land Orders have always been dictated by the Federal Land Management and Policy Act of 1976. Using the CRA to attack these protections also creates a reckless precedent that would allow Congress to retroactively target virtually any public land action as a 'rule.'

Beyond setting a dangerous precedent, removing Boundary Waters protections by passing this CRA would blatantly ignore the voices of the American people and prioritize the profits of a foreign mining company—Chilean conglomerate Antofagasta—over the interest of this nation's citizenry and beloved public lands. Once compromised, the Boundary Waters cannot be restored. This region is much more than a beautiful place. It embodies the best of our public lands: clean water, expansive habitat, world-class recreation, and a strong, sustainable local economy. Generations of Midwesterners and Americans from across the country have formed deep connections to nature through hunting, fishing, camping, canoeing, and hiking in the Boundary Waters.

Allowing copper mining to proceed by overturning the mineral withdrawal puts at risk not only the environment but also the regional economy. The outdoor recreation economy in northeastern Minnesota supports over 17,000 jobs and contributes more than \$1 billion in annual sales. Studies consistently show that protecting the Boundary Waters generates stronger and more sustainable economic benefits than short term and toxic sulfide-ore copper mining.

We urge you to vote no on H.J.R. 140. Do not sell out our wilderness and public lands against the will of Americans who want these special places preserved.

Sincerely,

Alaska Wilderness League; Allegheny-Blue Ridge Alliance (ABRA); American Bird Conservancy; American Hunters & Anglers; Big Mountain Dreams; BlueGreen Generation; Bolder Options; Californians for Western Wilderness; Cascade Forest Conservancy; Center for Biological Diversity; Change the Chamber; Clean Water Action Minnesota; Colorado Mountain Club; Colorado Wild Public Lands; Conservation Colorado; Conservation Lands Foundation; Conservation Minnesota; Conservation Northwest; Conservatives for Responsible Stewardship; Crow River Trail Guards.

CURE; Earthjustice Action; Earthworks; EcoFight; Elders Climate Action; Endangered Species Coalition; Environment America; Environment Minnesota; Environmental Action; Environmental Law & Policy Center; Environmental Law & Policy Center; Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness; Giniw Collective; Great Old Broads for Wilderness; Healthy Ocean Coalition; Inland Ocean Coalition; Izaak Walton League of America; John Muir Project; League of Conservation Voters; Living Rivers Colorado Riverkeeper; Lutefisk Technologies, Inc.

MN Center for Environmental Advocacy; mtn bio; National Parks Conservation Association; Natural Resources Defense Council; Nebraska Division IWLA; New Mexico Wild; New York State Division IWLA; Next 100 Coalition; Nimiipuu Protecting the Environment; Ocean Defense Initiative; Ohio Division IWLA; One Mississippi; Outdoor Alliance; Presbyterians for Earth Care; Quiet Use Coalition; Rivers Without Borders; Rocky Mountain Wild; San Juan Citizens Alliance; Sanitas Sales Group; Save Lake Superior Association; Save Our Sky Blue Waters.

Save the Boundary Waters; Sheep Mountain Alliance; Sierra Club; Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance; Standing Trees; Student Public Interest Research Groups; The Conservation Alliance; The Wilderness Society; Vet Voice Foundation; Voyageurs Conservancy; Washington Wild; WaterLegacy; West Virginia Division IWLA; Western Slope Conservation Center; Western Watersheds Project; Wild Montana; Wilderness Watch; Wilderness Workshop; Wisconsin Division IWLA.

JANUARY 20, 2026.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the undersigned hunting and fishing conservation organizations representing hundreds of thousands of members and supporters, we write to share our concern regarding H.J. Res. 140, a Congressional Review Act (CRA) resolution which would revoke critical protections for the watershed of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, a world-class fishing and hunting destination averaging over 150,000 visitors annually, and overturn existing precedent for the management of our nation's public lands.

The Boundary Waters and downstream Voyageurs National Park are currently protected by Public Land Order 7917, the 20-year mineral withdrawal placed in 2023, banning sulfide-ore copper mining on over 225,000 acres of federal public lands in the Rainy River Watershed of Northeast Minnesota. This mineral withdrawal was based on the U.S. Forest Service's comprehensive Environmental Assessment, which concluded that sulfide-ore copper mining near the Boundary Waters would cause irreversible harm to this sensitive ecosystem. The Forest Service's 2022 analysis included 675,000 public comments, over 95% of which favored protecting the withdrawal area from non-ferrous mining.

At nearly 1.1 million acres, the Boundary Waters spreads across the northeastern tip of Minnesota, containing over 1,100 lakes, 2,000 designated campsites, hundreds of miles of rivers and streams, and the largest contiguous areas of uncut forest remaining in the eastern United States. The three-million-acre Superior National Forest, which includes the Boundary Waters, contains 20 percent of all the fresh water in the entire National Forest System.

The Boundary Waters offers unparalleled opportunities for fishing, hunting, camping, and paddling. It's a haven for hunters and anglers who come to the region to pursue walleye, smallmouth bass, northern pike, whitetail deer, grouse, black bear, and one of the largest self-sustaining populations of native lake trout in America. The potential loss of these unique recreational opportunities is a stark reminder of the stakes involved in protecting this irreplaceable natural resource.

H.J. Res. 140 would overturn the 20-year mineral withdrawal, which complied fully with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), including extensive public review and comment. Mineral withdrawals have never been considered "rules" eligible to be overturned by the CRA, which is why Public Land Orders such as this have never been submitted to Congress.

This CRA resolution is an entirely unprecedented maneuver that ignores the foundation of our public lands management system and threatens not only the future of the Boundary Waters, but how all federal public lands are managed going forward. Attempting to revoke this mineral withdrawal through this unprecedented manner completely sidelines the environmental analysis and public process required under FLPMA to amend or rescind mineral withdrawals.

Further, the CRA is a blunt legislative tool that has historically been used only in rare instances. In the first twenty years after enactment, the CRA was used to overturn a federal rulemaking only once. Again, public land orders have historically not been submitted to Congress under the CRA—setting this precedent could open the door for overturning any public land order since 1996.

Further, this would open the door for Twin Metals MN, a subsidiary of the Chilean mining company Antofagasta, to permit the Twin Metals MN copper-nickel mine less than a mile upstream from the Boundary

Waters. More importantly, Antofagasta plans to ship its metal concentrates from the Twin Metals project to China for processing and sale, and already has contracts in place with Chinese smelters. This mine will not directly supply critical minerals domestically, as the minerals will be funneled to a strategic adversary of the United States.

Notably, the Boundary Waters withdrawal area includes only four out of eighteen known mineral deposits in the Duluth Complex, the mineral rich formation found in northern Minnesota. Neither does the withdrawal affect other mineral deposits in the region, such as the Tamarack Intrusion, where the electric vehicle manufacturer Tesla committed to purchasing 75,000 metric tonnes of nickel from Talon Metals's Tamarack Nickel Project. Furthermore, recent research from the Colorado School of Mines, By-product recovery from US metal mines could reduce import reliance for critical minerals, concluded that 90% recovery of these minerals/metals as by-products at active U.S. mines now could meet nearly all our critical mineral needs as a nation. In other words, we don't need to put the Boundary Waters at risk to meet domestic critical mineral demands.

Overturning the Boundary Waters watershed mineral withdrawal jeopardizes not only the environment but also the regional economy. The outdoor recreation economy in northeastern Minnesota supports over 17,000 jobs and contributes more than \$1 billion in annual sales. Studies consistently show that protecting the Boundary Waters yields stronger, more sustainable economic benefits than short-term, toxic sulfide-ore copper mining.

As hunters, anglers, and outdoor enthusiasts who rely on places like the Boundary Waters, we find this legislation troubling. Removing existing safeguards by passing H.J. Res. 140 would ignore the voices of the overwhelming majority of the American sporting community, prioritize the profits of a foreign mining company, and set a dangerous precedent for similar protections across the country.

We respectfully request that you uphold protections for the Boundary Waters that ensure generations of incredible hunting, fishing, and paddling opportunities. Our sporting heritage and the outdoor economy of Northeast Minnesota rely on an intact and water-rich backcountry habitat that millions of Americans have visited. Please oppose H.J. Res 140 and any similar actions taken in the Senate.

Sincerely,

American Fisheries Society; American Fly Fishing Trade Association; Angler Action Foundation; Backcountry Hunters & Anglers; Bass Anglers Sportsman Society (B.A.S.S.); Fly Fishers International; Izaak Walton League of America; Minnesota Trout Unlimited; Minnesota Wildlife Federation; National Deer Association; National Wildlife Federation; North American Falconers Association; North American Grouse Partnership; Pheasants Forever; Quail Forever; Sportsmen for the Boundary Waters; Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership; Trout Unlimited; Whitetails Unlimited; Wildlife Management Institute.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, as a former Secretary, I don't think anyone in this body has spent more time on Twin Metals reviewing the science than I have, so I think we should separate the hype from the science and the bull from fact.

First of all, why are we here and why is it important at all?

Well, this behind me are a few things we need critical minerals for: particularly our military, medical, and supply chain.

What do all these have in common? The MQ-9 Reaper, the Javelin missile system, the Virginia-class submarine, the Tomahawk, the night vision, and Amron, what do they have in common? Those minerals are found in Twin Metals in the great State of Minnesota.

Now, is it in the boundary waters? Is it in the area that is protected around it? No, it is not.

I have seen these wonderful pictures of canoeing, of waters, of streams, of lakes, and they are absolutely beautiful. The problem is that is in the boundary waters. That is not where the mine is.

Then, oh, Deb Haaland—I respect Deb Haaland. I had her in committee, Mr. Speaker. I asked her one question after a few: What minerals were in the mine area which she rescinded and put a moratorium on? I was amazed at her answer. She couldn't name one. So let's follow the science.

I agree. There is a place to mine, and there is a place not to mine. I think probably I stand on the conservation side as much as any Member, but I have actually read the documentation. I have actually read the mining plans. I have a degree in geology and looked closely at it. Do you know what. There are good projects, and there are bad projects. We don't mine like we used to.

In Montana we have Virginia City. They took a paddleboard up the river stream, took everything, turned it around. We don't mine like that anymore.

We use science now, and when you look at the science and documentation on this mine, it uses the best technology.

Oh, by the way, water, it is a closed-circuit. What does that mean? That means effluent doesn't travel outside. Its reuse is compressed. When you do mine, what you do is you put core samples in. That core sample will tell you how much overburden you have to remove. After the core samples, then you have a mining plan that tells you where the material is moved. In this case it is not an open-pit mine. It is subsurface.

I would invite my colleagues to look at the science and look at the water tables. They say 100 percent of the mines in the past were pollutants. They are not pollutants if you have a mining plan that undergoes the scrutiny that this one has.

Lastly, I will speak about the law. Notification and memo are not the same thing as a rule. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that people actually look at the mining plan and read it, just like reading the law, what the law says. It is not a trick. I am not here tricking anyone.

What I am saying is this: Once again there are good places to mine, and

there are bad places to mine, but you have got to go with the science and not the hype. When a mine is not located in the wilderness, it is not located in the buffer, it is located in a Forest Service holding, which by nature, which by law is multiple use, then mining is an appropriate use in it.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis of this, we are facing a crisis in our country because foreign adversaries hold our critical minerals, which are critical to everything we do in medical and in our military.

Secondly, follow the science and not the hype. I understand political gerrymandering and fundraising and showing pictures of wonderful canoes going across, and, oh, we are going to mine right in the middle of the wilderness area, but that is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, I ask and I urge my colleagues to support this. It is a good mine. It is a good project.

By the way, it doesn't approve anything. You still have to go through the process. So approving this act today you are not going to start the mine tomorrow. They still have to go through the process. It is about process, and that is what makes decisions good or bad is going through the process.

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

I appreciate that the gentleman from Montana is suddenly so forthcoming about all of the analysis that has gone into this particular mining project because that wasn't always the case. When he was Secretary, we asked to see that analysis, and what we got back was page after page of redaction. We got zero information.

I appreciate the newfound candor from the gentleman, but I have to question his scientific credentials when he assures us that this will be the first ever copper mine of its kind to have no toxic pollution, even though 100 percent of mines using this particular method have leached toxic pollution. Somehow, we are told this will be the first one to not do that because of all the extra scrutiny it has received.

Well, this series of black pages tells you a lot about the transparency and the scrutiny we have come to expect from the folks across the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MORRISON).

□ 1540

Ms. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 140. This resolution would permanently allow copper sulfide mining in the watershed of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness.

Copper sulfide mining is the most toxic industry in America, and it is particularly ill-suited to water-rich environments because it acidifies the water. It leaches heavy metals like arsenic, lead, and mercury into that water, which is part of the reason it has never been done in Minnesota before. Remember, Mr. Speaker, we are

the Land of 10,000 Lakes. Minnesotans do not want a toxic mine on the watershed of the Boundary Waters. In fact, 70 percent of Minnesotans want permanent protection for the Boundary Waters, our State's crown jewel.

Antofagasta, owned by a Chilean billionaire who is a crony of President Trump's, is the foreign mining company that wants to extract minerals from this watery wilderness. They have contracts set up to send copper they extract to China for processing, and from there, it will be sold on the open market. Allowing a Chilean mining company to extract copper from our public lands, destroy the Boundary Waters, and send minerals to benefit billionaire owners and China will not protect our national security. Some sacred places should be off-limits from this kind of mining, and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is clearly one of those places.

Mr. Speaker, remember too that 22,000 outdoor recreation jobs and the \$13.5 billion outdoor recreation economy in Minnesota will all be in serious jeopardy if this resolution passes. The Boundary Waters is a national treasure, the most visited wilderness area in the United States. There is no place like it on Earth, and once it is destroyed, it will be gone forever.

Like many Minnesotans, people around the country and the world, my husband and I have paddled and camped with our kids on the Boundary Waters every year since they were small. We share magical and life-changing memories from our adventures there that we all cherish. Preserving this wilderness for future generations should be our goal, not its destruction.

This resolution is an existential threat to our beloved Boundary Waters. I implore my colleagues to reject this resolution. Mr. Speaker, you have the opportunity to stand up for public lands and the Boundary Waters and prevent the inevitable water, air, noise, light, and land pollution that will destroy this unique wilderness.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, again, I can't emphasize this enough: There is not going to be any mining in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. There is not going to be any mining in the boundary area around the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. If there is ever a project approved, it would be in the land set aside by Congress in the Superior National Forest for mining and timber harvesting.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, it won't surprise you that the Representative from that area supports this resolution. My colleagues and friends across the aisle, even from my great State of Minnesota, mention mining in the Boundary Waters.

Mr. Speaker, for the umpteenth time: There will be no mining in the Boundary Waters. There will be no mining in

the buffer zones around the Boundary Waters.

Mr. Speaker, that was settled in 1978. Then-Democratic Congressman Jim Oberstar said: Okay, if you are going to make the wilderness area, do not take our livelihoods away, which was timber harvesting and mining.

These are good mining job. Mr. Speaker, according to 2023 statistics, the average miner in the State of Minnesota makes \$115,000, and the seasonal tourist employee makes \$35,000.

Unions, LIUNA, NABtu, operating engineers, the Iron Range, and building and construction trades all support this project. These are good union jobs. By the way, there is a project labor agreement. Three million work hours, Mr. Speaker, are going to go into any proposed mine. This is all union work for all my constituents in northeastern Minnesota so we can keep our schools open, so we can keep our economy going.

By the way, every school district benefits from mining in the State of Minnesota. These acquired Federal lands, through the life of any proposed mine, will bring \$1.8 billion, Mr. Speaker, \$1.8 billion in Federal royalties. Over the life of the mine, that is about \$800 million in Federal taxes.

When my colleagues across the aisle say that it is not going to do anything, I just named a great portion and a benefit.

By the way, I go up to the Boundary Waters. I canoe there, I fish there, and I recreate there. We are not mining in the Boundary Waters. That is a falsity. That is not true. That has been misrepresented for a lot of years. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Minnesota, we have a saying: It is better in our backyard. It is better in our backyard.

We are not going to use child slave labor like over in Congo. One-third of the world's cobalt comes from child slave labor, forced slave labor. We have 88 percent of the reserves right in that complex.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, this Congressional Review Act doesn't approve or disapprove any mining. It reverses the mining ban, the dangerous mining ban, that the Biden administration put forward under Secretary Haaland. By the way, Mr. ZINKE said she couldn't name one critical mineral in the mine, yet it is the biggest untapped copper-nickel find in the world.

We will not rely on China or other adversarial nations. We can do it. This can be a win-win-win. If anybody knows how to mine, it is the Minnesota miner. It is better in our backyard than China, Russia, or other adversarial nations.

Minnesota has been mining for 145 years. We know how to do it. Mr. Speaker, it is better in our backyard where our environmental and our labor standards are met or exceeded and our State permitting is met or exceeded.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, we are well aware that the Twin Metals mine is proposed just

outside of the border of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. We have been very clear on that. However, it is very much within the watershed of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. In fact, it is right on the edge. It is just a couple of miles upstream on a river that flows right into this area. Let's stop kidding ourselves. To try to say that it is outside the border on this map and, therefore, the Boundary Waters have nothing to worry about when this mine leaks—because it will, because every mine of this kind, 100 percent in the past, have leaked and have caused toxic pollution—when it happens, that pollution is going straight into America's most popular wilderness. That is a fact.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, we have heard this song and dance over and over again: No mining. That is big key because my State of Arizona has taken the brunt of this.

This CRA needs to be done away with because we have to have that ability. The predecessor of the gentleman across the way advocated no mining. In fact, he used a national monument, disgracefully, to actually bring in a tin-silver mine. Yes, that is bad, but we can have our cake and eat it too. That is technology.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the Boundary Waters that everyone is debating, we have Canada actually doing gold mining up here with more toxic chemicals.

Have they had a break?

I don't think so.

I am wondering what makes the difference here. It is not in my backyard.

I sit on the Natural Resources Committee. We kept asking the other side, the opposition: Where would you like to have it? Have you been to a mine? Yes.

Guardians actually made that comment.

I said: Which mine did you go to? They actually said: Resolution Copper. I said: Really? How did you like the information and the precautions that you have to take going down in the pit that takes 20 minutes on an elevator?

Obviously, they had to rescind it because they didn't go down there.

There have been problems from way past, but that has been 100 years ago. We have technology like this I am holding in my hand that will actually take away any oil and anything that comes out. That is where our future is, but to bind this up where you don't have a future is the wrong answer. This CRA needs to go back and get serious about mining.

□ 1550

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, now we hear about a gold mine on the Canadian side of the Boundary Waters watershed that has been producing min-

erals without incident. I am beginning to worry that my colleagues don't understand basic hydrology and how water flows and moves. To begin rebuttal, I include in the RECORD two articles on New Gold:

<https://www.northernontariobusiness.com/industry-news/mining/new-gold-fined-for-2016-discharge-772366>

<https://www.tbnewswatch.com/local-news/new-gold-inc-fined-100000-after-sediment-spill-from-dam-988742>

Mr. Speaker, the mine was fined nearly \$200,000 for discharging 19 million liters of pollution into the watershed. New Gold was fined again in 2018 after a sediment spill from a dam.

The only reason that that wasn't catastrophic for the Boundary Waters is because that mine is on the north side of the wilderness, where the water flows away from the protected areas.

That is how it works: Water in a watershed flows downhill in whatever direction that watershed takes it. I don't know why that basic principle seems so hard to understand, but apparently we have some hydrology problems across the aisle.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEUSER). The gentleman from Arkansas has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I said it: Would it surprise you that the Representative from the district supports the resolution?

I talked about jobs and the economy. I am going to reiterate: NABTU, the Operating Engineers, Teamsters, and the Iron Range Building and Construction Trades have 3 million work hours, with an average mine salary of \$115,000. This is good for my constituents.

As we go forward, I want to reiterate to my colleagues: This CRA does not approve any mine. The CRA simply removes the withdrawal. It reverses the dangerous withdrawal that the Biden administration put forth for purely political reasons. They stated in their reasoning that it was to prevent mining. The Secretary, again, when asked said: I didn't think there were critical minerals there.

In the biggest copper-nickel find in the world, she signs the PLO that removes mining in the Superior National Forest, where timber harvesting and mining are desired activities.

Democratic Congressman Jim Oberstar was so far ahead of his time. When the wilderness was enacted, he said: Okay, if you are going to enact the wilderness, don't take our livelihoods away. He was so far ahead of his time.

Today, we are fighting that fight. I am fighting for my constituents. I am

fighting for our economy. I am fighting for our community, our technology, and our national security. It is worth it. It is deeply worth it.

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

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

Again, Mr. STAUBER said it, I have said it, and others have said it. This CRA simply reverses the withdrawal that the Biden administration put out. It takes us back to Congress' original intent to allow somebody to propose to develop a project. It doesn't change any of the permitting laws. They still have to go through every permitting law.

There seems to be a lot of scare tactics on what this mine, which hasn't even been permitted or approved yet, is going to do, but we know one thing. It will have to stand up to all the rigorous permitting requirements that the U.S. has to offer. It will also have to stand up to the labor, health, and safety requirements that we have here in the U.S., unlike many of the places around the world where these critical minerals are mined.

This gives somebody a chance to develop a project to provide the things that we need here in America, to provide jobs for northern Minnesota, and to provide a stronger sense of national security, as we all saw the equipment that these critical minerals go into that Representative ZINKE showed in the poster.

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 the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told time and again by our friends across the aisle that we have nothing to worry about here because this mine, even though it is proposed right next to the Boundary Waters wilderness on a river that flows directly into the wilderness with a type of mining that has a 100 percent track record of leaching toxic pollution, that, in spite of all that, we have all these wonderful environmental standards that will protect America's most popular wilderness.

That is pretty cold comfort, Mr. Speaker, coming from lawmakers who are working overtime to gut every single one of those bedrock environmental protections.

It may not be in this particular bill, but do I have to remind my colleagues that, just a few weeks ago, we were here on the floor debating their legislation to gut the National Environmental Policy Act. In our markup the same week, Republicans led the charge to eviscerate the Endangered Species Act. Separately, in other committees, they are going after the Clean Water Act.

Every one of these safeguards that we are told will be a backstop against anything going wrong in the Boundary Waters is under unprecedented attack

from the same folks who are pushing this legislation right now.

Don't be fooled that everything will be fine because of our environmental laws and standards. Those are under an unprecedented attack.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this resolution for both the extreme danger that it poses to the Boundary Waters and the outrageous abuse of the Congressional Review Act that it represents.

As you have heard today, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is an American treasure with a strong, nonpartisan history of protection, dating back to 1909 through treaties with Canada and to 1964 with the Wilderness Act, which passed with overwhelming bipartisan support back when we had great conservation champions in both parties.

Americans from across the country who have experienced the serenity of this wilderness know exactly what is at stake. Passing this resolution would pave the way for toxic mining that would, without a doubt, cause permanent and irreparable harm, mining that wouldn't even benefit the U.S. economy.

This move is deeply unpopular in Minnesota and does not put American critical mineral security first. This material will go to China.

It would also have far-reaching consequences for the future of public lands management, making beloved, protected lands across the country vulnerable to exploitation with very little oversight.

At the end of the day, some places really are worth protecting, and this is one of those places. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.J. Res. 140, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I include in the RECORD a coalition letter from over 140 organizations in support of H.J. Res. 140. These groups include the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce, Minnesota Power, MiningMinnesota, Minnesota State Building and Construction Trades Council, Ely Public School District, Jobs for Minnesotans, Laborers' International Union of North America, and more.

JANUARY 20, 2026.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN THUNE,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON, MAJORITY LEADER THUNE, MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES, AND MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER: Our organizations represent a broad range of Americans who care deeply about advancing opportunities for individuals and families across the country and fostering a stronger nation. We represent

vital industries such as mining, manufacturing, transportation and energy; we represent hundreds of thousands of union workers; we include economic development associations; we are business leaders and much more.

We are writing to express our strong support for Congress' efforts to utilize the Congressional Review Act to disapprove of the mineral withdrawal that was enacted in northeast Minnesota by the Department of the Interior (DOI) in January of 2023 on more than 225,000 acres of federal lands.

Minerals are fundamental to everything in our modern world, from wiring in homes, to energy technologies and infrastructure, medical technologies, transportation, defense capabilities, smartphones and laptops and more. Simply put, critical minerals are vital for a safe, secure and prosperous America.

Currently, China and other adversarial nations dominate the globe in critical mineral production and processing, while U.S. dependence on foreign sources for these materials has recently reached an all-time high. The ban on mining across a significant portion of Minnesota only set us further behind as a nation.

As a result, this mineral withdrawal, an administrative action which forbids any mining or exploration activity on these lands for 20 years, was enacted in an area of the United States that contains enormous amounts of the critical minerals our nation needs to achieve its goals of energy independence, stronger domestic supply chains and American job creation. These are goals our organizations collectively work to advance.

Northeast Minnesota is home to the world's largest known undeveloped deposits of copper, nickel, cobalt, platinum group metals and more. The area contains 95 percent of domestic nickel resources, almost 90 percent of domestic cobalt and about a third of our nation's copper. Industries pursuing the responsible development of these resources, from the mining companies who have invested in the region to the suppliers to the high-skilled workers seeking employment, have been negatively impacted by the enactment of the mineral withdrawal, as have the communities in the region that want to see mining projects move forward for the betterment of the local and statewide economy.

Congress now has the opportunity to correct a detrimental action that ran contrary to our national interest, and to do so assures that these minerals will be produced domestically according to some of the world's most rigorous environmental standards.

Minnesota and the federal government have already put in place comprehensive rules and a framework to ensure the environment is protected and that any proposed industrial activity in the area meets stringent regulatory standards. The U.S. also has some of the most robust safety standards for workers. To ignore the opportunity to produce domestically for materials we use in our everyday lives means that we are relying upon nations with low-to-non-existent worker protections.

Disapproving the withdrawal in Minnesota will undo an unnecessary and damaging action. It will also correct a course in which industries seeking to generate jobs and revenue for generations to come, were simply no longer allowed to propose mining projects in the area and forbidden to go through the law and science-based environmental review process to prove they can meet the high standards in place before earning permits to construct a mine.

We collectively support the use of the Congressional Review Act to overturn the mineral withdrawal currently under consider-

ation in Congress, as it is an essential step forward in unlocking the resources that our nation needs to reduce our dangerous reliance on China and other adversarial nations.

Signed,
Laborers' International Union of North America (LIUNA); Minnesota State Building and Construction Trades Council; The National Association of Manufacturers; International Brotherhood of Teamsters; MichAuto; Indigenous Business Advisors; Better in Our Back Yard; Iron Range Building Trades; Minnesota Pipe Trades Association; LIUNA Minnesota and North Dakota; Northern Midwest Regional Council of Carpenters; Minnesota Power; Whitebird Services Inc.; Duluth Seaway Port Authority; Citizens for Responsible Energy Solutions; Minnesota Chamber of Commerce; Women's Mining Coalition; ClearPath Action; International Union of Operating Engineers Local 49; Plumbers and Pipefitters Local 589; Area Partnership for Economic Expansion (APEX).

Range Association of Municipalities and Schools (RAMS); Mining Minnesota; Jobs for Minnesotans; American Exploration and Mining Association; Society for Mining, Metallurgy & Exploration; National Mining Association; United Way of Northeastern Minnesota; American Chemistry Council; Teamsters Joint Council 32; Teamsters Local 346; Laborers Local 1097 "Iron Range"; Sprinkler Fitters Local 417; UA Plumbers Local 15; Local 6 Plumbers and Pipefitters; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Minnesota State Council; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 242; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 110; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 31; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 1426; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 160.

Up North Jobs Inc.; Minnesota Conservative Energy Forum; Green Bridge Metals; City of Babbitt, MN—Mayor Andrea Zupancich; Duluth Area Chamber of Commerce; Laurentian Chamber of Commerce; Hermantown Area Chamber of Commerce; Copper Development Association; Mt. Iron-Buhl School Board, MN—Lisa Kvas; Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce; American Coal Council; Industrial Township, St. Louis County, MN—Don Carlson; Northeast Technical Services; Grand Itasca Clinic and Hospital; Lakehead Constructors; Ely Public School District—Anne Oelke; Fight for Mining Minnesota; Road Machinery & Supplies Co.; Feeley Township, Itasca County, MN—Deb Langanki; Lake Country Power; Encampment Minerals, Inc.

Giant; B.R. Clark Consulting LLC; RMS Tritex; Global Minerals Engineering; Wyoming Mining Association; American Peat Technology; Millcreek Engineering Company; Mine Development Management LLC; Borell Consulting Services LLC; StarPoint Resources, LLC; Geobruigg North America; Clementine Exploration; Idaho Mining Association; Agnico Eagle; Pebble Limited Partnership; Archkey—Parsons Electric; Superior Rock Bit; Innate North; GEOTEMPS/GEOPROS, Inc.; Superior Marine Charters.

American Peat Technology; Wescom Inc; Furin & Shea Welding & Fabricating, Inc.; Sandvik Mining and Rock Processing; City of Hibbing, MN—Mayor Pete Hyduke; City of Kinney, MN—Mayor Patrick E. Haley; API Group Inc.; ME Global Inc; A Martin Consulting, LLC; Malton Electric Co.; Quick Supply Co.; North Star Manganese Inc & Electric Metals (USA) Limited; GR Engineering Services; Amvest Capital Securities; Twin Metals Minnesota; Kalenborn Abresist Corporation; Larkin Hoffman Attorneys; ME Elecmetal; City of Biwabik, MN—Mayor Steven Biondich; Solenis LLC.

Kirschner Transport; General Equipment & Supplies Inc.; JBW Consulting Engineers; PX4 Software; Gerdau Amersiteel US Inc; QT Environmental; Wolverine Fuels; Alaska Miners Association; Furin & Shea Welding & Fabricating, Inc.; Universal Polymer And Rubber; TJR Technical Services, Inc.; Beaver Bay, Inc.; AMIGOS; Hayday; Tidal Health; Northeast Title; Marshall Area Chamber of Commerce; Timberline Drilling; Ziegler Cat; Kalenborn Canada Inc.

Superior Fuel Company; Baldwin Supply Company; Dodge Industrial; Baldwin Supply; Avidid Global Water; Vics Crane & Heavy Haul; Hamilton Monroe & Co; Electric Power Door; Duncan Co.; Victaulic; General Equipment and Supplies, Inc.; LRL Construction; Contour Inc.; Borealis Fuels & Logistics; Cenovus Energy Superior Refinery; Hibbing Taconite Co.; Snowbird Willies Boat Canvas; Hamilton Monroe; MHE Consulting; Salem Republic Rubber; Enbridge.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the letter states: "Disapproving the withdrawal in Minnesota will undo an unnecessary and damaging action. It will also correct a course in which industries seeking to generate jobs and revenue for generations to come were simply no longer allowed to propose mining projects in the area and forbidden to go through the law and science-based environmental review process."

Mr. Speaker, I will just say that I actually have taken hydrology courses. I am a professional engineer. It has been a long time ago, but I remember something very distinct from those hydrology and hydraulic engineering courses, and that is that water flows downhill. If it doesn't, you can get a pump. That is an engineering joke. It is probably not very funny.

□ 1600

The thing about these mines in Minnesota is, they are below-grade mines. They are not pit mines. They are actually digging tunnels down into the earth to pull this ore out to take it to the top to refine it. If there are tailings, these tailings will be placed in a secure area where there is no way they can be leached back into the watershed.

Don't let the scare tactics influence the way you vote on this legislation because the inputs we need to sustain our fast-growing electricity grid are right under our feet. We should be leading the world in technological innovation and AI infrastructure.

The only reason we are mired in mineral dependence today and not enjoying or sharing the benefits of American mineral dominance is because of outdated or misguided policies like the one we are overturning today.

The resolution before us would correct these policies by reopening mineral-rich land to exploration and reducing our reliance on China for minerals.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) for his leadership on the issue. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1009, 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The Motion to Recommit H.R. 6945; Passage of H.R. 6945, if ordered; and Passage of H.J. Res. 140.

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

SUPPORTING PREGNANT AND PAR- ENTING WOMEN AND FAMILIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 6945) to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to clarify the authority of States to use funds for pregnancy centers, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 213 not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]
YEAS—209

Adams	Carbajal	Costa
Aguilar	Carson	Courtney
Amo	Carter (LA)	Craig
Ansari	Case	Crockett
Auchincloss	Casten	Crow
Ballint	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
Barragán	Castro (TX)	Davids (KS)
Beatty	Cherfilus-	Davis (IL)
Bell	McCormick	Davis (NC)
Bera	Chu	Dean (PA)
Beyer	Cisneros	DeGette
Bishop	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	DelBene
Boyle (PA)	Cleaver	Deluzio
Brown	Clyburn	DeSaulnier
Brownley	Cohen	Dexter
Budzinski	Conaway	Dingell
Bynum	Correa	Doggett

Elfeth	Leger Fernandez	Rivas
Escobar	Levin	Ross
Espallat	Liccardo	Ruiz
Evans (PA)	Lieu	Ryan
Fields	Lofgren	Salinas
Figures	Lynch	Sánchez
Fletcher	Magaziner	Scanlon
Foster	Mannion	Schakowsky
Foushee	Matsui	Schneider
Frankel, Lois	McBath	Scholten
Friedman	McBride	Schrier
Frost	McClain Delaney	Scott (VA)
Garcia (CA)	McClellan	Scott, David
Garcia (IL)	McCollum	Sewell
Garcia (TX)	McDonald Rivet	Sherman
Gillen	McGarvey	Simon
Golden (ME)	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Goldman (NY)	McIver	Sorensen
Gomez	Meeks	Soto
Gonzalez, V.	Menendez	Stansbury
Goodlander	Meng	Stanton
Gottheimer	Mfume	Stevens
Gray	Min	Strickland
Green, Al (TX)	Moore (WI)	Subramanyam
Grijalva	Morelle	Suozzi
Harder (CA)	Morrison	Sykes
Hayes	Moskowitz	Takano
Himes	Moulton	Thanedar
Horsford	Mrvan	Thompson (CA)
Houlahan	Mullin	Thompson (MS)
Hoyer	Nadler	Titus
Hoyle (OR)	Neal	Tlaib
Huffman	Neguse	Tokuda
Ivey	Norcross	Tonko
Jackson (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Torres (CA)
Jacobs	Olshewski	Trahan
Jayapal	Omar	Tran
Jeffries	Pallone	Underwood
Johnson (GA)	Panetta	Vargas
Johnson (TX)	Pappas	Vasquez
Kamllager-Dove	Pelosi	Veasey
Kaptur	Perez	Velázquez
Keating	Peters	Vindman
Kelly (IL)	Pettersen	Walkinshaw
Kennedy (NY)	Pingree	Wasserman
Khanna	Pocan	Schultz
Krishnamoorthi	Pou	Waters
Landsman	Pressley	Watson Coleman
Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Whitesides
Larson (CT)	Ramirez	Williams (GA)
Latimer	Randall	Wilson (FL)
Lee (NV)	Raskin	
Lee (PA)	Riley (NY)	

NAYS—213

Aderholt	De La Cruz	Harshbarger
Alford	DesJarlais	Hern (OK)
Allen	Diaz-Balart	Higgins (LA)
Amodei (NV)	Donalds	Hill (AR)
Arrington	Downing	Hinson
Babin	Dunn (FL)	Houchin
Bacon	Edwards	Hudson
Baird	Ellzey	Huizenga
Balderson	Emmer	Hurd (CO)
Barr	Estes	Issa
Barrett	Evans (CO)	Jack
Baumgartner	Ezell	Jackson (TX)
Bean (FL)	Fallon	James
Begich	Fedorchak	Johnson (LA)
Bentz	Feenstra	Johnson (SD)
Bergman	Fine	Jordan
Bice	Finstad	Joyce (OH)
Biggs (AZ)	Fischbach	Joyce (PA)
Biggs (SC)	Fitzgerald	Kean
Bilirakis	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (MS)
Boebert	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)
Bost	Flood	Kennedy (UT)
Brecheen	Fong	Kiggans (VA)
Bresnahan	Fox	Kiley (CA)
Buchanan	Franklin, Scott	Kim
Burchett	Fry	Knott
Burlison	Fulcher	Kustoff
Calvert	Garbarino	LaHood
Cammaack	Gill (TX)	LaLota
Carey	Gimenez	Langworthy
Carter (GA)	Goldman (TX)	Latta
Carter (TX)	Gonzales, Tony	Lawler
Ciscomani	Gooden	Lee (FL)
Cline	Gosar	Letlow
Cloud	Graves	Loudermilk
Clyde	Griffith	Lucas
Cole	Grothman	Luna
Collins	Guest	Luttrell
Comer	Guthrie	Mace
Crane	Hageman	Mackenzie
Crank	Hamadeh (AZ)	Malliotakis
Crawford	Harrigan	Maloy
Crenshaw	Harris (MD)	Mann
Davidson	Harris (NC)	Massie