

The Honorable Mike Johnson
Speaker of the House
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable John Thune
Majority Leader
U.S. Senate
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Hakeem Jeffries
Democratic Leader
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Chuck Schumer
Minority Leader
U.S. Senate
Washington, DC 20510

May 5, 2026

Dear Speaker Johnson, Democratic Leader Jeffries, Majority Leader Thune, Minority Leader Schumer:

The undersigned allied organizations strongly oppose the inclusion of any language mentioning or similar to **the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act, H.R. 142/ S. 485** in a Budget Reconciliation bill.

The REINS Act represents one of the most radical threats in generations to our government's ability to protect the public from harm. The bill's clear aim is to halt the implementation of critical new public health and safety safeguards, financial reforms, and worker protections – making industry even less accountable to the public. It would do nothing to improve protections for the American public but instead would benefit only those corporations that wish to game the system, price gouge, and evade safety standards.

Under the REINS Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, and our other protector agencies could not enforce a “major” rule – a rule with a large economic impact – unless both houses of Congress affirmatively approved it, with no alterations, within a 70-day window. It would stop the most important rules, including the substantial number of non-controversial rules agencies produce every year, from being finalized.

Currently the process of putting forth the rules necessary to implement and enforce public safeguards and protections can take several years. For example, the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration has been working on a standard to protect health care and social assistance workers from workplace violence since 2016, and over the past ten years the agency has only progressed to the small business review pre-rulemaking stage. During this time, the rate of serious and preventable workplace violence injuries has increased for workers in health care and social assistance.

Part of the reason for this lengthy process is that large teams of professional experts at agencies must work diligently to gather and process complex information and solicit and incorporate input from a broad range of interested stakeholders when designing new rules. A failure to follow this process carefully means that a rule can be struck down by the courts during judicial review. In contrast, the REINS Act would allow congressional inaction to supersede all of this painstaking effort. The most common sense, non-controversial rules could be blocked for any reason or no reason at all.

Congress already has the first and last word when it comes to agency rulemaking, making the REINS Act unnecessary. Agencies can only exercise authority that has been delegated by

Congress in authorizing legislation. Any attempt by an agency to overstep these bounds is likely to result in judicial scrutiny and reversal of the agency's action. And Congress always retains the authority to enact new legislation to block any rule it opposes.

The REINS Act would subvert these regular order legislative processes and instead incentivize congressional inaction, thwarting the most beneficial public protections by requiring Congress to approve them.

Federal agencies employ personnel with policy, scientific, and technical expertise to produce smart and sensible regulations. The REINS Act would give special interests even more influence over the regulatory process by creating a new opportunity for politics to trump science and defeat the public will.

By giving one chamber of Congress veto power over any new significant public health and safety protection, no matter how non-controversial or sensible it may be, the REINS Act is designed to leverage the dysfunction and obstructionism that plague our political process to block agencies' efforts to fulfill their statutory mandates to pursue public protections.

Further, the goal of the REINS Act is unequivocally to rescind regulations. To be included in the reconciliation process, provisions cannot cause a change in spending or revenues that is "merely incidental" to the provision's non-budgetary effects. The application of the Byrd Rule to the REINS Act would render it extraneous since the clear purpose of the REINS Act or similar provision is to repeal regulations.

For these reasons, we strongly urge you to oppose the inclusion of the REINS Act or anything similar to the REINS Act with a goal of establishing a fast-track process to repeal regulations in the Budget Reconciliation bill.

Sincerely,

Affordable Homeownership Foundation Inc

AFL-CIO

AFT: Education, Healthcare, Public Services

Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments

American Bird Conservancy

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)

American Sustainable Business Council

Americans for Financial Reform

Breast Cancer Prevention Partners

Center for Auto Safety

Center for Digital Democracy

Center for Economic Integrity

Center for Environmental Health
Center for Justice & Democracy
Center for Media and Democracy
Center for Progressive Reform
Center for Science in the Public Interest
Clean Water Action
Coalition for Sensible Safeguards
Consumer Action
Consumer Federation of America
Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety
Defenders of Wildlife
Earthjustice Action
Economic Policy Institute
EDF Action
Endangered Species Coalition
Environmental Protection Network
Food & Water Watch
Friends of Buckingham
Georgia Advancing Communities Together, Inc.
Government Information Watch
Greenpeace USA
Green Science Policy Institute
International Union, United Automobile Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW)
League of Conservation Voters
League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
Maryland Pesticide Education Network
National Association of Consumer Advocates
National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low-income clients)
National Health Law Program

Natural Resources Defense Council
New Jersey Poor People's Campaign
MassCOSH
Oceana
Oregon Consumer Justice
Pesticide Action and Agroecology Network
Physicians for Social Responsibility
PODER
Public Citizen
Public Knowledge
Sciencecorps
Service Employees International Union
Texas Appleseed
Third Act Union
Union of Concerned Scientists
United Steelworkers (USW)
Virginia Citizens Consumer Council
Woodstock Institute

CC: House Committee on the Judiciary
House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs