

I have joined Meals on Wheels for deliveries in Oregon, and it is very meaningful. I have introduced a bipartisan House resolution recognizing the value of these Older Americans Act programs in addressing hunger, malnutrition, and isolation among seniors.

I invite my colleagues to show their support for the Older Americans Act nutrition programs by visiting their delivery and community meal programs and by signing on to our House resolution.

REMEMBERING GEORGE HENRY WHITE

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 2026 marks 125 years since Congressman George Henry White of North Carolina delivered his historic farewell, or Phoenix address.

He was the fourth African American to represent North Carolina's Second Congressional District during the late 19th century, elected in 1896 and again in 1898, after moving to Tarboro, North Carolina, and at the time the only African-American Member of Congress.

He chose not to seek a third term of office, as new laws were enacted and due to other factors. In his farewell address, he spoke with remarkable hope, declaring that African Americans would one day return to Congress, rising again "Phoenix-like."

Though it took 28 years, his words call us to remember his service, especially during Black History Month. Let us prove worthy of the faith he placed in this incredible institution by ensuring that no voice is ever again forced to leave this Chamber unheard.

CELEBRATING INCREDIBLE OLYMPIC ATHLETES

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

Mr. WIED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two incredible athletes from Wisconsin's Eighth Congressional District who will represent Team USA at the 2026 Winter Olympics. Deedra Irwin of Pulaski and Paul Schommer of Appleton will compete in the biathlon this month in Milan and hope to be the first to bring home a medal for the U.S. in biathlon.

This is not the first Olympic trip for these two outstanding athletes. Both represented Team USA in the 2022 Winter Olympics in Beijing. This is not an easy feat to achieve, and competing in biathlon requires athletic skill, precision, and mental fortitude.

This event combines cross-country skiing and rifle shooting. Athletes have to race on skis through a course and stop to shoot at targets from different positions and at varying distances.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Deedra and Paul the

best of luck in the upcoming Olympic Games. As they get ready to compete, I hope they know that everyone across northeast Wisconsin and our great country will be cheering them on.

CONGRATULATING COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO'S FOOTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the College of San Mateo's football team, the Bulldogs, on becoming back-to-back champions. Their dramatic 28-27 victory in the California Community College Athletic Association Championship was their impressive third title in 4 years.

While the San Francisco Bay Area welcomes the NFL for Super Bowl LX, I would like to also properly call attention to this remarkable program. Bulldogs Coach Tim Tulloch says it best: These students work hard to overcome adversity, and this transformational program builds young men for the rest of their lives. The team has a 3.4 GPA. Thanks to their academic achievements and talent on the gridiron, many earn scholarships to transfer to 4-year universities.

Congratulations to the College of San Mateo Bulldogs on another historic championship title. They represent the Nation's best of community college athletes in the heart of my district, and they make us all proud.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HELEN PLUTA

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate a remarkable woman, Helen Pluta, whose life was defined by compassion, generosity, and unwavering commitment to others.

Helen's contributions to Rochester are profound and lasting. Alongside her late husband, Andy, she helped build the Pluta Cancer Center that began as a vision for compassionate, patient-centered care and continues today as a place of hope and healing that has served thousands of patients and families in our community, including my own.

Helen gave of her time, her spirit, and her heart, bringing warmth and laughter wherever she went. Helen and her entire family's generosity opened doors and eased burdens. Their dedication reminds us what it means to truly care for your neighbor.

We mourn her passing, but we also give thanks for a life of service, love, and profound impact.

Rochester is a better place because Helen Pluta walked among us.

□ 1220

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOAQUIN CASTRO, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOAQUIN CASTRO, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 2, 2026.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I, Representative Joaquin Castro, have been served with subpoenas in a criminal trial issued by the United States District Court for the District of Nevada. This criminal trial is in relation to alleged threats made against me.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoenas are consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JOAQUIN CASTRO,
U.S. Representative (TX-20).

COMMUNICATION FROM CHIEF OF STAFF, THE HONORABLE JOAQUIN CASTRO, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Ben Thomas, Chief of Staff, the Honorable JOAQUIN CASTRO, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 2, 2026.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I, Ben Thomas, have been served with a subpoena in a criminal trial issued by the United States District Court for the District of Nevada. This criminal trial is in relation to alleged threats made against Representative Joaquin Castro.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

BEN THOMAS,
Chief of Staff, Rep. Joaquin Castro.

CRITICAL MINERAL DOMINANCE ACT

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1032, I call up the bill (H.R. 4090) to codify certain provisions of certain Executive Orders relating to domestic mining and hardrock mineral resources, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATRONIS). Pursuant to House Resolution 1032, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4090

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Critical Mineral Dominance Act”.

SEC. 2. POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to establish the position of the United States as the leading producer of hardrock minerals, including rare earth minerals, which will—

- (1) create jobs and prosperity at home;
- (2) strengthen supply chains for the United States and the allies of the United States;
- (3) safeguard the national Security of the United States; and
- (4) reduce the global influence of malign and adversarial states.

SEC. 3. ANALYZING ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF MINERAL NET IMPORT RELIANCE.

(a) **COST OF NET IMPORT RELIANCE.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate—

(1) for each mineral commodity included in the document published by the United States Geological Survey titled “Mineral Commodity Summaries 2025” (Version 1.2; March 2025) for which the United States is reliant on imports, the dollar value associated with such reliance; and

(2) the overall impact on the economy of the United States of imports and exports of mineral commodities listed in the document published by the United States Geological Survey titled “Mineral Commodity Summaries 2025” (Version 1.2; March 2025) for which the United States is reliant on imports.

(b) **SUBSEQUENT INCLUSION.**—Beginning in 2026, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall include in each Mineral Commodity Summaries published by the United States Geological Survey the information described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

SEC. 4. PRIORITY PROJECTS.

(a) **PROJECT IDENTIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a list of each mining project on Federal land for which a plan of operations, a permit application, or other application for approval has been submitted to the Department of the Interior.

(2) **APPROVAL OF CERTAIN PROJECTS.**—Not later than 10 days after the date on which the Secretary submits the list required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to each mining project included on the list—

(A) identify each priority mining project for which the Secretary can immediately approve or issue each plan of operations, permit application, and other application for approval submitted to the Department of the Interior; and

(B) take all necessary and appropriate actions to expedite and approve or issue each such plan of operations, permit application, and other application for approval.

(b) **IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL HARDROCK MINERAL AND BYPRODUCT PRODUCTION.**—Not later than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a

list of each mining project on Federal land, whether active, inactive, or proposed, that has the potential to—

(1) increase production of hardrock minerals or the byproducts of hardrock minerals;

(2) expand operations to include the byproducts of hardrock minerals;

(3) produce hardrock minerals from mine tailings; or

(4) produce hardrock minerals from coal ash and other coal byproducts.

(c) **REPORT ON BARRIERS TO BYPRODUCT PRODUCTION.**—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate on the barriers to byproduct production from mining projects on Federal land, including recommendations to Congress on how to reduce those barriers.

SEC. 5. MINING POTENTIAL ON FEDERAL LAND.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall identify all Federal land managed by the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, which may be leased for the exploration, development, or production of hardrock minerals or is open to location under the Act of May 10, 1872 (commonly known as the Mining Law of 1872), where—

(1) hardrock mineral exploration is being conducted;

(2) the Secretary, in consultation with the United States Geological Survey, determines hardrock minerals may be present but where thorough exploration has not been conducted; or

(3) known economically recoverable hardrock minerals are present.

(b) **PRIORITY.**—In identifying Federal land under subsection (a), the Secretary shall prioritize identifying Federal land on which the exploration, construction, or operation of a mining project—

(1) can most quickly be fully permitted and operational; and

(2) would have the greatest potential effect on the robustness of the domestic mineral supply chain.

(c) **SUBMISSION OF LIST.**—The Secretary shall annually submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a list of all Federal land identified under subsection (a).

SEC. 6. REGULATORY REVIEW.

(a) **IDENTIFYING BURDENSOME FEDERAL REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall—

(1) review all existing regulations, orders, guidance documents, policies, settlements, consent orders, public land withdrawals, and any other agency actions within the jurisdiction of the Secretary (in this section referred to collectively as “agency action”) to identify each agency action that imposes an undue burden on the exploration, identification, development, or operation of domestic mining projects;

(2) solicit industry feedback on regulatory bottlenecks and recommended strategies to expedite approval of mining projects on Federal land; and

(3) begin implementing an action plan—

(A) to implement industry feedback received pursuant to paragraph (2); and

(B) suspend, revise, or rescind, as applicable, each agency action identified as unduly burdensome under paragraph (1) as expeditiously as possible.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall submit to Congress a report including—

(1) recommendations for changes to law in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act

necessary to accomplish the policy described in section 2; and

(2) a nationwide review of State and local statutes, regulations, and ordinances the Secretary determines impede development of domestic mining and mineral exploration projects.

SEC. 7. MAP BABY MAP.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall prioritize efforts to accelerate the ongoing, detailed geologic mapping of the United States, with a focus on mapping previously unknown deposits of hardrock minerals.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report regarding the progress and estimated completion date of the comprehensive national modern surface and subsurface mapping and data integration effort of the Department of the Interior described in section 40201 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (43 U.S.C. 311).

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means—

(A) National Forest System land;

(B) public lands; and

(C) any land that may be leased for the exploration, development, or production of hardrock minerals.

(2) **HARDROCK MINERAL.**—The term “hardrock mineral”—

(A) includes deposits of—

(i) minerals found in sedimentary or other rocks;

(ii) base metals;

(iii) precious metals;

(iv) industrial minerals; and

(v) precious and semi-precious gemstones; and

(B) does not include deposits of—

(i) coal;

(ii) oil;

(iii) oil shale;

(iv) gas;

(v) sodium;

(vi) potassium;

(vii) sulfur; or

(viii) mineral materials subject to disposition under the Act of July 31, 1947, commonly known as the Materials Act of 1947 (30 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).

(3) **MINING PROJECT.**—The term “mining project” means a project that involves the exploration for or development, extraction, or processing of a hardrock mineral.

(4) **PUBLIC LANDS.**—The term “public lands” has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(5) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

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

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the 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.R. 4090.

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 strong support of H.R. 4090, the Critical Mineral Dominance Act.

This legislation addresses one of the most urgent challenges facing our Nation today: our growing and unnecessary dependence on other nations for the critical minerals that drive our economy and sustain our national defense.

The United States has never been more reliant on hard rock minerals than it is today. Copper is the backbone of our electricity grid. Nickel, cobalt, and lithium go into the batteries that power our communications devices and back up critical infrastructure such as hospitals and data centers. Rare earth elements make possible the cutting-edge technologies that enable our economy to innovate and our military to keep us safe.

The global mineral race is not optional. Over the next 15 years, demand for copper and rare earth elements is expected to rise by 50 percent; cobalt, 150 percent; and lithium, up to 500 percent. Shortages of all the above could be upon us within a decade.

Yet these minerals are right here under our feet. We have the safest, most sophisticated, efficient, and environmentally friendly mining technology and workforce anywhere in the world. The United States should be the world's mineral supply chain. The only reason we are not is because of our outdated, shortsighted Federal policy that hinders domestic mining.

President Trump recognized the dangerous gap between America's mineral needs and mineral production. Upon returning to office a year ago, he signed three executive orders to help close that gap.

The first directed Federal agencies to correct or rescind regulations that unduly burden domestic mining and instructed the Secretary of the Interior to accelerate geologic mapping.

A second executive order required Federal agencies to prioritize mineral development on viable Federal lands.

The third directed Federal agencies to assess the economic costs and national security risks of our dependence on foreign minerals.

H.R. 4090, sponsored by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), would codify the natural resources-related provisions of these EOs and require additional reporting from the Department of the Interior.

The reports will, for the first time, reveal the true costs that mineral dependence imposes on the U.S. economy. They will clarify the scope and location of America's vast mineral deposits.

During markup, the Natural Resources Committee worked in a bipartisan manner to strengthen the bill, adopting two minority amendments that required DOI to report to Congress

on barriers to byproduct mineral production on Federal lands and to examine projects with the potential to produce hard rock minerals from coal ash and coal byproducts.

Mr. Speaker, the alternative to American mineral dominance is buying foreign minerals from supply chains controlled by the Chinese Communist Party. That is where we are now: mineral dependence. Mineral dependence benefits no one except the CCP. Mineral dependence does not help the environment. It does not drive economic growth. It doesn't make us or our allies safer.

American mineral dominance will create thousands of new mining and mineral-related jobs. It will establish the United States as the hub of the world's mineral market. It will secure critical mineral access for the U.S. military and for our allies.

Mr. Speaker, we need these minerals to build a better future. Our choice is whether to lead the world in meeting that need as only we can or to cede that responsibility to corrupt regimes, systems, and foreign enemies we know will abuse it. The American people have made their choice. It is time for us to honor it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. STAUBER for his work on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4090, 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 in strong opposition to H.R. 4090, a bill that hands the mining industry, amazingly, the power to gut its own regulations while doing nothing to secure American mineral supply chains or help make life more affordable for the American people.

It is more of the same from House Republicans and this administration, more favors for their billionaire buddies, and more ways to enrich themselves all at the expense of the American people, who are struggling.

If we asked everyday Americans right now to list 100 things that you care about that you want Congress to be working on to make your life better, I promise you that giving more sweetheart deals to multinational mining corporations would not be anywhere on that list. I can think of a thousand better ways to spend our time than debating this bill on the House floor. We could be reining in the out-of-control agency ICE, which is terrorizing communities around the country and murdering people in the streets.

We should be addressing skyrocketing healthcare costs, which our Republican colleagues seem to have forgotten entirely about. We could be talking about how to lower energy prices, including the skyrocketing utility bills caused by Donald Trump's crazy war on clean energy, but no. We are back here, once again, talking about deregulation designed for and by the mining industry.

