

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1820

SAVING HOMEOWNERS FROM OVERREGULATION WITH EXCEPTIONAL RINSING ACT

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, Pursuant to House Resolution 977, I call up the bill (H.R. 4593) to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to revise the definition of showerhead, 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 977, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4593

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 "Saving Homeowners from Overregulation With Exceptional Rinsing Act" or the "SHOWER Act".

SEC. 2. REVISED DEFINITION OF SHOWERHEAD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 321(31)(D) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6291(31)(D)) is amended to read as follows:

"(D) The term 'showerhead' has the meaning given such term in ASME A112.18.1-2024, except such term does not include safety shower showerheads."

(b) REVISIONS TO REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall promulgate such revisions to regulations as may be necessary to conform such regulations to the definition of showerhead in section 321(31)(D) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended by subsection (a) of this section.

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

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4593.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, under the previous administration, American consumers

were subjected to Washington's constant micromanagement of appliances and equipment in their homes and businesses.

In fact, the Biden-Harris administration finalized more than 30 new or amended energy efficiency standards, totaling over \$60 billion in costs and regulating nearly every appliance in Americans' homes. Part of this effort focused on complicating the definition of a showerhead by prohibiting multi-nozzle shower systems if the whole system collectively delivers more than 2.5 gallons of water per minute, instead of following the straightforward statutory definition of a showerhead.

The new, highly bureaucratic definition was an amazing 13,000 words in length and a novel interpretation. This resulted in shower systems with more than one nozzle having a lower flow rate compared to individual showerheads.

Additionally, this definition is misleading to consumers looking to buy multi-nozzled shower systems for the purpose of increasing water flow.

President Trump has taken executive action to restore the regulatory definitions and standards to the law's original intent by allowing a maximum water use of 2.5 gallons per minute for each faucet in a shower system. H.R. 4593 would codify President Trump's definition by allowing the 2.5 maximum flow rate to apply to each nozzle in the shower system.

This legislation will ensure manufacturers, like Delta Faucet in my district in Morgantown, Kentucky, are not subjected to the swing of the political pendulum with ever-changing interpretations of the law.

Further, this legislation is simple and pro-consumer choice. It is unfortunate that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are seeking more regulation for its own sake and limiting the choices of American consumers. If an individual wants low water pressure, they have a variety of options. They can purchase a single-nozzle showerhead, or they can simply turn down the faucet. It is that simple, but those choices must be left to individual Americans and not to Washington.

H.R. 4593 would bring regulatory certainty to manufacturers, performance effectiveness to a household appliance we all use, and choice to American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The American people are struggling to make ends meet. They are feeling the pinch of the affordability crisis and bearing the brunt of rising costs at the hands of Republicans. Yet my colleagues continue to turn a blind eye to the cost-of-living crisis. In fact, President Trump has called the affordability crisis a con job and a Democratic scam.

That is how out of touch they are, Mr. Speaker. Healthcare costs are sky-

rocketing, and electricity bills are through the roof. Meanwhile, President Trump just illegally invaded Venezuela, and Secretary Kennedy is putting children's lives at risk by restricting access to vaccines.

There is a lot this Congress could be doing this week, but the first bill Republicans bring to the floor in 2026 is about showerheads. It is almost impossible to believe. To make matters worse, this bill will actually drive up monthly utility bills for American families.

Electricity prices are up 13 percent across the country. Eighty million Americans are struggling to pay their utility bills, and Republicans want to make that financial pain even worse. Meanwhile, grocery prices are surging, and, of course, monthly healthcare premiums are skyrocketing across the Nation, thanks to the healthcare crisis Republicans created by failing to extend the Affordable Care Act's enhanced premium tax credits. As a result of their inaction, more than 20 million Americans are now facing skyrocketing monthly healthcare premiums. In many cases, and I will say in my home State of New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, they are double or triple the cost that they paid last year.

We just heard a debate on the discharge petition a few minutes ago, and as a result of that discharge petition, and no thanks to most of the Republicans and the leadership, we are going to have an opportunity to vote on the premium tax credits. The bottom line is that that has nothing to do with the Republican leadership. This was a Democratic initiative that a few Republicans finally joined with us so that we have an opportunity to vote on it.

There isn't a single thing that the Republicans can point to about dealing with the affordability crisis that they have created. President Trump and his Republican accomplices are completely out of touch with the alarming reality millions of Americans are facing. Republicans have no plans to address affordability, and I think today proves it.

They are beginning this new Congress with a bill that changes the definition of "showerhead" in order to open the door for the Trump administration to increase already rising monthly utility bills and to waste our scarce water resources. This bill would actually increase costs for consumers.

In Trump's first term, he redefined "showerheads" to allow them to use significantly more energy and water. Showerheads with multiple nozzles could vastly exceed the current limits. For example, a showerhead with eight nozzles could use up to 20 gallons of water per minute under Trump's 2020 definition.

Think about this, Mr. Speaker: You are raising the costs. You are increasing utility bills not only for electricity but also for water. You are wasting energy, and you are wasting water.

The bottom line is that manufacturers didn't want this. They largely rejected this move by President Trump

and didn't produce showerheads that exceeded the limit that existed. That was because they knew that consumers value money-saving and water conservation showerheads that are good for both their wallets and the environment.

Energy and water conservation standards, Mr. Speaker, save consumers money. The only reason that we have these energy-efficient standards both for showerheads and for so many other things is that Congress, on a bipartisan basis, decided to establish a program where if the Department of Energy or other Departments, mostly the Department of Energy, could show that, in fact, you could save money for consumers and eliminate a lot of waste in terms of water and energy, then they would put forth these standards. These are bipartisan standards.

In 2024 alone, energy and water conservation standards slashed \$576 off Americans' utility bills while cutting our energy and water consumption.

I am just trying to point out, Mr. Speaker, that Republican priorities are completely out of touch with the concerns of everyday Americans. They are out of touch with the manufacturers and out of touch with the average American.

The only Republican priority is pleasing President Trump with whatever he wants. They give in to his every wish, even if it means driving up utility bills for American families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1830

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

When the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) had his poster, he didn't actually have the poster that President Trump was referring to when he was talking about affordability.

It was a poster that showed the different States and the rising price of energy. It showed certain States and certain areas—he colored them blue and red States on his poster—and the difference in what people are paying for electric rates.

You can tie it directly to State and local governments that are making decisions to shut down generation of energy. When you overregulate—why are people paying more for appliances, dishwashers and stoves? It is because of the regulations.

Why are they paying more for showerheads? As we said, if people can have the choice, they can also turn down their water. As I said, it is just that simple.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), my good friend, the vice chair of the Energy Subcommittee.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the SHOWER Act, led by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY).

Over the last several years, Americans have seen firsthand what happens

when a radical regulatory agenda takes over Washington. The previous administration, it is sad to say, inserted itself into nearly every aspect of American life, raising costs and imposing rules that made no sense for American families.

One of the clearest examples is what they did, believe it or not, to our showers. They twisted the law to claim—you can't make this stuff up—that the 2.5-gallon-per-minute standard applied to the entire shower system instead of just each individual showerhead. You can't make this stuff up. Quite frankly, I think they were all wet. The result was weaker water pressure and daily frustration for homeowners, all in the name of government control.

For a year now, this Congress has worked to reverse the damage left behind by previous administrations, Mr. Speaker. The SHOWER Act is simply another step in that effort. It locks in the law's original intent and ensures that future leftist administrations cannot weaponize regulations against everyday Americans again.

This bill is one of many we must pass, Mr. Speaker, to reverse the harm already done and restore America to the one we once knew. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the SHOWER Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the ranking member of our Energy Subcommittee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding the time.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 4593 with a great concern that House Republicans simply do not care to work on any solutions to lower the cost of living for our hardworking neighbors back home.

In 2025, House Republicans failed to bring one bill to the floor to lower the cost of living or to tackle the high rate of inflation, but here is some good news actually: By tomorrow, thanks to House Democrats and a handful of Republicans who stood up to their Speaker, the House will vote to lower the cost of healthcare coverage for millions of Americans. That is a little bit of good news.

If Americans were hoping that Republicans in Congress would start 2026 off with some relief for their pocketbooks, I am sorry to report that, no, Republicans are not bringing bills to lower the cost of living.

I congratulate my Republican colleagues, their first bill of 2026, to set the tone, is to address showerheads. This is critical. You heard that right. It is ridiculous, isn't it? It is so out of touch.

The President promised he was going to cut Americans' power bills in half, but since he took office last year, electric bills are up by 13 percent across the country, and they are much higher in some places. There are 80 million Americans who are struggling just to pay their electric bills. In Florida, the

Republican-controlled utilities commission just approved the highest rate increases in the history of the country—they are calling them that—a \$6 billion rate increase.

Across the country, folks are facing about \$86 billion in electric rate increases, so hold on to your wallet. Rather than help, Republicans have only made things worse. They have gone along with arbitrary tariffs that have raised the cost of living and taken a hatchet to cleaner, cheaper energy. They have gone along with illegally halting energy projects. They ended tax cuts and rebates that helped people afford their electric bills in order to pay for tax breaks for billionaires. They are out of touch.

Folks in the Northeast are worried about their rising electric bills because the President in December arbitrarily terminated five offshore wind projects that were under construction. That energy onto the grid would have helped keep the pressure on lower electric bills.

The President canceled final approval for what would have been the Nation's largest solar farm, a 6.2 gigawatt project in the Nevada desert. He illegally ended low-cost solar installation for working-class families that would have helped them and their family budgets.

The President now has canceled major upgrades to the power grid out of the bipartisan infrastructure law, such as the Grain Belt Express transmission line.

Republican policies now—we are adding it up—have cost Americans about 266 gigawatts of planned electricity generation projects in 2025 at a time when there is a surge of new demand for electricity across the country. They are out of touch.

Speaking of being out of touch, of course, the President doesn't believe there is an affordability crisis. He has called it a hoax. The real issues for the President are shower pressure, redecorating the White House, and so much more.

Yes, it was last April that the President thought it was so important he issued an executive order to end the Obama-Biden war on water pressure and make America's showers great again. He is out of touch. However, he urged Congress to codify that order, so that is what we are doing here tonight on the first bill of 2026 by this Republican majority. Are they serious?

What has been the President's focus during all this time he has called the affordability crisis a hoax? Well, he paved over the Rose Garden. He has torn down the East Wing of the White House to make way for a grand ballroom funded by people who have business in front of the Federal Government.

I haven't been over to the White House, but all of the pictures show 24 karat gold ornamentation all through the White House. He has installed marble floors. I have seen him tweet that

out. He has also added his name to the Kennedy Center.

For those of you who haven't come to Washington, D.C., he has put banners of his picture up on Federal buildings. He is proposing to put his likeness on gold coins.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of Utah). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think you get my drift here. It was so galling as people are trying to pay their electric bills and their grocery bills that the President here is bragging about how he has redone the Lincoln bathroom, yes, with gold showerheads.

We don't need to redefine what constitutes a showerhead. We don't need to weaken energy and water conservation measures that help people save money. We don't need to make life more expensive for hardworking neighbors back home. We don't need to boost foreign manufacturers who want to import inferior products to the U.S., but that is what they are doing.

No, in 2026 we are going to need real solutions. I beseech my colleagues to work with us to tackle the high cost of living. You can look back on 2025 now; Federal spending is up. They added \$2 trillion to the national debt and they have lost manufacturing jobs when you add it all up. Now their answer on the first bill of the Congress in 2026 is showerheads. They are out of touch.

□ 1840

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about affordability, we did pass and sign into law no tax on Social Security. It is a deduction for people who generally have incomes that are almost all Social Security. They won't pay any tax on that. We passed the no tax on tips. People working on tips income won't be paying tax on their tips.

I come from the world of manufacturing where people work hard all week hoping for overtime over the weekend so they can earn more money for their families. Now there is no tax on overtime to make things affordable for people and give them more money in their pocket to pay for things, but we also need to make them cheaper.

We worked hard on energy. We have passed bills out of committee and across the floor on permitting energy. We have energy in this country, but we have to be able to generate the electrons, and we have to be able to move the energy to where it needs to be. The problem is permitting. I am a believer in all of the above, and we need to develop an all-of-the-above energy strategy.

We have 112-gigawatts of power—a gigawatt is the city of Seattle. There are 112-gigawatts of power scheduled to go offline in the next decade because of environmental regulations, which we can do safely and securely and save our

environment and produce the energy that people need.

Again, if you bring the poster that the President used, you can see States that have the highest energy prices, and it goes to their energy regulation that their State and local governments have done to themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I was in California putting gas in a rental car, and I looked over to the guy next to me and said: Do you have any idea how much people pay for gas in the rest of the country?

I paid \$2.80 in Kentucky and paid over \$4 in California. It is State and local governments that make these decisions, and they are bringing that to Washington, D.C. We want to make it cheaper and for our people to have more affordability.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. FRY), the sponsor of this legislation and my good friend.

Mr. FRY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to set the scene in contrast to some of the revisionist history that Democrats seem to be talking about today.

The definition of a showerhead was outlined very clearly in a 1975 act that Congress passed, not some bureaucrat and not some administration. Congress actually got together and said we are going to have some efficiency standards on showerheads and a number of other things. We are going to pass this bill, in 1975, and for over 30 years that was the national standard.

Even the American Association for Mechanical Engineers, this is their definition that is in this bill. Along comes the Obama administration, and rather than take the very simple, easy-to-understand, congressionally mandated standard of what a showerhead is, the Obama administration, in some closet somewhere, decided we are going to reinvent the definition of a showerhead.

Now, why is this important? Because this is exactly why people have a problem with Washington, D.C. They make rules that are not congressionally driven, that the people elect their representatives to be their voice in Washington. No, it is some unelected, unaccountable bureaucrat that decides to create a problem and then solve the problem that they created.

This is a microcosm to a much larger problem. That is overregulation. I think the ranking member said Trump changed the definition. No, he changed it back. He changed it back to what Congress intended to begin with.

Now, we have the Biden administration that comes in and pulls it back again. We have this ping-pong effect of regulations that are creating uncertainty for manufacturers and creating uncertainty for consumers. You can take showerheads, but the Biden administration also did this on home appliances, gas stoves, any number of things. The degree of regulation that Democrats and their bureaucratic allies are willing to do even, as something as small as a showerhead, that

should send alarm bells. Why are we not empowering people to make choices about what they want in their own homes?

If they want a nozzle that dribbles on their head, then go get one of those. If you want something that slices an orange, then go get one of those. That should be your choice as a consumer. But we find ourselves in this endless game of whack-a-mole in Washington, D.C., because bureaucrats create problems and then solve them like they have done something meritorious for the country. It is total BS.

This bill is quite simple: It restores the definition of a showerhead to what Congress originally intended in 1975. It was a law for 32 years before the problem was created by the Obama administration. Then they solved the problem.

The President is absolutely right not just on showerheads but on home appliances. The Democrats want to talk about energy costs. For a second, by the way, I think it is really rich coming from them because I think eight of the top ten States with the highest energy costs are blue States that are run by Democrat State legislators and Democrat governors. They want to talk about the rising cost of energy. It disproportionately affects blue States. Why? Because they have terrible policies.

This bill is quite simple: It restores the definition that Congress originally intended. If an administration, any future administration, wants to change policy, rather than that coming from the bureaucrats, it should come before Congress. Congress set the efficiency standards in 1975, and if Congress wants to address those, that is Congress' prerogative, not some unelected, unaccountable bureaucrat in Washington, D.C.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), a member of our committee.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, Ranking Member PALLONE, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans ended 2025 by failing to extend Affordable Care Act tax credits causing healthcare costs to skyrocket for millions of Americans.

Since President Trump took office, electricity prices have gone up by 13 percent nationwide and 20 percent in New Jersey, leaving over 80 million Americans struggling to pay their utility bills. Instead of addressing the affordability crisis that they have ignored, that President Trump has called a hoax, the Republicans' priority on day one is showerheads.

It is obscene that with all the work we need to do to uplift American families, to give them a fair shot at the American Dream, the Republican majority would choose instead to focus on showerheads. Why? Because it is important to one person and one person only, Donald Trump.

Not once, at any of the townhalls I have had, has anyone said that their showerhead pressure is their top concern. Housing, yes. Healthcare, yes. Childcare, yes. Not once did they say showerheads was their primary concern.

If my colleagues were serious about governing, we would be voting on protecting healthcare, lowering costs, and addressing the real issues that working families are facing. We would not be here today talking about showerheads.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to get serious and focus on the priorities our constituents sent us here to address. For all these reasons and so many more, I strongly oppose this bill.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RULLI), my good friend and member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. RULLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Congressman FRY's SHOWER Act.

I am not going to pull a NANCY PELOSI, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to rip up the speech that I had written, but I am not going to give that speech.

I have to talk about the opposition party, and I have to talk about their complete lack of interaction with the blue-collar Joe Bag of Donuts, which is Youngstown and Akron and Canton and Cleveland and Pittsburgh. These are working people that they have forgotten.

They bring up electricity, sir, but they do not allow us to address power plants. They shut down coal plants. They put regulations on gas-powered generated plants, but then they say there is an electricity problem.

Let's talk about prices. In my district right now, eggs are \$1.29. We have chicken breast at 99 cents. In Trumbull County, we have gas at \$1.99. I have 45,000 jobs that I cannot fill.

We are on the ground. We are listening to the people. You guys are promoting the Ford Lightning, which nobody who is a working person even gives a crap about. They want to have Silverados and they want to have their Mopar and they want to have gas-powered engines inside of those cars, but yet they say they have it. All they work on is the narrative, Mr. Speaker. That is what they do.

I will tell you how I came to Congressman FRY's bill and how I got interested in it. We were replacing a showerhead at my mom's house, and I said to my plumber, Marty: What is going on with these showerheads? He said: You tell me. The people in Washington messed this up. Nobody can have a darn good shower in the last 10 years.

Why does that matter? What did they say? They say we are worried about showerheads. We are worried about the working man. We are worried about the standard of living that they have taken away from them. They have taxed them to death. They play this game

with healthcare. They created ObamaCare. They never had a solution. It was never a permanent fix.

□ 1850

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats kicked it down the road, and then they said to just extend it without even dealing with it. What my Democrat colleagues are doing to the American people is wrong.

When a person goes on vacation, they go to a motel and take a shower. It is the worst shower they have ever had. It is cold. It is dripping out there. The working man cannot even enjoy his daily life. That is what they have missed.

We want to talk about how grand their philosophy is. When we look at the mayor of New York City, he wants to have government-owned grocery stores. People will be able to choose about 400 or 500 items instead of the 30,000 or 40,000 items they could choose today, all in consideration of the blue-collar Joe Bag of Doughnuts, the forgotten worker.

This is why Donald Trump was elected. We care about the forgotten worker. We are going to fix healthcare. We are going to fix affordability. Gas prices are already coming down. Grocery prices are coming down. Wait until that tax cut hits in 2026.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 4593 and so should you.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my, my, my. I rise today, amazed that with the healthcare crisis unfolding, the Republican priority before us is plumbing.

At a time when families are already being squeezed by the rising cost of living, from groceries to rent to utilities, President Trump is focused on renaming the Kennedy Center, building a ballroom, running a foreign country, and the water pressure in his showers.

Republicans in Congress, instead of focusing on lowering healthcare costs, are debating the definition of showerheads. Really? Millions of Americans are losing their healthcare coverage after Republicans allowed the Affordable Care Act tax credits to expire.

The nightmare of families having to choose between taking their child to the doctor or paying their rent is now a reality, hitting my home State of Florida especially hard. In Florida, more than 4 million people rely on the ACA and face premiums that are doubling or tripling.

A self-employed mom recovering from cancer in Lake Worth Beach is dropping her coverage as her premium tripled overnight. A 62-year-old waiter in West Palm Beach is going without insurance because it now costs more than his rent.

Here is a fact. When people lose health insurance, the consequences are real, and they are devastating. Medical debt piles up. Families drain their savings. They face bankruptcy.

Untreated illnesses force workers out of their jobs. When people lose their coverage, it affects all of us. Hospitals are strained. Businesses are hurt. Costs rise for everyone.

Here is a solution. I urge my colleagues to support the 3-year extension of the ACA tax credits and stop millions of hardworking families from losing their coverage. Fix the pressure where it matters the most. Lower healthcare costs.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RILEY).

Mr. RILEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, my kids are little. The other day they asked why daddy has to go back to D.C. I said that it is for work. They seemed sad about that. My wife chimed in, and she said that it is really important work. It is work that is going to help make people's lives better.

Now here we are, back at work. The first thing on the agenda in 2026 is not to lower the soaring utility bills. It is not to lower the insurance premiums. It is not to make housing more affordable. It is showerheads. We are out here talking about showerheads.

Not a single person in upstate New York has ever told me they want Congress focused on showerheads. The owner of the tattoo shop in Ithaca told me she will go uninsured this year because she can't afford the premiums.

There is a grandma in Endicott who is cutting back on the groceries because NYSEG is jacking up the rates and sending all her money to Spain.

There is a couple in their twenties. They are both young nurses. They can't save up for a home because Wall Street is gobbling up all the inventory.

Here we are, talking about showerheads. We wonder why people look at this place and see it as a self-serving, out of touch, dysfunctional mess. We don't need new ballrooms. We don't need new showerheads. We don't need a new name for the Kennedy Center. We need lower costs, better jobs, and a square deal.

At the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules had allowed it, I would have offered a motion with an amendment to lower costs for hardworking families in upstate New York.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? There was no objection.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, there are days, increasingly so, when I cannot believe my eyes and my ears in this

Chamber. It is about 7 p.m. East Coast time. It has been a long day. I just came from the Oversight Committee where we just subpoenaed additional witnesses in the Epstein investigation including potential co-conspirators in the crimes of Jeffrey Epstein.

We spent several hours today getting a classified briefing on what happened in the unauthorized invasion of Venezuela by this administration and the capture of a foreign leader, as our President and his administration are threatening to invade other foreign countries and have failed the most basic constitutional duty of seeking the consent of Congress and advising Members of Congress.

Today, we forced a vote on this floor, forcing all of my colleagues to ensure that we vote to save the Affordable Care Act so millions of Americans could have healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, we have to understand how absolutely inane and bizarre it is to come to the floor at 7 p.m. for the first real bill of this Congress this year and it is on showerheads.

When I heard that we were going to vote on showerheads, I literally had to google and look up what this was all about. I was actually genuinely shocked that the President, of course, had signed an executive order in April, demanding that we change the efficiency standards for showerheads.

As I often do, I went down a rabbit hole. In fact, I pulled up pictures of the kinds of showerheads we are talking about. It was fascinating to me, Mr. Speaker, to hear the impassioned pleas for regular working people to take high-pressure showers in motels because that is not why Donald Trump signed an executive order on this issue.

No, Donald Trump likes his big, fancy showers with multiple heads. We are talking about showers for rich people. These aren't even everyday showers.

Mr. Speaker, my question is: Why on God's green Earth on the first full day that this Congress is back in 2026 are the Republicans using their floor time in the midst of armed conflict and daily corruption by this administration to run a bill on rich people's showers for Donald Trump? It is just absolutely amazing.

Mr. Speaker, I have a little less than a minute left in my time. I would ask my colleague across the aisle one simple question: Did Mr. Donald Trump ask him to run a showerhead bill today on the House floor? If my colleague across the aisle cannot answer a simple question about why we are running legislation on the United States House floor on showerheads, I think we rest our case.

□ 1900

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to answer the question of the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, no, he did not ask to do this bill on the floor today. I know the President is very interested in this issue, but not on this floor today.

Mr. Speaker, what I have tried to ask and nobody has answered is: The enhanced tax credits, the COVID-era tax credits, were set to expire in the Inflation Reduction Act, which was a bill under the reconciliation process. It was solely the Democratic Party who put that in place, and the question I have always asked is: Why did they set them to expire?

They may say it was the reconciliation process. There were issues in that bill that they made permanent, but they chose to have the enhanced tax credits expire.

What happens when the enhanced tax credits expire? They are enhanced, so we go back to the basic law. The basic law we are operating under is the Affordable Care Act.

Why is the Affordable Care Act not saving people money?

I remember when this first came out. I was speaking to a Rotary Club, and a person said to me at the end that I was talking so negatively on the Affordable Care Act.

I said to him: You know, I really hope that people will keep the doctor they want to keep, have the choices they can have in healthcare, and their premiums will go down. If that happens, I will eat my words. I hope I can eat my words because there is no joy in having a bill pass and see people lose their doctors of choice, lose choice in health plans because it is consolidating, lose choices in healthcare because it is consolidating, and see their premiums skyrocketing.

Talking about how much the premiums are skyrocketing, do you know why? What is the underlying law? The underlying law is the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could answer the question. I wish I would get an answer to the question of why did they set them to expire and why is the Affordable Care Act not working.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to respond to the chairman of our committee who, of course, I respect a great deal.

The Republicans have never supported the Affordable Care Act. When we passed it—and I was one of the drafters how many years ago now—I think there were none—certainly almost no Republican votes.

They were not there when we tried to expand tax credits because we knew that in order for people to be able to afford their health insurance, we would have to reauthorize the tax credits from time to time or expand them for certain incomes. They were never there.

Frankly, I don't want to go into this in any great deal or depth today, but the bottom line is that I and most

Democrats believe that healthcare is a basic right and that we, as a Congress, have a responsibility to make it so that most people, if not all Americans, can have health insurance because, otherwise, they can't see a doctor. They end up in the emergency room. They get sicker, and our society suffers for it, either financially, healthwise, or whatever.

I don't really want to get into this debate about who, when, and where because the bottom line is that the Republican Party has never supported any of this. Many of them don't even believe, I think, that somehow we should be helping Americans pay for their health insurance. In any case, they have never supported the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare. They have never supported the enhanced premium tax credits, and so talking about when you did it or didn't do it, to me, is irrelevant.

The bottom line is that the majority had the opportunity to extend it during the reconciliation bill. My colleagues did not. Republicans had the opportunity right through the end of this year to extend it before it expired, and all these double and triple costs per month for health insurance started on January 1. My Republican colleagues didn't do it and are not doing it now.

We had the debate just a half hour or 1 hour ago about the bill that is finally coming to the floor, not because of the Republicans but because every Democrat in this House signed a discharge petition and we got a handful of Republicans to sign the discharge petition, overturning the right of the Speaker to determine what bills come to the floor. So it will come to the floor tomorrow, but when I was here for the debate on the rule, there was only one Republican who got up and said that they were supportive of extending the tax credits.

I am going to see tomorrow how many Republicans come to the floor and say that they are going to extend the tax credits or vote to extend the tax credits. There will be very, very few, unfortunately, because this is not what Republicans support.

In any case, I will talk a little bit about the affordability crisis in general. Across the country, the American people are trying to find ways to afford the rising prices of groceries, electricity, and their water bills. We hear from our constituents—I do every day—that affordability is their top concern. As democratically elected Members of Congress, I think it is our job to address these concerns—not only health insurance, but electricity costs, water costs, and so many things that deal with affordability.

I see my Republican colleagues only seem to be interested in fighting the Trump administration's latest culture war on showerheads.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried not to laugh about this because I think the issue has a level of seriousness, but it is incredible that not only are they

bringing up this bill as their first bill of the new year, but the fact is that the bill does nothing to help the American people.

If the majority was doing something with showerhead bills to bring down costs, I would say “fine,” but that is not the case. This is only being done because President Trump has been complaining about efficiency standards for everything since his first term. I think he is completely out of touch with the realities that everyday Americans face.

The truth is simple that efficiency standards lower costs for Americans. I have said it before, but it is worth repeating: In 2024 alone, energy and water conservation standards slashed \$576 off of American utility bills while cutting our energy and water consumption. Why is that a bad thing? It is a good thing.

It is totally, in my opinion, kind of dishonest for Republicans to claim that the cost of compliance with environmental regulations and efficiency standards drive up prices. They do not. It is not conservation that is driving up prices for Americans. It is Republican policies, and I would particularly point to Trump’s tariffs that are driving up costs for the average American.

The Republican Party let the Affordable Care Act enhanced premium tax credit expire without any safety net, so millions of Americans are going to lose their health insurance. Some have already decided not to sign up because they can’t afford it. They are going to lose their health insurance. We will have more tomorrow and the next day and the next day. Until we pass this enhanced tax credit bill, more and more Americans will have no health insurance and the negative consequences from that.

Let’s also talk about the big, ugly bill—Republicans call it the big, beautiful bill—that is projected to increase electricity prices for American families by 61 percent. Nearly 1 in 20 American households are in severe utility debt. This winter, families are forced to make the impossible choice of heating their homes or putting food on the table.

We have to address this issue, but somehow that is not enough for my Republican colleagues. They now are trying to pass partisan legislation to increase utility bills, too. That is what this bill does.

Again, all I can say is that the Republican Party’s priorities are senseless, cruel, and misguided.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, my point when I talked about the Affordable Care Act is that once it was in place, I wish it had worked. I wish what was believed to be in place worked because I think people with sincere hearts were the ones who voted for it and put it in place. If we

did have choice and we had more people provided—we didn’t have consolidation, and we had cheaper health insurance. That is what we wanted.

I will tell you that the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Ways and Means Committee are going to be focusing on the cost of health insurance. We talked yesterday and put out that health insurance executives from the major health insurance companies, or CEOs, are going to come before our committee. We are going to spend this year to hopefully find ways that we can work together because the premiums reflect the cost of healthcare.

We want to understand the premiums, how they devise the premiums, where the premium is going, who is getting the money, and what about the consolidations. We are going to have a series of hearings, and the first one is going to be CEOs of major insurance companies to come before our committees to do the proper oversight to see why it is going from \$14,000 to \$22,000 and why are people being affected that way.

□ 1910

That is the answer the American people deserve. That is the work we must do, and I hope we can do it together.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 977, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4593 is postponed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o’clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order and pursuant to House Resolution 978, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 8, 2026, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable Doug LaMalfa.

Thereupon (at 7 o’clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 8, 2026, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

EC-2574. A letter from the Secretary, Division of Market Oversight, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s Notice of withdrawal of Commission interpretive guidance — Retail Commodity Transactions Involving Certain Digital Assets (RIN: 3038-AF64) received January

5, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-2575. A letter from the Secretary, Market Participants Division, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Revisions to Business Conduct and Swap Documentation Requirements for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants (RIN: 3038-AF38) received January 5, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-2576. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s Major final rule — Regulatory Capital Rule: Modifications to the Enhanced Supplementary Leverage Ratio Standards for U.S. Global Systemically Important Bank Holding Companies and Their Subsidiary Depository Institutions; Total Loss-Absorbing Capacity and Long-Term Debt Requirements for U.S. Global Systemically Important Bank Holding Companies (RIN: 3064-AG11) received January 5, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-2577. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s final rule — Adjusting and Indexing Certain Regulatory Thresholds (RIN: 3064-AG15) received January 5, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-2578. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-102; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2579. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-088; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2580. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-081; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2581. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-036; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2582. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-028; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2583. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-080; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2584. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-090; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2585. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-079; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-2586. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-076; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.