

truth, education, and prevention. That is because remembrance is not just about the past, it is about protecting the future.

I will continue to stand with the Armenian community, and I will work to ensure that the promise of “never again” is upheld.

**CELEBRATING EL PACHA**

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate Frederick Martinez, El Pacha, a defining voice in the Dominican media as he celebrates 3 years of “El Pacha Oficial,” his newest entertainment series.

Known to millions of people as El Pacha, Martinez has built a legacy as one of the most dynamic and influential communicators in the Dominican community.

From standout programs like “Ritmo del Sabado,” “De aqui pa’ alla con El Pacha,” and “Sabadazo con El Pacha,” he introduced a bold style that broke traditional molds and brought audiences closer to him.

More than a presenter, Pacha is a cultural phenomenon. His improvisational talent and authentic voice have inspired generations of broadcasters while redefining Caribbean entertainment.

Today, we celebrate not just a career, but a legacy, one defined by passion, authenticity, and lasting impact.

New York is yours.

“Pacha, New York is yours; “Pacha, Nueva York es tuyo.”

**CONGRATULATING JACKSON COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL BLUE DEVILS**

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the remarkable achievement in Tennessee’s Sixth Congressional District: The Jackson County High School Blue Devils have claimed the TSSAA Class 1A State championship in boys’ basketball.

The Blue Devils of Jackson County did not just win a title, they earned it. Game by game, practice by practice, through early mornings and late nights in the gym, these young men from our corner of Tennessee rose above every opponent to stand atop the entire State.

To the coaches and the staff: Your belief in these young men made champions out of them.

To the parents and families who traveled every mile and cheered every possession, this title belongs to you, as well.

To the community of Jackson County, you have every reason to be proud.

Class 1A is where heart beats talent and where small towns prove that

greatness has no ZIP Code. The Blue Devils proved that in dramatic fashion this season, and the Sixth District is better for it.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Jackson County Blue Devils, State champions.

□ 0920

**COMMEMORATING 160TH ANNIVERSARY OF ANTIOCH MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH**

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

Mr. MENEFEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and commemorate the 160th Anniversary of Antioch Missionary Baptist Church.

Mr. Speaker, 160 years ago, formerly enslaved persons got together along Buffalo Bayou with nothing but faith and freedom. There, they built a church with their own hands, their own bricks, and their own will. That church is Antioch, which has served Fourth Ward, downtown Houston, Texas.

Antioch has been a hub of activism since Reconstruction. It had its doors open during the civil rights movement, where people needed organizing and courage. Under Pastor Lou McElroy and First Lady McElroy, that mission continues today.

Isaiah 43 tells us not to dwell on the former things. Antioch’s impact is not just the past. It is present. The congregation is still educating, organizing, impacting, and showing up for Houston each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Antioch Missionary Baptist Church on 160 years of excellence and service to Houston, Texas, and to this Nation.

**HARNESSING ENERGY AT THERMAL SOURCES ACT OF 2026**

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1189, I call up the bill (H.R. 5587) to amend the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 to waive the requirement for a Federal drilling permit for certain activities, to exempt certain activities from the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 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 1189, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 5587

*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 “Harnessing Energy At Thermal Sources Act of 2026” or the “HEATS Act”.*

**SEC. 2. NO FEDERAL PERMIT REQUIRED FOR GEOTHERMAL ACTIVITIES ON CERTAIN LAND.**

*The Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

**“SEC. 30. NO FEDERAL PERMIT REQUIRED FOR GEOTHERMAL ACTIVITIES ON CERTAIN LAND.**

*“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall not require an operator to obtain a Federal drilling permit for geothermal exploration and production activities conducted on a non-Federal surface estate, provided that—*

*“(1) the United States holds an ownership interest of less than 50 percent of the subsurface geothermal estate to be accessed by the proposed action; and*

*“(2) the operator submits to the Secretary a State permit to conduct geothermal exploration and production activities on the non-Federal surface estate.*

*“(b) NO FEDERAL ACTION.—A geothermal exploration and production activity carried out under subsection (a)—*

*“(1) shall not be considered a major Federal action for the purposes of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969;*

*“(2) shall require no additional Federal action;*

*“(3) may commence 30 days after submission of the State permit to the Secretary;*

*“(4) shall not be subject to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973; and*

*“(5) shall only be considered an undertaking under division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ‘National Historic Preservation Act’), if, with respect to the State in which the activity occurs, there is no State law in effect that addresses the preservation of historic properties in such State.*

*“(c) ROYALTIES AND PRODUCTION ACCOUNTABILITY.—(1) Nothing in this section shall affect the amount of royalties due to the United States under this Act from the production of electricity using geothermal resources (other than direct use of geothermal resources) or the production of any byproducts.*

*“(2) The Secretary may conduct onsite reviews and inspections to ensure proper accountability, measurement, and reporting of the production described in subsection (a), and payment of royalties.*

*“(d) EXCEPTIONS.—This section shall not apply to actions on Indian lands or resources managed in trust for the benefit of Indian Tribes.*

*“(e) INDIAN LAND.—In this section, the term ‘Indian land’ means—*

*“(1) any land located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancharia; and*

*“(2) any land not located within the boundaries of an Indian reservation, pueblo, or rancharia, the title to which is held—*

*“(A) in trust by the United States for the benefit of an Indian tribe or an individual Indian;*

*“(B) by an Indian tribe or an individual Indian, subject to restriction against alienation under laws of the United States; or*

*“(C) by a dependent Indian community.”.*

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

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. ANSARI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5587.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5587, the Harnessing Energy At Thermal Sources Act, or the HEATS Act.

This is an important bill to help add to the energy needs that our country has. We can do that very responsibly. We can do it in a smarter and more proactive way.

I thank Representative YOUNG KIM for being a leader on this issue and working with our committee to bring this bipartisan legislation to the floor.

H.R. 5587, the HEATS Act, is a commonsense bill that would expedite the development of geothermal energy on non-Federal surface lands where the Federal subsurface estate is less than 50 percent.

Currently, geothermal operators on non-Federal land are required to undergo a full Federal permitting process under the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the National Historic Preservation Act if they intersect any quantity of Federal subsurface resources, even if the Federal mineral interest is minuscule.

This process creates unnecessary delays for geothermal energy project developers, who must already comply with rigorous State-level permitting requirements.

H.R. 5587 would address this issue by alleviating the need for the Bureau of Land Management to issue permits for geothermal wells on State and private lands where the Federal Government holds an ownership interest of less than 50 percent of the subsurface geothermal estate.

Crucially, this bill upholds strong environmental standards by stipulating that Federal requirements may only be waived if operators receive drilling permits and comply with historic preservation laws on the State level.

Notably, the bill would not impact the royalties paid to the Federal Government. Therefore, it will not reduce the Federal revenues generated by geothermal production. In fact, this legislation would actually increase Federal revenues by reducing the administrative responsibilities of Federal agencies and expediting the permitting process so that we can build more geothermal energy projects and do more development in that area.

I want to emphasize the importance of this legislation. Again, energy demand is skyrocketing, and geothermal energy stands ready to meet the mo-

ment and bring gigawatts of new baseload power online.

Out West, the Great Basin region encompasses swaths of California, Oregon, Utah, and most of Nevada. According to a recent study from the U.S. Geological Survey, this region alone hosts approximately 135 gigawatts of geothermal potential.

To unleash geothermal energy's full potential, we must cut unnecessary red tape holding back key projects on these lands. By reducing duplicative Federal requirements on State and private lands, this bill will give developers the regulatory certainty needed to spur greater investment in geothermal exploration and production.

Mr. Speaker, again, this is an opportunity to do something proactive, something that I think we can all be proud of in the future. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My constituents and Americans across the country are struggling under the rising costs of gas, groceries, and electricity from President Trump's tariffs and endless wars. We should be spending our time finding ways to lower costs for families. Instead, we are moving on legislation that is just another chapter in the Republican playbook to gut commonsense safeguards for energy development.

I am a strong supporter of geothermal energy. Geothermal is a clean, reliable, affordable, and abundant form of electricity. Unfortunately, I have to oppose H.R. 5587, the HEATS Act, on the floor today.

This is a complex issue. The bill waives the requirement for a Federal drilling permit if a project starts on private or State lands and then drills underground into Federal lands, provided the total project is made up of less than 50 percent Federal subsurface land.

The bill says these projects don't need to do any analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. They don't need to comply with the Endangered Species Act. They don't need to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act so long as the State has any law that vaguely "addresses the preservation of historic properties."

The majority says that this is about reducing duplicative reviews, but I see it as an irresponsible waiver of the Federal Government's obligation to steward our Federal resources.

In practice, this means that in areas where the Federal Government owns the underground mineral rights but a rancher owns the surface rights to graze their cattle, or a farmer to grow their crops, underground development could take place without that landowner even knowing and without sufficient protections in place.

The permit to drill process is the process surface landowners use to work

with developers to make sure their lands and resources, like groundwater they depend on for their wells or springs, are protected when developers are drilling into Federal minerals.

We are not talking about developers just tapping into a few feet of underground Federal lands. Geothermal wells can extend horizontally for kilometers.

While geothermal energy is exponentially safer than oil and gas development, that doesn't mean that developers should just skip their environmental reviews altogether.

Landowners and communities have the right to provide input into how public lands are developed, whether that development is on the surface of the land or below it.

Again, I am a strong supporter of geothermal energy. It provides 24/7 carbon-free energy and creates good jobs in the clean energy economy.

For decades, geothermal energy was confined to naturally occurring hot water reservoirs, but recent technological breakthroughs have created next-generation geothermal systems that can be deployed in a wide range of conditions at competitive prices.

At this rate of innovation, low-cost, next-generation geothermal could soon be possible all across the country, not in decades but in the next few years.

This could be truly transformational for our energy system. Paired with wind and solar, geothermal can help us break free from fossil fuels and build a reliable, homegrown energy system that we need to fight climate change and tackle the affordability crisis.

I have a bill, the Geothermal Gold Book Development Act, that is part of the package of six bills, three from Democrats and three from Republicans, that the Natural Resources Committee passed out of committee by unanimous consent.

These bills, including my own, would all help make permitting easier for geothermal through commonsense ways like increased coordination at BLM field offices, cost-recovery authority, and some categorical exclusions that already exist for oil and gas development on previously disturbed lands.

Those are the kinds of things that we should focus on that will actually help move the needle on projects.

□ 0930

I have heard arguments that we should provide these waivers so that the Bureau of Land Management's limited staff can focus on bigger problems. I agree that staff in BLM field offices are overworked and understaffed.

However, let's be honest about the situation. The Bureau of Land Management doesn't have enough staff because the President continues to try to zero out the budget for renewable energy, and former Presidential aide Elon Musk kicked off across-the-board staff cuts.

You cannot break the system, then blame the broken system as your excuse to waive the law. When we waive

those Federal review obligations, we end up relying on a patchwork of State laws.

Under State laws, what happens to the government-to-government consultation responsibilities required by the National Historic Preservation Act or federally protected endangered species? What if a State doesn't provide opportunities for public input or even public notice?

Again, I strongly support geothermal energy development on our Federal lands. It is a very promising and growing source of energy. But instead of spending floor time on geothermal legislation that everyone supports and could help stop skyrocketing electricity bills, we are debating a bill to solve a problem that may not even be a burden on the industry.

I am happy to continue to work across the aisle to advance geothermal legislation, but, unfortunately, I must oppose this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of similarities on both sides of the aisle, but there is a big difference. The similarities are that I think both sides of the aisle support geothermal energy. It is similar that we talk about inflation and high costs and how that affects Americans.

The difference is, on this side of the aisle we actually pass policies that will help those things. On the other side of the aisle, they vote against those policies.

We talk about the high cost of living. Republicans voted to give Americans a huge tax cut last year. All the Democrats voted against it.

We talk about high healthcare costs. Republicans voted to send \$50 billion to help with rural healthcare. All Democrats voted against it.

Today, we are talking about geothermal energy and the opportunities that are there. We have an opportunity to help make that happen more. Republicans are supporting it. I believe some Democrats will actually support this legislation, but there is a difference between saying you want something to happen and actually voting to make it happen.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM), and I thank her for her work on geothermal energy.

Mrs. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 5587, the Harnessing Energy At Thermal Sources Act or the HEATS Act.

Republicans ran on a simple promise: to unleash American energy dominance and lower prices for families. The HEATS Act delivers on those commitments.

Geothermal energy is a powerful domestic energy source that can generate electricity and heat homes and build-

ings without relying on foreign adversaries or suppliers.

America has enormous geothermal resources sitting right beneath our feet. My State of California has some of the richest geothermal reserves in the world, but burdensome permitting requirements are keeping that energy locked away.

The HEATS Act fixes that by cutting red tape and waiving Federal drilling permit requirements for geothermal wells on State and local lands. Operators will still go through a rigorous State-level permitting process, but they will no longer be subjected to duplicative Federal requirements that slow production, raise costs, and kill jobs.

This means more American energy coming online faster, lower energy costs for working families, and a stronger domestic supply chain that doesn't depend on adversaries like China.

H.R. 5587 is a commonsense, pro-growth measure that lowers energy costs and strengthens our national security.

I thank Representative GRAY for working with me and co-leading this effort. I also thank Chairman BRUCE WESTERMAN for his work to accelerate geothermal production and advance American energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the HEATS Act.

Ms. ANSARI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of geothermal energy, we are sure hearing a lot of hot air from the other side with this fantastical narrative that Republicans, I guess, are now lowering costs and saving healthcare.

The American people can decide whether they want to believe those whoppers, but today it is at least refreshing to see our colleagues across the aisle tiptoeing back in the direction of this all-of-the-above energy policy that they always swore they supported. Yet, for the past year-plus they have been cheerleaders for Donald Trump's insane war on clean energy that is trying to destroy an entire sector, to surrender American leadership to China and others, and drive up utility bills for the American people.

Nevertheless, I welcome the fact that we are talking today about geothermal energy. Like the gentlewoman from Arizona, the ranking member, I like geothermal energy a lot. This is something that we should be working on together in a bipartisan way. I represent the largest geothermal energy plant in America in my district, and I am proud of it. I want to see more of it.

Good geothermal energy projects can move forward with bipartisan support and with very expeditious permitting, but good geothermal energy projects don't need the kind of sweeping waiver that is proposed in this legislation, which simply misses the mark.

Let's talk about that. Under this bill, a geothermal project would no longer require a Federal drilling permit if it is on land where the surface is not federally owned, but the subsurface is significantly, up to 50 percent of the acreage.

While this may sound innocuous—oh, it is just subsurface; it is below what we can see with our eyes—without a Federal permit, the core safeguards for development affecting Federal resources would totally disappear. That includes protections under the National Environmental Policy Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

All of it would be waived for geothermal exploration, development, and the production activities that would be covered under this bill. That goes entirely too far. It is bad news for Tribes, communities, and property owners on the ground. Again, good projects don't need this kind of sweeping free pass from environmental review.

Under the circumstances laid out in this bill, all Federal oversight goes away, along with public input and consultation requirements, and that includes Tribal consultation. It takes away opportunities for public involvement that can make projects better. It takes away the convening process that brings Federal, Tribal, State, and local entities to the table so they can identify basic health and safety risks, flag concerns, and work through conflicts and impacts to protect the resources that are owned by the American people, even if they are below the ground, even if they are not something you can see with the naked eye.

This public input and compliance with Federal laws, like NEPA and others, is essential to building a solid foundation for our clean energy future.

We need these types of energy projects, but we need to do them right because, let's be clear, underground drilling can still have impacts above the ground, like sinking, subsidence, settlement of lands, earthquakes, and on other resources like groundwater.

Geothermal development is a lot safer than oil and gas, but there still are some risks—it is not zero—and the public deserves the opportunity to engage.

I will say that this bill is also playing games with percentages. The threshold is set at 50 percent Federal subsurface ownership, and that may sound trivial. It may sound reasonable, but even my rudimentary math skills tell me that 50 percent of a project that might be 2,000 acres is 1,000 acres. That is a lot of land. That is a lot of potential impacts. It is not insignificant.

Another alarming point about this bill, without a Federal drilling permit, it creates a gray area for underground injection control permits, which allow for the assessment of potential seismic activity. How could we not look at that?

□ 0940

These injection control permits aren't in our Natural Resources Committee's jurisdiction. This is something that I brought up in the markup. I urged the majority to consider working with the Energy and Commerce Committee to add clarifying language to make sure those permits would still be required. Unfortunately, the majority failed to address that concern.

There is no clear opportunity to require bonds if this legislation passes that would otherwise need to happen because we are talking about Federal resources. What happens if there is a subsidence event within the Federal resource? States and property owners would be on the hook.

We are talking about publicly owned resources here, even if you can't see them, and the Federal Government has an obligation to steward them responsibly.

The last thing I will emphasize is that this bill is clearly not just about geothermal energy. This is the proverbial camel's nose under the tent. The oil and gas industry has been trying to get this same policy, this same broad waiver, for subsurface Federal lands for years.

This is a precedent we should not set. Mark my words: If this legislation advances before this sputtering Congress comes to an end later this year, you will see another bill where the oil and gas industry is seeking the same treatment.

To deploy clean energy, we don't need to create shortcuts and exemptions from oversight. What we need is to fully fund our agencies so that they can have the capacity for thorough, efficient, and timely reviews. I would be happy to work with my colleagues across the aisle to advance responsible and well-balanced geothermal and other renewable energy development on Federal lands, but I have to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this poorly drafted legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the question: What is well balanced and what is fair about requiring a duplicative process? It is almost, from the minority's testimony, like there is no permitting that will happen. We are talking about a well that is drilled on State or private property close to Federal property. The surface disturbance is all on the State or private property. They have to go through the State permitting process, which is very rigorous. It is looking at the same things the Federal permitting process looks at.

The argument not to pass this bill is that we want to put on a belt and suspenders. We want to make the developers go through the total duplicative process because the underground well that is thousands of feet below ground would be receiving thermal energy that is under the Federal estate and all of the historical preservation, all the

NEPA, all the ESA, that has been looked at under the State permitting process.

Again, the surface disturbance would not be on Federal land. You are only talking about the migration of thermal energy thousands of feet below ground, and we are saying it is reasonable and fair and a good process to make a developer go through double permitting and opening up Pandora's box for people who, for whatever reason, don't like geothermal energy will have all these Federal statutes and the broken permitting process to stop geothermal energy projects.

If we are serious about producing more energy for this country, if we are serious about being energy independent, if we are serious about developing energy sources like geothermal energy, then this is a pragmatic, proactive way to make that happen. It removes duplicity, and it makes the process make sense.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, even good energy sources need good permitting policy. I am a strong supporter of geothermal energy, but the HEATS Act could undermine the on-the-ground support and good environmental track record geothermal currently enjoys.

The HEATS Act empowers one set of landowners at the expense of their neighbors. This bill allows developers to skip Federal permitting when drilling from their property into federally owned subsurface minerals which often sit under a neighbor's private property.

The Federal permit process gives surface landowners who happen to live above Federal minerals a say in what happens beneath their homes. What happens underground doesn't always stay underground. Drilling can cause earthquakes and sinkholes or accidentally contaminate drinking or irrigation water.

State laws do not always require the same protections for surface landowners, especially if they are not the ones doing the drilling. Without a Federal drilling permit, the Federal Government can't require financial assurances from developers to cover the costs of cleanup if surface damages do happen. That means landowners or Federal taxpayers will be on the hook to pay for the cleanup.

This bill would eliminate real, meaningful protections for landowners, not just red tape.

I am disappointed that this is the bill that the majority has chosen to bring to the House floor rather than the bipartisan package of real, commonsense permitting solutions for geothermal that the Natural Resources Committee unanimously supported.

That package includes my own Geothermal Gold Book Development Act to standardized best permitting practices across the Bureau of Land Management to responsibly speed up geo-

thermal development. I hope to keep working across the aisle to advance geothermal energy, but this particular bill is a step in the wrong direction.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, again, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5587. These reforms will both streamline the permitting process for geothermal energy projects and reduce agency workloads, which will allow BLM to focus on projects that actually have a majority Federal nexus.

States, as I have already mentioned, have robust requirements in regulations for developing energy resources within their borders, so eliminating duplicative Federal-level bureaucracy will help stop the things that are impeding geothermal energy development. This quite simply is just common sense.

Accelerating geothermal energy production and deployment is a win for our economy, a win for national security, and a win for American energy dominance.

