

Steil  
Steube  
Strong  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner  
Valadao

Van Drew  
Van Duyne  
Van Orden  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Waltz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup

Westerman  
Williams (NY)  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Yakym  
Zinke

## NOES—205

Aguilar  
Allred  
Amo  
Auchincloss  
Balint  
Barragan  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bowman  
Boyle (PA)  
Brown  
Brownley  
Budzinski  
Bush  
Caraveo  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson  
Carter (LA)  
Cartwright  
Casar  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Cherfilus-  
McCormick  
Chu  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Craig  
Crockett  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Davids (KS)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (NC)  
Dean (PA)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deluzio  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Evans  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Foushee  
Frankel, Lois  
Frost  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Garcia, Robert

Golden (ME)  
Goldman (NY)  
Gomez  
Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al (TX)  
Harder (CA)  
Hayes  
Himes  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Hoyle (OR)  
Huffman  
Ivey  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson (NC)  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Kamlager-Dove  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (NJ)  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Landsman  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Lee (PA)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin  
Lieu  
Lofgren  
Lynch  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McClellan  
McCollum  
McGarvey  
McGovern  
Meeks  
Menendez  
Meng  
Mfume  
Moore (WI)  
Morelle  
Moskowitz  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Mullin  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Nickel  
Norcross  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone

Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascarell  
Pelosi  
Peltola  
Perez  
Peters  
Pettersen  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Quigley  
Ramirez  
Raskin  
Ross  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan  
Salinas  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Scholten  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Sorensen  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Suozi  
Takano  
Thanedar  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tokuda  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Vargas  
Vasquez  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Wexton  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST RESTORATION ACT

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1173, I call up the bill (H.R. 3195) to rescind Public Land Order 7917, to reinstate mineral leases and permits in the Superior National Forest, to ensure timely review of Mine Plans of Operations, 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. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the amendment in nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

## H.R. 3195

*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 “Superior National Forest Restoration Act”.*

## SEC. 2. SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LANDS IN MINNESOTA.

(a) *RESCISSION.*—The order entitled “Public Land Order No. 7917 for Withdrawal of Federal Lands; Cook, Lake, and Saint Louis Counties, MN”, issued by the Bureau of Land Management and dated January 31, 2023, is hereby rescinded.

(b) *TIMELY REVIEW.*—The Secretary shall complete all necessary environmental and regulatory review, including processes subject to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), for all Mine Plans of Operations within the Superior National Forest lands in the State of Minnesota—

(1) *with respect to such Mine Plans of Operations submitted before the date of the enactment of this section, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section; and*

(2) *with respect to a Mine Plan of Operations submitted or resubmitted in the 7 year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section, not later than 18 months after the date on which such Mine Plan of Operations is submitted or resubmitted.*

(c) *REISSUANCE OF MINERAL LEASES.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary shall issue each mineral lease, preference right lease, and prospecting permit canceled by the Secretary relating to lands within Superior National Forest during the period beginning on January 31, 2021, and ending on the date of the enactment of this section on the same terms as were in effect on the date of such cancellations.

(2) *JUDICIAL REVIEW.*—A lease or permit issued under paragraph (1) is not subject to judicial review.

(d) *SECRETARY DEFINED.*—For the purposes of this section, the term “Secretary” means—

(1) *the Secretary of the Interior; or*

(2) *when used with respect to any unit of the National Forest System, the Secretary of Agriculture.*

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 Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) and the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. PORTER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3195.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3195, the Superior National Forest Restoration Act of 2024.

The district I am proud to represent, Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District, is blessed with an abundance of mineral wealth that would allow America to lead in the 21st century.

We are home to the Duluth Complex, one of the largest undeveloped mineral deposits in the world, which includes an estimated 8 billion tons of copper, nickel, cobalt, and other platinum group metals. In fact, this deposit is the world's second largest copper deposit, with 34 percent of the United States' total reserves and the world's third largest nickel deposit with 95 percent of United States' total reserves.

These minerals are experiencing large upswings in demand due to their use in battery storage, electric vehicles, and other rapidly expanding sectors. Domestic production of these minerals is critical to our national security and our supply chain security.

The deposits in northern Minnesota could provide enough copper for over 70 million electric vehicles and nickel for 3.5 million battery packs.

The Duluth Complex and its abundant resources lies under the Superior National Forest and throughout the iron range. The Superior National Forest is a working industrial forest where timber harvesting and mining are desirable activities.

Regrettably, in January of 2022, the Biden administration caved to radical antijobs, antimining activists by canceling two-decade-old mineral leases held by Twin Metals Minnesota in the Superior National Forest.

At the same time, the Biden administration began the withdrawal process on nearly a quarter million acres of land in the region. The finalized withdrawal of 225,504 acres went into effect in January of 2023 and prohibits the extraction of any mineral, including copper, nickel, cobalt, platinum, and iron ore for the next 20 years.

Northern Minnesota, home to the historic iron range, has been mining iron ore, a critical component in steelmaking, for over 140 years. This is the iron ore that provided the military might to the United States and our Allies to fight and win World War II. The iron ore mined in the region accounts for over 80 percent of America's domestically produced steel. Now, the Biden

## NOT VOTING—15

Adams  
Blumenauer  
Cole  
Curtis  
Diaz-Balart

Granger  
Grijalva  
Langworthy  
Magaziner  
Murphy

Nehls  
Smith (NE)  
Swallow  
Sykes  
Wild

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1241

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

administration even wants to restrict iron ore mining in northern Minnesota. They have gone too far, Mr. Chair.

These two actions taken by the Biden administration are in immediate opposition to its stated campaign goals to increase domestic mining to meet rising global mineral demand. They are disregarding years of environmental review, a pending mine plan of operation, and an abundance of support from union workers, local residents, schools, builders, and miners.

In doing this, President Biden has made his real position on mining known. He would rather rely on foreign adversaries like Communist China instead of union workers who stand ready to deliver Minnesota's mineral wealth under the strongest environmental and labor standards in the world.

This is morally irresponsible, as China is the world's top polluter and relies on child slave labor in their mines in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. That is a fact. They use child slave labor.

Imagine the national security crisis we would face should China suddenly decide to withhold these resources.

If the Biden administration's actions are allowed to stand, their direct opposition to the domestic mining industry will not only make our Nation less safe, but it will also cripple a sector that provides incredible economic benefit to northern Minnesota.

The national importance of the Duluth Complex is only matched by its significance to our local community. Twin Metals signed a project labor agreement with the local Iron Range Building and Construction Trades association, guaranteeing local union jobs during the mine's construction. The economic benefits would be felt throughout our State as mineral development provides funding to every single school district in Minnesota through the permanent school trust fund.

The Superior National Forest Restoration Act would revitalize an essential pillar of northern Minnesota's economy, provide for the production of critical minerals, secure our supply chain, strengthen our national security, and bolster the entire domestic mining industry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3195, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, welcome back to the show, unlimited drilling and extinction of wildlife brought to you by the GOP, a subsidiary of Big Oil.

This week's target: The Boundary Waters in northeastern Minnesota, a pristine wilderness that is, in fact, the most visited designated wilderness area in our country. It is the most visited for a good reason. Its beautiful landscapes, crystal clear waters, and abundant wildlife make it a haven for outdoor recreation.

The Boundary Waters support a thriving outdoor recreation economy with hundreds of thousands of annual visitors and tens of thousands of jobs across northeastern Minnesota. In fact, the Boundary Waters is so popular that an overwhelming majority of Minnesota voters oppose building new mines near this federally protected wilderness.

This region and its resources, our resources, have been under threat for years and are being threatened again today.

In 1966, the Bureau of Land Management issued two mineral leases covering 5,000 acres of the Superior National Forest just outside of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. There was never mining on either lease, never mining, yet they were renewed in 1989 and again in 2004.

In 2012, Twin Metals Minnesota, a wholly owned subsidiary of a Chilean mining company, requested another extension of those two expired leases on Forest Service land in the Boundary Waters watershed to build a sulfide-ore copper mine.

In 2016, after an extensive environmental review process, which included public input and scientific analysis, the Forest Service concluded sulfide-ore copper mining, which is significantly different from the taconite mining that the region is used to, could result in "extreme" and "serious and irreparable harm" in the watershed of this wilderness area.

The watershed there flows north, meaning it would flow past the mine and into our protected wilderness. The Forest Service found that any spills, leaks, or pollution would be all but impossible to contain, putting the entire ecosystem and watershed at risk.

This should have been the answer: "No" to this sulfide-ore copper mine because that is what the scientists say, that is what the community wants, and that is what the law means, that a wilderness area is protected from severe harm. However, foreign companies wanting to mine and the politicians who answer to them were too enticed.

□ 1300

As soon as President Trump came into office, his administration ignored the science and community input and reinstated Twin Metals' leases.

The Department of the Interior solicitor under the current administration found that President Trump improperly renewed those leases. Thankfully, after another thorough review and rounds of community input and Tribal consultation, the Biden administration finalized 20-year protections for 225,000 acres around the wilderness area, making that area ineligible for mining, but this bill seeks to undo all of that.

This bill would mandate the withdrawal be overturned and the leases be reinstated with no judicial review allowed. This means that it will not matter if the water and air become poisoned and the surrounding Tribes

and communities become severely ill. No one will be able to take those concerns to a judge and ask that they revisit the decision to mine the Boundary Waters.

Mr. Speaker, you will hear today that Americans have to choose between mining for minerals to secure our clean energy future over protecting the health of our families and vulnerable ecosystems. That is simply not the case.

We all understand the need for mining as part of our clean energy future, but America is already a top producer of copper and is already invested in a circular economy with our trusted trading partners for cobalt and nickel.

If we are going to build a sustainable, enduring, modern mining industry, then we have to do that while respecting sound science and community input, including Tribal consultation.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply respect the workers who mine and their families and the way that that tradition has contributed to the backbone of industrial America, but they live and work in locations where mining is appropriate and where there is minimal to no harm to the environment or human health. Unfortunately, this bill disregards all of that and seeks to destroy now and deal with the ramifications not later but not at all.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I will just share with you that Congressman James Oberstar, a Democrat for 36 years for Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District, supports mining and timber harvesting. In fact, in 1978, when the wilderness legislation was enacted, he didn't originally support it, but he said if you are going to do it, then do not take away our opportunity to mine outside the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and outside the buffer zone. He was right then because he knew that we would be here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIMENEZ), my good friend.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my friend Representative STAUBER's bill, H.R. 3195, the Superior National Forest Restoration Act.

Throughout this Congress, the work of the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party has shown what many of us already believed: that the threat of Communist China looms larger than ever before, casting a shadow over our Nation's security and prosperity.

As an exile who was forced to leave my native Cuba after the Communist takeover, I understand this threat firsthand. That is why I am urging my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3195, which would reverse the Biden administration's plan to cut off Minnesota's mineral deposits containing 88 percent of America's cobalt and 95 percent of America's nickel.

Right now, Congo accounts for 75 percent of the world's cobalt supply. These mines are CCP-owned, Chinese Communist Party-owned, and massive perpetrators of illegal child labor. These minerals are then shipped to Communist China for refining.

President Biden is putting America at risk by failing to combat Communist China's subversive tactics, including undermining America's defense industrial base.

We must obliterate the CCP's monopoly over rare earth minerals critical to the development of batteries and 21st century technology.

H.R. 3195 is an amazing step in reasserting America's industrial might. We work more efficiently, guarantee fairer wages, and extract these minerals cleaner than any other nation in the world.

What the Biden administration is doing makes absolutely no sense. We cannot afford to turn a blind eye to the CCP's cynical vision and their relentless pursuit of dominance in the global arena.

H.R. 3195 is the epitome of Made in America, and I urge its passage on the House floor.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, you probably don't know this, but Minnesota stands and represents the land of sky blue waters, so I rise to oppose this unnecessary and harmful piece of legislation.

Before I talk about the legislation directly, I want to take a minute to loop back to the discussion that is taking place on the floor about national security.

Mr. Speaker, I am the ranking member and former chair of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and I take a back seat to no one in making sure that our industrial base and this Nation have the minerals and capability to reshore and to make things happen here at home so that we have an efficient supply chain. This piece of legislation doesn't do that.

One of the things that I want to clear up is this misnomer about how mining this copper through Antofagasta, which is a foreign-owned Chilean company, means somehow this copper magically all stays right here in the United States. It doesn't, Mr. Speaker. In fact, when this ore is mined, Antofagasta has most of its contracts shipping their mined copper to China for smelting, and then it is sold on the open market.

This is not circular where these particular minerals are going to be mined in Minnesota, let alone smelted in Minnesota or here in the United States. They will be sold on the open market.

The other thing this bill does is it talks about restoring the Superior National Forest. I served with Congressman Oberstar. I knew him well. I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that at the

time Congressman Oberstar was talking about mining and forestry, we were talking about iron ore mining. I support iron ore mining in Minnesota.

In fact, when I have introduced pieces of legislation to protect the Boundary Waters, in my legislation, I made sure that we do nothing to harm iron ore mining because that is the backbone, that is something that is mined and the steel is produced here in the United States and does go, if we want to talk about defense, back to our industrial base here.

Mr. Oberstar is not here to discuss copper sulfide-ore mining or these particular leases and what we know now about Antofagasta's mining record.

This piece of legislation would revoke key protections for a watershed that contains some of the purest and freshest water in the Nation and, in fact, in the world. This is water that when you are in a canoe, Mr. Speaker, you can dip your hand into it and drink from it and not worry about anything happening to you. It is that pure.

In fact, the Superior National Forest contains 20 percent of all the freshwater in the entire region in the U.S. National Forest System.

Being from Minnesota and having served on the committee that has the bill before us today, the Natural Resources Committee, I often hear colleagues joke that they want our water. Why? Wars will be fought over water. Water is a precious resource.

What this bill does is reinstates two mineral leases for which the Forest Service denied their consent because these mines pose an unacceptable risk to this precious preserve of clean water that we enjoy as a wilderness for not only today but will be there for future generations.

This bill would also rescind a mineral withdrawal that the Biden administration finalized last year, which prohibited mining for 20 years in the watershed of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. It is not permanent. It is 20 years. Maybe technology does change, but right now, these mines fail. They will fail to protect the waters.

The Federal action that was supported by a robust environmental assessment had 19 accompanying resource reports. When the Trump administration undid what the Obama administration had done in protecting this water, I was chair of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, they said they were going to do and promised they would do a study. I asked for the study repeatedly. When I finally did get the study, which was never completed, Mr. Speaker, every single page was redacted. Every single page was blank.

I have enough of a security clearance, being on the Defense Subcommittee, that they could have shown me. I could have gone in the SCIF to read it. It was blank because it was a bogus study.

This bill ignores documented scientific consensus that is proven now.

This bill to support a mineral withdrawal would overturn all the public input, the overwhelming public input, in protecting this unique watershed.

To make matters worse, it also strips away the judicial review, as Representative PORTER mentioned, in favor of pro-mining policies, further silencing the voices of those who want this watershed protected by stripping away their rights to challenge these actions in court.

For these reasons alone, we should not support this bill.

I want to make sure that instead of undermining a 20-year mineral withdrawal, this amendment that I will offer later in the form of an MTR would protect the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. It would ensure that public lands and waters, not only the BWCA, but the Voyageurs National Park, will never be polluted by toxic drainage from sulfide-ore mining.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of the amendment that I will be offering.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will support and join me in my amendment that was not allowed in committee, but as an MTR, I will offer it to substitute the language of the Boundary Waters Wilderness Protection and Pollution Prevention Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Representative for yielding me the time.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, just to underscore this, when the Under Secretaries of Defense and Energy were asked what it would do to the United States if China stops selling us their critical minerals today, they said that it would be devastating and dangerous.

We cannot allow China to continue to dominate the critical minerals space when we have this opportunity right here.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I live, work, and play in northern Minnesota. As I said, this is the district that I am privileged to represent. I know clean water. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? It is because the cleanest water is in the heart of mining country in the great State of Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), my good friend.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear about what this bill actually does. This bill does not reduce any environmental protections. It simply tells the Secretary of the Interior to do her job and complete the necessary environmental and regulatory reviews.

Apparently, President Biden and congressional Democrats are so opposed to mining here in America that they won't even allow a company to prove that they can mine in an environmentally safe way.

By opposing this bill, Democrats are allowing mines with unregulated labor practices and environmental standards to control the critical minerals market.

Republicans are for American jobs, economic security, supply chain security, and protecting the environment by mining here in the United States, where we have more environmental protections than anywhere else in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. STAUBER, for his enduring work on this important issue. I look forward to voting to reestablish mining for vital minerals in Minnesota's Superior National Forest.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot about America and America's mineral supplies, but what we are not hearing about is the truth about Antofagasta, the Chilean mining company that is pursuing these leases. In Antofagasta's mines in South America, the minerals are shipped to China for refining and smelting and then sold on the global market.

I have seen no evidence because there is no evidence that Antofagasta won't do the exact same thing here: extracting our publicly owned minerals from pristine wilderness, paying no royalty for them, and then selling them abroad, leaving Americans with all the mess and no benefit.

□ 1315

So much for America first.

I also want to talk about the environmental effects of this mining. Sulfide-ore copper mining is what we are talking about—not iron mining, not taconite iron mining—sulfide-ore copper mining. That is what is being proposed outside of the Boundary Waters Wilderness Area, and that sulfide-ore copper mining poses a unique threat. It is different than taconite iron ore mining.

What happens in sulfide-ore copper mining is the ore that is extracted contains metals that are bound together with sulfur. When exposed to air and water, this sulfide-bearing ore discharges acid mine drainage into the ground and surface water. The waste rocks and the tailings from this mine would generate acid mine drainage for hundreds of years, at least.

Just so everyone knows, these facts aren't hyperbole. This is available information, studied and reported by scientists, with some who have published their findings on the dangers of sulfide-ore copper mining at universities, including the University of Minnesota.

Proponents of this mine say that their tailing facilities would be safe from leakage. We hear that every time about every environmental extraction proposal. However, the facts are clear here. The Forest Service found that 100 percent of sulfide-ore copper mines in the United States experienced pipeline spills or accidental releases.

It is a near certainty that that is what will happen, that we will have a pipeline spill, we will have an accidental release. We will have irreparable, severe environmental damage if this sulfide-ore copper mine is allowed to occur on this Forest Service land. It would infect and pollute the Boundary Waters, and we would be unable to reclaim our beautiful, pristine wilderness.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, just so my colleagues understand, in the United States, we have the strongest environmental labor standards. Any mine that mines in Minnesota or other States must follow those standards.

Additionally, I will say, for Twin Metals in particular, the mine's unique underground construction, as well as the mine's planned use of "dry stack tailings" means there is no potential for acid rock drainage, and dry stack tailings was recommended for this mine plan of operation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation today because we have a very simple question that lies before us: Is the 21st century going to be an American century or a Chinese century?

We all know the history of the 20th century. As we left the 20th century, America stood ascendant, that shining city on the hill. Now, as we go into the 21st century, the question needs to be asked again: Whose century will this be, because the Chinese seek hegemony. One of the ways in which they do it is to control the minerals that are traded around the world.

We stand here today, and this is one of the small decision points that we are going to make. It is no different than, right across from northern Minnesota, there is a natural gas plant that is being held up by the Biden administration and a few small, select group of local people to prevent a natural gas-fired plant from being built. Making one of those small decisions, are we going to be dependent on other countries because, if we are dependent, then we will not be that shining city on a hill.

I think about the goals that this administration has stated. They have talked about American manufacturing, and I hear it from both sides. We must have American manufacturing. How are we going to have American manufacturing if we don't produce some of the minerals and the metals that come out of the ground? How are we going to have American manufacturing if we don't produce some of that in America?

I hear that this administration wants to make sure that there is union labor. There is a project labor agreement that is in place to be able to build this mine. This is going to create union jobs, one of the goals of this administration.

Certainly, my colleagues have talked about electrification. We want to elec-

trify our vehicle fleet as well as getting rid of natural gas, natural gas-fired stoves. How are we going to get there if we don't have the minerals that produce those devices that are going to be able to provide that? Remember, in every Toyota Prius, there is 60 pounds of copper. How are we going to electrify the vehicle fleet without producing minerals right here in America?

I think back to January 20, 2021, and the very first action that this administration took saying that they are going to shut down Keystone XL, and making it very clear we are going to be energy dependent once again. What immediately happened to the price of oil? It went from \$60 a barrel. Within a couple of months, it was up to \$100 a barrel, enriching the despot Vladimir Putin, who has used it to wage war in eastern Europe.

That is what happens when we do not utilize our natural resources, whether it is our forest resources, our mineral resources, or our oil and natural gas resources. We end up being dependent on other countries.

I hear consistently from the other side that the minority is all for mining, but then I pose the question to my colleagues: Where? Where do minority Members support new mines? It is easy to say: Well, a mine has been there for a hundred years and to be able to support it and the union jobs that oftentimes come with it, but where do Democratic Members support new mining in America?

The opposing side's witness could not answer that question at our hearing, and I still haven't heard an answer from the minority yet. Where do my colleagues support mining in America if Democrats support mining?

Twin Metals has gone through an exhaustive process, and they have been proving that they can do this. Let them finish the process here of the rigorous environmental permitting that we have, not just at the Federal level, but at the State level because, living in Minnesota's neighboring State, Wisconsin, I know how rigorous the State of Minnesota's mining regulations are.

We have a choice before us today. Are we going to allow dirty mining around the world to be able to provide our natural resources in America, or are we going to respect the health of people, which we have the best health standards of anyone in the world? We have the best safety standards. Go to Congo and see the safety standards that are there with 8-year-olds mining in Congo.

We have the highest and best environmental standards. If we want workers to be safe, if we want them to be healthy, if we want to have the highest environmental standards, then we will support American mining.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I will just close with this: In 1960, John F.

Kennedy went to my district in Hurley, Wisconsin, to the Montreal Mine, thousands of feet down into that mine.

He said to those miners: You did as much to win World War II as I did on PT-109.

Are we going to have a 21st century that is an American century or a Chinese century?

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

Mr. Speaker, I just heard that Republicans now support a clean energy transition. I hope we can clip that because that is wonderful, wonderful news.

Let me be the first to welcome the majority to the clean energy transition club, where we are going to support investments for States, municipalities, and Tribal governments to purchase clean energy technology, like solar panels, electric vehicle charging infrastructure, wind turbines, all of which, until today apparently, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle opposed.

As the newest members of the clean energy transition club, let me give my colleagues on the other side of the aisle a brief lesson on where the U.S. stands with mineral production and trade, which is needed for the construction of clean energy technology, as my colleagues have correctly pointed out.

First, the United States is among the top five producers of copper in the world and, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, has a low disruption potential.

Second, while we do not, in the United States, have a significant amount of nickel or cobalt, we do have close trading relationships with our allies who do. Those allies are Canada—which is a leading supplier of nickel—Norway, Japan, and Finland.

However, let's talk about what the Twin Metals mine would produce. If this project by this Chilean-owned mining company was allowed to go forward, mine, and pollute our wilderness, ship the ore and the jobs to China, and sell it anywhere in the world, what would it complete? Even if they were to sell all of it to us—and there is no guarantee they would choose to sell any of it here in the United States—it would produce about 1.5 percent of cobalt, about 2.3 percent of copper, about 3.6 percent of nickel, according to 2019 annual consumption, the most recent figures I could find.

I emphasize there is no guarantee that the minerals produced at this proposed Twin Metals mine would wind up back here in the United States, but we are absolutely guaranteed to end up with pollution, contamination, and the destruction of beloved wilderness lands. That is what is at stake here.

I also emphasize that the bill, H.R. 3195, would undo the withdrawal of 225,000 acres in the Superior National Forest. Removing these lands from the protection from mining would violate the will of indigenous communities.

In this case, the Boundary Waters and Superior National Forest are traditionally known as the Anishinaabe

land. The Ojibwe, or Chippewa people, have occupied this area since 1000 C.E.

The region's interconnected waterways have been used as critical trade routes for thousands of years. By the 1830s, the United States Government began forcibly removing indigenous people from their lands in the upper Midwest. In exchange for millions of acres of land, the government promised to pay the Ojibwe people \$35,000 each year for 20 years, and the Tribes were also granted the right to hunt, fish, and gather on those ceded lands.

In 1848, copper was discovered along the north shore of Lake Superior. Mining companies pressured the government to open the land to mining, which required another land cession, including what would become the Boundary Waters Wilderness Area.

The Tribes had to sue. In 1985 and 1989, they won confirmation of the Tribe's right to hunt, fish, and gather on those ceded lands, something that had been previously denied.

To further protect these treaty rights, the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe supported the administration's withdrawal, and they support my colleague Representative McCOLLUM's bill to permanently protect this region from mining.

Because of their support for permanent protections, the Tribe has faced boycotts from mining-aligned interest groups, who have boycotted their casinos, event venues, and restaurants. That is a ridiculous and cruel response to a Tribe that is simply trying to protect its ancestral lands and waters from toxic pollution.

To add insult to injury, this bill restricts judicial review of the reinstatement of leases, a blatant attack on treaty rights. The U.S. Government deciding on permits without allowing the Tribes to address their concerns in court is an egregious overreach of legislation in general, but also of particular concern to Tribal governments, who would be directly affected but unable to address their concerns in the only legal means that they currently have.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe in support of permanent protection of their Boundary Waters.

THE MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE,  
January 31, 2020.

Hon. RAÚL GRIJALVA,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. BETTY MCCOLLUM,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. ALAN LOWENTHAL,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES GRIJALVA, MCCOLLUM, AND LOWENTHAL: The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe is a federally recognized Indian tribe that is comprised of the following six Bands: Bois Forte; Fond du Lac; Grand Portage; Leech Lake; Mille Lacs; and White Earth. The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe has approximately 41,000 members. The duly elected governing body of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe is the Tribal Executive Com-

mittee which is comprised of the Chairpersons and Secretary/Treasurers from the six constituent Bands.

The United States has government-to-government relationships with both the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe and each of the six Bands of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe. Three MCT Bands, Fond Du Lac, Grand Portage and Bois Forte, retain hunting, fishing, and other usufructuary rights that extend throughout the entire northeast portion of the state of Minnesota under the 1854 Treaty of LaPointe (the "Ceded Territory"). In the Ceded Territory, all the Bands have a legal interest in protecting natural resources and all federal agencies share in the federal government's trust responsibility to the Bands to maintain those treaty resources.

The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe is concerned with the prospect of a series of sulfide-ore mines being developed in the headwaters of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area ("BWCA") watershed. The BWCA watershed is located on the Minnesota/Ontario border and is entirely within the 1854 Ceded Territory. The BWCA watershed is comprised of a vast area of pristine interconnected waterways that have been used by the Chippewa for centuries. Low buffering capacity of water and soil and the interconnection of lakes and streams, make the BWCA watershed particularly vulnerable to the impacts of mining.

We are very supportive of HR5598, the Boundary Waters Wilderness Protection and Pollution Prevention Act. This bill would permanently withdraw federal minerals from potential leasing for sulfide-ore copper mining in the Rainy River Headwaters, which directly drain into the BWCAW. As former US Forest Service Chief Tom Tidwell stated, sulfide-ore copper mining has the potential to permanently destroy the pure waters and intact forests in the area of the proposed Twin Metals mine. The fish in adjacent waters—Birch Lake, the South Kawishiwi River, and downstream water bodies—are subject to consumption advisories designated by the Minnesota Department of Health because of mercury in their flesh. Sulfide-ore copper mining will increase the amount of mercury in fish, a toxin of great concern to our members who depend on wild caught fish for their sustenance. Wild rice and terrestrial species will also be at risk, as pollution and habitat destruction will have wide reaching impacts.

We are currently blessed with a healthy environment, a healthy economy, and a public resource that offers sustenance and solace. All of this is at risk if any mining proposal in the watershed moves forward. It is unacceptable to trade this precious landscape and our way of life to enrich foreign mining companies that will leave a legacy of degradation that will last forever. We encourage you, in the strongest terms, to move this legislation forward. We need this protection before it is too late, and the future of this area is now in your hands.

Sincerely,

CATHERINE J. CHAVERS,  
President.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I remind my friends on the other side of the aisle that the United States imports 46 percent of the copper we consume every year from foreign nations ourselves. The first step to reshoring and securing our mineral supply chain must be to allow and support domestic mining. H.R. 3195 does just that.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN), my good friend.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Superior National Forest Restoration Act presented by my good friend and colleague, Mr. STAUBER.

Northern Minnesota has a long, proud legacy of responsible mining that was pivotal in our Nation's victory in World War II. As we enter into greater strategic competition with China, we are presented with a similar challenge: We can either source American critical minerals such as those contained in the Superior National Forest ourselves or become even more dependent on our chief adversary for our mineral and energy needs.

America has the most stringent environmental standards in the world, and we are being forced to source minerals from dictators and despots who use child labor and who are without concern for the ecological impacts.

We have abundant resources here at home, including the abundant Duluth Complex. Despite the environmental and economic benefits of these minerals, the Obama and Biden administrations have consistently worked to block exploration and development of these lands.

This bill will reinstate the mining leases for the world's largest untapped copper-nickel deposit and help our Nation dominate the critical mineral sector while providing hundreds of reliable, well-paying jobs.

This is an economic issue and a national security issue. We can either be beholden and reliant on a foreign nation that seeks to supplant us, or we can be a global leader in the critical mineral industry.

I support the Twin Metals project, I support this bill, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

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

I will be talking about what is good for our economy. There have been studies showing that what is best for the economy, including this area, is to continue to protect these public lands.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an abstract on a study by James Stock and Jacob Bradt, Harvard economists, outlining the regional economic impacts of two scenarios, the first being the now-finalized withdrawal, and the second being if this mine is allowed to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, the link to the full study can be found here: <https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/stock/files/snf-withdrawal-stock-bradt-updated-june-2019.pdf>

# ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED 20-YEAR MINERAL LEASING WITHDRAWAL IN SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST

(By James H. Stock, Department of Economics and Harvard Kennedy School, Harvard University)

(By Jacob T. Bradt, Harvard Kennedy School, Harvard University, June 24, 2019)

## ABSTRACT

The Rainy River Watershed on the Superior National Forest is home to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW). It also contains deposits of copper, nickel, and trace metals, and copper-nickel mining has been proposed adjacent to and upstream of the BWCAW. This sets up a potential tradeoff between economic benefits from mining and concerns about negative economic consequences of that mining on the local recreational and amenity-based economy. Existing studies of mining in the Superior National Forest focus on static effects on a single industry (e.g. mining) at some unspecified point over a medium-run horizon. We draw on these studies and the economics literature to provide a unified analysis of the effect of the proposed mining development on income and employment over time. Our results suggest that the proposed development would lead to a boom-bust cycle that is typical of resource extraction economies, exacerbated by the likely negative effect on the recreation industry.

Keywords: Economic impact analysis, resource extraction, recreation economy, mining economy

Declaration of interest: None.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, if mining were permitted, these economists find that there would be an initial but temporary net growth in employment.

But over time, any economic benefits of mining would be outweighed by the negative impacts of mining on the existing recreational industry and on folks moving to this area.

Under any scenario where sulfide-ore copper mining is allowed, it leads to a boom-and-bust cycle where the local economy is left worse off than before.

Look, these leases sat for decades and decades with no mining used. Now, when it is economically convenient, they want to mine. That illustrates that this is a boom-bust economy and what will be destroyed, though, is of enduring, lasting, economic value.

By protecting this region and the land this will help preserve and grow the 22,000 jobs and \$1.4 billion in annual visitor spending, including its small businesses, which are essential for a strong and robust diversified economy.

The other choice, the alternative, is to allow a Chilean mining company to pollute our land, take our minerals without paying a royalty, ship them overseas to China, smelt them, and sell them on the global market, including to our competitors.

What is best for our American economy is to protect the strong recreational economy we have now in this area and continue to protect these public lands.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from California is right. The United States does produce a lot of copper, but it uses even more. In 2016,

the United States was only 29 percent import reliant on copper. Eight years later that number has risen to 46 percent.

This trend cannot continue. We must support our new domestic mines to meet our own demand.

Mr. Speaker, I will also say that my colleague just referenced a Harvard study that was not peer-reviewed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also thank the gentleman for his commitment not just for his district, not just for the communities in his district and the industry, but the communities and industries across this whole country.

Mr. Speaker, we had the opportunity last year to visit his district and hold a field hearing.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there was not a single colleague from the other side of the aisle that attended that field hearing. If they did, they would have learned a few things.

Number one, that it is one of the largest deposits of critical minerals in the world. That Federal land sits beside State land that does have permits for mining the same thing, but the Federal land is being held up.

As a matter of fact, 80 percent of all critical minerals that are mined in this country are sent over to China to be processed because we have shut down smelters in this country. We are down to three.

My colleagues would have also seen the look on the faces up there, the face of people in a community that is being devastated. They are worried not just about themselves, but for the generations that are to come. These are people that set the standard for mining around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is one more step in overturning and untangling this web these out-of-control Federal agencies have placed on a good industry, a great industry in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to please vote for this bill.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a 2022 poll citing a 2-1 margin of Minnesotans opposing sulfide-ore copper mining on the edge of the Boundary Waters.

[From Impact Research, May 10, 2022]

# MINNESOTANS SUPPORT PERMANENT PROTECTIONS FOR THE BOUNDARY WATERS FROM THE RISKS OF SULFIDE-ORE COPPER MINING

(By: Zac McCrary, Luke Martin)

Minnesotans are deeply connected to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and it remains a uniquely popular and loved resource in an age of polarization. Since 2015, polling has consistently shown that due to this deep connection, voters in Minnesota are strongly opposed to sulfide-ore copper mining on the edge of the Boundary Waters and in its watershed. Voters support taconite mining and sulfide-ore copper mining in areas of the state that don't pose a risk to the pristine Boundary Waters. Voters readily reject mining industry arguments that the watershed of the Boundary Waters is specifically needed to fulfill the nation's critical



mineral needs. As a result, Minnesotans support several legislative and administrative actions that would increase protections for the Boundary Waters, including permanent protection.

The Boundary Waters is uniquely popular and well-regarded in Minnesota. Favorability for the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is near unanimous across the state with 86 percent statewide who are favorable, including 70 percent who are very favorable. More than 2-in-3 Minnesotans (67 percent) say they have personally been to the Boundary Waters including 9 percent who visit every year.

By a 2-1 margin, Minnesotans oppose sulfide-ore copper mining on the edge of the Boundary Waters (60 percent oppose vs. 31 percent support). A strong majority of voters have been consistently opposed to sulfide-ore copper mining in the watershed of the Boundary Waters since pollsters began asking this question in 2015. Even among the 31 percent who would currently support sulfide-ore copper mining on the edge of the Boundary Waters, their support is soft—just 12 percent strongly support it, and nearly 2-in-3 supporters (63 percent) say their support is contingent on an environmental analysis that finds that sulfide-ore copper mining in the Boundary Waters watershed could be done without risk to the Boundary Waters.

Minnesotans overwhelmingly support a broad array of legislative and administrative actions to protect the Boundary Waters from sulfide-ore copper mining, including legislation to permanently protect the Boundary Waters:

Minnesotans support legislation to permanently protect the Boundary Waters from the risks associated with sulfide-ore copper mining by a 35-point margin (63 percent support vs 28 percent oppose). Permanent protections are also a winning issue with undecided voters (58 percent support), Independents who support them by a 7-point margin, and in the new 8th Congressional District (56 percent support). After hearing arguments from both sides of the issue, support for permanent protections increases to 67 percent among all likely Minnesota voters.

By a 19-point margin (45 percent support vs 26 percent oppose), Minnesotans agree that the state should update its nonferrous mining rules have not been updated in 30 years, and currently allow for levels of pollution that would contaminate the Boundary Waters. Updating the state's rules would allow for the application of modern science to protect the Boundary Waters.

Minnesota voters reject the false choice between mining in the watershed of the Boundary Waters for critical minerals needed for national security or clean energy purposes and protecting the Boundary Waters. In testing responses to statements about mining for critical minerals in the watershed of the Boundary Waters for national security or a green economy, voters agree by double-digit margins that we don't have to choose between critical minerals and protecting the Boundary Waters. By working with our allies such as Canada, Norway, and Australia and increasing recycling in our own country, we can have both critical minerals the nation needs and preserve the legacy of the Boundary Waters.

Minnesotans are not anti-mining in general. A majority of voters support taconite mining (61 percent) and sulfide-ore copper mining in areas where it would not pose any danger to the Boundary Waters or its watershed (53 percent). However, there is overwhelming opposition to sulfide-ore copper mining in the watershed of the Boundary Waters due to pollution and contamination risks. Opposition to mining in the Boundary Waters cuts through demographic, geo-

graphic, and ideological lines, making their protection a clear political winner for elected leaders in Minnesota.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a letter from the Wilderness Society in opposition to this legislation.

THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY,  
May 11, 2023.

Dear Chairman Pete Stauber, Ranking Member Ocasio-Cortez, and Members of the House Natural Resources Energy and Minerals Subcommittee:

On behalf of our more than one million members and supporters, The Wilderness Society (TWS) writes to urge you to oppose House Congressional Resolution 34 and the so-called Superior National Forest Restoration Act. We respectfully request that this letter be submitted to the hearing record.

TWS supports Public Land Order 7917, which in early 2023 withdrew 225,504 acres of public lands and minerals located in the headwaters of the Boundary Waters in the Superior National Forest from the federal mineral leasing program for twenty years. House Congressional Resolution 34 and the Superior National Forest Restoration Act would reverse the goals of that Public Land Order.

The two pieces of legislation being heard by the Subcommittee today represent a wholesale attack on both the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness's unique character and ecological values, as well as an attack on executive agency authority to protect our federal public lands and waters, particularly under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

Protecting the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness from Copper Mining. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness in the Superior National Forest of northeastern Minnesota is made up of 1.1 million acres of interconnected lakes and rivers and is located adjacent to and downstream of Voyageurs National Park and Canada's Quetico Provincial Park. The Boundary Waters not only provides habitat for wildlife, but it is also a refuge for people from every state in the U.S. who visit the Boundary Waters to fish, canoe, hike, recreate, and enjoy its forests, tranquil lakes, trails, and more than 1,200 miles of canoe routes.

The Boundary Waters is core to the region's booming outdoor recreation industry, which generates \$913 million in revenue and supports more than 17,000 local jobs annually. A 2019 economic study by Harvard Professor James H. Stock, Ph.D., former chair of Harvard's economics department, found that protecting this watershed from copper mining would result in 1,500 to 4,600 additional jobs and \$100 million to \$900 million in additional income over a 20-year period in an already thriving outdoor recreation-based economy.

In October 2021, the Biden administration announced they were re-initiating the process for a 20-year mineral withdrawal, reversing a misguided move by the former Trump administration to prevent a withdrawal and advance the destructive Twin Metals Mine. In early 2023, the Biden administration issued an environmental analysis and decision that found the impacts of sulfide-ore copper mining at the headwaters of the Boundary Waters could harm the area's abundant freshwater, deemed "immaculate" by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. Secretary Debra Haaland then issued Public Land Order 7917 withdrawing the area from new mining leases and permits, protecting America's most visited Wilderness area as well as Voyageurs National Park from toxic sulfide-ore copper mining in its headwaters.

H. Con. Res. 34 and H.R. \_\_\_\_ needlessly cancel the science-based mineral withdrawal

of the Boundary Waters, reinstate the cancelled mineral leases, and limit scientific and community input on the future of the Boundary Waters. The science is clear about the pollution and destruction that sulfide-ore copper mining on upstream land and waters would do: that pollution would flow directly into the Boundary Waters and into Voyageurs National Park and Canadian lands and waters as well.

We urge your committee to reject this legislation and instead permanently protect the Boundary Waters by passing H.R. 5598, Rep. McCollum's Boundary Waters Wilderness Protection and Pollution Prevention Act.

Mineral Withdrawals under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. The Federal Land Policy & Management Act (FLPMA) explicitly grants the Secretary of the Interior the authority to make large-tract withdrawals of 5,000 acres or more of public lands from mineral extraction for up to 20 years. Republican and Democratic administrations have used this authority approximately 90 times over more than four decades, and Congress has never overturned one of those withdrawals.

Both H. Con. Res. 34 and the Superior National Forest Restoration Act seek to undermine this key provision of FLPMA, threatening the ability of future presidential administrations to set aside tracts of land from mineral development. FLPMA withdrawals are used to protect a wide range of public land resources for conservation, cultural resource protection and even research. In fact, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) recently withdrew 22,684 acres of Public Land in Nevada's Railroad Valley upon request of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to preserve the area's land surface which is used to calibrate NASA's Earth-observing satellites.

Finally, H. Con. Res. 34 relies on a provision of FLPMA that is widely understood to be an unconstitutional legislative veto. Section 1130 of the House of Representatives Manual lists the provision as among several dozen unconstitutional legislative veto provisions. Additionally, a federal appeals court in 2017 definitively found the unconstitutional legislative veto provision severable from the Secretary of the Interior's withdrawal authority, which remains fully operative.

Conclusion. TWS strongly opposes H. Con. Res. 23 and Superior National Forest Restoration Act and we urge all members of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee to oppose both pieces of legislation being considered by the Subcommittee today.

Sincerely,

LYDIA WEISS,  
Senior Director, Government Relations,  
The Wilderness Society.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, lastly I include testimony in opposition to the legislation from Becky Rom, national chair of The Campaign to Save the Boundary Waters, a coalition of businesses, conservation groups, and outdoor recreation organizations.

Mr. Speaker, the link to Becky Rom's testimony can be found here: <https://docs.house.gov/meetings/II/II06/20230511/115888/HHRG-118-II06-Wstate-RomR-20230511.pdf>.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from California just mentioned temporary jobs.

When we first started mining iron ore 145 years ago, the American Rockefeller family thought they were going to be just temporary jobs as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN).

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from northern Minnesota for yielding. We share a lot of commonalities, and one is our love of the outdoors and of our national treasures.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor today of H.R. 3195, the Superior National Forest Restoration Act. For those of us in the North Woods of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, mining is a core part of our history, economies, and way of life. From the long heritage of copper country in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan to the millions of tons of iron ore that come from Minnesota each year, it is a treasure.

The abundant resources in our region are now more important than ever with sources of nickel, cobalt, titanium, and now even helium being discovered and poised to play a huge role in the growth of renewable energy technologies and mineral independence.

At the same time, those of us in the Great Lakes region are fiercely protective of our forests, waters, and wilderness, which is why I am a proud supporter of programs like the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and the North American Wetlands Conservation Act.

It is the job of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service to properly balance responsible resource extraction with the protection of our natural treasures.

Instead of balance, the Biden administration pushed a 20-year ban on mining on more than 200,000 acres of land entirely outside the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. This decision ignored a very simple truth: Environmental conservation and utilization of our natural resources are not mutually exclusive.

Projects should be approved or disapproved based on their individual merits and risks after proper environmental reviews are completed, not just banned wholesale. This abrupt cancellation also goes directly against the Biden administration's efforts to secure domestic supply lines for critical minerals that go into solar panels, batteries, and other renewable energy infrastructure.

The United States cannot lead the world in clean energy while at the same time being reliant on the minerals produced by countries with absolutely no regard for environmental standards like China and Russia.

This reliance on foreign adversaries for our domestic mineral manufacturing and energy supply lines also poses significant risk to our national security. We are blessed to have abundant natural resources within our borders, and we have the responsibility to protect the environment while we secure America's mineral and energy independence into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

I will start by noting that the Harvard study was, in fact, peer-reviewed. As a former professor, I am very familiar with the peer-review process. It is a reliable study, and what it shows is what is best for the economy of this region and that is to protect these public lands and waters.

Let me ask, what is the value of clean water? Water is also a valuable resource. It is also a resource in scarce supply around the country.

If this bill moves forward, it will allow for the irreversible pollution of this pristine and incredibly valuable landscape. Remember, the Forest Service concluded after scientific study that there is a virtual certainty of severe and irreparable economic harm. All 100 percent of the sulfide-ore copper mines in this country have had leakages and environmental contamination. That is what will happen here.

This will mean the decimation of local economies that depend on visitation. This is the most visited wilderness area in our country. It belongs to the people of the United States. It does not belong and should not belong to a Chilean mining company which, under our outdated mining laws, will pay no royalty at all to the American people.

If the U.S. wants to reduce our demand for copper, which is increasing, then we should invest in recycling, in reuse, in manufacturing improvements. That would create jobs domestically and not risk special places like the Boundary Waters.

If this mine proceeds, and if this water is contaminated and destroyed, there is no known remediation strategy. It cannot be undone. The U.S. Forest Service has conducted an environmental review. They have consulted with communities, they have consulted with Tribal members, and they have relied on cutting-edge science, and they have concluded that these mines should not go forward.

The science is done here. It just doesn't line up with the answer of my colleagues' donors.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, first off, they have never completed an environmental review. I will be very clear: There will never be mining in the Boundary Waters or the buffer zone around it. That was decided in 1978. This bill will not circumvent or short-change environmental review in any way. We are not requiring any permits or mine plants be approved. We are simply requiring that they go through the review process the way any other project would move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), the majority whip.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Superior National Forest Restoration Act.

For the last 3 years, the domestic mining industry in Minnesota and around the country has been under assault. Mining supports good-paying jobs, and it is critical to our economy and national security. However, rather than putting Minnesota miners to work, those opposing this legislation would rather rely on China and Russia to supply our critical materials making us less secure and causing greater environmental harm.

This bill strengthens Minnesota's economy while promoting a safe and clean energy supply. I thank Congressman STAUBER for his relentless work on this issue, and I urge all of my colleagues to support his bill.

□ 1345

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, I want to reiterate the fact to the American people, there will be no mining in the Boundary Waters, and there will be no mining in the buffer zone around the Boundary Waters. That was settled in 1978.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), the Chair of the full Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3195, the Superior National Forest Restoration Act of 2024.

First of all, I thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), my good friend, for his leadership in this area.

Since his first day in Congress, Mr. STAUBER has fought tirelessly for his district and has done an excellent job representing the people and the interests of the Iron Range through his work here in Washington.

This bill is the culmination of years of meetings, hearings, and hard work to ensure that the voices of those living in northern Minnesota are heard in Congress and the White House.

I have been to northern Minnesota many times, even with Mr. STAUBER's predecessor, Democrat Congressman Rick Nolan, and I have seen how important the mining industry is to the region, as it has been for over a century.

I have also seen American mining companies' dedication to producing essential minerals with exemplary regard for their employees, the environment, and the communities in which they operate. In doing so, U.S. domestic mines set the global gold standard for responsible resource procurement.



The Duluth Complex in northern Minnesota contains one of the largest deposits of minerals in the world, including the world's second largest deposit of copper. According to S&P Global Market Intelligence, global copper demand is expected to be double current production in the next decade, driven primarily by the push to electrification.

In fact, annual copper output from the Twin Metals project alone would support the production of 13,000 megawatts of wind turbine power or 10,000 megawatts of solar power per year. Yet, from 2022 to 2023, U.S. copper production dropped by 11 percent, even as our net import reliance—meaning the amount of copper we have to buy from foreign sources—rose 46 percent. The Duluth Complex also contains world-class reserves of critical minerals such as cobalt and nickel.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. The Biden administration's recent actions to restrict access to this treasure trove of vital and increasingly scarce minerals simply does not make sense for our national security, for the people of northern Minnesota, or even for President Biden's own mineral-intensive goals to build out renewable energy production and achieve net-zero emissions.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3195 and reinstate Minnesotans' rights to access their abundant resources.

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

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, the Boundary Waters is not a bathtub. The water flows from one place into the other, and in this case the watershed flows north, meaning it would flow past the mine and into the protected wilderness.

My colleague on the other side of the aisle says there would be no mining in the Boundary Waters, but there would be waste. There would be pollution in those waters because of the watershed.

This is exactly why we should rely on the scientific process and the conclusion of the Forest Service that this mining would cause severe and irreparable harm. I have heard no rebuttal from the other side of the aisle to the fact that 100 percent of every sulfide-copper mine in our country has had leakages and environmental harm.

Mr. Speaker, we have been having hearings, markups, and floor votes on this issue for years. Administrations have canceled and reinstated these leases, and then canceled them again.

The Biden administration, unlike the previous administration, took the time and effort to do the process right. They came to the considered decision, based on science, to cancel the wrongly reinstated leases and to protect the Boundary Waters region for the next 20 years.

That decision is not just based on sound science. It also is based on community input, robust Tribal consultation, and at the end of the day on the best interests of the American people because that is who these public lands belong to. That is who should benefit from these public lands.

However, a foreign company and politicians who bend to their interests don't like it. As I have made clear in this Congress, their priority is not putting science first or protecting communities. Their priority is putting corporate polluters' profits above all else by any means necessary.

My Republican colleagues say that the toxic mining industry needs certainty. Well, this is certainty. The Boundary Waters watershed is off limits.

I welcome the opportunity to work across the aisle to reform the mining law; for example, to require royalty payments. That way we can build a sustainable future for the industry. Part of that conversation—support of mining—needs to be recognition that some places are too special and too risky, and some types of mining are too risky to do.

At the end of the day, what would you choose: your child's health, our lands, wilderness, endangered species, tourism jobs, our local economy, or would you choose a foreign company who wants to mine in a location that would hurt the environment, our economy, and our health? I know what I would choose.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

The Biden administration's mining policy is: anywhere but America, any worker but the American worker.

The Republicans refuse to allow child slave labor to happen. We refuse to allow this great country to purchase minerals mined by child slave labor in Congo. We will not turn a blind eye to the atrocities and the slave labor happening in Congo where this administration wants to purchase its minerals.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3195. The bottom line is you can't be a proponent of national security, a proponent of reducing global emissions, and a proponent of fair labor, and yet be against domestic mining at the same time.

Congress voted to spend billions of dollars on building out transmission and increasing renewable energy development, all of which require enormous amounts of copper, nickel, cobalt, and other minerals that can be sourced right here in the United States of America in my home State of Minnesota.

Issuing directives to pursue renewable energy development while at the same time denying access to the minerals needed to domestically manufacture the products simply does not make sense.

The International Energy Agency estimates that achieving net zero by 2050 would require six times more mines than are currently operating today. While the U.S. is blessed with abundant mineral resources within our borders, domestic, primary mine production of critical minerals—those defined by USGS as essential for our economic and national security—decreased by almost 25 percent from 2022 to 2023, forcing the U.S. to look elsewhere to source these materials.

We cannot totally rely on our allies to access these vital resources. China currently dominates global production for over half the materials on the critical minerals list. Biden's mining policy of anywhere but America, any worker but American must be stopped.

We can mine these minerals domestically under the best labor and environmental standards in the world. We know this all too well in northern Minnesota, where mining is our past, our present, and our future. If we get the politics out of the way, our mining future will be bright. Minnesotans know how to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support for this bill from the National Mining Association, Jobs for Minnesotans, Mining Minnesota, Up North Jobs, Range Association of Municipalities and Schools. I also include the project labor agreement between Twin Metals Minnesota and Iron Range Building and Construction Trades Council.

*Washington, DC, April 29, 2024.*

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

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

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: On behalf of the National Mining Association (NMA), I am writing to express our strong support for the Superior National Forest Restoration Act (H.R. 3195). Ensuring access to our federal lands for responsible mineral exploration and development is critical to securing the essential materials necessary for nearly every sector of our economy.

Northern Minnesota is a place of tremendous natural beauty and is also blessed with worldclass mineral deposits including copper, nickel and essential metals that are vital for U.S. economic and national security priorities. In fact, this area contains the largest undeveloped deposits of nickel, copper and platinum metals in the world. Despite these abundant resources, the U.S. continues to be increasingly reliant on foreign sources of metals and minerals, including from geopolitical adversaries that do not share our values when it comes to environmental, labor and safety standards.

The Biden administration's self-sabotage of domestic mineral supply chains through mineral withdrawals, restrictions and duplicative permitting processes is completely out of step with the dramatic increase in minerals production that is needed in the coming decades to keep up with new technologies, infrastructure and manufacturing needs, let alone the administration's energy transition goals. Instead of ceding our nation's mineral supply chain security to other countries, the U.S. should utilize its world-class environmental standards to produce

needed minerals while protecting our environment.

H.R. 3195 supports responsible mineral exploration and development in an area specifically designated and set aside by Congress and the U.S. Forest Service for such activities. The administration's anti-mining actions continue a dangerous trend of politicizing domestic mineral supply chains first initiated in the waning days of the Obama administration. Continuing to pursue dangerous policies that lock up federal lands with high mineral potential will both kill future mineral development in this region and deny the hard-working men and women of Northern Minnesota the opportunity of high-paying jobs—all, while eliminating significant revenues for Minnesota's rural communities that come from these projects in the form of taxes and royalties. These revenues support local schools and important regional development projects.

Currently, less than half of the mineral needs of U.S. manufacturing are met by domestically mined minerals. H.R. 3195 will help change this alarming trajectory by ensuring access to one of our nation's important mineral deposits.

The NMA urges passage of this important legislation and continued trust of our nation's strong environmental regulations and system of due process to strengthen a reliable and stable domestic mineral supply chain for the future.

Sincerely,

RICH NOLAN.

JOBS FOR MINNESOTANS,  
St. Paul, MN, April 29, 2024.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: I am writing today on behalf of Jobs for Minnesotans, a nonpartisan coalition co-founded by the Minnesota Building and Construction Trades Council and the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce and strengthened by labor unions, community leaders and business members from across the state. We represent 70,000 union workers, 6,300 companies and 500,000 employees in Minnesota.

In May 2023, the Superior National Forest Restoration Act—H.R. 3195 was introduced by House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources Chairman Pete Stauber (R-MN) to re-establish the ability for safe, sustainable mining in northeast Minnesota. Our coalition is in strong support of H.R. 3195. We have consistently advocated for a fair regulatory process—fair to the public, the government agencies and investors alike.

The Duluth Complex in Minnesota is home to significant domestic reserves of nickel, cobalt, and copper. Unlocking this domestic supply of critical minerals is crucial for bolstering US national security by reducing our nation's reliance on foreign resources, strengthening a secure supply chain, and fostering a timely energy transition.

H.R. 3195 is essential for preserving the 140-year historical legacy of mining in northeast Minnesota, which has been an economic cornerstone for the region. By re-establishing safe, responsible mining, H.R. 3195 aims to secure and create jobs in the region, allowing Minnesota to live up to its full potential in leading the responsible production of critical minerals that are essential to our nation's clean energy goals.

To ensure the continued prosperity of mining in the region, H.R. 3195 includes provisions that give companies a chance to undergo the rigorous, scientifically based regulatory processes under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) that are needed to start new mining projects. These processes ensure mining activities are conducted responsibly and with minimal environmental impact.

Passing the Superior National Forest Restoration Act is not only an issue of economic importance but also one of securing domestic mineral production for the long run. We hope you will join us in supporting this critical legislation.

Thank you for your consideration,

DAVID CHURA,  
Board Chair.

—  
MINING MINNESOTA,  
April 26, 2024.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: Last May, House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources Chairman Pete Stauber (R-MN) introduced the Superior National Forest Restoration Act—H.R. 3195 to reestablish the ability for safe, sustainable mining in Northeastern Minnesota. On behalf of MiningMinnesota and our members, we are writing to urge you to support this vital piece of legislation.

The recent withdrawal of federal land use for over 225,000 acres by the Biden Administration has put essential mining projects, including Twin Metals Minnesota, at risk. This decision undermines American mineral independence. The Duluth Complex in Minnesota is home to significant domestic reserves of nickel, cobalt, and copper. Unlocking this domestic supply of critical minerals is crucial for bolstering US national security by reducing our nation's reliance on foreign resources, strengthening a secure supply chain, and fostering a timely energy transition.

Furthermore, H.R. 3195 is essential for preserving the 140-year historical legacy of mining in Northeastern Minnesota, which has been an economic cornerstone for countless cities and towns in the region. By re-establishing safe, sustainable mining, H.R. 3195 aims to secure the jobs that the withdrawal aims to threaten, thereby restoring the economic livelihood of those in Northeastern Minnesota.

To ensure the continued prosperity of mining in the region, H.R. 3195 includes provisions that give companies a chance to undergo the rigorous, scientifically-based regulatory processes under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) that are needed to start new mining projects. These processes make certain that mining activities are conducted responsibly and with minimal environmental impact.

Passing the Superior National Forest Restoration Act is not only an issue of economic importance but also one of securing domestic mineral production for the long-run. We hope you will join us in supporting this critical legislation.

Thank you for your consideration,

JULIE C. LUCAS,  
Executive Director.

—  
UP NORTH JOBS,  
April 26, 2024.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: Last May, House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources Chairman Pete Stauber (R-MN) introduced the Superior National Forest Restoration Act, H.R. 3195, to establish safe, sustainable mining in Northeastern Minnesota. On behalf of Up North Jobs Inc., a Minnesota based nonprofit and our almost 3,500 individual and corporate members, we are writing to urge you to support this vital piece of proposed legislation.

The recent withdrawal of federal land use for over 225,000 acres by the Biden Administration has put essential mining projects, including Twin Metals Minnesota, at risk. This decision undermines American mineral independence. The Duluth Complex in Minnesota is home to significant domestic reserves of nickel, cobalt, and copper. Unlocking this

domestic supply of critical minerals is crucial for bolstering United States national security by reducing our nation's reliance on foreign resources, strengthening a secure supply chain, and fostering a timely energy transition.

Furthermore, H.R. 3195 is essential for preserving our 140-year historical legacy of mining in Northeastern Minnesota, which has been an economic cornerstone for countless cities and towns in the region. By reestablishing safe, sustainable mining, H.R. 3195 aims to secure the jobs that the withdrawal threatens, thereby restoring the economic livelihood of those in Northeastern Minnesota.

To ensure the continued prosperity of mining in the region, H.R. 3195 includes provisions that give companies a chance to undergo the rigorous, scientifically-based regulatory processes under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) that are needed to start new mining projects. These processes make certain that mining activities are conducted responsibly and with minimal environmental impact.

Passing the Superior National Forest Restoration Act is not only an issue of economic importance but also one of securing domestic mineral production for the long-run. We hope you will join us in supporting this critical legislation.

Thank you for your consideration,

GERALD M. TYLER,  
President and CEO.

RANGE ASSOCIATION OF  
MUNICIPALITIES AND SCHOOLS,  
Mt. Iron, MN, April 30, 2024.

Re RAMS Letter of Support—Superior National Forest Restoration Act (H.R. 3195)  
CONGRESSMAN STAUBER AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: On behalf of the Range Association of Municipalities and Schools (RAMS), I would like to indicate our support for the Superior National Forest Restoration Act (H.R. 3195).

This legislation recinds Public Land Order no. 7917 and allows for the reissuance of mineral leases for safe and sustainable sourcing of materials needed for Minnesota and the nation to meet green new deal goals and the 2035 energy transition. Without a domestic source of these minerals, we are at the mercy of unethical foreign governments. Minnesota operations have long been a leader in ethical and sustainable mining practices. The materials needed to meet these goals and an opportunity to do so are within our reach.

Our choices matter. The need for the minerals in the Duluth Complex and surrounding areas is clear. We support the clean energy transition and we must allow companies like Twin Metals and others be able to act on previously issued leases and move their projects forward to be a part of it.

Sincerely,

PAUL PELTIER,  
Executive Director.  
PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENT,  
August 21, 2019.

Whereas, Twin Metals Minnesota and Iron Range Building and Construction Trades Council recognize skilled employees from construction and supporting crafts are vital to quality and timely completion of an underground copper, nickel, platinum group metals and cobalt mine; and

Whereas, Both parties are committed to working together in a spirit of harmony and stability; and

Whereas, Both sides are committed to building a 21st century underground mine operation that is safe for workers and environmentally friendly; and

Whereas, the legacy of quality represented by the people of the Building and Construction Trades continues a long tradition that built Northeastern Minnesota; and

Whereas, Work and completion of the Twin Metals Minnesota construction project will help Iron Range communities to prosper and grow;

Now, therefore both parties agree to enter into this comprehensive Project Labor Agreement, which shall be signed by Project Contractors selected for construction related to the mining, processing of precious metals in the Maturi Deposit, and tailings storage.

KELLY OSBORNE,

*CEO, Twin Metals  
Minnesota.*

MIKE SYVERSUD,

*President, Iron Range  
Building & Con-  
struction Trades  
Council.*

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, 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. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, 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. McCollum of Minnesota moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3195 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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

Ms. McCollum moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3195 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Boundary Waters Wilderness Protection and Pollution Prevention Act".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is a 1,090,000-acre Federal wilderness area, located within the Superior National Forest, that was originally designated in the Wilderness Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-577).

(2) The Forest Service manages the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, which includes—

(A) nearly 2,000 pristine lakes ranging in size from 10 acres to 10,000 acres, and more than 1,200 miles of canoe routes;

(B) 1,500 cultural resource sites including historic Ojibwe village sites and Native American pictograph panel sites; and

(C) 150 miles of land and water on the international border with the Government of Canada.

(3) In 1978, Congress passed the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Act (Public Law 95-495) to remove incompatible uses, prohibit mining within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and on 220,000 acres of the Superior National Forest, and to provide management guidance to protect, preserve, and enhance the lakes, waterways, and forested areas of the Boundary Waters Canoe

Area Wilderness to enhance public enjoyment of the unique landscape and wildlife.

(4) The federally recognized Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, and the Bois Forte Band of Chippewa retain hunting, fishing, and other usufructuary rights throughout the entire northeast portion of Minnesota, including the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, under the 1854 Treaty of LaPointe. All Bands have a legal interest in protecting natural resources and the Forest Service shares in the Federal trust responsibility to maintain treaty resources.

(5) The Rainy River Watershed lies within the Superior National Forest, which contains 20 percent of the fresh water supply in the entire National Forest System.

(6) The Rainy River Watershed headwaters begin in northeastern Minnesota and flow north through the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Voyageurs National Park and into Canada along the shared international border. These international waters are governed by the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty, which states that "boundary waters and the waters flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property on the other".

(7) The waters of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Voyageurs National Park are classified as Outstanding Resource Value Waters under Federal and State law, and degradation of water quality is prohibited. A risk of mining development is acid mine drainage which generally occurs when sulfide minerals are exposed to air and water creating sulfuric acid, which decreases water pH and leaches harmful metals such as copper, zinc, lead, cadmium, iron, and nickel.

(8) Acid mine runoff from sulfide-ore copper mining entering groundwater, rivers, streams, and lakes harms aquatic life, degrades water quality, and results in potential severe environmental impacts.

(9) A peer-reviewed study of water quality impacts from 14 operating United States copper sulfide mines found 100 percent of the mines experienced pipeline spills or accidental releases; 13 mines experienced failures of water collection and treatment systems to control contaminated mine seepage resulting in significant negative water quality impacts.

(10) The mining of copper and other metals in sulfide bearing ore on Federal lands in the Superior National Forest, within the Rainy River Watershed, poses a direct and long-term threat from sulfide-ore mining contamination to the pristine water and air quality and healthy forested habitat of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Voyageurs National Park.

(11) The likely contamination of the air, water, and forested habitat of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Voyageurs National Park from the mining of copper, nickel, platinum, palladium, gold, and silver on Federal lands within the Rainy River Watershed puts at risk—

(A) the nationally recognized natural resources of the area; and

(B) the region's amenity-based and tourism industry, which if protected by a mineral withdrawal, would grow by 1,500 to 4,600 more jobs and \$100,000,000 to \$900,000,000 more income over the next 20 years than if such mining were not banned.

(12) In 2016, the Forest Service issued a Record of Decision which found "unacceptable the inherent potential risk that development of a regionally untested copper-nickel sulfide ore mine within the same watershed as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness might cause serious and irreplaceable harm to this unique, iconic, and irreplaceable wilderness area". The Forest

Service subsequently proposed a 20-year mineral withdrawal of 234,328 acres of Federal lands and waters in the Rainy River Watershed.

(13) In 2018, approximately 20 months into a 24-month review period of the Rainy River Watershed mineral withdrawal proposal, the Department of Agriculture abruptly canceled the withdrawal application and abandoned the Environmental Assessment.

#### SEC. 3. WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LANDS AND WATERS IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.

(a) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this Act, the term "Map" means the map prepared by the Forest Service entitled "Superior National Forest Mineral Withdrawal Application Map" and dated December 5, 2016.

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 234,328 acres of Federal land and waters in the Rainy River Watershed of the Superior National Forest in the State of Minnesota, as located on the Map and described in the Federal Register Notice of Application for Withdrawal, dated January 19, 2017 (82 Fed. Reg. 6639), are hereby withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(c) ACQUIRED LAND.—Any land or interest in land within the area depicted on the Map that is acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act shall, on acquisition, be immediately withdrawn in accordance with this section.

(d) REMOVAL OF SAND, GRAVEL, GRANITE, IRON ORE, AND TACONITE.—The Chief of the Forest Service is authorized to permit the removal of sand, gravel, granite, iron ore, and taconite from national forest system lands within the area depicted on the Map if the Chief determines that the removal is not detrimental to the water quality, air quality, and health of the forest habitat within the Rainy River Watershed.

(e) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The Map shall be kept on file and made available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for the protection of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and interconnected Federal lands and waters, including Voyageurs National Park, within the Rainy River Watershed in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes."

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

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. 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.

#### TRUST THE SCIENCE ACT

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1173, I call up the bill (H.R. 764) to require the Secretary of the Interior to reissue regulations removing the gray wolf from the