

A TRIBUTE TO SHARON KRAUSE

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Sharon Krause for being named a 2013 Women of Influence honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, *Business Record*.

Each year, *Business Record* undertakes an exhaustive review to identify a standout group of women in the Greater Des Moines area who, as the publication notes, "have made a difference." An impressive group of inspiring female leaders are selected annually for this prestigious distinction, which is based on combined criteria of community involvement, career success, and being a role model for other women to emulate. The 2013 Women of Influence honorees join an impressive roster of more than 130 women who have changed and are continuing to change our communities for the better.

Sharon Krause has been a do-it-all professional—and it stems from her commitment to turning her passions into her livelihood. She became Des Moines' Firestone Agricultural Tire Co.'s first female engineer, helped coordinate Metro Waste Authority's Curb It! recycling program, worked in business development at Kum & Go LC, and has gone on to lead a mostly one-person ranch operation, Dalla Terra Ranch LLC, where she runs livestock and tends to the ample plant life. Given her varied interests and work ethic, it should come as no surprise that she turned a long series of violin lessons into a guest orchestra performance at this year's annual Bravo Greater Des Moines Gala—which she chaired and for which she helped set a record number of tables sold.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Sharon Krause in the United States Congress, and I am pleased to recognize her for working to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating her on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at *Business Record* for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2013 Women of Influence class continued success.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, with Mr. Hultgren in the chair.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the so-called Regulations in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act.

This misguided legislation would overturn the long-established process for the promulgation of major federal policy rules and tie the health, environment, and economy of our nation to the ability of Congress to act. Considering we are working through the 113th Congress—which is on pace to be the least productive Congress in history—this is a terrible idea.

Federal agencies issue rules to implement laws that are passed by Congress and signed by the President. Federal agencies cannot issue rules on policies Congress has not authorized them to act on, and the very laws the Congress passes explain in detail the authority of the agency to issue rules and often mandate the very rule the agency must issue. The purpose of this process is to allow the policy experts at those agencies to conduct the research, seek the public input, and craft the most efficient and effective way to issue the rules to implement the legislation that Congress has passed. This bill would insert partisan politics into this deliberative and complex process, undermining the ability of these agencies to protect the public's health and safety.

Besides ignoring the fact that the agencies are simply issuing rules to implement the statutes that the Congress has enacted, supporters of this legislation forget that there already exists a mechanism through which Congress can review and reject rules issued by executive agencies. Under the Congressional Review Act, the Congress can help reject a rule if it passes a joint resolution disapproving any rule within 60 days of receiving the rule (the President must also sign the resolution). Additionally, Congress has considerable authority over federal rulemaking through the appropriations process, where it can restrict the use of funds to implement certain rules. Finally, the Congress can continue to pass legislation to reform the rulemaking process, such as when it enacted the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, and the Paperwork Reduction Act.

This legislation would cause any major rule issued by a federal agency to be automatically rejected unless Congress acts in approval within 70 days. The legislation does not guarantee that there will be an up-or-down vote in that time period; therefore, it leaves these important rules vulnerable to partisan obstruction and inaction. Congressional Republicans exemplify the danger of this approach through their repeated rejection of all compromise and obstruction of efforts to move our country and our economy forward. Giving one chamber of Congress de-facto veto-power over Executive Branch agencies would put at risk our environment, inject uncertainty into the economy for our businesses, and endanger the health and well-being of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, with Mr. Hultgren in the chair.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise to strongly oppose the REINS Act (H.R. 367). This reckless legislation would put American families at risk while doing nothing to create jobs.

If enacted, H.R. 367 would delay and possibly block agency rulemaking in critical areas of public health and safety. This legislation would require that any "major" new rule be approved by Congress and the President within 70 legislative days. If Congress fails to act by the deadline, the proposed rule could not be reviewed again until the next Congress. My Republican colleagues do not deny this cumbersome process would prevent many new rules from taking effect. They argue preventing new rules is necessary to stimulate hiring and strengthen the economy.

Bruce Bartlett, a former advisor to Republican Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush, said congressional Republicans' anti-regulatory fervor has nothing to do with jobs. Bartlett recently wrote: "Regulatory uncertainty is a canard invented by Republicans that allows them to use current economic problems to pursue an agenda supported by the business community year in and year out. In other words, it is a simple case of political opportunism, not a serious effort to deal with high unemployment." Supporters of this legislation rely on a thoroughly debunked study that claims regulations cost Americans in excess of \$1.75 trillion. Moreover, the independent, nonpartisan Congressional Research Service (CRS) cited major flaws in the study's methodology, noting that the bill's authors admitted that it was "not meant to be a decision-making tool for lawmakers or Federal regulatory agencies to use in choosing the 'right' level of regulation" and that they made "no attempt to estimate the benefits" of regulations.

H.R. 367 will fail to create jobs and expose American families and small businesses to new and unnecessary risks. President Obama has threatened to veto the bill, arguing it would "delay and in many cases thwart" implementation of important rules and increase unnecessary confusion and uncertainty in the economy. The Coalition for Sensible Safeguards warns that this legislation "would make it virtually impossible for federal agencies to ensure that American families are protected from tainted food, unsafe drugs, predatory financial schemes, dirty air and water, and dangerous workplaces."

Abandoning Americans to an unregulated marketplace is not a solution for economic growth—it is a sure threat to public safety. In recent years, many Americans have died as a result of E. coli and salmonella outbreaks in our food supply. A failure to enforce federal workplace safety standards resulted in the tragic deaths of 29 miners in West Virginia. Finally, under-regulation allowed irresponsible bankers and mortgage lenders to destroy the education and retirement savings of millions of Americans. America is, in fact, facing a regulatory crisis. Not the crisis of "over-regulation" my Republican colleagues claim, but a series of crisis resulting from a failure to enforce and enact common-sense rules.

Sensible regulation is necessary for an efficient, fair and innovative private market. But