H.R. 4090 would codify parts of President Trump's executive orders on min-

ing. I will say that we can agree on many of the bill's stated goals: creating good jobs, strengthening our supply chains, reducing the global influence of our adversaries, and safeguarding national security.

The stated goals are one thing. Then there is what actually is in the bill, what the bill does, and that is quite another thing.

We should not confuse the mining industry's best interests with the public interest. This bill would direct the Interior Secretary to take all necessary steps to expedite and approve certain priority projects with no restrictions on who operates the projects, what they mine, or where.

There is nothing to stop this administration right now from prioritizing mines owned and controlled by our foreign adversaries. That loophole, that glaring problem, that national security threat, is not corrected at all in this bill. There is nothing to require a focus on minerals actually needed for clean energy and national defense. There is nothing to prevent the administration from approving mines on sensitive public lands or even in our national parks. These are all simple safeguards that, for some reason, are not in this legislation. That is ripe for abuse and misuse of our public resources when you advance a bill like this.

In prioritizing lands for mining, the bill makes no mention of minimizing conflict with neighboring communities, like Tribes, or protecting other important natural resources and uses of public lands like logging, grazing, and recreation. The bill also looks to the mining industry itself for direction on which regulations to roll back, and again, no public input and no Tribal consultation.

My colleagues across the aisle often tout the United States' environmental and labor protections as the best in the world, but as protections are eroded in favor of polluters over people, who is to say that basic protections for drinking water and worker safety aren't the next targets?

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, our environmental laws have reined in the industry's worst pollution and abuses, but regulations being successful doesn't mean that we no longer need them. Nothing in this bill guarantees that minerals mined here will stay here or benefit Americans.

Time and again, we have suggested guardrails that could be put in place, into bills like this, to make sure that foreign adversaries don't end up taking advantage of all of these corporate giveaways that our Republican friends keep putting on the table. It ensures that they don't come here and, practically for free, extract our publicly owned natural resources and take them to other parts of the world and use them in ways that are not in our interests. We keep offering these guardrails. Our Republican colleagues keep saying no.

Under the General Mining Act of 1872, anyone, including subsidiaries of foreign adversaries, can claim our publicly owned materials, mine them for free, ship them abroad into the global market, and do nothing to help the interests of the United States of America.

Time and again, we have raised this glaring vulnerability with legitimate solutions on the table to address it, and our Republican friends refuse to work with us.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 4090, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. 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 in strong support of my bipartisan bill, H.R. 4090, the Critical Mineral Dominance Act.

This bill will help strengthen our Nation's critical mineral security and enable our critical mineral dominance by codifying several of the policies that President Trump put forth in his hardrock mining executive orders earlier this year.

This bill does three things, Mr. Speaker. First, it mandates a new study on the cost of U.S. mineral import reliance, including from adversarial nations like China. This will help give the United States a much clearer picture into our critical mineral security, including what kind of vulnerabilities we face by failing to mine here and continuing to depend on other nations.

Next, it requires the administration to expedite priority mining projects on Federal lands and identify Federal lands that have the potential for new mineral production, as well as increase geological mapping to give us a much clearer picture of our incredible mineral wealth right here in the United States.

Lastly, this bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to revise or rescind any agency actions that are a barrier to domestic mining, as well as make recommendations to Congress as to how current law can be changed to streamline mineral development. It will also conduct a broader review of State and local laws that are also holding us back from our true mineral potential.

I think each and every one of my colleagues in this body, from both sides of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, understands and realizes the important role that critical minerals play in our 21st century economy. This will only increase as time goes on.

We have tremendous mineral wealth in our country, not only in my district in northern Minnesota, which is home to the largest untapped copper-nickel deposit in the world, but in States all across this great Nation.

There is no reason for the United States to be dependent on other coun-

tries, including foreign adversarial nations, for our critical mineral future. Nobody does it better than the United States.

I implore my colleagues: Where is the world currently mining for critical minerals that have better labor standards or environmental standards than us?

Mr. Speaker, nothing in this bill green-lights any mining project without necessary scrutiny. Nothing in this bill allows for a project to bypass NEPA, the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, or the Endangered Species Act, nothing.

This bill is a strong signal from Congress to the executive branch that we need to get serious about our critical mineral strategy and take necessary steps to win once again.

Before I yield back, I would note a number of the outside groups that are supporting this legislation. They include labor unions like the North America's Building Trades Unions and the Laborers' International Union of North America, LIUNA.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a statement in support from Albert Gore, executive director of Zero Emission Transportation Association, representing the views of the domestic electric vehicle industry; a letter of support from a group of 17 organizations representing different areas of the domestic mining sector; a letter of support from the Essential Minerals Association; and a November 2025 op-ed published by RealClearEnergy, expressing support for this legislation.

JANUARY 16, 2025.

Zero Emission Transportation Association (ZETA) is an industry coalition representing approximately 50 companies spanning the electric vehicle (EV) supply chain end-to-end, including critical mineral and material producers, cell and battery manufacturers, vehicle manufacturers, charging companies and electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) providers, utility companies, and battery recyclers.

The United States is blessed to have vast mineral resources, but a holistic government approach is needed to fully unlock them. Critical minerals and materials are necessary for EVs, battery manufacturing, defense, and nearly every other advanced technology industry. Enabling the United States to truly compete in these sectors is necessary to maintain our edge in the global marketplace and create jobs here at home.

H.R. 4090 (Stauber), the Critical Mineral Dominance Act, helps us achieve this goal by supporting the secure and reliable sourcing of minerals for domestic manufacturing. Among other provisions, the bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to determine the economic impact of each mineral commodity for which the U.S. is import reliant, continue mapping federal lands suitable for mineral development, analyze regulations that may handicap the development of domestic projects, and provide Congressional committees of jurisdiction recommended policy changes to reduce regulatory burdens for project development.

We were glad to see this legislation move through the Committee on Natural Resources, and encourage Members of Congress

to support this bill when it comes to the House Floor for consideration.

Sincerely,

ALBERT GORE,
Executive Director.

FEBRUARY 3, 2026.

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

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

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: As the House of Representatives continues efforts to strengthen America's mineral supply chains and restore U.S. competitiveness, we write in strong support of H.R. 4090, the Critical Mineral Dominance Act.

For decades, domestic mineral producers have operated in a regulatory environment marked by uncertainty, as permitting priorities and interpretations have changed between administrations. This lack of consistency disincentivizes long-term capital investment and discourages development opportunities in the U.S.

H.R. 4090 will provide greater stability and predictability for mine developers and promote job creation by codifying key provisions of President Trump's executive orders related to domestic hardrock mining. This legislation represents an important step toward a more efficient, predictable and durable federal permitting framework. By improving permitting efficiency, expanding responsible access to our nation's mineral endowment on federal lands and reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens, H.R. 4090 will help reposition the U.S. to compete in the minerals age.

Developing domestic mining and onshoring mineral supply chains are foundational to advancing U.S. economic and national security priorities. By reducing our reliance on mineral imports, especially those from geopolitical adversaries, this bill improves supply chain resilience, protects military readiness and ensures the U.S. can meet current and future needs while maintaining world-leading environmental, labor and safety standards.

H.R. 4090 enhances U.S. economic competitiveness and takes direct aim at our strategic vulnerabilities. This bill is a critically important step forward to ensure America can responsibly and efficiently develop its vast domestic mineral resources. We urge your support for H.R. 4090.

Sincerely,

Alabama Mining Association, Alaska Miners Association, American Exploration & Mining Association, Arizona Mining Association, Colorado Mining Association, Georgia Mining Association, Idaho Mining Association, MiningMinnesota, Montana Mining Association, National Mining Association, Nevada Mining Association, New Mexico Mining Association, Tennessee Mining Association, Texas Mining and Reclamation Association, Utah Mining Association, Women's Mining Coalition, Wyoming Mining Association.

JANUARY 16, 2025.

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

Hon. JARED HUFFMAN,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WESTERMAN AND RANKING MEMBER HUFFMAN: The Essential Minerals Association (EMA) writes to express our strong support for H.R. 4090, the Critical Mineral Dominance Act.

EMA is the representative voice of approximately 100 companies that extract,

process, and support a vital and beneficial group of metal/nonmetal minerals that are the essential ingredients for a strong national defense and economy as well as many of the products used in everyday life. Our members' minerals are essential building blocks for the agriculture, defense, energy, infrastructure, manufacturing, and technology sectors, to name just a few.

Securing and strengthening our domestic mineral supply chains is vital to securing our national defense and economy, both now and into the future. Recent years have shown us the danger of relying on hostile foreign nations such as China for essential mineral resources which can be cut off at any time due to geopolitical or economic tensions. Maximizing domestic production and processing of mineral resources is the optimal strategy for addressing this dynamic and will also create many well-paying jobs for American workers.

To that end, Congress must act decisively to ensure that domestic mineral mining in the U.S. can thrive. To that end, Congress must act decisively to properly understand the impacts of mineral import reliance, find and map federal lands that are well-suited to domestic mineral production, ensure identification and prompt approval of high priority mineral projects, and remove unnecessary barriers to opening a mine in the United States. The Critical Mineral Dominance Act represents a step in the right direction and EMA urges Congress to pass it as soon as possible.

H.R. 4090 will direct the Department of the Interior (DOI) to revise or rescind agency actions that hinder mining projects, recommend reforms of current mining laws to Congress, and conduct a nationwide review of state and local laws impeding mineral exploration and development. The bill will also require DOI to identify and approve mining projects which can be expeditiously permitted and made operational as well as continue prioritization of accurate national mapping of hardrock mineral resources.

The provisions of H.R. 4090 represent necessary actions to securing domestic mineral supply chains. Congress and the administration need to identify lands with strong mineral potential and rapidly approve projects which can reduce our reliance on imported mineral resources, and H.R. 4090 would further those objectives. Further, the bill's requirement to remove regulatory regimes which present unnecessary barriers or delays to opening a mine is key to ensuring that projects can be approved expeditiously and become operational as quickly as possible while still maintaining appropriate protections for the environment and worker health and safety. The sooner such projects can come online, the sooner the U.S. can reduce its dependence on foreign hostile nations like China for important mineral resources. The Critical Mineral Dominance Act represents a series of steps in the right direction toward securing our domestic mineral supply chains and securing American mineral independence. EMA supports this bill and encourages Congress to pass it as soon as possible.

Securing and fortifying our domestic mineral supply chains must remain a top priority for Congress and the administration in order to protect U.S. national and economic security. H.R. 4090 will further this goal and enable the U.S. to reduce our dependence on hostile foreign nations like China for essential mineral resources while creating jobs across the country for American workers. EMA urges Congress to pass the Critical Mineral Dominance Act and send it to President Trump for signature as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

CHRIS GREISSING,

President, Essential Minerals Association.

[Nov. 11, 2025]

PRESIDENT TRUMP NEEDS BETTER RARE EARTHS NEGOTIATING TOOLS

(By Debra Struhsacker, Sarah Montalbano)

President Trump secured a one-year reprieve from Beijing's threat to shut down global rare-earth exports, which would have interrupted manufacturing of semiconductor chips and magnets essential in military and technology applications. The President quipped that "there's no roadblock at all" and rare earths "will hopefully disappear from our vocabulary for a little while."

But the President's brinkmanship has not diminished the vulnerability of the world's rare earths supply chains. To strengthen its position in future negotiations with Beijing, Washington can't eliminate rare earths and critical minerals from its vocabulary. The U.S. must win the rare earths and critical minerals race with China to support our economy and guarantee our national security.

With the Pentagon manufacturing weapons systems using over 80,000 parts subject to Chinese critical minerals export controls, the U.S. can no longer treat critical minerals as commodities that can be managed like consumer products. We cannot continue to rely on other countries—including our allies—for these materials. This will require dramatically increasing domestic mining and mineral processing and stockpiling.

The U.S. must start producing critical minerals from domestic mines and refineries as soon as possible, which will require long-term policies to encourage domestic minerals investments. Mining companies require policy certainty to justify investing hundreds of millions of dollars to explore for minerals and billions more to develop new mines and mineral processing facilities. Without this certainty, they will continue to explore and build in countries that have stable and supportive mining policies.

It's going to take time to rebuild the U.S. mining industry, which has atrophied due to decades of hostile federal policies. Deals like the recent U.S.-Australia critical minerals and rare earths framework make sense to secure supplies in the near term. But relying on minerals from Australia and other allies could be risky if an adversary strategically interferes with international shipping.

The U.S. suffers from a lack of investment in mining and mineral processing research and development. The U.S. Bureau of Mines used to conduct research and provide minerals expertise until Congress' short-sighted decision in 1996 to stop funding this Bureau. Thirty years later, the U.S. is woefully behind China in our understanding of the best ways to process minerals, including rare earths. Today, China has superior technology to separate the individual rare earth elements needed to manufacture products like magnets from rare earth feedstocks.

China is also light years ahead of the U.S. in training mining engineers, metallurgists, and other mining professionals. China's numerous mining schools graduate thousands of students annually to support its strategy to secure global minerals dominance. U.S. mining schools have dwindled to 14 institutions—down from 25 in 1982—and graduate fewer than 200 mining engineers each year.

To solve the current minerals emergency, Congress must amend the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to codify the Supreme Court's ruling in *Seven County Coalition v. Eagle County, CO*, a unanimous judgement establishing that NEPA "does not mandate particular results, but simply prescribes the necessary process for an agency's environmental review of a project." NEPA has added years of permitting and litigation that delay most infrastructure projects, not just new mines.

A bipartisan bill, H.R. 4776, that Chairman Bruce Westerman (R., AR) and Rep. Jared Golden (D., ME) recently introduced, would codify key elements of the Supreme Court's *Seven County Coalition* ruling and enact judicial reforms to reduce NEPA litigation, which, according to the Supreme Court, has "transformed NEPA from a modest procedural requirement into a blunt and haphazard tool employed by project opponents."

Congress should also enact Rep. Pete Stauber's (R., MN), H.R. 4090, to codify some of the minerals directives in President Trump's executive orders, and the bipartisan and bicameral Mining Regulatory Clarity Act (S-544 and H.R. 1366) to reduce the uncertainties about whether federal lands can be used for mining support facilities stemming from litigation seeking to curtail mining on western federal lands.

Although President Trump staved off the rare earths emergency for a year, he needs better future negotiating tools. The rare earths truce with China buys the U.S. some time to remove regulatory barriers and start ramping up domestic mining and mineral processing. Reducing our reliance on China for rare earths and other critical minerals is the best way to increase the President's negotiating leverage.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan piece of legislation, H.R. 4090.

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

Mr. Speaker, there we have it, and I am sure not for the last time in this conversation. The risk of terrible environmental harm by this huge corporate giveaway is nothing to worry about because we have NEPA. We have the Clean Water Act. We have the Environmental Protection Agency. We have all of these environmental safeguards, every one of which is under withering attack from the same colleagues across the aisle who are moving bills like this and from this administration.

This is across the board. There is legislation to gut all of these bedrock environmental laws. There are actions by this administration and litigation moving forward from the industry.

Mr. Speaker, it is cold comfort indeed. I am, frankly, shocked that anyone across the aisle could even say these things with a straight face and point to our bedrock environmental laws as an assurance that nothing will go wrong for the environment, our public lands, our natural resources, Tribes, and others who are worried about this corporate giveaway.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from upstate New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. Critical minerals are essential building blocks for a clean energy economy and many other technologies central to our everyday lives. I do not dispute that, but how we source and process these materials matters just as much as how quickly we deploy them.

We must pursue critical minerals in a way that is responsible and in a way that is sustainable. Demand for these

minerals is growing rapidly. Yet, global supply chains remain highly concentrated and often linked to serious human rights abuses and environmental harms.

This should push us toward thoughtful policies that strengthen domestic supply chains and not reckless ones that endanger our environment and communities like H.R. 4090.

One underutilized source of critical minerals is recycling. By recovering and reusing already mined resources, we are tapping into a new domestic supply. While recycling alone will not meet all of our projected demand, it can significantly reduce pressure on primary extraction if we invest now. This bill completely ignores the role of recycling to strengthen our supply chains.

Another way to strengthen these supply chains is through enhanced transparency. Last Congress, I introduced the bipartisan Critical Materials TRACE Act to improve supply chain visibility. Transparency can help drive responsible sourcing and innovation and reduce environmental, labor, and human rights abuses, ultimately making our supply chains more secure.

These are areas where bipartisan agreement is indeed possible, but H.R. 4090 is not that answer. This bill would make it easier to sell off public lands to polluting mining companies and weaken key protections that safeguard our drinking water and protect communities.

We can meet our critical mineral needs without sacrificing public lands, environmental laws, or, yes, public health. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a lot of agreement on this issue. There is the fact that we need more critical minerals in the United States, and the demand for that is not going away. We need it for economic security. We need it for national security. The rub seems to be where these critical minerals and elements are going to come from. What we are promoting is that they come from America.

□ 1240

The other argument seems to be that we need them but not in our backyard. That has been the position of our country for far too long.

Mr. Speaker, instead of not in our backyard, it is much better in our backyard because we have better labor standards, better environmental standards, and better health and safety standards.

God has blessed our country with these deposits of minerals really from sea to shining sea. We just need to be getting them out of the ground here, creating American jobs while doing that, creating more American jobs and more wealth while we refine those ores into metals and then manufacturing from that.

That is what our vision is. We want to see Americans use American resources to promote American security and American economic growth. I wish we could all agree on that, but that is what this bill will help to promote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, take a good look around you. Everything you see wherever you look, everything that makes your life comfortable, everything that makes your life possible—everything—is either mined, or it is grown. There are no exceptions. Everything you enjoy and depend upon is either mined or grown from the ground. The generation that built our country understood this.

Mr. Speaker, over the chair from which you preside is emblazoned the prayer from Daniel Webster, which reads: “Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.”

Yet, for 50 years, the environmental left has torn down these great achievements and waged war against everything that is mined or grown. They have piled tax upon tax, restriction upon restriction, and regulation upon regulation that have made mining and agriculture increasingly expensive and needlessly scarce.

That is the heart of the affordability crisis. The left has turned abundance into scarcity. Finally, in our day, a new generation is discovering that this self-destructive lunacy is not going to end well.

That brings us to this bill to reduce the regulatory burdens that the left has imposed upon our Nation’s ability to prosper and advance. It codifies President Trump’s executive orders that identify the resources that we can develop and calls forth the powers of prosperity that those resources promise.

It restores freedom to meet the challenge that Daniel Webster set before us by realigning our institutions on behalf of the American people so that we too can perform something worthy to be remembered, to make America great again.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. GRIJALVA).

Mrs. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member HUFFMAN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose H.R. 4090. This bill hands the mining industry the power to gut its own regulations. It directs the Secretary of the Interior to expedite and approve any mine that the administration deems a priority, and it tells the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service to identify any public lands that should be a priority for mining, without any public input or Tribal consultation.

In the eyes of this administration mineral dominance means mining above all else—above protection of our public lands, above the people who will live with toxic pollution, and above the local communities’ interests.

My home State of Arizona is all too familiar with the harms left behind from an unregulated mining industry. Over a century of mining left polluted waters, poisoned land, and generations of families feeling the health impacts, including my own. Tribal nations had their lands stolen and sacred sites desecrated by the mining industry.

Some may argue that the mining industry is different now and that our regulations are in need of change. I agree that we are in need of modernization, but H.R. 4090 is a move in the wrong direction.

We need only look at the notorious track records of mining companies abroad to see what disaster will look like in the United States.

BHP, one of the world’s largest foreign mining companies and one of the co-owners of the proposed Resolution Copper mine in Arizona, was responsible for the disastrous collapse of a Brazilian tailings dam that killed 19 people and spilled tons of toxic waste into a major river in 2015. This disaster has been called Brazil’s worst environmental disaster.

Rio Tinto, the other co-owner of Resolution Copper, blew up a 46,000-year-old sacred aboriginal site in Australia in 2020.

Now, just upstream from Phoenix, Arizona, BHP and Rio Tinto are pushing to destroy Oak Flat, a sacred site for multiple Apache Tribes that is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, to build the Resolution Copper mine. This is a mine that would create one of the largest toxic tailings dams and ponds in the world.

Does that sound like an industry ready to responsibly regulate itself?

Through the Save Oak Flat from Foreign Mining Act, I seek to reverse the giveaway of publicly owned land and the natural resources beneath it to this foreign mining conglomerate. It is clear that we have to reaffirm that decisions about mining on public lands must respect Tribal nations, local communities, and public health. Tribes and local communities most impacted by mining deserve more say, not less, in the future of their lands and waters.

This bill is about making it easier for foreign entities to extract and take away America’s resources and leave the pollution to forever scar the land. We must fight back. We must listen, and we must be the advocates and fighters that we were sent here to be. We must protect our public lands for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong opposition to H.R. 4090.

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

Mr. Speaker, if you read the bill, there is absolutely nothing in the bill

about allowing foreign mining companies to come into the U.S. and exploit our Federal lands, to bypass all Federal regulations, and create scenarios like may have happened in some other country. Those are just scare tactics to continue this idea of not in my backyard.

We all want these things. We all recognize that we need these things. We have to have these critical minerals. We have to have these rare earth elements, but the mindset is that we will just get them from somewhere else. We will ship off our environmental issues to some other country and let them deal with it instead of dealing with them here in America, where we, again, have the most stringent rules, have the highest expectations, protect human rights, protect the environment, and promote occupational health and safety.

Show me some place in the world that does that better than we do. It is certainly not Communist China, where all of these rare earths and critical minerals are coming from right now.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, my good friends on the other side of the aisle will promote, again, anywhere but America and any worker but the American worker when it comes to mining. Anywhere but America, and any worker but the American worker.

They are exporting their environmental guilt. They are okay with getting these critical minerals mined by child slave labor.

Mr. Speaker, 30 percent of the cobalt comes from child slave labor. Both the Trump and the Biden administration agree with that.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this legislation that removes NEPA. Nothing in this legislation removes the clean water. Nothing in this legislation removes the clean air in the decision-making, and nothing in this legislation removes any of the endangered species protections.

Mr. Speaker, we took a bipartisan trip last year up to Alaska. Greens Creek Mine is in a national monument. There is exceptional mining of the nickel in the national monument. We can do it here, Mr. Speaker, better than anywhere. We have the mineral wealth. We have the workers. We can do both. We can have a clean environment and clean water and domestically mine.

My friends across the aisle consistently say: Yes, we need critical minerals. Yes, we need it for strategic national security. Yes, we need it for medical instrument technology. Yes, we need it for our everyday lives. They refuse to allow it to happen. They put up roadblock after roadblock. They say that they want it, but they never support it, or very rarely support it.

That is the mindset and the philosophy, Mr. Speaker, that has brought American critical mineral mining to

its knees and allowed China to take over.

China's global mineral dominance is not a threat. It is a reality. This is what is happening right now because of that philosophy of not in my backyard, not in our backyard.

There is a philosophy that it is better in our backyard. We do it better than anybody. Look at the unions that are supporting this piece of legislation. It came out of committee in a bipartisan fashion. This is what the American people want, bipartisan work. Here it is.

I look forward to this bipartisan piece of legislation that strengthens our national security moving forward this afternoon.

□ 1250

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

Mr. Speaker, there they go again. For the second time, we hear references to NEPA, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the bedrock environmental laws, that they will protect us from all of these terrible scenarios that they say Democrats are raising as scare tactics.

I just can't think of anything less persuasive than hearing that kind of cold comfort from the very folks who are attacking every one of those bedrock environmental laws with other legislation and through administrative actions by this President and in the courts. It is remarkably hypocritical and certainly not very persuasive.

Now, when we think about this mining free-for-all that our Republican friends are trying to create with this legislation, we are not having this conversation in a vacuum. We have to think about who benefits.

Just 2 weeks ago, the Trump administration announced that it would invest over a billion dollars and take an equity stake in USA Rare Earth, a mining and manufacturing company. So much for concerns about socialism. Reporting uncovered that USA Rare Earth hired Cantor Fitzgerald to help with fundraising, a firm chaired by Brandon Lutnick. If that sounds familiar, it is because he is the son of Secretary of Commerce Howard Lutnick.

In October, the Trump administration announced equity investments in the mining company Trilogy Metals, while simultaneously directing agencies to fast-track permitting for Ambler Road, the controversial project needed to access Trilogy Metals' proposed mine site. Trilogy Metals' third largest shareholder is John Alfred Paulson, a Trump mega donor and an economic adviser. His Trilogy shares increased by \$70 million in value after that announcement.

It is a similar story for Trump adviser Stephen Miller, who personally sold shares worth between \$50,000 and \$100,000 in the mining company MP Materials following a July announcement of one of these lucrative equity deals.

The administration is making a pattern out of picking winners and losers

in the mining industry, and a suspicious number of those winners have close ties to Trump officials or Trump family members. This is an incredible grift that our friends across the aisle are playing into.

These deals tie taxpayer dollars to corporate balance sheets and incentivize administration officials to prioritize individual corporate interests over the broader public good.

Earlier this week, myself, Ranking Member ROBERT GARCIA of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and Ranking Member MARTIN HEINRICH of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources sent a joint letter to the administration, demanding answers on Trump's taxpayer-funded mining spending spree.

To date, there has been no public disclosure of procedures or safeguards in place to ensure these ownership stakes do not influence permitting decisions, regulation, enforcement, contracting decisions, or other agency decisions relating to these mining and mineral projects. Before we give this administration even more power to enrich themselves and their friends at the expense of everyday Americans, let's get some answers to these basic questions.

Now, with that, Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about China, the boogeyman of China, our adversary on the global stage. Yet, we have a bill before us that, my guess is, the People's Republic of China would absolutely love. Here to tell us more about that is the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing from the other side that we need to mine in America, and we just heard the ranking member talk about how if we are going to mine in America, if we are going to mine anywhere, we should make sure that it is done free of corruption. He didn't use that word, but that is the word that we are worried about.

What I am going to talk about today is that we should make sure where those minerals are going if we are mining in America. That is the question I keep asking: Where are they going? The reality is, because they keep refusing amendments that I bring up, those minerals are going overseas, and those minerals are going to China.

Under our outdated mining laws, a foreign corporation can set up a shell company to stake a claim. Guess what. They get U.S. minerals for free, zero royalty.

The Critical Mineral Dominance Act—these titles they have are always the opposite of what they do—this act that they are trying to sell the American people today, is yet another hand-out to multinational mining companies that will do nothing to stop our adversaries from shipping our publicly owned critical minerals overseas.

Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this

bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an amendment to prevent Federal agencies from fast-tracking and approving mining projects if they are at least 10 percent owned or controlled by a foreign adversary like China.

In a hearing last year, I described legislation similar to what I am proposing to Trump's Secretary of the Interior Burgum. His response: "I don't think we should be allowing foreign adversaries to mine critical minerals in our country."

Sadly, Republicans must disagree with Secretary Burgum because they keep opposing every one of my amendments to protect American minerals from foreign adversaries.

With every rejection, they are telling the American people that they care more about big international mining corporations than they care about you, about your clean water, about your working conditions.

This bill would allow our adversaries to fast-track permitting, and the people who pay for that are United States citizens who those regulations are meant to protect.

It doesn't make any sense, except, as I mentioned earlier, that Republican bill titles are always the opposite of what the text says. This bill doesn't give the United States dominance. It opens the door for foreign ownership of our critical minerals.

Republicans always seem to stand with the richest corporations instead of Americans.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Ms. LAGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, if my Republican colleagues really cared about stopping China's dominance, they would vote for the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. Speaker, in preparing for this floor debate, I should have asked my staff to bring posters of smoke and mirrors because it would be fitting for the arguments that we are hearing that seem to try to distract us from everything but the real issue. That issue is that we are not producing the minerals and elements here in our country that we need for our economy and our defense, and China is dominating those markets.

Now, I agree with the gentlewoman from New Mexico: We should be processing these mined materials here in the United States. We have to ask ourselves the question: Why aren't we processing more minerals in the United States? Number one is that we can't get new mines. Why do we need a processing facility if we can't get the mate-

rial we need to go through the processing facility?

The other one is that we can't permit a new processing facility in a timely manner and build it in a cost-competitive manner because of our overburdened permitting and regulatory processes and laws that we have here in the United States.

This is the argument why we need permitting reform, why we need to speed up the process, and why we need to give certainty to investors that we can build here in America again.

When we talk about refining metals, let's talk about copper. In 1995, we produced three times more copper than China. Today, they are producing 10 times more copper than we are. We have two copper smelters. They have 50. It is not because we don't know how to build copper smelters, don't have copper deposits, or don't want to produce copper in the U.S. It is the fact that there have been so many obstacles and barriers put in place that it has driven that industry overseas to other places.

It is time we bring it back here and do it in a more environmentally responsible manner—again, with human rights protections, health and safety protections, environmental protections, and the standards of the United States. It is time we start doing this in our backyard and not exporting our issues to other countries while we turn a blind eye to it.

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

□ 1300

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I want to paraphrase in my own mind what was said moments ago across the aisle, real simple: anywhere but America, any worker but the American worker. I am paraphrasing from my own mind what I heard. The excuses, the excuses, the excuses, the excuses. We have to mine here. We can't mine here.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman who just spoke in her beautiful State, she has allowed oil and gas development. In her beautiful State, she has allowed mining. Why not in my State? Why can't my union workers make the \$135,000-a-year jobs, but in her State it is okay? This bill is for the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents need good-paying jobs, too. It is good for our economy and good for our communities. The technology we use is second to none.

I want to answer my friend from New Mexico who just spoke. She asked: Why aren't we processing and refining here? I have good news for her. Very shortly, there is going to be legislation to allow that, to permit the mining and processing here in the United States of America. I am going to go directly to my good friend and colleague from New Mexico to help sponsor that with me because she is right. Let's do it here. Let's mine here, Mr. Speaker. I am

going to give her and my friends across the aisle that opportunity very shortly.

The fact of the matter is, we have the opportunity. We have to remove the political science—the truth and the facts—to allow this mining to move forward.

This is our backyard. My good friend across the aisle, who is managing the debate, talked about the economic value or the lack thereof. I share with my good friend and colleague that in my State of Minnesota, just one mine proposed, just one, will bring between \$1.4 and \$1.8 billion of Federal revenue, \$800 million for the taxpayers of Minnesota. Every single school district in the great State of Minnesota benefits from mining.

You want to know why I am passionate? These are my constituents that will be mining these critical minerals with the best labor standards and the best environmental standards in the world. We have been mining in Minnesota for 145 years. We have mined the iron ore that makes over 80 percent of this Nation's steel.

The cleanest water in the State of Minnesota, Mr. Speaker, is in the heart of mining country in Buhl, Minnesota. We know how to do it.

Let's stop exporting our environmental guilt. Let's stop exporting our environmental guilt and do it here with our labor standards, our technology, and our workers.

I am happy that New Mexico has oil and gas development and mining development. I am happy for those workers. We need that. Let Minnesota mine.

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

Mr. Speaker, if my friend from Minnesota actually heard us say the things that he just says he heard in his own mind, I am genuinely worried that we need to get an audiologist in here. I am glad that we have a court reporter and that we have a video record because we said nothing of the kind.

My friend, Mr. WESTERMAN, did say something very important. I don't know if this was his intent, but he sort of made one of our points for us. We cannot mine our way to security with brute force because China controls 80 percent of the world's processing power and nearly 90 percent for rare earth elements. If our only solution is to just have more and more mines and to open up this mining free-for-all in the United States, as Republicans seem singularly focused on, we are essentially giving a gift to our largest adversary.

Let me tell you what this bill does to address the lack of processing capacity here in the United States—or anywhere outside of China—nothing, absolutely nothing. That is what it has been throughout this Congress from our friends across the aisle—crickets about addressing the real problem when it comes to our competitive threat of China on processing but a rush to open

up our public lands and gut our environmental laws for the mining interests.

Setting up a safe, environmentally sound processing industry in the United States and with our allies does have some barriers right now, but rarely is the lack of raw mine materials one of those barriers.

Take copper and lithium, for example. The Bipartisan Policy Center published a report last year that found that sourcing feedstock domestically or from free trade agreement countries was not a primary barrier to processing.

Much bigger barriers are competition for labor and a lack of price competitiveness, which are major barriers across the board. For some of the other essential minerals like cobalt, nickel, and rare earths, while feedstock is a challenge, it certainly isn't the only one. It is naive to think that fast-tracking mines alone will secure our supply chains and fix these problems.

Instead, we should support a responsible processing strategy, build a more circular economy, and innovate around low-impact mineral sources, like by-product recovery from mine tailings and recycling, as Mr. TONKO from New York talked about a moment ago.

We need to train the highly skilled American workforce that we need to do all of these jobs. These are things that we need to be working together on. Instead, it is always a rush to open up public lands and give more corporate giveaways for mines.

It has been suggested that there is some sort of a spiteful agenda behind all this, a NIMBY interest where some States allow oil and gas extraction but they don't want it done in Minnesota and other places.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ) to speak about some of those accusations that have been made.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor to offer an amendment so that we could prevent our foreign adversaries from mining American resources for free and taking them across the ocean to their lands. When we let our foreign adversaries take our resources away for free, it doesn't do any good for American dominance or for American taxpayers.

My opponents in this argument have decided to attack New Mexico's oil and gas and mining interests. Let me remind the gentleman that in New Mexico—and I am pleased that in New Mexico we have a lot of oil and gas production, including in my district—we have wind and solar production, including in my district; we have mining, including in my district, but we do it with sensible regulation so that our clean water and air and the economic interest of our citizens are protected.

What I am suggesting to him is that the environmental protections that we have in New Mexico apply across the country because there was a time when it wasn't like that.

□ 1310

That is because there was a time when it wasn't like that. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in my backyard, where I played, where I drank water, and where we fished as children, those waters were destroyed by mining. That was because there wasn't enough regulation.

Guess who had to clean up that mining? It was taxpayers, taxpayers in the State, and not so much the Federal Government.

What we are trying to do is protect the taxpayers from these mining companies that will put profit above planet and will put profit above the interests of the communities that live there. It is because when they mined irresponsibly, they destroyed water and destroyed jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. They destroyed things I care about. They destroyed fishing, and they destroyed farming. I am downstream. I own land. I own farmland that is downstream from those mining companies' destruction. I am trying to protect that. I am trying to protect everybody who relies on clean water, who is downstream from mining companies.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, there are 50 million gallons a day of contaminated water that is put into our groundwater and our streams from mines that didn't have regulation. That is what we are trying to do, to avoid an increase in that 50 million gallons a day of dirty water.

We cannot afford to destroy our water. We cannot afford to fast-track mining companies that aren't going to do the right thing by the American people. We cannot afford to send our resources overseas to China.

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

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the issue at hand here. I want to address the policy issue and the weakness in the argument that we could restrict mining companies to 10 percent Chinese ownership. That is a bad policy decision.

It is a bad policy decision, Mr. Speaker, because if you are the Chinese Communist Party and see a mine is getting ready to happen in the United States, and it is going to be done by a company that is traded publicly, you could go buy 10.1 percent and stop the project. We don't need that kind of policy.

Plus, that policy doesn't apply to the jurisdiction of this bill. If a policy like that needs to be designed, then it needs to go through the Financial Services Committee.

Also, don't think, Mr. Speaker, that our opposition on this—being China, for the most part—will not play dirty. What they do is when they see any kind of mining project or processing facility considered in the United States,

they dump product onto the global market, driving the price down to make the economics such that nobody would invest in that project.

Fortunately, that is being addressed. Just this week, the administration announced something called the vault, which will be a repository for critical minerals. It will be similar to our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. We will have strategic critical mineral reserves.

We need to be able to produce those critical minerals here in the United States to put in that reserve, which will insulate against foreign bad actors dumping in our markets to drive the prices down to make projects not economically viable.

Again, the real issue here is that we need this material in America, sourced by American mining companies, processed in America, and going into American manufacturing. We can partner with our allies around the world to help make this happen, but when we look at where the deposits are, they are here in America. We have to produce oil and gas where the oil and gas deposits are. We have to mine copper where the copper deposits are.

Again, we are blessed to have all of those things here in our country, but we are not utilizing them. Because we are not utilizing them, we are allowing our adversaries to control the markets.

It is not just an economic issue. It is a national security issue. That is why we need legislation like this legislation. That is why we need permitting reform.

We talk about building processing facilities in America. We passed the bipartisan permitting reform bill, but, unfortunately, many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted against that.

The Senate is considering that now. Hopefully, the Senate will pass that bill in a bipartisan manner, like we did in the House, but with a larger bipartisan group. We can get it to the President's desk so we can create certainty, so we can start building more processing and manufacturing here in our country, and so we can utilize these abundant resources that we have.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I oppose H.R. 4090 for all the reasons that have been discussed.

This is a bill that directs the administration to prioritize and approve mines, any mines that it wants, even ones owned by foreign adversaries, giving them an expedited path to mine our publicly owned minerals and to export them, usually straight to China.

The Republicans have named it the Critical Mineral Dominance Act, but they forgot to make sure that it was America that would benefit. Democrats have tried again and again to add commonsense guardrails to stop foreign adversaries from benefiting from our

minerals. Republicans have repeatedly blocked these efforts with creative new excuses every time.

Let's drop the facade. This bill is not about American mineral dominance. It is not about critical minerals, either, because nothing in this bill limits the special treatment to strategically important minerals. Nothing in this bill would stop the administration from declaring a gold mine a priority and fast-tracking it. We have already seen them give millions of taxpayer dollars away to a gold mine in Nevada. Gold has never been critical, except when it comes to, I guess, decorating the White House.

This bill is an industry giveaway, pure and simple, and it leaves Americans footing the bill.

We have heard a lot of passionate talk from across the aisle about mining more here in America because we do it best and because we have such strong environmental and labor safeguards. However, this bill tells the Interior Department and the Forest Service to roll back those very regulations that my colleagues brag about and to go ahead and weaken pollution protections if the mining industry thinks they are too "burdensome."

Communities around the country know the consequences of unregulated mining all too well, especially Tribal communities who have borne much of the brunt of mining pollution: toxic waste, poisoned land, polluted water, and generations of pollution and disease.

Is this what it means to Make America Great Again? I think we can do a lot better than that. Democrats are willing to work to find responsible, strategic solutions to securing our critical mineral supply chains, but this bill takes us in the wrong direction, creating an industry-led free-for-all that allows anyone to mine our minerals, profit from them on the global market, and then leave Americans with nothing but the pollution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I will reiterate the fundamental fact of this debate. In the 21st century, America's economy, military, healthcare, communications systems, and transportation infrastructure depend on hardrock minerals.

There is no scenario where the United States and the rest of the world aren't competing to purchase these critical minerals. The only question is whether we are all competing for minerals mined here in the United States or in mines controlled by our foreign adversaries.

According to the U.S. Geological Survey, in 2024, the United States was 100 percent net import reliant for 15 nonfuel mineral commodities. Additionally, of the 60 minerals identified as critical by USGS, the United States

was 100 percent net import reliant for 12, and at least 50 percent net import reliant for an additional 30.

Mining them here is better for our economy, our national security, our allies, and the environment. H.R. 4090 will help close America's mineral production gap and begin to end our dependence on foreign minerals.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1320

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1032, 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. LEGER FERNANDEZ. 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. Leger Fernandez of New Mexico moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4090 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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

Ms. Leger Fernandez of New Mexico moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4090 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 9. EXCEPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act do not apply with respect to a project that is owned or operated by—

(1) a foreign entity of concern; or

(2) an entity that is a subsidiary of a foreign entity of concern.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED NATION.—The term "covered nation" has the meaning given the term in section 4872(f) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term "foreign entity of concern" has the meaning given the term in section 40207(a)(5) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 18741(a)(5)).

(B) CLARIFICATION.—For purposes of this section, a foreign entity of concern is subject to the jurisdiction or direction of a government of a foreign country that is a covered nation within the meaning of section 40207(a)(5)(C) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 18741(a)(5)(C)) if the foreign entity of concern is more than 10 percent owned, directed, controlled, or financed, directly or indirectly, individually or in aggregate, by any individual that is the citizen, national, or permanent resident, or is an entity subject to the jurisdiction, of the government of a covered nation.

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

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. 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 are postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Holstead, one of his secretaries.

DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN APPROVING THE D.C. INCOME AND FRANCHISE TAX CONFORMITY AND REVISION TEMPORARY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2025

Mr. GILL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1032, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 142) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the D.C. Income and Franchise Tax Conformity and Revision Temporary Amendment Act of 2025, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1032, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 142

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress disapproves of the action of the District of Columbia Council described as follows: The D.C. Income and Franchise Tax Conformity and Revision Temporary Amendment Act of 2025 (D.C. Act 26-217), enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia on December 20, 2025, and transmitted to Congress pursuant to section 602(c)(1) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act on December 30, 2025.

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 Oversight and Government Reform or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. GILL) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GILL).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILL of Texas. 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 the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.