

Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

GLENN "GT" THOMPSON,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, February 17, 2026.

Hon. GLENN THOMPSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: I write regarding H.R. 5419, the "Enhancing Administrative Reviews for Broadband Deployment Act," which was ordered reported by the Committee on Natural Resources on February 11, 2026.

I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and appreciate your willingness to forgo further consideration of the bill. I acknowledge that the Committee on Agriculture will not formally consider H.R. 5419 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained therein.

I am pleased to support your request to name members of the Committee on Agriculture to any conference committee to consider such provisions. I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill and will include such letters in the committee report on H.R. 5419. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation.

Sincerely,

BRUCE WESTERMAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5419 directs the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Forest Service to evaluate policies, rules, and regulations related to the siting and permitting of broadband infrastructure on public lands. This bill is a commonsense step to help update and modernize our broadband infrastructure.

Public lands host a lot of communications infrastructure that Americans rely on every day to connect our smartphones, laptops, and televisions. Broadband isn't just for entertainment. It is what people use to do their jobs, access healthcare, and file their taxes.

Thanks to the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, Oregon recently received Federal approval to move forward with the largest broadband infrastructure investment in our State's history. This will connect over 100,000 unserved and underserved Oregonian households and businesses to affordable, high-speed, and reliable internet services.

However, in States like Oregon and in districts like the one I have the honor to represent with large amounts of Federal land, broadband infrastructure projects often require additional levels of permitting and coordination across local, State, and Federal Government.

H.R. 5419 will help us look for opportunities to address any broadband permitting barriers and update the rules in a measured and responsible way.

This bill will help balance two critical obligations: building out the infra-

structure we need for vital technology and upholding our commitment to the health and stewardship of our public lands. We can and must meet both obligations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN) for introducing this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 5419, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN), the lead sponsor of this bill.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of my legislation, H.R. 5419, the Enhancing Administrative Reviews for Broadband Deployment Act.

Even as our world increasingly relies on the internet to access daily needs, communities across the country still lack a reliable wireless connection, especially in the most rural and Tribal communities.

The process of obtaining permits to improve broadband and communications infrastructure in these areas is often duplicative, inconsistent between agencies, and can set projects back by years.

Outdated bureaucratic processes, inefficiencies, and delays should not stand between American communities and access to a reliable internet connection.

My legislation directs an interagency review of the procedures used by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture to process permitting requests for communications infrastructure. This will allow Congress to direct smart and targeted reforms to improve efficiency, timeliness, and help accelerate access to the internet.

For government to work at its best and most responsive, we must invite regular reevaluation of its procedures, judge what works and what doesn't, and implement process improvements so that the Federal Government can better serve American people into the future. This legislation does just that.

H.R. 5419 ensures a coordinated interagency approach to making the government run more efficiently so our Federal Government is an active participant in, not an obstacle to, bridging the digital divide.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the partnership of Chairman WESTERMAN and bipartisan colleagues as this bill passed through the House Committee on Natural Resources earlier this month. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support 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, H.R. 5419 is a bill that cuts red tape, streamlines approvals, and accelerates broadband access by addressing the permitting barriers that

slow broadband development on Federal lands. By identifying areas to improve coordination, reduce onerous reviews, and strengthen the permitting processing at the Federal level, this bill will help close the digital divide that exists in rural and Tribal communities.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support Representative KEAN's legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5419, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a plan for ensuring timely review of broadband land use authorizations, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CRITICAL MINERAL CONSISTENCY ACT OF 2025

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 755) to amend the Energy Act of 2020 to include critical materials in the definition of critical mineral, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 755

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Critical Mineral Consistency Act of 2025".*

#### SEC. 2. CRITICAL MINERALS AND MATERIALS LIST.

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

*(1) in subsection (c)(4)(C), by inserting "minerals or materials" after "critical";*

*(2) by redesignating subsection (o) as subsection (p); and*

*(3) by inserting after subsection (n) the following:*

*"(o) CRITICAL MINERALS AND MATERIALS LIST.—*

*"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of the Critical Mineral Consistency Act of 2025, the Secretary shall publish a Critical Minerals and Materials List, which shall include—*

*"(A) any critical mineral designated by the Secretary under subsection (c); and*

*"(B) any non-fuel mineral, element, substance, or material that the Secretary of Energy has determined to be a critical material under subsection (a)(2) as of that date of enactment.*

*"(2) UPDATES.—The Secretary shall update the Critical Minerals and Materials List published under paragraph (1)—*

*"(A) not later than 45 days after the date on which the Secretary updates a critical mineral designation under subsection (c); and*

*"(B) not later than 45 days after the date on which the Secretary of Energy updates a critical material designation under subsection (a)(2).*

“(3) PUBLICATION ALIGNMENT.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy shall coordinate when updates to the Critical Minerals and Materials List may be required under paragraph (2).

“(4) ADMINISTRATION.—For the purposes of administering programs involving critical minerals or critical materials, the Secretary, the Secretary of Energy, and the heads of other Federal departments and agencies where such department or agency has incorporated by reference the definition of ‘critical mineral’ or ‘critical material’ from this section, as applicable, shall use the most recently published version of the Critical Minerals and Materials List published under paragraph (1).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOYLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material to H.R. 755, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 755, the Critical Mineral Consistency Act, which accomplishes the important task of unifying the U.S. Geological Survey’s list of critical minerals and the Department of Energy’s list of critical materials.

The Energy Act of 2020 defined “critical minerals” and directed the United States Geological Survey, or USGS, to publish a list of critical minerals every 3 years. The same act directed the Secretary of Energy to develop a critical materials list that includes all of the same minerals on the USGS list but adds: “any non-fuel mineral, element, substance, or material that the Secretary of Energy determines: (i) has a high risk of supply chain disruption; and (ii) serves an essential function in one or more energy technologies, including technologies that produce, transmit, store, and conserve energy.”

□ 1540

The discrepancies between the lists make it difficult for regulators and producers to determine what emphasis to place on each resource and how to allocate efforts toward resource recovery.

Under H.R. 755, each agency would determine what to include in its own list, but a new, combined list called the “critical minerals and materials list” would be published by the Department of the Interior.

Moving forward, all Federal agencies would be required to use this unified list when administering programs involving critical minerals or critical

materials. These changes promote accessibility, clarity, and consistency for regulators, producers, and members of the public.

I thank Representative CISCOMANI for his work on this important legislation. I support this commonsense bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Congress codified the critical minerals list in the Energy Act of 2020 to identify which minerals are most important to our economic and national security and at risk of supply chain disruption.

The United States Geological Survey was required to create and update that list, following a transparent, science-based process.

At the same time, Congress directed the Department of Energy to create its own list focusing on critical minerals and materials for energy needs.

Both lists provide crucial strategic direction for Federal decisionmakers to secure our most critical and vulnerable supply chains.

H.R. 755 provides administrative clarity by creating a unified critical minerals and materials list, which incorporates the lists from both USGS and DOE, while allowing the agencies to maintain the scientific integrity of their individual processes.

I thank the bill’s sponsors and my colleagues across the aisle for working with committee Democrats to incorporate changes to the original bill to better coordinate agency analyses without fully losing the individual purposes of the two lists.

Unfortunately, a lot of careful policymaking and scientific work to identify critical minerals and materials is actively being undone.

First, these lists are only useful if they are unbiased, and the current administration has blatantly violated the law by including metallurgical coal and uranium in the 2025 USGS critical minerals list, despite the Energy Act of 2020 explicitly prohibiting the inclusion of fuel minerals on the list.

They provide no public data or analysis to justify these inclusions or prove whether they meet the Energy Act of 2020’s criteria for critical minerals.

Political interference in the critical minerals list undermines the United States’ economic and national security. We should target Federal investments and interventions toward the most important at-risk minerals and materials and supply chains.

Additionally, designating minerals and materials as critical only matters if we can actually use these lists and designations.

Much of the latest critical minerals legislation that has passed on a partisan basis this Congress actually makes no distinction at all about prioritizing critical minerals. These bills have often provided deregulation across the board to every industry, from gold to coal.

Again, I thank the majority for working with us on this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), the House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources chairman.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 755, the Critical Mineral Consistency Act, introduced by my good friend from Arizona (Mr. CISCOMANI). The Energy Act of 2020 took a significant first step, recognizing the importance of critical minerals and critical materials to the American economy and our strategic national security.

While the respective lists developed by the U.S. Geological Survey and the Department of Energy have been helpful in ensuring we have policies in place that increase and stabilize our access to these critical minerals and materials, they are not hitting the mark and require further direction from Congress.

The two agencies use different criteria and do not take into consideration the same parameters, sometimes leading to different lists. Notably, the USGS list does not account for forward-looking data and analysis, such as international demand and growth trajectories, which the DOE list does. Currently, DOE automatically adopts any minerals USGS deems critical for their own critical materials list, but it doesn’t work the other way around.

H.R. 755 fixes this and amends the Energy Act of 2020 to automatically place DOE’s deemed materials on the USGS list.

Under this legislation, each agency would still be responsible for reviewing elements under their unique purview based on their own technical expertise. It would simply streamline interagency coordination and ensure USGS is taking into account the full picture and the best, most complete information when developing its critical minerals list.

This legislation is a small yet important step in ensuring we have access to the critical minerals and materials that are necessary for our national security, along with our ability to compete and win in this 21st century. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Ms. HOYLE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to say that the chairman, who is on the floor, is a good friend of mine and one of, I think, our best leaders in the Congress. I thank him for his continuing efforts and his willing to work together across the aisle.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to address the American public, of course, through the Speaker. We are at war, Mr. Speaker. When I rise in support of this bill,

which is a bill on which we all agree, I want to suggest that we also, at this time of crisis, pass something that we all agree on, that we have already voted on, that passed the House. It is legislation which funds Homeland Security.

Within that bill are things critically important to the security of our country, particularly at a time like this. ROSA DELAURO, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, has a piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that funds all the items on which we agree. That ought to be easy. It particularly ought to be easy at a time of crisis when we are at war and homeland security is so important.

The bill that Ms. DELAURO has put on the floor would fund the Office of the Secretary and the executive management. It would fund the Federal Emergency Management Agency. It would fund the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. It would fund the Coast Guard of the United States. It would fund the Secret Service, charged with the responsibility of defending the President of the United States and other officials. It would fund the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, CISA, as it is called. It would fund the Transportation Security Administration. It would fund the Science and Technology Directorate.

□ 1550

It would not fund Immigration and Customs Enforcement nor Customs and Border Protection.

Now, they are tied in one bill, but surely, I hoped, Mr. Speaker, my remarks would be compelling without us being at war, which we have been now for, I suppose, almost 96 hours. However, certainly at this point in time, we ought to come together at a time when we are at war on things on which we agree.

All of the ones I listed we have already voted for. They need to be funded. They are critical to our national security, and surely men and women of goodwill and patriotism should stand for funding things on which we agree.

Now, there are two things on which we do not agree, and, frankly, our disagreement is not relevant to our national security today or tomorrow or perhaps for at least 24 months.

Why?

It is because ICE and CBP, the Border Patrol, were funded in another bill that has already passed and been signed by the President, and approximately \$74.8 billion has been set aside for those two agencies already, so they are operating. Presumably their people are getting paid because we have already appropriated money for those two.

However, we have a substantial disagreement on the operations and activities being conducted by those two agencies, and therefore we don't have agreement on that. It is irrelevant to their present operations because we have already appropriated money

which, by the way, none of us voted for on this side of the aisle. We have a very substantial difference, based upon our constitutional concerns, that those two agencies are not acting within the strictures of the Constitution of the United States, the laws of the United States, or the norms of police activity in the United States of America. That is a legitimate and honest difference of opinion, and we ought not to hoist on the petard of the differences we have on these two agencies to preclude funding the Office of the Secretary, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Secret Service, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, the Transportation Security Agency, and the Science and Technology Directorate.

What person of common sense sitting around their kitchen table would say: Yes, we agree on those, but at a time of war, we will not give unanimous consent to fund all of these agencies I just mentioned.

Why?

It is because we have a legitimate difference. By the way, that legitimate difference is supported by more than 50 percent of the American people. As a matter of fact, it is somewhere in the sixties.

I rise on this bill which is not about this because I would not get time to speak about it otherwise, and I think it ought to be compelling to each one of us in this body and every American citizen to be concerned at a time of war when we are allowing a difference on one segment of a bill to preclude us from agreeing to the segment so critical to our domestic and international security.

I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that my Republican colleagues, and as I said, Mr. WESTERMAN is not involved in this other than I am speaking on his bill, but I hope the logic of what I am saying appeals to the patriotism in every one of us that we ought not to allow these agencies I have read and on which we have already voted, on which we already agree, and which the President ought to sign, because we are holding hostage all of them to the legitimate disagreement that we have on two of the agencies within this bill.

Surely, I don't believe the American citizens would say that that is a commonsense thing to do, nor do I think they would say that it was within the best interests of this country to do.

Surely, as a democracy, we should not take the position that if we can't agree on one of the issues, then we won't agree on any of the issues. I suggest that would be irrational.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the DeLauro bill, of which I am a cosponsor, and there are some 50 others of us who are cosponsors, to ask that the Republicans who are in charge, who are in the majority, and who can make this decision, I ask them to give consent, unanimous consent, to the passage of the DeLauro bill so that, and I will mention once again, we can fund

within the Department of Homeland Security a Secretary in the executive management of Homeland Security, the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and we have big snows, big winds, big storms, and crises around this country that require action for domestic security as we require international security.

There is not one of us who wants to defund the Coast Guard. There is not one of us who wants Coast Guard personnel going to work and not getting paid. There is not one of us who wants the U.S. Secret Service to be working and not getting paid. They have got to work because we deem them essential employees, as the Coast Guard are essential employees.

Under the present circumstances, where we can't get unanimous consent, and I hope we can, I urge that we do, I urge my Republican colleagues to say: On this we agree, and, therefore, we will move it forward. We will send it to the President for signature, and we will pay the members of the Coast Guard, we will pay the members of the U.S. Secret Service, we will give emergency relief around this country from FEMA, we will pay those who are working in the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, and we will pay the people at TSA whom all of us rely on to make sure that skies are safe.

I don't think there is a Member among us who wants to say: I don't want to pay them. I don't want that agency to be operating.

Now they are operating because they are essential, but we are not paying them. That is not right. In any event, we all know we are going to pay them at some point in time when, hopefully sooner rather than later, we open up the authority and the funding for those agencies.

We are considering suspension bills now. We expect them to get over 290 votes, and I will be one of those 290 votes on suspension bills.

Why?

It is because we agree, and it makes sense.

I welcome anybody who wants to come to the floor and say: I don't think the Coast Guard ought to be paid. I don't think FEMA ought to be paid, and I don't think Secret Service ought to be paid.

I welcome them to come to the floor. I don't think they are there. I think they do agree.

Mr. Speaker, do not take hostage those employees because we have a fundamental constitutional difference.

□ 1600

Now, by the way, you may think that, oh, well, we don't have a difference. Yes, we do. We don't believe that the two agencies we want to exempt are following the law.

Now, let me quote the border czar. His name is Tom Homan. The President of the United States sent him to Minneapolis to work at bringing the

confrontation in Minneapolis to a close. They knew the public was for that.

However, when a court ruled that what Border Patrol was doing was inconsistent with law and the Constitution, what was his response? Tom Homan said: I don't care what the judges think. I don't care.

I tell my friends in the House—through you, Mr. Speaker, of course—that we all ought to care that we have a law enforcement officer, the czar of our border, who says: I don't care what the judges say.

Mr. Speaker, we are a Nation of laws, and the laws are determined, finally, by the courts of our Nation and ultimately by the Supreme Court.

That is why we are not prepared to vote for a bill that includes those two agencies. Why opposition to that is so hard to believe is because they are already funded, notwithstanding our disagreement.

We are going to continue to make the point, unlike the Vice President of the United States who said the officers who killed two people in Minneapolis had total immunity. The Vice President of the United States said that. We don't agree with that. We want to debate that, and we want to change that. We want to offer amendments. We want to have the House consider it because I would be appalled if the whole House on either side of the aisle wants to have law enforcement officers who say: I don't care what the judges say.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my friends: When Ms. DELAURO asks for unanimous consent to fund the agencies—I will not read them again, but they are critical—I will ask them to give their consent and pass those bills for which we have agreement.

America deserves that. Frankly, our men and women in uniform in the Middle East deserve that. Our men and women in uniform who are here and who may be deployed deserve that. More importantly, every citizen in this country and every person who is in this country deserves to know that we follow our Constitution and laws of our Nation. We take an oath to that. Our citizens expect us to do that.

I hope that as of no later than tomorrow we will pass a unanimous consent request to fund the personnel who are protecting this country in a way on which we all agree and then move at some point in time to a legitimate discussion in this body about what CBP and ICE are doing within or without the law.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, back to H.R. 755. This bill will provide the certainty needed to grow domestic production of minerals like lithium, graphite, copper, and many other minerals necessary for the advanced technologies that will ensure national security, energy security, and economic competitiveness.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 755, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Energy Act of 2020 to harmonize the lists of critical minerals and critical materials, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMERICA'S NATIONAL CHURCHILL MUSEUM NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK ACT

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1945) to designate the America's National Churchill Museum National Historic Landmark, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1945

*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 "America's National Churchill Museum National Historic Landmark Act".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CITY.—The term "City" means the city of Fulton, Missouri.

(2) COLLEGE.—The term "College" means Westminster College, located at 501 Westminster Avenue in the City.

(3) LANDMARK.—The term "Landmark" means the America's National Churchill Museum National Historic Landmark designated by section 3(a).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) STATE.—The term "State" means the State of Missouri.

#### SEC. 3. AMERICA'S NATIONAL CHURCHILL MUSEUM NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK.

(a) DESIGNATION.—America's National Churchill Museum located at the College, including the Winston Churchill Memorial listed on the National Register of Historic Places, is designated as the "America's National Churchill Museum National Historic Landmark".

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in consultation with the State, the City, and the College, may enter into cooperative agreements with appropriate public or private entities, for the purposes of—

(A) protecting historic resources at the Landmark; and

(B) providing educational and interpretive facilities and programs at the Landmark for the public.

(2) TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may provide technical and financial assistance to any entity with which the Secretary has entered into a cooperative agreement under paragraph (1).

(c) NO EFFECT ON ACTIONS OF PROPERTY OWNERS.—Designation of the America's National Churchill Museum as a National Historic Landmark shall not prohibit any ac-

tions that may otherwise be taken by a property owner (including the College and any other owner of the Landmark) with respect to the property of the owner.

(d) NO EFFECT ON ADMINISTRATION.—Nothing in this section affects the administration of the Landmark by the State, the City, or the College.

#### SEC. 4. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a special resource study of the Landmark.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the national significance of the Landmark;

(2) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Landmark as a unit of the National Park System;

(3)(A) consider alternatives to that designation for the preservation, protection, and interpretation of the Landmark by the Federal Government, the State, the City and other affected units of local government, or private and nonprofit organizations (including the College); and

(B) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, operation, and maintenance associated with the alternatives described in subparagraph (A); and

(4) consult with interested Federal agencies, the State, the City and other affected units of local government, private and nonprofit entities (including the College), and other interested individuals.

(c) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall conduct the study under this section in accordance with section 100507 of title 54, United States Code.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to carry out the study under this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report that describes—

(1) the results of the study; and

(2) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOYLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1945.

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.

I rise in support of H.R. 1945, the America's National Churchill Museum National Historic Landmark Act, sponsored by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ONDER).

This bill recognizes a place of global consequence in the heart of small-town America: America's National Churchill Museum at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri.

On March 6, 1946, on the heels of a devastating world war, Sir Winston