On this floor today and not too much longer, we are going to have an opportunity to vote for American energy, for American workers, for common sense, and for doing the right things. I have heard many times: I support this, but . . . There is always a but—but what about this or what about that. Today is an opportunity to actually vote for something good.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1189, 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 186, not voting 12, as follows:

(Roll No. 137)

YEAS—231

Aderholt	Bentz	Calvert
Alford	Bergman	Cammack
Allen	Bice	Carey
Amodei (NV)	Biggs (AZ)	Carter (GA)
Arrington	Biggs (SC)	Carter (TX)
Babin	Bilirakis	Ciscomani
Bacon	Boebert	Cline
Baird	Bost	Cloud
Balderson	Brecheen	Clyde
Barr	Bresnahan	Cole
Barrett	Buchanan	Collins
Baumgartner	Budzinski	Comer
Bean (FL)	Burchett	Correa
Beigich	Burlison	Costa

Crane	Hoyer	Obernolet
Crank	Hudson	Ogles
Crawford	Huizenga	Onder
Cuellar	Hunt	Owens
Davidson	Hurd (CO)	Palmer
Davis (NC)	Issa	Panetta
DesJarlais	Jack	Pappas
Diaz-Balart	Jackson (TX)	Patronis
Donalds	James	Perez
Downing	Johnson (SD)	Perry
Edwards	Jordan	Pflugger
Elzey	Joyce (OH)	Reschenthaler
Emmer	Joyce (PA)	Riley (NY)
Estes	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (AL)
Evans (CO)	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Ezell	Kennedy (UT)	Rose
Fallon	Kiggans (VA)	Rouzer
Fedorchak	Kiley (CA)	Roy
Feenstra	Kim	Rulli
Fine	Knott	Rutherford
Finstad	Kustoff	Salazar
Fischbach	LaHood	Scalise
Fitzgerald	LaLota	Schmidt
Fitzpatrick	Langworthy	Schweikert
Fleischmann	Latta	Scott, Austin
Flood	Lawler	Self
Fong	Lee (FL)	Sessions
Foxx	Letlow	Shreve
Franklin, Scott	Loudermilk	Simpson
Fry	Lucas	Smith (MO)
Fulcher	Luttrell	Smith (NE)
Fuller	Mackenzie	Smith (NJ)
Garbarino	Malliotakis	Smucker
Gill (TX)	Maloy	Spartz
Gillen	Mann	Stauber
Gimenez	Massie	Steil
Golden (ME)	Mast	Steube
Goldman (TX)	McCaul	Strong
Gonzalez, V.	McClain	Stutzman
Gooden	McClintock	Taylor
Goodlander	McCormick	Tenney
Gosar	McDonald Rivet	Thompson (PA)
Gottheimer	McDowell	Tiffany
Graves	McGuire	Timmons
Gray	Messmer	Turner (OH)
Griffith	Meuser	Valadao
Grothman	Miller (IL)	Van Drew
Guest	Miller (OH)	Van Dwyne
Guthrie	Miller (WV)	Van Epps
Hageman	Miller-Meeks	Van Orden
Hamadeh (AZ)	Mills	Vasquez
Harder (CA)	Moolenaar	Vindman
Haridopolos	Moore (AL)	Wagner
Harrigan	Moore (NC)	Walberg
Harris (MD)	Moore (UT)	Weber (TX)
Harris (NC)	Moore (WV)	Webster (FL)
Harshbarger	Moran	Westerman
Hern (OK)	Moulton	Wied
Higgins (LA)	Murphy	Wilson (SC)
Hill (AR)	Nehls	Wittman
Himes	Newhouse	Womack
Hinson	Norman	Yakym
Houchin	Nunn (IA)	Zinke

NAYS—186

Adams	Crockett	Hoyle (OR)
Aguilar	Crow	Huffman
Amo	Dauids (KS)	Ivey
Ansari	Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)
Auchincloss	Dean (PA)	Jacobs
Balint	DeGette	Jayapal
Barragan	DeLauro	Jeffries
Beatty	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Bell	Deluzio	Johnson (TX)
Bera	DeSaulnier	Kamlager-Dove
Beyer	Dexter	Kaptur
Bishop	Dingell	Keating
Bonamici	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Boyle (PA)	Elfreth	Kennedy (NY)
Brown	Escobar	Khanna
Bynum	Espallat	Krishnamoorthi
Carbajal	Evans (PA)	Landsman
Carson	Fields	Larsen (WA)
Carter (LA)	Figures	Larson (CT)
Casar	Fletcher	Latimer
Case	Foster	Lee (NV)
Casten	Foushee	Lee (PA)
Castor (FL)	Frankel, Lois	Leger Fernandez
Castro (TX)	Friedman	Levin
Chu	Frost	Liccardo
Cisneros	Garamendi	Lieu
Clark (MA)	Garcia (CA)	Lofgren
Clarke (NY)	Garcia (IL)	Lynch
Cleaver	Gomez	Magaziner
Clyburn	Green, Al (TX)	Mannion
Cohen	Grijalva	Matsui
Conaway	Hayes	McBath
Courtney	Horsford	McBride
Craig	Houlihan	McClain Delaney

McClellan	Pingree	Strickland
McCollum	Pocan	Subramanyam
McGarvey	Pou	Suozzi
McGovern	Pressley	Sykes
McIver	Quigley	Takano
Meeks	Ramirez	Thanedar
Mejia	Randall	Thompson (CA)
Menefee	Raskin	Thompson (MS)
Menendez	Rivas	Titus
Meng	Ross	Tlaib
Mfume	Ruiz	Tokuda
Min	Ryan	Tonko
Moore (WI)	Salinas	Torres (CA)
Morelle	Sanchez	Torres (NY)
Morrison	Scanlon	Trahan
Moskowitz	Schakowsky	Tran
Mrvan	Schneider	Underwood
Mullin	Scholten	Vargas
Nadler	Schrier	Veasey
Neal	Scott (VA)	Velazquez
Neguse	Sewell	Velazquez
Norcross	Sherman	Walkinshaw
Ocasio-Cortez	Simon	Wasserman
Olszewski	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Omar	Sorensen	Waters
Pallone	Soto	Watson Coleman
Pelosi	Stansbury	Whitesides
Peters	Stanton	Williams (GA)
Pettersen	Stevens	

NOT VOTING—12

Brownley	Garcia (TX)	Mace
Crenshaw	Goldman (NY)	Stefanik
De La Cruz	Kean	Williams (TX)
Dunn (FL)	Luna	Wilson (FL)

□ 1032

Mr. LEVIN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GOTTHEIMER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to illness, I was unable to vote on H.R. 5587. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 137.

Stated against:

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote during the vote series today. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 137, Passage of H.R. 5587—HEATS Act of 2026.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today due to a commitment in my Congressional district. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 137.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 2026, TO MONDAY, APRIL 27, 2026

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of West Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING CARTER PEARCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Carter Pearce, a senior at DuBois Area High School, for winning an international vocabulary competition.

Vocabulary Bowl is sponsored by Vocabulary.com and invites more than 900,000 high school students to compete in a virtual competition, which lasts over a month.

Carter, who placed first, mastered over 8,000 words. After winning in the fall, he competed in the spring competition and mastered all the featured words.

Carter is also a member of the DuBois Area High School Vocabulary Quiz Bowl team and has helped the team win multiple regional competitions. Since joining 2 years ago, Carter has helped the team win four State titles.

Carter graduates later this spring and plans to major in history. His goal is to become a history teacher.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fantastic achievement, and I thank Carter for representing Pennsylvania so well. I wish Carter all the best in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING SECOND CHANCE MONTH

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

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Second Chance Month to raise awareness of the challenges faced by millions of individuals with criminal records transitioning back into society.

Every day, individuals with criminal records are held back from the opportunity to rejoin society and contribute. Instead of letting their past define them, we must create pathways that allow these folks to rewrite their histories.

As a former prosecutor, I am passionate about diversion programs that help low-level, nonviolent offenders, especially, avoid incarceration by connecting them with the treatment, support, and life-skills training to break the cycle of recidivism.

That is why I introduced the BRIDGE Act last month, which expands pathways to employment and economic freedom for justice-impacted adults and youth.

One bad situation should not define a person's entire story. Let's give people a second chance to make a better life for themselves. When we do so, it has the added benefit of also making our communities safer.

HONORING DR. PAUL BRADLEY BRECHTELSBAUER

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the