

gun lobby and overzealous gun support in the Senate. Instead of passing a bill to extend the voting rights that the residents of the District of Columbia deserve, the Senate attached amendments that would overturn some of the local laws that are meant to stem the tide of gun violence in the city, meant to restore peace and safety to its streets and neighborhoods.

So in addition to the violence that could follow from allowing concealed weapons, as their amendment would do in just about every venue, against the wishes and rights of the District of Columbia to decide, doing what they did would allow another sort of violence. It did untold violence to the District by holding its voting rights, the voting rights that it should have in this body hostage. That is unfair, and it is just plain wrong.

But in addition, it is some of the poorer neighborhoods in this country where poverty and other ills breed violence. It is in those neighborhoods that we see the voter restrictive policies are being placed. Their ability to vote for individuals who would help them to quell the violence in their neighborhoods and keep their families safe, it is their ability to vote that is being interfered with most by these laws that are being passed by Republican legislatures, and promoted and signed by Republican governors.

I hope that this Congress, and if not this one the next, will have the courage to pass strong and sensible gun control laws. Yes, we are very concerned, as has been said—and which is the subject of our Special Order this evening—about voter protection in the face of many States that are passing laws to restrict voting in ways that do particular harm to the rights of young people, seniors, people of color, and the poor to vote.

As we were reminded, it was made abundantly clear a few weeks ago by that Republican Pennsylvania legislator what the intent of these new restrictive voter so-called poll tax laws are all about: they are being passed to try to defeat President Obama. Well, I have news for them. Those very groups that they are trying to keep from voting, the good people of this country are not going to let that happen. That brings us right back to the need for gun control legislation. The communities that need it most are also the ones that most need us to protect their right to vote. Although everyone in this country must have their right to vote protected, these are the communities where there is violence, where there is poverty, that we must work very hard to protect their right to vote.

In too many communities, violent crime is rising. It is due to the flow of guns, the increase in assault weapons, and it has to be stopped. It is time for us to come together to save our young people, and really to save ourselves. Gabby's shooting shows that none of us are safe unless all of us are safe. My

and many other communities are calling out for help. This is a crisis in many parts of our country, and we who are elected to provide for the welfare of our communities and our country have an obligation to do just that. So let's come together. Let's all support the legislation that is before us, the Voter Empowerment Act. Let's also pass gun control legislation. And in the end, though, it is in the voters' hands to decide in November whether we are going to have safe streets and neighborhoods, whether this assault on voting rights will stop. And if we just protect their right to vote, I know that they will do the right thing.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

GOP FRESHMEN HOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARDNER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for the opportunity to address the House tonight. I appreciate the time and consideration that we will have, the opportunity to visit with the American people about some of the biggest issues we are facing as a Nation.

I thought I would start with highlighting an article that appeared July 18 in Politico. The headline of this bill is: "President Obama's job's panel, missing in action."

□ 2000

The first paragraph of this Politico article says:

President Barack Obama's Jobs Council hasn't met publicly for 6 months, even as the issue of job creation dominates the 2012 election.

So we know that the economy is suffering. We know that unemployment continues to burden this country. But the fact is even the President and his Jobs Council isn't taking the issue seriously enough to make sure they're meeting regularly to talk about what's important for the American people.

Tonight as we talk about those issues that are important to the American people, I want to talk about the issue of regulations and how the issue of regulations, whether it's a large business or small business, are affecting the ability of businesses to hire around this country to get people back to work because we are indeed becoming a regulation nation.

The effort continues this week for House Republicans to ensure that government doesn't stand in the way of America's job creators. Washington doesn't need more regulations, we need smarter regulations.

Tomorrow, we will be considering H.R. 4078, the Red Tape Reduction and Small Business Job Creation Act, which is a package of proposals aimed at providing regulatory relief from the

red tape that continues to burden our small businesses. This package imposes a moratorium on any new regulation until unemployment drops below 6 percent nationally. It's been over 3 years since our unemployment has actually dropped below 8 percent. This is the 41st month in a row where unemployment in this country has been at or exceeded 8 percent. This bill aims to curtail the practice of midnight regulations, regulations that are promulgated from the day after the November election through January 20, the day of the presidential inauguration, and highlights the increasing concern of "sue and settle" agreements.

As a Member of Congress, I try to vote the right way and push forward the right Federal policies and practices so that businesses can operate more effectively without the hand of government guiding it. I wanted to break down some of the barriers throughout the night that are truly affecting job creators and their ability to hire to make this country work. I thought I would just talk a little about current events across the Nation. Some of these are State regulations, and some of these are local regulations. There is a Forbes article printed last year on August 3, 2011, "The Inexplicable War on Lemonade Stands" about regulations that required a child's lemonade stand to cost \$400 in permitting alone, bake sale busts across the country because regulations don't allow for children to have bake sales, and Big Gulp attacks in New York as the mayor attempts to regulate the size of pop that people can buy.

Some of these are Federal regulations, and some of these are State regulations. But the fact of the matter is this Nation faces a greater and greater challenge in becoming a regulation nation that hurts job creators and our ability to pull ourselves out of this economic slump.

Tonight I'll be joined by Members of Congress from across the United States, from Indiana to Alabama to Arizona and beyond, to focus on those issues that are important to our Nation's small businesses and job creators.

With that, I would like to yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Alabama who has been working tirelessly to make sure that her constituents have the opportunity they need to get back on their feet again when it comes to our economy.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentleman from Colorado and the other Members that are here tonight to talk about the Red Tape Reduction and Small Business Job Creation Act that we will be voting on here in the House this week.

Earlier this month, President Obama commented in a speech:

If you've got a business, you didn't build that. Somebody else made that happen.

President Obama has even talked about how excessive regulation hurts job creation saying that:

Sometimes rules have gotten out of balance placing unreasonable burdens on business, burdens that have stifled innovation, and it's had a chilling effect on the growth of jobs.

This is straight from this President's and this administration's mouth. Even as recently as February of 2012, *The Economist* put out this, "The Over-regulated America." This is not a secret that we are talking about here tonight. This is something that is clearly well established. And if any Member of Congress has taken, as I know many have, the time to travel throughout their districts, as we all do, to meet with business owners, small businesses, medium-sized businesses or even large businesses, they will tell you that they are not creating jobs because they are overregulated. And I have used example after example on this very floor where I have met with the private sector, with these businesses, and they've said we had to reinvest all of our capital into just making sure that we are dotting the I and crossing the T, when all of that capital could be reinvested in creating jobs.

So what we have on this floor this week is a series of bills. I know Mr. QUAYLE from Arizona is here to talk about his incorporation in this bill, but there are seven different ideas incorporated into this one bill that is going to ease regulations in this country on businesses in different ways. I think tonight, as the gentleman from Colorado has already suggested, we can have a real frank discussion, because this is about being honest with the American people.

I get asked the question, as I'm sure all of you do, what are you doing? What is Congress doing? Well, this is what we're doing. And why our friends in the Senate, for the life of me, I do not understand, nor do the people I represent in southeast Alabama understand, why Mr. REID and those in the Senate will not take up these very bills that will remove the heavy hand of government and unleash the private sector's ability to create jobs in this country. I look forward to continuing this conversation, and thanks for letting me be here.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentlelady from Alabama, and *The Economist* article, I've got a copy of it here as well, this is not exactly the bastion of conservatism that Republicans hold up all the time to highlight their beliefs. This is the *Economist* dated February 18, 2012, headline as you stated, "Over-regulated America." And just to share one little factoid from this report that *The Economist* put out here, it says a study from the Small Business Administration, a government body, found that regulations in general add \$10,585 in costs per employee per year—\$10,585 per year per employee is the cost of regulations. If you're a business that's just getting started, or if you're struggling to balance the books and make sure you are able to continue into next year, here's the cost, \$10,585 per employee.

Mrs. ROBY. Just to jump in real quick, have you heard from your employers back in the district where you go and you do these site visits and they immediately tell you not just how overregulated they are but how excited the regulators are to come into their business and write them up for things they have never done before? In the past, these regulators have been ambitious to help job creators to correct situations that may be unsafe or a dangerous situation for the employees. But, now, instead of providing employers an opportunity, there are fines after fines after fines that are just putting more of a burden on these very people that want to take their capital and invest in job creation. I hear it everywhere I go.

Mr. GARDNER. You're exactly right, the punitive approach to regulation that's not actually trying to make a business improve, it's not trying or concerned with safety, but it's more concerned with the number of tickets or violations that they write, the number of fines that they can collect.

I know the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) has a lot of insight on this. You talk about a State that has seen some incredible challenges over the years as it comes to the economy, but certainly rebounding now under great leadership of Mr. YOUNG himself as well as a great Governor, Mitch Daniels. I certainly look forward to the comments you have tonight.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Thank you so much for your hard work on this issue and your leadership on so many other efforts. I can certainly identify with the comments that you've made and that the gentlelady, my fellow colleague from Alabama, has made. We've seen an uptick certainly in my district of these numbers of notices and penalties that the aggregates businesses, for example, in my district receive, oftentimes for petty little issues. And it seems that there has been an increase in the enforcement from this administration on some things where frankly you ought to have these agencies working with our businesses, helping them come into compliance, consulting with them, doing even a little cost-benefit analysis on the ground level. We've lost all sense of perspective.

I have to say as someone who has just been here for a year and a half, I've been a little surprised by a number of things, but perhaps it was my own naivete that led me to expect most of my constituents' concerns would be related to how we should vote on a given matter.

□ 2010

Vote "no" on this resolution. Vote "yes" on that given bill. But instead, so much of what I have heard over the last 1½ years has been, as much as anything else: Stop this regulation from being enforced. It's really killing our business. It's hurting job creation right here in our part of the country. How can you rein in these executive man-

dates? So I've tried to do my part, and others have here as well.

I'll cite my colleague from Indiana, Congressman TODD ROKITA, who has worked very hard on a project the last year and a half that he calls the Red Tape Rollback. I hold right here in my hand a report which Congressman ROKITA's office recently put out, the catalogs, these regulatory concerns of businesses in my home State and the job-destroying effects of overregulation. It turns out there's a reason why so many businesses in the Hoosier State are suddenly feeling the crushing effect of regulation, and it's because we've seen a sharp increase in regulations under this administration.

Let me throw out some numbers here:

Since 2008, there have been over 34,000 regulators added to the government's payroll;

Additional regulatory costs have increased by \$46 billion per year since the beginning of 2009;

The number of regulations with an economic impact of \$100 million or more—so-called "major regulations"—has increased by 32 just last year. By comparison, the last President only added 28 such regulations in his first 3 years in office. All told, this President added 106 through the end of last year.

So the list goes on and on. I know my colleagues can add to this list—parade of horrors—with respect to regulations. Something needs to change up here. I'm glad we're here tonight to talk about a particular bill that will change things for the better.

Mr. GARDNER. I want to just ask a quick question about something that you said there. I believe you said, since 2008, 34,000 regulators have been hired by the Federal Government?

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. That's right. They've been added to the government's payroll.

Mr. GARDNER. These are individuals whose sole job it is to write new regulations; 34,000 new people to write new regulations.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. To write new regulations, to go out there and to pore through private sector books, to be boots on the ground to enforce these existing regulations. So we've got 34,000 more individuals who are interfering with private sector activity.

Now, I use the word "interfering." I acknowledge there are cases where we have to have regulations. I think everyone here would agree with that sentiment. But things have gotten out of whack, and we're really constraining job creation at a time when our constituents want us to be creating more jobs.

Mrs. ROBY. I would love to add to the out-of-whack statement because I have a few examples here.

I don't know if you have agriculture in your districts, but the farmer that is having to deal with duplicative permitting processes or concerns over the Federal Government making them regulate dust on their farm. As one of our

colleagues said, last time she checked, if you drive a pickup truck down a dirt road, it's going to generate dust. But we're regulating that. That's what the Federal Government is regulating.

Not to mention ObamaCare or the pulp and paper industry—which we have a lot of in my district—concerned about the Boiler MACT regulations that are so costly, the gas station owners that are worried about EPA requiring that their gasoline have certain percentages of ethanol mixed into their fuel or they have to pay a penalty, or the chicken hatchery farmer—now, this is a good one that happened last week.

We had a chicken hatchery farmer that called our office just last week about a new regulation that will require keeping his eggs at a certain temperature to go to processing to make dried eggs to avoid salmonella. Well, here's the kicker. And this is just to demonstrate the ridiculousness of the overregulation.

On the surface, this makes sense because we want to protect America's health. But this same regulation, this very same regulation, is letting the grade egg farmers that do have potential salmonella in their facilities send their possible contaminated eggs to the same processing plants. Processing eggs for dried eggs and other products kills the salmonella that would potentially be in this product. The FDA is allowing possible exposed eggs into the system.

So why should a hatchery farmer, who only sells to this type of processing when they have extra eggs be forced to put it all in a sort of refrigeration process that has nothing to do with the prevention that the regulation says that it's trying to prevent? And the answer is overregulation. This is just another example. I like eggs. I fixed some scrambled eggs this morning for breakfast. This affects me. It affects all of us in our lives, in our homes, in the grocery store.

When I buy milk for my kids, I see the costs increasing because of these very regulations. Whether it's the EPA and the ethanol in the gas or these actual very specific regulations that have to do specifically with the product being sold, we all are affected by this. It's costing jobs, and it's costing the American taxpayer to have to spend dollars that are unnecessary.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for making the point, especially on the issue of farm dust.

I can remember a committee hearing we had a month ago where the assistant administrator of the EPA was asked directly whether or not the EPA regulates farm dust, and she denied that the EPA is going to regulate farm dust. But when she was asked whether or not the EPA regulates dust from farms, the answer was yes. Now, only in Washington, D.C., Mr. Speaker, can farm dust and dust from farms be two different things.

But somebody who has also been standing the line to make sure that they are fighting for America's job creators, somebody who's been doing the hard work it takes to get this economy back on track, and somebody who has experience himself as a job creator, running a small business, putting people to work, is our colleague from Colorado, SCOTT TIPTON, who has worked tirelessly to make sure that this country's policies reflect a nation of job creators instead of a nation of bureaucrats.

With that, I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) for joining us tonight.

Mr. TIPTON. My pleasure, and I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have a great challenge in this Nation: to be able to get our people back to work.

Right now we are paying, as a country, \$1.75 trillion per year in regulatory costs. As was noted earlier, small businesses are incurring better than \$10,000 per employee. That is a burden that they cannot sustain, hoping to be able to create jobs and to be able to get this economy moving.

I'd like to be able to just give you a couple of real, personal examples of regulations that are impacting real lives.

A gentleman in Pueblo, Colorado—they just had their new unemployment figures come out: 11.1 percent, and those are just the official numbers. The real numbers are even much higher. Jim Bartness, much to his dismay, contributed to that, simply because he tried to play by the rules that the government had issued.

A small construction company, Mr. Bartness had had a few good years. In fact, under the President's proposals now, a couple of years ago he would be deemed as wealthy. What did he do with his wealth as a small business man, an LLC, a sole proprietorship? He reinvested those dollars right back into his business—to be able to create jobs, to be able to provide for his family. He paid down his line of credit to zero, kept a little bit of cushion to be able to get them through the tough times.

In construction, if you're familiar with that, you often bid jobs but you don't get them. So he needed to re-up that line of credit to be able to keep his business going, to keep his employees going. When he went down to the local community bank, he was told they wanted to re-up that line of credit, but regulatorily, they could not. He could not get that line of credit. The one option he had was to shut down his business, line up that equipment, and auction it off.

As I talked to Mr. Bartness, you could see tears welling in his eyes as he related that story of calling in those 23 employees to tell them it was going to be their last day. That was a regulatory killing—literally—of a business.

I think we all do concur. We know there need to be some regulations. You

know, at the beginning of the 1900s in this country, when we first started building cars, there were only two automobiles in New York City. They ran into each other. A stoplight isn't a bad idea. But we have seen such overreach out of government.

When we're talking about the agricultural community, as I traveled through the San Luis Valley, where I was this last weekend, held a town hall meeting and met with potato farmers, fully willing to take on the issues that we deal with often in Colorado, dealing with water, they didn't want to talk about water. They wanted to talk about the EPA. The overreach of government in the regulatory process is literally killing business.

We had a message that they wanted to be able to have delivered. They heard the President's comments that they didn't build that business; they owed it to government. They want the President to know that when they open up that business early in the morning and put in those 12-, 14-hour days, sometimes 7 days a week, and they are the ones that lock that door at night, it isn't Washington, D.C., but it is this President's policies which are inhibiting job growth in America.

□ 2020

We've got to be able to get America back to work, and the Red Tape Reduction and Small Business Job Creation Act is something that will help achieve that, and I'm proud to be able to stand with you and speak to this this evening.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

And again, I will highlight some of the statistics that he pointed out. And the gentleman from Colorado can correct me. You said \$1.75 trillion cost of regulations. That's per year?

Mr. TIPTON. That's correct.

Mr. GARDNER. And that's just money that businesses are using to comply with more and more regulations that are in place every year by the Federal Government.

Mr. TIPTON. It is. And I think it's incredibly important to note, they're continuing to grow. The moving bar that our businesses face in terms of regulatory compliance is costing American jobs.

Mr. GARDNER. And I would point out, too, as the gentleman has mentioned, the cost of regulations and the time that regulations take, this is a—again, going back to that same economist article talking about the issue of overregulated in America. And it talks about how every hour spent, every hour spent by a doctor in this country today, under the President's health care bill, when a doctor meets with a patient for an hour, that doctor, that health care clinic, that hospital, is going to spend at least 30 minutes filling out paperwork and forms. So the doctor meets for an hour with the patient; they're going to be spending at least 30 minutes of paperwork, and often a whole hour.

You talk about regulations. That's what the President's health care has brought us.

And I know the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. QUAYLE) has been a champion for job creators in his State. The next speaker tonight is BEN QUAYLE from Arizona, who's going to talk, amongst other things, about a bill that he has introduced, H.R. 3862, to get to the very heart of some of the challenges that we face when it comes to protecting America's job creators and making sure that we're not strangling our job creators through regulations. I look forward to his comments tonight.

Mr. QUAYLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Our friend Mr. TIPTON from Colorado was talking about some of the President's comments about business owners and people who created businesses, when he said that, you know, if you have a business, you didn't build that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have news for the President. They did build that. They built it on the sweat of their own brow, their hard work, their determination. Sometimes they failed, but most of the time they succeeded. And they didn't succeed because of government; they succeeded in spite of government because of all of the regulatory burdens they put in front of small businesses to grow, all of these things that they have to comply with, and the rules change on a daily basis.

I was reading an article—actually, an interview—with former Secretary of State George Shultz the other day in *The Wall Street Journal*, and he had a very appropriate analogy when he said that, if you take a sports game, whether it's football or baseball or what have you, and you're asking a team—here, it's going to be businesses—to get involved, get on the playing field, which is exactly what people are saying right now when people are holding back their cash if they've been lucky enough to have that success.

But the problem is you don't ever want to go onto a football field if you don't know what the rules of the game are, if the rules are going to change, or if you have a referee, like this administration, who is not going to faithfully execute the laws based on what is written rather than what they believe should have been written.

And so that is a huge difference, and it's a huge problem that's facing our job creators right now. They don't know what the rules are. They're constantly changing, and they don't have a referee that's going to call balls and strikes just as balls and strikes and not just make things up as they go along.

Our friend from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) mentioned that \$1.75 trillion of annualized costs are dedicated to regulations. If you break that down, that's about \$10,585 per employee for the average small business. I don't know about you, but that is a huge cost that is an annual cost that they pay every single year, and it's choking the ability for small businesses to take that money,

take that capital, invest it, grow it, hire new people. Instead, they're using that for compliance costs. Instead, they're using that to push paper.

Those are the things that we're trying to get rid of. Those are the things we're trying to streamline so that we don't have the red tape that's going to continue to stifle economic growth in this country.

And if you look at what's coming down the road, my goodness. You have Taxmageddon that's coming up on January 1, where we have the Democrats in the Senate say that they're willing to go over the fiscal cliff in order to get after some of the best job creators and tax them, basically to Armageddon.

And then you have the regulatory environment that continues to stifle economic growth. And if you look at what the Obama administration has been able to do, just in 2011, they added \$231.4 billion in new regulatory burdens. They added 82,000 pages to the Federal Register. That is an insane amount.

But this week we're going to be fighting back. That's why the Red Tape Reduction and Small Business Job Creation Act is so vitally important for the economic future of our country.

Now, I have a bill that's entitled *Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlement Act of 2012*, and that's a piece of this bill. And what it does, it kinds of goes into an area that's not really talked about that much, but this is basically regulation via litigation, and it's extraordinarily damaging.

What happens is, if you have an interest group, they lobby Congress for a rule, for a statute, and having one of the agencies write a rule by a certain specific date. Now, the date is artificially short so they can't actually comply and go through the normal rule-making process. So then that date lapses, and then that special interest goes and sues that agency. The DOJ comes in and tries to defend it, and sometimes—and most of the time—we get a more stringent regulatory burden that is placed on our businesses, and they don't even have a chance to respond. A lot of times they file the complaint the same day as the settlement agreement, and it is virtually impossible for a subsequent administration to actually change that because they have to go through the whole judicial process rather than going through the normal agency process.

So this starts to bring some transparency to that, brings the stakeholders to the table so they can have a say in what's going to happen in the regulation that's going to directly affect their business.

Now, some of the most onerous regulations that have been passed recently have been passed via this regulation via litigation, whether it's the Boiler MACT, the Cement MACT, the Utility MACT that's coming down. Some of the ones that affect Arizona especially, we're having one that came out that's going to affect the Navajo Generating

Station that could cost hundreds of jobs, drive up Arizona energy prices by 20 to 30 percent, our water costs by 20 or 30 percent, and the compliance cost for the Navajo generating station is \$1.1 billion.

□ 2030

This came through regulation by litigation. These are the types of things that this bill, which we're going to be debating in the next couple of days, is going to stop. It's going to put an end to it so our small businesses can grow again, so we can get our economy moving again, and so we can get people back to work.

I thank the gentleman for highlighting this issue and for leading on this issue.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

You mentioned at the beginning of your comments tonight the President's statement that, if you have a business, you can thank government for that.

Have you ever had a small business owner or somebody who opened a business call you and thank the government for building his business? I don't know. I certainly have never had that.

Mr. QUAYLE. No. I think Ronald Reagan said the scariest words you can hear are: "I'm from the government. I'm here to help." I think that that is basically what our small businesses are saying right now, that if you have the government knocking on your door, it's not a good thing.

Mr. GARDNER. And \$1.75 trillion is the yearly cost of regulations. If you were to hire 35 million people at \$50,000 a year, that would equal \$1.75 trillion. \$1.75 trillion could hire 35 million people at \$50,000 a year.

Mrs. ROBY. I would even add to that and say that I've had business owners in my district who have lodged complaints about what we talked about before, this punitive regulation, but they don't want you to go to bat for them because they're afraid it's only going to end up costing them more and that then their businesses will become targets of this Federal Government.

Now, what kind of United States of America is that when we have businesses that are afraid to complain to their Representatives in Congress about exactly what you're talking about? "Hi, I'm here. I'm from the government and I'm here to help." Then you complain about it, and you get targeted as a business.

Mr. QUAYLE. You're exactly right. Because of all the different agencies that there are to respond to, they're worried that, if they actually challenge the ruling or challenge the regulation that is being put upon them, then they will actually have further burdens placed upon them, further ramifications placed on them so that you have a constant living in fear because they're going to still have to report to that agency. Then, if they actually try to combat what just happened, they're going to have the full force of this

agency going down their throats. That is a huge issue.

Mrs. ROBY. If you talk to the Great-est Generation, you know that is not what this country was built on.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. In everything you've described—from the sports analogy, where people are afraid to go onto the field because they don't know the game, to the direct impact it has on all sorts of businesses—that also applies to our Nation's financial institutions.

It's through our banks and credit unions that so many of our small businesses get off the ground, and that's how, oftentimes, they're able to sustain themselves during dips in the economy. Unfortunately, there is great uncertainty in the financial sector as well. We can cite a number of different things, but I put Dodd-Frank high on the list. I certainly hear that in my district. Let me relate to you a little story about the impact of regulations as they affect banks and how they, in turn, affect businesses in my district and around the country.

I visited, not long ago, a business that manufactures food products, things like these little miniature pizzas that are frozen—you buy them at the grocery store—and little hot dogs with dough encrusted around them. It's actually an incredibly productive manufacturer of these things, and it has developed a lot of expertise. This company was on the verge of a major expansion. It would have created hundreds of jobs in my district and led to additional jobs because of the supply industry that would have supported this company.

But Federal regulations got in the way.

The company needed a \$3 million bridge loan to get everything online and begin production. They were a dream sort of business. To give you a sense of what they had lined up, they had a world-renowned entrepreneur, and they had a billionaire investor. The person who had conceived of this business put up \$1 million of his own money—his life savings. They had several high-profile, nationally known businesses lining up with purchase orders. They'd already secured a new facility and invested significantly in new capital equipment.

So everything is online, but the new banking regulations prohibited them from getting the money they needed to take it to the next level. Things are finally moving forward for this business. I'm happy to say that, despite these headwinds, the founder of this business was able to secure alternative financing from private sources and others. Ultimately, it was regulations that almost killed these hundreds of jobs in my district.

This is the sort of human impact that so many Americans and communities are facing right now. This is what we're trying to get our hands on with this legislation that we're passing.

Mrs. ROBY. To quickly add to that, in the Dodd-Frank Act, there are 36

rules implemented, and it will grow to the 400 required under that act. That goes to your point exactly.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Absolutely.

So we've seen this in the ag sector, where traditionally between crops being planted and harvested, it's not uncommon to get bank loans to keep the operation afloat, especially with smaller farms. We see it in all types of businesses. It's time that we take care of these financial regulations and other types of regulations, and I'm glad we are acting here on the Republican side in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GARDNER. Again, thank you for sharing that story with us about a manufacturer of a restaurant—a food business, I guess, operator—that is ready to create jobs if it could just get government out of the way and let it do what it does best, which is run its own business.

I am pleased tonight that we are joined by the gentlelady from North Carolina, VIRGINIA FOXX, who is a champion on the House floor in making sure we are doing just that—getting government out of the way and letting America work.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank members of the freshman class—I think people don't realize we call ourselves “freshmen” our first year here—for doing such a wonderful job of humanizing this bill.

This is not the most exciting legislation that has ever passed the House of Representatives, and I have to say my piece of this legislation is probably one of the least exciting pieces of it. It's H.R. 373. It's called the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act. It's pretty dull. I'll tell you, when you read it, if you need something to put you to sleep, it's a great thing to put you to sleep, but it is very important legislation. All seven pieces of the legislation that you all are talking about tonight have real impact on the public.

I want to say, in 1995, when Republicans took over the majority for the first time in 40 years, they passed a bill with bipartisan support called the Unfunded Mandates bill. We all grew up hearing how the Federal Government was putting unfunded mandates on State and local governments. So they said, well, we're not going to do that anymore. We're going to figure out how much this costs, and if it costs over \$100 million, we're not going to do it. Well, guess what? There were loopholes in the legislation. We hear about loopholes all the time in tax legislation, but you don't hear very many people talking about the loopholes that are out there that govern the bureaucracy. Well, there were lots of loopholes in the Unfunded Mandates bill, or UMRA.

What my bill does is close those loopholes to keep the bureaucrats from getting around telling us how much these unfunded mandates are going to cost. For the first time ever, it is going to apply to the private sector so that we will really know—these rules and regu-

lations that the gentleman from Indiana was talking about—how much they're going to cost that business that was almost put out of business. That's what we need to be doing.

So the rules may go into effect, but this Congress is going to understand and the world is going to understand how much it is costing us, and that is very, very important.

I thank you for letting me share a couple of minutes of your time tonight in order to bring some information forward about H.R. 373, which is a bipartisanly supported bill, as I think most of these bills are. So, while they are not exciting, they do good work.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentlelady.

In going back to some of the comments that have been made tonight, the gentleman from Indiana talked about the 34,000 new rule makers—the people who have been hired to do nothing but write rules. I live in a town of about 3,000 people, so 34,000 people is a heck of a lot more than I have in my hometown, and they were all hired to write regulations. The gentleman from Arizona talked about 82,000 pages.

To the gentleman, I think that was 82,000 pages of regulations in 2012 alone?

Mr. QUAYLE. 2011.

Mr. GARDNER. 2011. So that's 82,000 pages of regulations written in 2011.

During the first 3 years in office, the Obama administration unleashed 106 new major regulations that increased the regulatory burdens in this country by more than \$46 billion annually. I want to share with you a statement that the President, himself, made. This is a statement that he made recently, saying:

The rules have gotten out of balance, placing unreasonable burdens on business, burdens that have stifled innovation and have had a chilling effect on growth and jobs.

Yet here we are increasing regulations by this President, by this administration.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. We've just lost all sense of perspective. We ought to be measuring the cost of any given regulation—of any proposed regulation—of the benefits, and then comparing the two. I think any fair-minded person would take into account both of them and, in the end, decide whether or not a given regulation makes sense.

I was doing a little research earlier in preparation of my coming down to the floor. I just wanted to see what some of the cost-benefit analyses have been for recent regulations.

□ 2040

I came across a report by the National Bureau of Economic Research. It was from a decade ago. They took a look at some of the regulations that have been proposed over the years. One of them was child-safe lighters. The Consumer Product Safety Commission determined that a life would be saved for a cost of only \$100,000 by implementing these regulatory standards for

child-safe lighters. That strikes me as pretty reasonable. That's absolutely worth it. There was another regulation proposed, and conceivably for a cost of \$100 trillion that we might save a life some day by the solid waste construction regulatory standards that our Federal Government has proposed. There has got to be a sense of balance here, or we're going to crush our economy.

Mr. GARDNER. We continue to hear testimony before our committees that talk about how for every \$1 million you spend on regulations, it creates 1.5 jobs, as if regulations and adding burdens to business is actually job creation in and of itself.

Mrs. ROBY. Didn't you have the opportunity to question a witness on your committee and ask very specifically as it relates to energy? If I watched the hearing correctly, you were unable to ever get really until the final admittance that, in fact, they do not take economic impact into consideration when instituting these regulations.

Mr. GARDNER. It's one of the greatest frustrations I have. You're talking about major regulations and their impact on job creation and impact on jobs, and yet this bureaucrat admitted that they don't take into account in the economic analysis they carried out, they don't take into account the impact on jobs.

Mrs. ROBY. What do they take into account?

Mr. GARDNER. Somehow they have cost and benefits, yet they consider their economic analysis complete, even though it doesn't take into account jobs.

Mrs. ROBY. Without the input of the private sector that is actually impacted by the very regulations.

Mr. TIPTON. I would like to be able to comment really in regards to Congresswoman FOXX, that this is an exciting piece of legislation.

The fact is that if you sit down and you talk to small businesses, they're excited about this legislation because they're the ones that are literally feeling this impact. We passed the REINS Act to be able to pull back those massive regulations which were impacting jobs in this country. We are standing up for the small businesses that create 7 out of 10 jobs in this country to be able to get our people back to work.

Just recently when we were talking about committee hearings, we just had a hearing in a Small Business Subcommittee that I chair over at Energy, Ag, and Trade, and we saw that the Department of Labor was going to start regulating children working on the family farm. You couldn't work on a haystack higher than 6 feet; you couldn't take your animal down to the county fair to be able to show. In farming and ranching, you learn by doing. They pulled that rule now for the balance of the year. What's frightening to the farm and ranch community is the words "for the balance of the year."

They will be back. The regulators will be back.

This is a commonsense piece of legislation that's speaking to the heart of the people that drive this country, the small businessmen and -women who are willing to wake up those mornings and put in that hard labor just for the hope of being able to live the American Dream. This is the right thing to do at the right time for American business, to be able to stimulate jobs and get this economy moving.

Mr. QUAYLE. I very much agree with that.

One thing that Mr. GARDNER from Colorado was talking about in terms of actually taking into account in the cost-benefit analysis is the impact on jobs. I've talked to a number of businesses, and they say that with all of the new regulation that has been coming out of this administration, that they've actually had to replace somebody in a productive part of their company, in R&D, research and development, with somebody on the administrative side just to be able to comply with the regulations.

If you look at that, it's a net zero for job creation or job loss. The problem is that that person who is involved in R&D, they have the ability to get new products on the market that are actually going to expand their company. Somebody who's actually just pushing paper and trying to comply with regulations is never going to put in some sort of measure where they're actually going to be able to expand their company. That's the big thing that we're talking about when you're saying that for every regulation you have 1.5 jobs for whatever million dollars. That's just hogwash. It's ridiculous that they're pointing to that. I've heard other Members say that increased regulation increases jobs. It does not. It increases paperwork. We don't want a bunch of paper pushers. We want people who are going to provide products and services that are going to be expanding the economic pie that we have in the United States.

Mr. GARDNER. I often tell my constituents a story about my great-granddad when he came to Colorado and opened up the farm equipment dealership that still remains in our family today. I tell the story about how they came to our hometown, a small town, and they built their business. I talk about how my wife and I wonder if our children are going to be able to have the same opportunities that he did to start a business of their dreams. I don't think they ever imagined that the government would be considering prohibiting a 16-year-old from working on their uncle's farm. I don't think they ever imagined that the government might try to require dairies to build berms around the cows in case there was a milk spill. I don't think they ever would have imagined a world where the government would introduce, as a result of litigation, a proposal that could wipe out 25 percent of

our electricity generation just because they decided this regulation has to go into effect because of a lawsuit that they agreed to settle, and the cost that that will force upon America's job creators.

Again, we get back to this notion of the millions of people in this country that are unemployed. We get back to the very simple fact that one out of every two college graduates today is either unemployed or underemployed. Our Nation has seen unemployment rates at or above 8 percent for 41 months in a row. All while the promise of the President's stimulus bill said we're going to solve these problems, unemployment is going to be drastically reduced, we're going to create energy opportunities by giving millions and millions of dollars in loan guarantees to companies that go bankrupt. Yet, we have job creators in Indiana ready to hire, but they can't get the money that they need because of regulations. We have a government that would rather give loan guarantees to companies they know are going to fail than to actual job creators that are already succeeding.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. If I can intervene here. You would think that during a down economy, what some have called the worst economy since the Great Depression, we would stop piling on. It's the first rule of holes: you stop digging when you find yourself in one. But we continue to dig even though we're in a hole. We pile on new significant regulations on top of the existing significant regulations.

There's a portion of this legislation that was offered originally by Congressman GRIFFIN. His name is still on it: Regulatory Freeze for Jobs Act. This places a moratorium on all significant regulations, all of those with \$100 million or more economic cost on our economy.

This is common sense among my constituents, probably among the vast majority of the American people here, that you just stop piling on the major regulations during a down economy. I'm certainly supportive of this. I think we need to go further.

Mr. TIPTON of Colorado mentioned the REINS Act. It would be my preference that every time we have any proposed rule or regulation imposing a \$100 million cost or more on our economy, it comes back to Congress for a hearing, for an up-or-down vote. We should allow our constituents to weigh in on the manner, tell us how to improve the regulation, tell us if they think it ought to be eliminated altogether, or perhaps they like it. In the end, I think we need to own these significant regulations.

You know what? If we pass that REINS Act, that will give all of us an incentive not to punt on the hard issues, not to pass them onto the EPAs and OSHAs and USDAs of the world. Ultimately, we would own it. We would be accountable. I would invite that sort of scrutiny and accountability.

Mrs. ROBY. Wouldn't that be a novel idea?

Just real quickly if I may. We've now stated on more than one occasion some quotes from the President and this administration going back to the fact that if you've got a business, you didn't build that. Then, as the gentleman from Colorado just read again, the President said that these rules have gotten out of balance. Mr. GRIFFIN in his op ed he wrote in support of his amendment. I'm just going to make sure we give the gentleman from Arkansas some credit since he's not standing here with us. He also points out at the end of this opinion piece that the President admitted in his State of the Union address, "There's no question that some regulations are outdated, unnecessary, or too costly."

□ 2050

And I just want to read that again. "There's no question"—this is the President, this President, President Obama—"There's no question that some regulations are outdated, unnecessary, and too costly." Yet every single time in my short tenure in this House of Representatives that we have brought a bill to the floor to deregulate, to do away with unnecessary regulations so that the private sector can grow, we are blocked in the Senate, and the President is not there to support us.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Just one addition to the gentlelady's comments. The President also ordered a regulatory review of all regulations in that very same speech. And he was going to root out, he said, existing regulations that were constraining job creation. He reaffirmed his commitment to repealing all these sorts of measures. You know, his rhetoric is not matched by commitment, by action. So we're acting in terms of this piece of legislation, and I am proud of that.

Mr. GARDNER. And I would like to ask the gentleman from Colorado tonight—you know, the gentleman from Indiana mentioned the Regulatory Freeze for Jobs Act. This is the idea that we put a freeze on regulations when the economy's down, but it is specifically about the REINS Act.

You know, the REINS Act that we talked about earlier this year was a bill that we passed that said, if a rule or regulation has a certain economic impact on our economy, then it has to come back to us to say whether or not this is something that we need to pass on to America's job creators.

When we served together in the State legislature, every year we worked on the rule review bill. And the gentleman from Colorado will recall that this was a bill that came up to us, and we got to look at the regulations and give them a thumbs up or thumbs down on whether or not we thought the executive agency had gone too far, whether we thought they were doing the right thing.

And again, this is just one way for us to say, hey, let's do what's right for America's job creators.

Mr. TIPTON. You know, in Colorado, we just call that common sense. And I bet we do in every other State in the Union as well.

Here is what is fundamentally the problem: We will recall that Minority Leader PELOSI, with the passage of the President's health care mandate, said that once it is passed, we'll find out what's in it. It is a little comical to be able to hear that. But the fact is, it was actually true because they continued to fill in the blanks with regulations. We continue to see that with Dodd-Frank. And the Congress is not having the opportunity to truly be able to be engaged.

I know in each of our committees, we have challenged bureaucracies, departments as they have come in to be able to bring those rules back to the authoritative committees, to be able to bring them back to Congress to actually be able to play a role because here is fundamentally the problem: Once they go final with a rule, it takes that proverbial act of Congress to be able to pull back that rule that a Member of Congress, a Member of the Senate never asked for.

We have got to be able to have these opportunities, to reengage the people who are actually elected to be able to represent the American people rather than having nameless, faceless bureaucrats writing regulations that are hurting American business, hurting our economic prospects, and preventing us from being able to get this economy moving.

Mr. QUAYLE. You know, it is kind of a shame that we actually have to pass something like this. But so much power has been amassed in the executive branch that we need pieces of legislation like the REINS Act, like this bill.

But the thing is is that if the President would just pick up the phone and call his agency heads and say, Cut it out; don't pass these rules and regulations that are going to keep putting a damper on economic growth. I mean, they believe that they have executive discretion for just about anything. But my goodness, the one thing that they should be using some sort of discretion for is not putting more burdens on small businesses that are trying to grow.

So the President needs to just pick up the phone. That could lead to the biggest economic growth that could happen in this country if he picked up the phone and told every agency head, Hey, let's cut off all these new regulations that you guys are trying to implement.

Mr. GARDNER. And I think the gentleman from Arizona brings up a good point because the President likes to blame Congress for not increasing taxes or for spending enough money. But we know that this President is in charge of his executive branch agencies, that he's the one who appointed his cabinet, approved by the Senate. He could just pick up the phone, as you

said, call, and say, Let's make sure we're making it easier for businesses, not more difficult. And again, it's an incredible, incredible opportunity that the President has to stand up and lead. But it goes back to that very issue: he's required to stand up and lead.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Does anyone know—I will pose this question to my colleagues. Is the President's jobs council working on this issue?

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Indiana brings up a great point. And as I mentioned earlier tonight, there was an article in Politico that was printed last week. The President's jobs council hasn't even met for 6 months. I don't know if they have given up or if he just is afraid that they may not support his policies.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I have heard that. It seems he has other priorities. But we need to force the hand. We need to make the argument here. This is what our constituents are asking us to do, every conceivable thing we can think of to create an environment where jobs can be created, where new businesses can be started, where entrepreneurship is at a 15-year low, where existing businesses can expand, where unemployment remains above 8 percent for how many months now.

Mr. TIPTON. I applaud that comment.

Let's make American jobs the key priority. Putting Americans back to work; that must be a priority. And we call on the President to join us in this action. We are putting forward the idea. But we need some partners that are willing to be able to work with us.

Mr. GARDNER. I want to thank my colleagues from Indiana, Alabama, Colorado, Arizona, and North Carolina who stood on the House floor tonight talking about what we could do to get this country moving again, what we could do to unleash the innovators and the entrepreneurs across this country.

We face a lot of challenges. We know that we face insurmountable debt that we must address. We know this country faces spending challenges each and every day. But we can't build a long, sustainable economy unless we get America's job creators back on their feet.

The Small Business Administration recently released a study that said, per employee, small businesses face regulatory costs 36 percent higher than large businesses. It's now easier to start a business in Slovenia, Estonia, and Hungary than in America.

The message that we join together tonight to send to our job creators is that we stand with you. We stand with businesses across this country who are struggling to hire that next person, to make sure that they have the opportunities that the people who started their businesses did, to make sure that the generations that follow have the same opportunities as the generations before them.

So I want to thank my colleagues again for joining us tonight and to

make sure that the American people know that we, indeed, have a jobs plan. And tomorrow, when we pick up, again, a debate to talk about America's job creators, that we will talk about how we can get this economy moving forward again. And we will be voting on H.R. 4078, the Red Tape Reduction and Small Business Job Creation Act, that every vote we take on it will be made with one purpose: to get this country moving again and to get our economy back on track and to get America's job creators hiring once again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4078, RED TAPE REDUCTION AND SMALL BUSINESS JOB CREATION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6082, CONGRESSIONAL REPLACEMENT OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S ENERGY-RESTRICTING AND JOB-LIMITING OFFSHORE DRILLING PLAN

Ms. FOXX (during the Special Order of Mr. GARDNER), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-616) on the resolution (H. Res. 738) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4078) to provide that no agency may take any significant regulatory action until the unemployment rate is equal to or less than 6.0 percent, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6082) to officially replace, within the 60-day Congressional review period under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, President Obama's Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program (2012-2017) with a congressional plan that will conduct additional oil and natural gas lease sales to promote offshore energy development, job creation, and increased domestic energy production to ensure a more secure energy future in the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FARR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in district.

Mr. HONDA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical reason.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 24, 2012, 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:

7011. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Azoxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0398; FRL-9352-2] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7012. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dicloran and Formetanate; Tolerance Actions [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-0507; FRL-9353-7] (RIN: 2070-ZA16) received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7013. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0343; FRL-9354-1] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7014. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sulfentrazone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0758; FRL-9353-8] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7015. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Norton A. Schwartz, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7016. A letter from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's report on Reverse Mortgages; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7017. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hazardous Chemical Reporting: Revisions to the Emergency and Hazardous Chemical Inventory Forms (Tier I and Tier II) [EPA-HQ-SFUND-2010-0763; FRL-9674-1] (RIN: 2050-AG64) received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7018. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule Step 3 and GHG Plantwide Applicability Limits [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0517; FRL-9690-1] (RIN: 2060-AR10) received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7019. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2012-0208; FRL-9697-9] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7020. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Penn-

sylvania; Nonattainment New Source Review; Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) [EPA-R03-OAR-2011-0924; FRL-9698-2] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7021. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Delegation of National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories; Gila River Indian Community [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0286; FRL-9698-7] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7022. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Louisiana: Final Authorization of State-initiated Changes and Incorporation by Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R06-2012-0411; FRL-9694-7] received June 10, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7023. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report on the removal of United Nations arms embargo provisions against Rwanda; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7024. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 12-35, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7025. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 12-46, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7026. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7027. A letter from the Chief Human Capital Officer, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7028. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, transmitting the 2011 Statements on System of Internal Controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7029. A letter from the President, National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, transmitting the 2011 Annual Report of an independent auditor who has audited the records of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 4514; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7030. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a semi-annual report to Congress on the continued compliance of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan with the Trade Act's freedom of emigration provisions, as required under the Jackson-Vanik Amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk