

an entangling situation like that, it's time to look back.

What caused World War I? Entangling alliances.

Does entangling alliances involving Russia and so many other countries in Syria ring bells?

It's time the bells rang and we stayed out.

REGULATORY REFORM AND REGULATORY RELIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in another of a series of Republican freshman class Special Orders, this time to focus on our Nation's need for regulatory reform and regulatory relief.

As an American and a parent, I value the role of responsible regulations. Many regulations were designed with personal safety in mind, and these regulations make our workforce stronger. All too often, however, the Federal Government designs regulations that are often unnecessary and achieve little or no benefit at a very high cost. These regulations directly impact the hardworking men and women of northeast Georgia and across the Nation. Over the next hour, my colleagues and I will discuss the growing problem of regulation and why our Nation's economy so desperately needs regulatory relief.

I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the president of our freshman class, my dear friend and a tireless worker on this issue as well, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. I want to thank my good friend from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for recognizing me and for leading this Republican freshman class Special Order on the need for regulatory reform.

I also want to commend him and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO) for their initiative in creating the Freshman Regulatory Reform Working Group, of which I am pleased to be a member.

A recent editorial written by George Washington University Professor Jonathan Turley declared that:

Our carefully constructed system of checks and balances is being negated by the rise of a fourth branch, an administrative state of sprawling departments and agencies that govern with increasing autonomy and decreasing transparency.

The voice of the American people is marginalized when this so-called fourth state of government, our Federal agencies, fail to follow the wishes of their elected representatives or make policy in the absence of direction by Congress. And the American people are paying the price of this regulatory maze created by this unelected government.

For example, the Heritage Foundation has found that annual regulatory costs increased by more than \$23.5 billion during President Obama's fourth year in office. The total cost of regulations during the President's first term were nearly \$70 billion, a level unmatched by any previous administration.

It's time to unshackle America from the stranglehold these regulations have on our economy.

I again want to thank Mr. COLLINS and Mr. YOHIO for leading efforts among the freshman Republicans to eliminate and streamline burdensome Federal regulations. I look forward to working with them and all Members of the House to help create jobs by allowing America's businesses to grow and innovate by reining in the unelected bureaucracy standing in their way.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

I think you bring up a great point, and that's the issue of an unelected bureaucracy that is forcing sometimes businesses who just want to create, want to expand, and want to do those things. I appreciate your interest in this, and we are going to continue this fight because this matters to real people. This matters to Main Street. And when we matter to Main Street, then people understand what we're trying to do up here, and I think they then begin to have confidence that Washington has their best interest at heart.

Mr. MESSER. I would just add, sometimes I think this comes from both sides. In other words, there are times when laws passed by Congress are intentionally vague so that the bureaucracy steps in and leaders are able to say, Hey, blame it on those regulators.

I think we have a responsibility to make sure that we're making laws specific enough and simple enough to be understood by the American people.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I agree with that, and I thank the gentleman from Indiana. I appreciate his work on this.

It's now my pleasure to introduce someone who not only has come to Congress fired up about the issues that are going on, but has become my co-chair on this regulatory working group and bringing forth, I believe, a fresh perspective from Florida.

It is now my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO).

Mr. YOHIO. I thank my good friend from Georgia for yielding, and I appreciate the comments.

I'd like to title this talk, "Burden-some Regulations: The Dysfunctional Government Tax."

More than \$14,000 every year, that's what the average American family loses out on because of Federal regulations either in taxes or lower wages because their employers are carrying that burden.

How do we even get all these regulations, more than 6,000 regulations just this year? It happens when the executive branch goes around Congress to create their own policies. Some people call this "legislation through regulation." I call it the "dysfunctional government tax." It's the \$40 a day every American has to pay because the executive branch won't go through Congress. It won't work with those of us who are here tonight because we were sent here by the people.

In more places in my district, you could take your spouse out for a nice dinner for \$40. A person could fill up their gas tank and a minivan for about \$40, or you could take your children to a matinee movie on the weekends for \$40.

When I'm at home in my district, I hear from people who own their own business and from people who just care about their work, about how Federal regulations are making it harder to make ends meet. We're going to talk about a few of these regulations tonight, but let me tell you about a few stories from north central Florida.

There's a lumber company in my district that has to aim lower. By that I mean versus aiming higher to expand their business. This is because of the burden of the Affordable Care Act. It's too great to bear. They would love nothing more than to hire more people, more workers, or buy that extra piece of equipment, but there's no telling what the compliance cost of the ACA will be.

Not only that, these poor folks are subject to the rules and perhaps fines based on the discretion or interpretation of whatever inspector happens upon them that day. There is no certainty. And I think that's one of the biggest roles that we have to do is create certainty in the environment of the workplace so that businesses can go forward and expand their businesses. To create a stable economy, we need a stable environment for businesses to work in. The overregulation we've seen in recent years creates neither.

Yet another example comes from a watermelon grower in my district and an interpretation of a rule from the Food Safety Modernization Act, commonly called FSMA. This rule says that the use of water bottles cannot be used by workers in the field when they are picking the melons. I don't know if words can describe just how hot and humid it gets in Florida during this time of year, but it gets pretty darn hot. Not allowing water in the fields is tantamount to cruel and unusual punishment.

Even more ridiculous are the posters that have to be placed on site that talk about the risk of heat stroke. What you see here is a poster that's put up

by one of the regulatory agencies warning people about heat stroke, but yet they won't let you take water into the field to pick watermelons.

These are some of the regulations that don't make any sense, and it causes confusion in the workplace.

□ 1940

Another example that comes from Florida has to do with the poultry recycling program. This act was amended in 1997 to include new definitions; poultry products that have been below 26 degrees Fahrenheit may not be labeled as "fresh." Such labeled product is considered "misbranded." A company I know had a USDA inspection and identified poultry labeled as "fresh," and they said the product was frozen below 26 degrees Fahrenheit. Due to the rule, the product was detained. Keep in mind that, as a veterinarian, this poses no safety risk to the average consumer, to any consumer. After 4 months of engaging the agency with time and money spent on litigation, the USDA changed the rule to allow poultry frozen below 26 Fahrenheit to be labeled as fresh as long as they sold the product to end users like hospitals and restaurants. Precisely. This is the business that this company was selling their product to all along.

The bottom line is that it wound up costing them 4 months of lost revenue, and the rule cost this business \$681,000. And they had absolutely no way to recoup their losses.

These things have to change because they wind up stifling the entrepreneur. What we have is a regulatory agency that starts out to make the public safer, whether on the job or on the highways or the foods we eat. And it's a good thing. But what happens is they often overstep their authority, and often it is the interpretation of that rule by the inspector that gets the misinterpretation. And the end result is the owner gets fined and sometimes has to shut down until the situation gets resolved.

Yes, we want safer workplaces, safer highways, and cleaner air and water; but we shouldn't impede the very people trying to create jobs. Our government agencies should be a facilitator to our businesses, not a debilitator to these businesses. After all, with the lack of the extra regulations up to this point in our history, I think it has worked pretty good, and we shouldn't overstep that boundary, and we need to have commonsense regulations.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida's comments. It is amazing some of the things we're hearing and the examples, simply by putting it out there. I want to extend an invitation to our freshman class and others who may want to join us in this regulatory working group. Contact our offices; we would love to hear your input as we go forward.

It is now my pleasure to welcome and I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for putting this Special Order together.

Mr. Speaker, in his time served in office thus far, President Obama has said he's for the reduction of government red tape that places an unnecessary burden on government people. Again and again, he has extolled the virtues of transparency and bipartisanship in an effort to put people back to work; but if we look at his track record, this has simply turned out to be yet another string of broken promises and a failure of leadership.

In his first term alone, President Obama has finalized 130 major rules, a shocking 160 percent increase over the previous term under President George W. Bush. This alarming growth in government is an assault on our free enterprise system and on our individual liberties. Either the President is not interested in keeping the America's people's trust, or he simply does not have a handle on his own Federal agencies. Given recent events, either of these could very well be true.

The truth, however, Mr. Speaker, is that cost from new regulatory burdens on Americans increased by nearly \$70 billion during President Obama's first term in office, which is based on his own agency's estimates. It is very possible that the real costs far exceed this number. With major regulations in Dodd-Frank and ObamaCare still yet to be implemented, these burdens on small businesses and the American people will only skyrocket.

Dodd-Frank alone required government bureaucrats to write nearly 400 new rules, and yet 3 years later we have barely completed a third of them. Most of the laws' provisions have little or no connection to the financial crisis that prompted their creation in the first place. As a member of the Financial Services Committee, I have witnessed firsthand how arbitrary and irrelevant these rules can be, and how they cost the American people jobs and their hard-earned savings.

We can and must do more to hold these agencies accountable and stop this governance by fiat and the bypassing of Congress—we the people. This is why we must have the REINS Act, which I am proud to cosponsor. This legislation would rein in the Federal agencies and would require Congress to approve every new major rule proposed by the executive branch having an annual economic impact of \$100 million or more. It would allow Congress to regain our constitutional authority by limiting the size and scope of the rule-making powers of government bureaucrats who were not elected.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are fed up with this Big Government agenda. It's time to hold this administration accountable for the gross overreach of their power, whether it's regulation from the EPA or regulations implementing Dodd-Frank or ObamaCare. Enough is enough. The American people are tired of this government over-

stepping their constitutional authority.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate the gentlewoman from Missouri. She's right. That's the anger we feel and we hear from our constituents when they just don't understand what's going on here, and we need to continue that. I appreciate those words.

It's now my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky to provide an insight into what we're seeing right now of a regulatory environment gone amuck in a lot of ways.

Mr. BARR. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this Special Order this evening. This is a very important topic, and I applaud Mr. COLLINS and Mr. YOHIO for forming the Freshman Working Group on Regulatory Reform. Regulatory reform is desperately needed in this country to get our economy back on track.

We have seen persistent high unemployment in our country for the last 5 years. We got another bad jobs report just last week: 7.6 percent is the unemployment rate. But even more alarming than our persistent high unemployment rate is the fact that we have underemployment in this country. Only 58 percent of the American people who are eligible for employment who are of working-age population are actually employed. Only 58 percent.

Yes, we have a high unemployment rate. Yes, it has been persistently over 7.5 percent for the last 5 years. But even more troubling is the fact that only 58 percent of working-age people in this country are employed. That is 5 percent below the average employment rate for working-age people prior to the recession, and that number has been static for the last 5 years. So the question we have to ask ourselves is why is this happening; why are the American people not getting back to work.

Well, one of the primary impediments to economic recovery, to job growth, and job creation is the avalanche of new rules, regulations, and red tape coming out of Washington, all of which impose huge costs on businesses and create a destructive environment of uncertainty in the private sector. And it affects virtually every sector of our economy. It affects the health care sector with ObamaCare and the reams of regulations coming out of HHS. It affects the financial services industry with Dodd-Frank and all of the rulemakings. You know, Dodd-Frank authorizes over 400 new rules and regulations. A little more than half of those have been issued. According to certain estimates, compliance with those regulations equals about 24 million hours annually in man-hours to comply with the Dodd-Frank rules and regulations. To put that in perspective, 20 million man-hours was what was required to build the Panama Canal. This is literally an avalanche of rules and regulations crushing our financial institutions and impeding access to credit for entrepreneurs and small businesses. It's affecting the energy sector

where environmental regulations are destroying jobs.

In my home State, the coal industry has been devastated by the EPA's assault on the coal industry through over-regulation of the energy sector. In most countries that conduct mining activities, about 2 years is the average length of time for a regulator to review an application for mining. In the United States today, it takes 7 years for EPA regulators just to review and approve a surface mining permit.

□ 1950

So this backlog and this overregulation of mining activities is resulting in massive layoffs. Mining in central Appalachia is at its lowest production level since 1965. We've lost 4,000 coal mining jobs in just the last couple of years in eastern Kentucky as a result of the EPA's overzealous overregulation of the coal industry.

Yes, it's driving utility rates higher. Yes, it is certainly bad in terms of low-cost electricity for our manufacturers and small businesses and our seniors on fixed income, but it's also costing jobs. And it's having a negative impact on all of those people whose paychecks take care of their families.

We talked about the impact on health care. I had an administrator of a local small hospital in central Kentucky tell me that it used to be that they took care of patients. Today they take care of paper.

A small banker, community banker in eastern Kentucky told me that it used to be, in the community banking business, that they would provide loans and make a business decision based on the creditworthiness of the borrower, whether it was a farmer or a small business owner or an entrepreneur. Today, this banker says that the government makes that decision for them because of the avalanche of new rules and regulations.

There's another important dimension to this in addition to impeding economic recovery, and that's our Constitution. For the last 80 years, the growth of the administrative state has been a huge detractor from the original meaning of our Constitution. It has been offensive to the separation of powers doctrine. And one need only look to article I, section 1 of the U.S. Constitution, which simply reads:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the word "all" should be recognized as granting the Congress exclusive legislative power. And yet, for the last 80 years, as the administrative state has grown in Washington, the Congress has delegated its lawmaking powers to unaccountable, unelected bureaucrats in the executive branch. And so what we need to do in Congress is we need to rehabilitate what's known as the nondelegation doctrine, the idea that Congress shouldn't delegate away its lawmaking

powers to another branch of the government.

In the last several years, we've seen a dramatic growth in the regulatory burden on the private economy. The pages in the Code of Federal Regulations hit an all-time high of 174,000 pages in 2012. That's an increase of more than 21 percent during the last decade.

In 2012, the cost of Federal rules exceeded \$1.8 trillion, roughly equal to the gross domestic product of Canada, which is about \$1.81 trillion, and India, \$1.82 trillion.

The regulatory burden cost each U.S. household approximately \$14,768, meaning that red tape is now the second largest item in the typical family budget after housing.

And in 2012, 4,062 Federal regulations were at various stages of implementation. The government completed work on 1,172, an increase of 16 percent over the 1,010 that the Fed imposed in 2011, which was a 40 percent increase over the 722 in 2010.

And another measure of the regulatory burden, the pages in the Federal Register. By that measure, the Obama administration did not break the all-time record of 81,405 pages it set in 2010. But the 78,961 pages it churned out in 2012 mean that the President has posted three of the four greatest paperwork years on record.

Mr. Speaker, this avalanche of red tape is strangling American economic recovery. It is an offense to the Constitution of the United States, and it lacks all common sense. For the sake of the U.S. Constitution, for the sake of economic recovery, for the sake of common sense, and for the sake of the American people who are suffering in one of the worst economic downturns since the Great Depression, we need to rein in burdensome regulations.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky. He brings a good point. I think it would behoove all of us—we hear often on this floor we need to talk about jobs, we need to talk about job creation; and what we're finding right here is the very thing that is coming out of this bureaucracy, and this red tape is job-killing. And I think this is something we could find common ground on. I think it's a little bit of an agenda issue here, though.

When you come to Congress, you look for those who've stood the fight before you, and I am pleased tonight to yield some time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), sponsor of the REINS Act, who has fought this fight before we got here. And I am pleased to welcome him as an honorary freshman tonight, as part of the sophomore class, because you've led the way, and I appreciate that, and I am happy to yield time to you tonight.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank so much the gentleman from Georgia for his hard work on this issue, working with our colleague, Mr. YOHIO of Florida, and organizing this freshman initiative designed to tackle overly bur-

densome regulations, ensure that we produce smart regulations here at the Federal level and alleviate some of the pain during this very down economy that so many Americans are facing.

You know, when you talk about regulations, this is not some arcane issue. These are the rules we live by, just like the legislation that emerges out of this body. It impacts our jobs, our economic growth, the level of personal income that Americans enjoy. It impacts the number of long-term unemployed we have in this country, and right now we're at a historic low. It impacts these things and so many others.

People have too many hassles, too many burdens, too many anxieties, and regulations are a big part of the reason why. There are direct costs of regulations that come out of the alphabet soup agencies that populate Washington, D.C.

There are compliance costs that our small businesses, in particular, must contend with. There's a great deal of uncertainty associated with the regulations being developed in the buildings around Washington, D.C.; and regulations lead to an increase in the costs of our goods and services produced, thus making us less competitive economically vis-a-vis our international competitors. Regulations reduce, oftentimes, the productivity of our workers, which drives down their wages, which hurts our competitiveness once again.

So what's the solution to this?

Well, we here in Congress, especially folks on this side of the aisle—although, I have to say, this doesn't have to be a partisan issue, and, historically, it has not always been. I think that's a good thing. But we on this side of the aisle have been trying to alleviate the pain that many businesses and Americans feel by the costliest regulations coming out of Washington, D.C. I think that is proper, and I think we should continue to do so.

But I also believe it's time for us to consider a comprehensive approach to improving the entire regulatory process, and so that's why I have introduced, in this 113th Congress, the REINS Act.

Now, what the REINS Act does is it establishes a \$100 million threshold. This is the threshold established historically by our Office of Management and Budget for a so-called major regulation. And every major regulation, after it goes through the public hearing process, under the REINS Act, it has to go before Congress for an up-or-down vote before it can become the law of the land.

This would improve immeasurably the quality of regulations that come out of Washington, D.C. It would slow down the regulatory process, to be sure. But let's remember, our Founding Fathers devised a system where they wanted people in Washington to deliberate before we acted. This would lead to more deliberation, wiser judgment.

This would also allow the American people, the citizens of this great country, to weigh in on given regulations, ones they feel passionately about.

And, most importantly, the REINS Act would hold Members of Congress accountable for the regulations that come out of Washington.

You know, of course it would allow us to tame some of the executive agencies that have gone rogue from time to time, that pass unwise regulations. But I think, more importantly, it would allow those who elect us to bodies like this to hold us accountable for the things that cause pain to them, those imperial regulations that are promulgated from a distant Capitol, which our Founding Fathers were so upset about when this Nation was founded.

□ 2000

To the issue of congressional accountability, too many vague laws are made in this body—Dodd-Frank, the Affordable Care Act. I could go on and on. We pass and we kick the can down the road, as is often heard, on sticky issues, politically sensitive issues that politicians don't want to deal with because we know ultimately there will be regulators to fill in the gaps of our vague laws.

Well, the REINS Act would prevent that. It would incentivize Members of Congress to take on the hard issues in the beginning because they'd know that in the end those issues are going to come back and have to be resolved in this body.

When I go home and meet with small business people and individual constituents and they speak to me about specific regulations that are causing them pain, oftentimes, the best I can do and my colleagues can do is say, Listen, we'll try and repeal that particular regulation by preventing it from being implemented at the agency and by impacting the funding of that agency. These are very difficult things to do, and it's so incredibly difficult to identify all the bad regulations that are out there. But under the REINS Act, that would no longer be an acceptable excuse to my constituents. Unelected bureaucrats, in the end, would not be accountable; Members of Congress would. And that is the intent, in the end, of the REINS Act.

Now, I believe in regulations, smart regulations, and this bill is about improving the regulatory process so that here in the United States of America this remains a vibrant place to live with a growing economy. Our rules must be balanced against economic concerns. The American people must have a voice about what those rules will be, and Congress cannot skirt responsibility to legislate.

Again, I'd like to close here by thanking those who led this effort—Mr. COLLINS, in particular, for leading the floor conversation this evening. He's shown some great leadership as a freshman. He's working very hard. I know he came here, as did other Members,

the freshman class of the 113th Congress, to make a difference. By supporting the REINS Act, I think you will help advance that cause in a very big way.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Well, I appreciate it.

It's always easy to follow in the footsteps of those who fought the fight before us, and I appreciate what you've done and what others have done. We're going to continue that fight, because this matters to Americans, and that's what we've got to continue on. So I thank you for being here tonight.

It is now with great pleasure, another freshman who has come from just north of me in North Carolina, who has passionately fought for his constituents but also sees this from a different perspective, at this time, I want to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for the opportunity to discuss this administration's excessive regulation.

We know the harmful effect that overregulation has had on the economy. And since taking office, President Obama and his administration have continuously burdened the American people with an exceptional number of regulations, harming businesses and the economy.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses in this country are essential to our economic stability. Small businesses encourage innovation and hard work. It's the American Dream to have a unique idea and build something from scratch—and that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what small businesses do.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses have created 64 percent of net new jobs over the past 15 years and employed just over half of all private sector employees. In this stalled economy, small businesses are already struggling to be successful, and we need to take some of the current regulatory weight off their shoulders.

Recently, back home, I spent the week going around to different chambers of commerce in my district. I went to Wake Forest. I went to Fuquay-Varina. I went to Apex. I went to Nashville and Rocky Mount and met with several hundred small business owners and folks who work in small businesses. Of course, I have the constant complaint of overregulation. I started asking the question. I said, Has the government done anything that you know of in the last 5 years which would make your life as a small business person better? I got no positive responses, Mr. Speaker. That's stunning.

New regulations are complicated, and compliance is time consuming and expensive; and sometimes, job creators aren't informed of new regulations in a timely manner, giving them little time to prepare to comply with them. Business owners and their employees are now facing a time of uncertainty due to regulations. They're not confident in government policy coming out of

Washington, and they have no trust in the ability of Washington to do things that are in their better interest.

This sense of uncertainty, Mr. Speaker, may prevent an employer from hiring more people or force them to let go of current employees. As Mr. Yoho said earlier in his comments, he has small businesses in his district that are having to shoot lower rather than shoot higher. Small businesses may have to reevaluate how and when they do business, and that is unfortunate. Small businesses have no confidence in their government to give them pro-growth policy.

Excessive regulation harms not only individual small businesses but our country's growth as a whole. The Small Business Office of Advocacy has reported that Federal rulemaking has imposed a cumulative burden of \$1.75 trillion on our economy. Earlier this year in the Judiciary Committee, on which I serve, we heard testimony that, in the past 4 years alone, the cumulative cost burden has increased by \$520 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not only concerned about the negative effect of regulations on our overall economy, but also the administration's abuse of power. President Obama has been encouraged by regulatory advocates to circumvent regular order and impose his climate change agenda through regulations, and he made it clear in his State of the Union speech earlier this year his intent to do so.

I'm also concerned with the fact that the administration has repeatedly missed its required deadline for releasing a Unified Agenda of Federal Regulatory and Deregulatory Actions twice a year. This agenda lays out each governmental agency's proposed regulation and annual regulatory plan, and businesses need to know this information so they can anticipate how forthcoming regulations will affect them. And this administration needs to have more accountability and more transparency about the harmful effects of these abundant—may I say, excessive—regulations.

Mr. Speaker, in my district in North Carolina, many of the towns rely on small businesses. That's all that's there is small businesses. And whether it's a local restaurant owned by the same family for generations or an accounting firm or a clothing store or the town doctor, regulations are a major concern for them. We should be doing what we can do to encourage small businesses, not to deter them with strenuous and excessive regulations.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

What we're dealing with here is dealing with jobs. And I think what you shared in your time back in the district is small businesses, as we've seen, small business persons comprise 44 percent of the total U.S. private payroll and create more than half of the non-farm jobs in the gross domestic product here.

We've got to look at this. This is something that I think we can all come together, as the gentleman from Indiana stated just a few moments ago, this could be a bipartisan issue as we look to jobs and things we can bring to the floor. I know in talking to you and your passion about this, we came up here to try and help. We came up here to bring the voices of those who could not be up here on a given day to help them in their businesses and work hard.

I appreciate you so much for sharing your experiences in North Carolina. Really, what we're doing is fighting hard against these regulations so that we can see more jobs created.

Mr. HOLDING. As my friend from Georgia knows, numbers don't lie; and when we're spending \$1.75 trillion a year complying with regulations, that's a lot of money.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. It is that.

I appreciate the gentleman for being here tonight. I think this is something that we all see. In fact, in the 2011 speech, President Barack Obama stated that "rules have gotten out of balance," and the result is "a chilling effect on growth and jobs." I believe the President is correct about that. The rules have become so skewed that our Nation's regulatory system is at war with America's businesses.

In fact, he went ahead and even, in an executive order, stated that:

The last barriers we're trying to remove are outdated and unnecessary regulations. I've ordered a government-wide review, and if there are rules on the books that are needlessly stifling job creation and economic growth, we will fix them.

I'll tell you what. I will agree with the President on this. And I want to say this is something we can move forward with, and it's something that has an effect, because right now these burdens are killing American industry and American jobs.

When businesses are more concerned—right now, 40 percent is what I've seen in the latest survey from Morgan Stanley, said 40 percent of companies say policy uncertainty in Washington is preventing them from putting investments and job creation to work. This is something we've got to be a part of fixing because it matters, and it matters for jobs.

Industries such as manufacturing and technology are fighting to compete in a global market, but they first must survive the regulatory beast that is strangling innovation and growth.

□ 2010

Congress should be encouraging innovation to make it easier for businesses to bring new products or processes to the market. Outdated regulations should be cleared off the books—especially those created by unelected bureaucrats.

Let's go back to the basics of regulatory overhaul and restore a common-sense approach to regulations that encourage innovation and allow job creators to thrive.

I wrote to all the businesses in northeast Georgia and asked them to tell me how regulations are impacting their ability to grow and create jobs. Here are some of the responses that we received back:

Due to the new regulations that require businesses to issue 1099s to virtually everyone that we write a check to, we have to be more selective when we consider a new hire. I no longer have the opportunity to give unemployed folks a shot at a job to see how they are going to do. We have to make them full regular employees right out of the chute so we just don't look at hiring as many people, we look at other employees to work more hours.

Another of my constituents said that "the biggest issue we face from the Federal Government is the EPA's lack of approval of products in a timely manner, and their removal of excellent, safe products from the market altogether."

Unfortunately, regulatory burdens created by the EPA are an all too common story. A business owner in northeast Georgia wrote to me:

Currently the EPA is requiring off-road diesel engines to meet new tiers, or levels, of exhaust emission standards. These new standards are changing every 1 to 2 years. The final (we hope) regulations will be in place in 2015.

The result of the dramatic and frequent changes in regulations is the complete redesign of our products, which would allow us to retrofit and move manufacturing to the U.S., cannot happen cost effectively until 2015. At that time, we hope to move manufacturing of our products to Georgia.

I say hope to, because the rapid rise in regulations under the current administration may cause us to not move production at all.

We are all for protecting the environment and being good corporate citizens. However, the new regulations are burdensome, costly and add no value to the productivity of the product or the marketplace.

I couldn't have said that better myself. Regulations should be expedient and unambiguous, minimizing the uncertainty facing industries and businesses. This is how the government can facilitate, and no longer debilitate, economic growth.

I appreciate the comments from my colleagues tonight. It is clear that the need for regulatory relief is greater now than ever. As we've heard tonight, for the first time in history, the estimated cost of regulations is more than half the Federal budget itself. Let me just stop right there. For the first time in history, the estimated cost of regulations is more than half the Federal budget itself.

And we wonder why we're struggling with jobs right now. We wonder why our businesses are struggling with what they're going to do and how they're going to manage. I'm a firm believer, and it's been spoken of here tonight, there's many times we come to this House floor and we talk about things in ambiguous terms. We talk about the big picture. We talk about the process. People hear those conversations, they hear these words, but they're not really sure how it affects them. I'm a firm believer, both from a

Democrat perspective, a Republican perspective, how we can best lead is by understanding and giving people information on why this matters to them.

I'm just going to spend a few minutes here tonight talking about that. It is troubling in a time where families are struggling to make ends meet, American families are paying almost \$15,000 per year in hidden regulatory taxes. They are paying \$14,678 in hidden regulatory taxes. You want to know how that affects you. That's going on and you want to know how we're causing people to spend and we're also at the same time saying we want to create new jobs, we want to create new opportunities.

Well, here's what happens. Instead of paying a hidden regulatory tax, American families could, one, buy a new car. A 2013 Ford Fiesta, \$13,200; a 2013 Chevrolet Sonic, \$14,185. We hear it all the time how manufacturing creates jobs on all levels, starting from the manufacturing, from the parts and the dealers and the auto parts that come into this, how they all work together.

Well, instead of paying these regulatory costs, why don't we get them to buy a new car? I mean, I think that's what the American people would like. I think that's what our auto dealers would like. That's what the others in the chain of automotive supply would like. But, instead, they're trapped and they're bound.

Another constituent writes:

Most of the rules and regulations that are preventing our business from growing are a result of ObamaCare. Many of the provisions in this legislation are counterproductive to the growth of a medical practice.

I want to go back to what it means to the person sitting around the table tonight who may have just somehow turned over here and said, what are they talking about in our nation's Capitol? What we're talking about is your pocketbook. What we're talking about is regulations that can help you spend money the way you want to, spend money for your family's future, spend money that revives our economy and strengthens us as a nation.

This is what we're talking about. You can send their child to college. One year of tuition and fees at the University of Georgia is \$10,262. One year of tuition and fees at the University of Florida is \$6,150. Instead, they're trapped paying almost \$15,000 in hidden regulatory tax that comes through every year.

We all know the need for some rules for everyone to abide by. Make the regulations where they're simple to understand and inexpensive to comply with.

One of the problems I also see in Washington sometimes is we come to the floor and we talk about problems, but we never provide an answer. We never provide an answer on what can actually be done. As my colleagues and I have demonstrated, we are committed to providing regulatory relief to businesses and families.

There are several key pieces of legislation that are first and important

steps in alleviating the regulatory burden. The first bill I introduced in Congress was H.R. 1493, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2013. This legislation ensures the EPA cannot continue to enter into closed-door agreements with environmental groups without transparency and public participation. It does not affect the ability to bring suits. It just makes them clearer. Many of the costly rules and regulations that have impacted businesses and industries across the Nation have resulted from these backroom consent decrees. It's time we bring transparency and public participation back into the rulemaking process.

What else can we do? H.R. 367: require congressional approval for all major rules. We end the sue and settle EPA settlements—that's the one I just mentioned, H.R. 1493. We can require Federal agencies to choose the lowest-cost rulemaking alternative, H.R. 2122.

There are things that we can do. I believe the American public is looking to this place. They're looking to their Capitol for real solutions. They're looking to their Capitol for hope. They're looking for relief.

Every day, men and women get up and they wake their children up as I did this morning and they go to work and they go to make a better life. Many of those are small business owners wanting to add jobs, wanting to add to their businesses, but these regulations are killing that possibility right now. I believe when you look at what we've talked about here and my colleagues have talked about here on the floor, and I appreciate all of them being here, we bring to light what is really happening, and that is that regulations are not adding anything except government jobs. It's time we get back out and add jobs on Main Street, and when we add jobs on Main Street, everybody is impacted.

I want to thank my colleagues for joining me tonight and highlighting why American families and businesses so desperately need regulatory relief. Our freshmen are going to continue to do this, highlighting the real work that we believe matters to families and matters to Americans. Because when we're up here, we're up here doing your work. The thing that you sent us here to do was to work for you, and that's what we're going to continue to do and the freshman class are going to continue to do just that.

As we have mentioned tonight, not only are we talking about overregulation, we're going to be talking about many things in the weeks to come, and we're just letting the people know that we are here because we believe we can make a difference along with both sides of the aisle. Let's come together and see what we can do to make sure that not only regulations but other things get done so this government helps the businesses in our communities get back to work. That's what I want to be about, and I'm glad that we were here tonight to do that.

Before I close out, I do see a friend on the floor, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS). As we're through with our regulation part, I noticed that you had asked for time and I'm going to at this time yield to the gentleman from Arizona, my friend, Mr. FRANKS.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for yielding this time. One of the great hopes that I see that portends for a better future for America is to see men like DOUG COLLINS join this group and this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it seems like we are never quite so eloquent as when we are decrying the crimes of a past generation, while we oftentimes remain as staggering blind as some of our most intellectually sightless predecessors when it comes to facing and rejecting atrocities in our own time. Whether it was slavery, or the many human genocides across history, the patterns were the same.

□ 2020

Mr. Speaker, innocent human beings, children of God all, were systematically dehumanized and then subjected to the most horrifying inhumanity. All the while, human society as a whole at first hardened their hearts and turned away.

But, Mr. Speaker, truth and time travel on the same road; and though it was often agonizingly slow, the truth of these tragic inhumanities in our past began to dawn on the people of reason and goodwill. Their hearts first, and then their minds, began to change.

Mr. Speaker, I have often asked myself, what was it—that was it that changed their minds? What changed the minds of those who had previously embraced an almost invincible ignorance to hide from themselves the horror of what was happening to their innocent fellow human beings? I so wish I knew that answer, Mr. Speaker.

Because you see, today, such a conundrum looms before humanity again, the most glaring recent example of which are the gut-wrenching revelations surrounding the trial and conviction in Philadelphia of Dr. Kermit Gosnell. In the words of the grand jury report:

Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies: he killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it "ensuring fetal demise." The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking open scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it "snipping." Over the years, there were hundreds of "snippings."

When authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Gosnell, they found a torture chamber for little babies that I do not have the words or the stomach to adequately describe. Suffice it to say, Dr. Gosnell ran a systematic practice in his late-term abortion clinic to cut the spines of those babies who had survived his attempt to abort them.

Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breathing, and she described one as 2 feet long that no longer had eyes or a mouth, but, in her words, was making this "screeching" sound, and it "sounded like a little alien."

For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, we are better than that. America is better than that. And yet if Kermit Gosnell had killed these children he now stands convicted of murdering before they had passed through the birth canal only a few moments earlier, it would have all been perfectly legal in many States, in this the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Mr. Speaker, more than 325 late-term unborn babies were torturously killed without anesthesia in America just yesterday. Many of them—so many of them cried and screamed as they died. But because it was amniotic fluid going over the vocal cords instead of air, we couldn't hear them.

All of them had at least four things in common. First, they were just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone on Earth. And each one of them died a nameless, lonely, and agonizing death. And each one of their mothers was callously abandoned to deal with the emotional results that will inevitably follow. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity, Mr. Speaker, are lost forever.

So if there is one thing we must not miss about this unspeakably evil episode, it is that Kermit Gosnell is not an anomaly; he is the face of this murderous Fortune 500 enterprise of killing helpless unborn children in the United States of America. With all of the distortions and the bait-and-switch tactics opponents have hurdled at the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act leading up to this historic floor debate, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is very truly and simply a deeply sincere effort to protect both mothers and their pain-capable unborn babies entering their sixth month of gestation from heartless monsters like Kermit Gosnell.

Given the cataclysmic implications, Mr. Speaker, for any society who turns a blind eye to atrocities truly forced upon the most innocent and helpless of its members, would it be too much to hope for that Members of this body and Americans in general might research this issue and learn the truth of it for themselves?

Because you see, Mr. Speaker, the real question in the debate before us is not whether these unborn children entering their sixth month of gestation are capable of feeling pain. The real question is: Are we?

If our society is to survive with our humanity intact, our human compassion toward our fellow human beings must first survive. Fifty million children—50 million dead children are enough. That is why it is so important for people to see for themselves the humanity of these little victims and the inhumanity of what is being done to them.

Now, maybe it won't change everyone's mind, but it has changed so many minds; and most of these changed minds share a common thread. They were confronted with the brutal reality

of abortion on demand, and something inside them could no longer deny the truth, or they could no longer condone the murder of a defenseless child.

What changed their minds? Perhaps I will really never understand what sparked that change in their hearts, Mr. Speaker. But I am convinced of one thing: that it is the same spark in the human soul that has turned the tide of blood and tragedy and hatred and inhumanity throughout human history. And whatever else it is, Mr. Speaker, it is mankind's only hope.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CBC HOUR: SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials into the RECORD on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and my privilege once again to stand here on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus to help anchor this Special Order along with my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from the Silver State, Representative STEVEN HORSFORD, where for the next 60 minutes, members of the Congressional Black Caucus have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people about an issue of great significance as we kick off Small Business Week in America and commemorate the 50th anniversary.

Entrepreneurship innovation, the capacity of Americans who have an idea and want to translate that idea into a business initiative in urban America, in rural America, in suburban America, is something that we here in the Congress should not simply celebrate, as we will do this week, but figure out ways to make sure that we can facilitate those entrepreneurial ideas in the most robust manner possible and help those entrepreneurs from all over the country translate their ideas and their dreams into small business reality.

It goes without saying that small businesses are the heart and soul of the American economy. A significant number of people all throughout the country are employed in small businesses on Main Street and throughout inner-city commercial corridors and in the far reaches of rural America. Many of these small businesses we, of course, know were also hit extremely hard in the aftermath of the collapse of the

economy in 2008. They were knocked down on the ground. And it's our job in the Congress and government, working with industry, to help lift those small businesses up off the ground and get them back on their feet so they can survive and thrive in the face of the economic difficulty that they confronted.

□ 2030

So we will be presenting ideas related to entrepreneurship for small businesses throughout America generally and in the context of entrepreneurship and innovation in the African American community.

We are going to begin today with the distinguished gentleman from Newark, New Jersey, our good friend, Representative DONALD PAYNE, who is a distinguished member of the Small Business Committee. Prior to arriving in Congress, he worked hard on these issues, and he has been a leader since being sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives. It is my honor and my privilege to yield to Representative PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for anchoring tonight's CBC Special Order on entrepreneurship in the Black community.

Since 1963, the President of the United States has issued a proclamation designating a week in which the country applauds the critical contributions of America's entrepreneurs and small business owners. Annually, we recognize the fact that, though they are called "small businesses," there is nothing small about the impact they have on the Nation's economy. Last year, small businesses created nearly 700,000 jobs, accounting for 40 percent of employment gains across companies of all sizes nationwide. So it is fair to say that small businesses are truly the backbone of our economy and that entrepreneurship is still a primary pathway to realizing the American Dream.

This is particularly true in the Black community. The heart of entrepreneurship is opportunity, and, historically, Black entrepreneurship has meant opportunities for equality, equity and a vehicle out of poverty. Throughout the years, Black entrepreneurs have harnessed economic power to strengthen the Black community, create jobs and develop a voice to advocate for the well-being of Blacks in America.

After the Civil War, though employment prospects were slim for former enslaved men, Isaac Myers organized 1,000 black ship caulkers who had lost their jobs in Baltimore. He created a union, bought a shipyard and won a government contract to provide employment for these men.

In 1903, Maggie Lena Walker pooled her community's money to charter the St. Luke Penny Savings Bank. This bank was for the community, by the community, and it provided a safe and courteous place to conduct business away from the racism and harsh treatment often encountered in White-owned businesses.

In 1906, a young entrepreneur by the name of Dr. O.W. Gurley bought 40 acres of land in Tulsa, Oklahoma. He created and supported the creation of several businesses which attracted African Americans fleeing the oppression in Mississippi. The area became known as "Black Wall Street," and it was home to several prominent Black businessmen who created jobs and provided a safe haven for African Americans who were banned from other sections of the town.

We well know that Madam C.J. Walker revolutionized black hair care and that she was America's first Black female millionaire. However, she also used her financial power to contribute to anti-lynching campaigns and other efforts to equalize rights for Blacks in America.

These are a few of the countless examples of Black entrepreneurs who, through their businesses and their philanthropic efforts, have empowered the Black community. These efforts, as well as their relevance, continue today.

It is estimated that by the year 2015 Black buying power will be \$1.1 trillion. In this economy where the Black unemployment rate is double that of the Whites and where the income and wealth gap persistently intersects with the race gap, Black entrepreneurship is more important than ever in helping the community at large. More than 60 cents out of every dollar spent at local businesses is recirculated into the local economy. So local Black-owned businesses are a true asset to the community.

As a member of the Committee on Small Business, I have worked to strengthen the SBA's lending programs and have increased access to capital for all populations but especially for minorities and women. I will also be introducing two key pieces of legislation to assist small businesses as well. Recognizing the Nation's energy boom and green energy potential, this legislation will ensure that "green" small businesses have the resources to grow their businesses and hire more workers, especially in low-income communities. This effort will help Black businesses and other marginalized populations remain competitive in the small business arena.

Small businesses and entrepreneurship fuel the engine for economic growth and opportunity. For the Black community, that means lower unemployment, higher college attendance and completion, and strong outcomes for the present and the future. Consequently, there is no time to waste in getting our small businesses up and running. I will continue to be an outspoken advocate in empowering entrepreneurs to take risks, to pursue their dreams and to continue being an integral part of growing this Nation's economy.

Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, I would just like to talk a minute about my entrepreneurial experiences back in the mid-seventies, when my uncle, William Payne, a former assemblyman for