

This is very important for consumer protection. If you support consumer protection vote “yes” on this resolution. If you support safety and soundness for financial institutions vote “yes.” If you support reining in rogue regulators vote “yes.” This should be a wide bipartisan vote and a statement that the House supports digital assets, digital innovation, and thoughtful policymaking from our regulators and regulated finance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this resolution. I also thank my colleagues on the Democrat side, Mr. NICKEL, and on the Republican side, Mr. FLOOD, for their thoughtful approach to policymaking, and digital assets generally, but on developing this Congressional Review Act proposal, in particular.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MINING REGULATORY CLARITY ACT OF 2024

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1194, I call up the bill (H.R. 2925) to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to provide for security of tenure for use of mining claims for ancillary activities, 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 1194, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 118-416 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 2925

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 “Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2024”.

SEC. 2. USE OF MINING CLAIMS FOR ANCILLARY ACTIVITIES.

Section 10101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (30 U.S.C. 28f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) SECURITY OF TENURE.—

“(1) CLAIMANT RIGHTS.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF OPERATIONS.—In this paragraph, the term ‘operations’ means—

“(i) with respect to a locatable mineral, any activity or work carried out in connection with—

“(I) prospecting;

“(II) exploration;

“(III) discovery and assessment;

“(IV) development;

“(V) extraction; or

“(VI) processing;

“(ii) the reclamation of an area disturbed by an activity described in clause (i); and

“(iii) any activity reasonably incident to an activity described in clause (i) or (ii), regardless of whether that incidental activity is carried out on a mining claim, including the construction and maintenance of any road, transmission line, pipeline, or any other necessary infrastructure or means of access on public land for a support facility.

“(B) RIGHTS TO USE, OCCUPATION, AND OPERATIONS.—A claimant shall have the right to use and occupy to conduct operations on public land, with or without the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit, if—

“(i) the claimant makes a timely payment of—

“(I) the location fee required by section 10102; and

“(II) the claim maintenance fee required by subsection (a); or

“(ii) in the case of a claimant who qualifies for a waiver of the claim maintenance fee under subsection (d)—

“(I) the claimant makes a timely payment of the location fee required by section 10102; and

“(II) the claimant complies with the required assessment work under the general mining laws.

“(2) FULFILLMENT OF FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976.—A claimant that fulfills the requirements of this section and section 10102 shall be deemed to satisfy any requirements under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) for the payment of fair market value to the United States for the use of public land and resources pursuant to the general mining laws.

“(3) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subsection—

“(A) diminishes any right (including a right of entry, use, or occupancy) of a claimant;

“(B) creates or increases any right (including a right of exploration, entry, use, or occupancy) of a claimant on lands that are not open to location under the general mining laws;

“(C) modifies any provision of law or any prior administrative action withdrawing lands from location or entry;

“(D) limits the right of the Federal Government to regulate mining and mining-related activities (including requiring claim validity examinations to establish the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit) in areas withdrawn from mining (including under—

“(i) the general mining laws;

“(ii) the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

“(iii) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.);

“(iv) sections 100731 through 100737 of title 54, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ‘Mining in the Parks Act’);

“(v) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); or

“(vi) division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ‘National Historic Preservation Act’); or

“(E) restores any right (including a right of entry, use, or occupancy, or right to conduct operations) of a claimant that existed prior to the date that the lands were closed to or withdrawn from location under the general mining laws and that has been extinguished by such closure or withdrawal.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 30

minutes 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 New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY) each will control 15 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. 2925.

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. 2925, the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2024.

In May 2022, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed a lower court’s decision revoking an approved mine plan for the Rosemont Copper Mine project in Arizona.

This determination commonly called the Rosemont decision upended decades of regulatory precedent and specific U.S. Forest Service regulations that allow approvals of operation on or off a mining claim so long as these operations meet environmental and regulatory standards.

Essentially, this court’s ruling puts the cart before the horse and fails to reflect the process of how a company actually develops a mine. I think there is some confusion about the mine approval process and what the term “valid” claim means.

First, when looking to develop a mine, an operator must submit something called a Mine Plan of Operations to the United States Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management. This plan must include the intended uses of the surface of the mining claim, including those for waste rock placements, mills, offices, and roads.

The Mine Plan of Operations is key in determining the economic feasibility of a mining site, which, in turn, factors into the basis of determining which mineral deposits are commercially developable and, therefore, valid.

If allowed to stand, the Rosemont decision would require the discovery and determination of a valid mineral deposit, meaning that operators must prove the existence of a commercially developable deposit on a claim before a plan of operations can be approved.

Remember, a mine cannot move forward if the Federal Government does not approve any facet of the Mine Plan of Operations. Further, mineral validity cannot be determined until after the economic viability of a site—as is laid out in the Mine Plan of Operations—is verified by the Federal Government, as well.

H.R. 2925, Mr. Speaker, would reverse this backward determination of the court, allowing American mining to resume on Federal lands. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2925, and I will remind my friends across the aisle that mining is already happening on American lands and on our public lands.

However, this week, instead of working on meaningful legislation on behalf of the American people, our friends have opted instead to focus on a toxic free-for-all on our public lands and have opted to focus on legislation to rollback energy efficiency in home appliances.

In fact, they put forward a bill this week called Hands Off Our Home Appliances because they are so concerned about the American people that they want to regulate the efficiency of their toasters, their dishwashers, their refrigerators, and undermine the ability of our immigrant and our Hispano communities to have representation in the United States Census and, yes, to allow a free-for-all on our public lands.

Now, the American people are not asking us to do this. They are asking us to work on real problems: to work on the economy, inflation, helping families put food on the table and a roof over their head, protecting our reproductive rights and access to the ballot box, protecting our democracy, and dealing with the international crises that are happening on multiple continents.

My question is: Why the heck are we back on the House floor one week after we voted, on a bipartisan basis, to send this bad bill back to committee when it couldn't even be supported on the floor once?

Yet here we are, and our friends are trying to pass it once again, without revision, without changes because they think they found a few extra spare votes.

Let's talk about mining laws. The existing mining law of 1872 already gives our mining companies, including foreign-owned companies, the right to extract on our publicly-owned lands. They can also do so without having to pay even one cent in royalties. That includes companies that are controlled by governments of adversarial nations.

This is not only a shameful giveaway, but a huge national security vulnerability for the United States. This bill is not about clarifying a court decision, it is about giving more minerals away to those who would like unfettered access to our public lands. It would give opportunities for multinational corporations and adversarial nations to control even more of our resources without having to pay royalties to the U.S. Government, and to tie up claims on our public lands, whether or not there are minerals actually present there.

This would make it impossible to invalidate a mining claim, even if their real intent was other things, maybe to lock up development on other uses or buying them for other uses, including construction of transmission lines or other things that they would want to do.

This should be of deep concern to anyone who does not want adversarial nations or the companies that operate in them to control our public lands or minerals.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle argue that it is either mine here or mine abroad and create a false equivalency, but it is not that simple. Some of the countries that are trying to expand their mining operations here in the United States, in fact, many of these multinational corporations are owned as subsidiaries under countries like China and other countries that we have adversarial relationships with.

□ 1330

They also engage in practices that we know cause human rights abuses, things like slave labor elsewhere in the world. While my friends across the aisle have tried to claim that this is really about mining on American lands, it is about granting unfettered access to these corporations.

In fact, these entities can ship the minerals that they take from American lands anywhere in the world and smelt those materials on the cheap, often relying on human rights abuses abroad to cut costs.

As I said, we already had this debate last week. The outcome was the entire House, right here on this floor, voted to send this toxic bill back to the Natural Resources Committee. In fact, that hasn't happened in years because this bill was so flawed and such a giveaway to foreign national owned companies and a threat to our national security that it was agreed that it wasn't ready for prime time and shouldn't be passed on the floor.

My colleague from New Mexico, Representative TERESA LEGER FERNANDEZ, offered to send the bill back to committee so that we could discuss amending the bill to ban these adversarial corporations operating in adversarial nations from mining and locking up our public lands.

I have to say, I was heartened. We had six Republicans join the Democrats to do just that. They said they were not going to vote for that bill. Well, it was about time. We need some bipartisan support to double down on protecting U.S. interests.

In fact, as I said, it has been decades since the House sent a bill back to committee like that, but as we see today, here we are. Republican leadership is trying once again to get the bill passed through brute force without addressing serious concerns, without sending it back to committee, without going through due process. Here we are, debating it and about to take a vote again.

These concerns aren't new. Last year, the bill was included in H.R. 1. At that time, one of my Republican colleagues offered a very similar amendment banning mining on our public lands by foreign companies with records of human rights violations. We are literally talking about companies that have child slave labor records. That amendment passed through committee on a bipartisan basis, yet they stripped it out and are trying to pass the bill without it here today on the floor.

I find it absolutely jaw-dropping and extremely telling that this was the amendment that was stripped out of the bill and that we are back here a week later after this bill failed on the floor.

I think it is very clear what is going on here. This is really about advancing the interests of corporations, interests on our public lands, and opening them up for exploitation.

I think it is important that we talk about how outrageous this is. We have to ensure that our public lands are not open to our adversaries, to these multinational corporations that will exploit our minerals for free. We need some bipartisan action to make sure that that cannot happen.

We should be back in committee discussing the vulnerabilities, discussing the national security implications, discussing American competitiveness, discussing energy policy, not trying to jam through a bill that will violate human rights and international trade.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I want to be very clear: This bill will not allow mining companies to do whatever they want on public land. That is a fact.

Mining activity will not occur if any facet of a mine plan of operations has not passed our strict Federal guidelines and our strict environmental guidelines.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2925, the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act, offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI).

H.R. 2925 would resolve harmful permitting uncertainty and litigation delays caused by a harmful 2019 rogue court decision known as the Rosemont decision. This decision revoked a previously approved mine plan in my great State of Arizona, ignoring 40 years of Federal permitting and land management regulations.

The uncertainty caused by Rosemont threatens to add years of delays to any proposed mining project on Federal lands in the United States.

Congress should act to remedy the fallout created by Rosemont and must work to expedite mine permitting and build up domestic mineral supply chains.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill that will provide much-needed certainty for domestic mining projects.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, we have heard repeatedly from across the aisle that mining pollution is a thing of the past, that today's modern mining industry operates under the highest environmental standards, and that after the mining operations stop, the industry cleans up after itself. If that sounds too good to be true, it is because it is.

Our current regulations require companies to post financial assurances to cover the cost of cleanup after their mining operations stop, but it is not enough. Dangerous pollution still happens far too often. Depending on the mine type and location, between 74 and 82 percent of modern-day mines are polluting beyond what their permits allow.

The kicker? Taxpayers pay domestic and foreign mining companies for their subsidies and often the entire cost of cleanup. Given the \$54 billion backlog to clean up mines abandoned before our current reclamation regulations, which continue to pollute our lands, waters, and communities, the American taxpayer literally cannot afford new mining pollution.

That is why I filed an amendment to this bill to improve bonding requirements and make mining companies keep up with the new mining rush that this bill would enable.

This is a commonsense amendment. If we are going to allow a toxic mining free-for-all, we should at least make sure that taxpayers are not footing the bill. After all, this bill opens up our lands to our foreign adversaries, and I don't expect them to clean up after themselves out of the goodness of their hearts.

My amendment would make sure operators post financial assurances to fully cover reclamation of all mining activities. It would correct for inconsistencies in both BLM and Forest Service regulations and codify those corrections into law. It would have made sure these financial assurances were real money, like surety bonds, irrevocable letters of credit, certificates of deposit, or cash, not insurance policies that lapse if the mining company goes bankrupt.

It is time we hold industry accountable and make sure they cannot pass on the costs of cleaning up after themselves, the costs of their earning profits, to the American people.

Guess what? The Republican majority refused to even consider my amendment. They blocked it from getting a debate on the House floor and even from getting a simple up-or-down vote.

It is outrageous, and it paints a dark picture of the House Republican's priorities: polluters over people, and China over the American taxpayer.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), my good friend, for his words of support for this legislation.

Again, this legislation would correct a misguided court decision revoking an approved mine for the Rosemont Copper Mine Project in Arizona.

Arizona produced the second-most amount of minerals in the United States in 2023. It also has over 30 million acres of Federal lands. If the Rosemont decision stands, over 40 percent of Arizona's lands will be taken offline in the U.S. in the battle to produce enough minerals to meet our ever-growing needs.

As a member of the Natural Resources Committee, the Democrats brought an expert forward, Madam Speaker, an anti-mining expert. In fact, she said we have to stop hard-rock mining because the reclamation process doesn't work. I invited her to our great State of Minnesota to show her a reclaimed mine where we have deer hunting, bears, eagles, bees, birds, haymaking. We have drinking water that comes from mines that are not in operation. We have recreation in our mines in Minnesota and elsewhere in this country.

This hard-rock mining expert said it is too dry in Arizona and too wet in Minnesota to mine. I asked where she would like us to mine these minerals for our national security. She said the quiet part out loud. She said nowhere. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to allow mining to happen in this country.

The Communist country of China was just mentioned. This administration today, Madam Speaker, is in consultation with Congo, where 15 of the 19 industrial mines use child slave labor owned by the Chinese Communist country.

The Biden administration is entering into memorandums of understanding to have critical minerals mined by child slave labor in Congo, where there are zero environmental standards and zero labor standards, to meet their green agenda, Madam Speaker. They are okay with that but will not allow mining to happen in this country that follows our environmental and labor standards.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, I live in the heart of mining country, and the best water in Minnesota is in the heart of mining country. We can drink it right out of the ground in Buhl, Minnesota.

I can tell you that this country better take part in mining domestically. Otherwise, we are going to find ourselves, Madam Speaker, in deep, deep trouble.

The Department of Energy and the Department of Defense say we need more domestic mining. We cannot rely on China and other adversarial nations. This is a simple fix.

We believe the court erred, so it is our job to re-legislate this part of mining that is so important to the United

States of America. It is so important to our communities where we are blessed to have these natural resources.

For my good friends and colleagues from California, let's go back many years. California started on a gold rush. It began because of mining. Safe to say, we don't want to follow California much longer, with what is happening in that great State.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, I believe this is going to pass in a bipartisan fashion. It is a good piece of legislation. I look forward to passing it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Madam Speaker, yes, California is a great State.

Madam Speaker, six Republicans joined Democrats in voting to stop this bill and send it back to committee, something that hasn't happened in 32 years. Of the Republicans who voted to send the bill back to committee, one had an amendment to say that if a company is guilty of human rights abuses, including slave labor in other countries, than they are not welcome to our land and minerals for free.

By the time the bill came to the House floor last week, Republican leaders had stripped the amendment right out. I guess Republicans want to take the win on supporting drug cartels and child sex traffickers, groups that benefit from human rights violations.

In addition, the Republican chair of the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party also filed an amendment to close the loophole. That one was blocked twice by Republican leaders.

Republicans have voted to keep foreign adversaries from accessing our oil and gas. How are our minerals different? Insert side eye here because it doesn't add up.

Pardon my skepticism that there is not bipartisan concern here. This bill is a toxic national security giveaway to our foreign adversaries. It undercuts our competitiveness, and it is unconscionable on human rights. That is why we are seeing some Republicans buck their party on it, and I hope they will stand strong.

□ 1345

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I would like to insert my side eye, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The disastrous results of the Rosemont decision will redirect the huge amounts of capital needed to mine domestically to countries like the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Indonesia.

When we choose this out-of-sight, out-of-mind mentality approach to

mining, development flows to other nations with significantly lower environmental and labor standards. Indonesia, for example, is currently the world's largest nickel producer and its dominance is only expected to grow in the coming years.

Indonesian mining is accomplished with sweeping deforestation and pollution, many of which are financed, again, by the Chinese Communist Party. These operations consistently ignore environmental impacts on local communities and leave the land far worse off than they found it.

On the other hand, American mines, like this mine project in Nevada, adhere to the best standards in the world and are committed to restoring the land after minerals are extracted.

In fact, again, mines are not even permitted until the Federal Government approves a full Mine Plan of Operations, which must include a robust plan and financial assurance for reclamation after the project is complete.

Madam Speaker, this is simple. Either we do it here or we let foreign adversarial nations take over. This is a strategic national security interest.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, last week, House Republicans tried to pass H.R. 2925 to make it easier for the biggest mining corporations to take our public lands and mineral resources without giving the American people a dime.

I filed a motion to send the bill back to the committee to consider my amendment, which would have prevented companies owned or controlled by our adversaries from taking our gold, copper, and precious rare earth minerals to use against us in the market or in national security.

Fortunately, last week, a bipartisan majority, including six Republicans, passed my motion. We stood up together for our national security. However, the Republican leadership ignored last week's bipartisan vote, and here we are again.

What is worse, the Rules Committee Republicans rejected Chairman MOOLENAAR's amendment to ban foreign entities of concern from conducting mining operations on our public lands.

Let me remind everybody, Chairman MOOLENAAR heads the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party. It is his job to know how dangerous China's mining of our precious minerals is to our economy and national security.

The Republicans blocked their own Republican chair's amendment. I believe in bipartisanship, so when I see an amendment I like and recognize is good, I support it.

Madam Speaker, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit

this bill back to committee once again. If House rules permitted, I would offer the motion with Chairman MOOLENAAR's amendment, which would block foreign entities of concern from mining our public lands.

When Republicans block even consideration of an amendment which would ban China from taking away the precious metals that belong to the American people, Republicans are putting the interests of wealthy foreign corporations over the American people.

I hope the six Republicans who were courageous enough to stand up for American security interests last week stand for America today.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I urge support for my motion so that the Natural Resources Committee can consider this amendment, this time in good faith.

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

Federal lands account for as much as 86 percent of the land area in certain Western States, and these same States account for 75 percent of our Nation's metals production.

The Mining Regulatory Clarity Act is needed to ensure that we have certainty of access to these essential mineral deposits.

If we want to encourage investment in safe, responsible, clean mining practices that provide billions in taxes that support our roads, bridges, schools, and other essential services, along with the essential materials to the American people, then we also need to support H.R. 2925.

Madam Speaker, really quick, you are hearing the other side of the aisle not necessarily debate the actual legislation. We have heard them talk about the process. When you can't debate the legislation, then you go after the process.

This is a very, very good piece of legislation, and I look forward to it passing in just the next hour or so.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STANSBURY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2925, which rolls out the welcome mat to our foreign adversaries to exploit our minerals and violate human rights as well as national security.

We must defeat this bill. We did last week. We debated the merits. It is bad for America. It is bad for national security. It is bad for our economy. It is bad for American mining. It is bad for the environment, and that is why we must send it back.

Madam Speaker, I support the gentlewoman's motion to recommit. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Let's be clear: There are no mines operating on Federal lands that are owned by the Chinese Communist Party. Zero. Zero. Anybody that mines in the United States will follow our environmental standards and our labor standards. It doesn't matter which company it is. They are going to follow our rules.

For this administration to turn a blind eye to the atrocities and the human rights violations to meet their green agenda, it is unconscionable. We can do it here in the United States with the best labor standards, the best environmental standards, with our technology, and be proud of these minerals that we produce. We can lead the rest of the world on how to do it. Nobody does it better than the United States of America and our workers, period.

Madam Speaker, let me address some of the misinformation we have heard about this bill. This bill does not allow mining companies to continue to operate under conditions that don't follow our labor and environmental standards.

If the outlandish circumstances that my friends on the other side of the aisle have been telling you will happen if this bill is enacted could have actually happened all along, including land lock-ups and subversion of environmental and governmental oversight, then why didn't it happen?

It is because the harm they claim this bill could inflict upon our Federal lands is actually not true. It is inaccurate.

This bill would, however, allow America to become a global leader in mineral production once again.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Governor of Nevada in support of H.R. 2925.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
May 1, 2024.

Hon. DINA TITUS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STEVEN HORSFORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. SUSIE LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES TITUS, HORSFORD, AND LEE: I write in support of the Congressman Amodei's Mining Regulatory Clarity Act of 2024 (H.R. 2925) and encourage you to vote in favor of this critical bill when it reaches the House floor. In doing so you will stand in solidarity with Senator Cortez Masto and Senator Rosen, sponsors of the Senate companion bill (S. 1281), and the State of Nevada to support a key pillar of our economy. Since the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals issued its decision in *Center for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service*, also known as the Rosemont decision, the future of hardrock mining in Nevada and the West has been plagued by uncertainty. This matter must be favorably resolved for the Silver State and bipartisan, bicameral legislation must be signed by the

President to help ensure the economic viability of our robust mining industry.

The Mining Regulatory Clarity Act (MRCA) simply reinstates the contemporary mining policy and permitting practices that were upended by the Rosemont decision. Contrary to the scare tactics of critics, the MRCA does not open the door to unrestricted use of public lands, block renewable energy, recreation, or conservation, or allow mining in National Parks, wilderness areas, and other special areas. Rather, it provides much-needed business certainty and protects the 14,700 direct high-paying jobs and an additional 20,000 indirect jobs that are supported by the mining industry in the state. In addition to providing employment with high, family supporting salaries averaging over \$100,000, the industry provides \$4.9 billion of our state's gross domestic product and \$12.7 billion in economic output.

Schools and local governments in each of your districts also benefit from the \$389 million the industry paid in state and local taxes. More than half of the mining Net Proceeds of Minerals (NPOM) tax revenue goes to the Nevada State Education Fund. The other half goes to the county where the minerals were produced. Gold and silver operators further contribute to the State Education Fund through the Gold and Silver Excise Tax, or Mining Education Tax which was established during the 81st Nevada Legislative Session; and in fiscal year 2023, contributed approximately \$68 million to the State. Beginning in fiscal year 2024, revenue from the Mining Education Tax will go directly into the State Education Fund. The Rosemont decision ends hardrock mining as we know it and threatens the livelihoods and institutions that rely on it.

Nevada is counting on you to unite and join Senators Cortez Masto and Rosen and Congressman Amodei to provide certainty to one of Nevada's critical industries. I look forward to continuing to work collaboratively to ensure Nevada remains well positioned as a leader in domestic mineral production, from lithium and other critical materials to precious metals.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JOE LOMBARDO,
Governor.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I support fair labor standards, high environmental standards, and increasing our national security. In short, I support domestic mining. I urge all of my colleagues to do the same and support H.R. 2925.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1194, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Leger Fernandez of New Mexico moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2925 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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

Ms. Leger Fernandez moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2925 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.

Section 10101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (30 U.S.C. 28f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A claimant shall be barred from the right described in subsection (e)(1)(B) if the claimant—

“(A) is a foreign entity of concern; or

“(B) is a subsidiary of a foreign entity of concern.

“(2) FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN DEFINED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In this subsection, the term ‘foreign entity of concern’ has the meaning given the term in section 40207(a)(5) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 18741(a)(5)).

“(B) CLARIFICATION.—In this subsection, a foreign entity of concern is subject to the jurisdiction or direction of a government of a foreign country that is a covered nation (as that term is defined in section 2533c(d) of title 10, United States Code) within the meaning of section 40207(a)(5)(C) of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (42 U.S.C. 18741(a)(5)) if such entity is more than 10 percent owned, directed, controlled, financed, directly or indirectly, individually or in aggregate, by any individual that is the citizen, national or permanent resident or is an entity subject to the jurisdiction of the government of a covered nation.”.

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

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam 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.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-138)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to

the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004—as modified in scope and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13399 of April 25, 2006, Executive Order 13460 of February 13, 2008, Executive Order 13572 of April 29, 2011, Executive Order 13573 of May 18, 2011, Executive Order 13582 of August 17, 2011, Executive Order 13606 of April 22, 2012, and Executive Order 13608 of May 1, 2012—is to continue in effect beyond May 11, 2024.

The regime's brutality and repression of the Syrian people, who have called for freedom and a representative government, not only endangers the Syrian people themselves, but also generates instability throughout the region. The Syrian regime's actions and policies, including with respect to chemical weapons and supporting terrorist organizations, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13338 with respect to Syria.

In addition, the United States condemns the brutal violence and human rights violations and abuses of the Assad regime and its Russian and Iranian enablers. The United States calls on the Assad regime, and its backers, to stop its violent war against its own people, enact a nationwide ceasefire, facilitate the unhindered delivery of humanitarian assistance to all Syrians in need, and negotiate a political settlement in Syria in line with United Nations Security Council Resolution 2254. The United States will consider changes in policies and actions of the Government of Syria in determining whether to continue or terminate this national emergency in the future.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 8, 2024.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SECURING THE INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES SUPPLY CHAIN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118-139)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides