



Monday February 20th 2012

United States' economy

# Over-regulated America

The home of laissez-faire is being suffocated by excessive and badly written regulation

Feb 18th 2012 | from the print edition

Like Confirm Tweet 568



AMERICANS love to laugh at ridiculous regulations. A Florida law requires vending-machine labels to urge the public to file a report if the label is not there. The Federal Railroad Administration insists that all trains must be painted with an "F" at the front, so you can tell which end is which. Bureaucratic busybodies in Bethesda, Maryland, have shut down children's lemonade stands because the enterprising young moppets did not have trading licences. The list goes hilariously on.

But red tape in America is no laughing matter. The problem is not the rules that are self-evidently absurd. It is the ones that sound reasonable on their own but impose a huge burden collectively. America is meant to be the home of laissez-faire. Unlike Europeans, whose lives have long been circumscribed by meddling governments and diktats from Brussels, Americans are supposed to be free to choose, for better or for worse. Yet for some time America has been straying from this ideal.

Consider the Dodd-Frank law of 2010. Its aim was noble: to prevent another financial crisis. Its strategy was sensible, too: improve transparency, stop banks from taking excessive risks, prevent abusive financial practices and end "too big to fail" by authorising regulators to seize any big, tottering financial firm and wind it down. This newspaper supported these goals at the time, and we still do. But Dodd-Frank is far too complex, and becoming more so. At 848 pages, it is

### In this section

- » Over-regulated America
- A way out of the woods
- The elephant in the region
- Dialogue is the best defence
- Hands off the wheel

Comment (396) | Print | E-mail | Reprints & permissions

Advertisement

Feedback

### Recommendations

You need to be logged into Facebook to see your friends' recommendations.

- Stop the Linsanity?**  
524 people recommend this.
- Where do you stand? | Drones | The Economist**  
78 people recommend this.
- We are always moving towards failure**  
168 people recommend this.

Facebook social plugin

Most commented  
Most recommended

1. Latvia's referendum: What's my language?
2. India and its near-abroad: The elephant in the region
3. United States' economy: Over-regulated America
4. Greece and the euro: From tragedy to farce
5. Xi Jinping: We welcome your rise (sort of)
6. Europe and the euro: A way out of the woods
7. Daily chart: Speaking in tongues
8. Greece's woes: A reprieve, nothing more
9. China's new sports problem: Stop the Linsanity?

23 times longer than Glass-Steagall, the reform that followed the Wall Street crash of 1929. Worse, every other page demands that regulators fill in further detail. Some of these clarifications are hundreds of pages long. Just one bit, the “Volcker rule”, which aims to curb risky proprietary trading by banks, includes 383 questions that break down into 1,420 subquestions.

Hardly anyone has actually read Dodd-Frank, besides the Chinese government and our correspondent in New York (see [article](#)). Those who have struggle to make sense of it, not least because so much detail has yet to be filled in: of the 400 rules it mandates, only 93 have been finalised. So financial firms in America must prepare to comply with a law that is partly unintelligible and partly unknowable.

### Flaming water-skis

Dodd-Frank is part of a wider trend. Governments of both parties keep adding stacks of rules, few of which are ever rescinded. Republicans write rules to thwart terrorists, which make flying in America an ordeal and prompt legions of brainy migrants to move to Canada instead. Democrats write rules to expand the welfare state. Barack Obama's health-care reform of 2010 had many virtues, especially its attempt to make health insurance universal. But it does little to reduce the system's staggering and increasing complexity. Every hour spent treating a patient in America creates at least 30 minutes of paperwork, and often a whole hour. Next year the number of federally mandated categories of illness and injury for which hospitals may claim reimbursement will rise from 18,000 to 140,000. There are nine codes relating to injuries caused by parrots, and three relating to burns from flaming water-skis.

Two forces make American laws too complex. One is hubris. Many lawmakers seem to believe that they can lay down rules to govern every eventuality. Examples range from the merely annoying (eg, a proposed code for nurseries in Colorado that specifies how many crayons each box must contain) to the delusional (eg, the conceit of Dodd-Frank that you can anticipate and ban every nasty trick financiers will dream up in the future). Far from preventing abuses, complexity creates loopholes that the shrewd can abuse with impunity.

The other force that makes American laws complex is lobbying. The government's drive to micromanage so many activities creates a huge incentive for interest groups to push for special favours. When a bill is hundreds of pages long, it is not hard for congressmen to slip in clauses that benefit their chums and campaign donors. The health-care bill included tons of favours for the pushy. Congress's last, failed attempt to regulate greenhouse gases was even worse.

Complexity costs money. Sarbanes-Oxley, a law aimed at preventing Enron-style frauds, has made it so difficult to list shares on an American stockmarket that firms increasingly look elsewhere or stay private. America's share of initial public offerings fell from 67% in 2002 (when Sarbox passed) to 16% last year, despite some benign tweaks to the law. A study for the Small Business Administration, a government body, found that regulations in general add \$10,585 in costs per employee. It's a wonder the jobless rate isn't even higher than it is.

### A plea for simplicity

Democrats pay lip service to the need to slim the rulebook—Mr Obama's regulations tsar is supposed to ensure that new rules are cost-effective. But the administration has a bias towards overstating benefits and underestimating costs (see [article](#)). Republicans bluster that they will repeal Obamacare and Dodd-Frank and abolish whole government agencies, but give only a sketchy idea of what should replace them.

America needs a smarter approach to regulation. First, all important rules should be subjected to cost-benefit analysis by an independent watchdog. The results should be made public before the rule is enacted. All big regulations should also come with sunset clauses, so that they expire after, say, ten years unless Congress explicitly re-

Reprints

### Related topics

[Barack Obama](#)

[United States](#)

[Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act](#)

### 10. Immigration in the Netherlands: Shop an immigrant

Over the past five days

Advertisement



### Latest blog posts - All times are GMT

[TSA expands pre-check programme](#)

From [Gulliver](#) - 5 mins ago

[A good choice](#)

From [Newsbook](#) - 1 hour 1 min ago

[Could the American government default?](#)

From [Buttonwood's notebook](#) - 1 hour 35 mins ago

[Super for democracy?](#)

From [Democracy in America](#) - 2 hours 44 mins ago

[The kingmaker is dead](#)

From [Baobab](#) - 2 hours 50 mins ago

[Life on the Phillips curve](#)

From [Free exchange](#) - 3 hours 0 mins ago

[Looking inwards](#)

From [Graphic detail](#) - 3 hours 20 mins ago

[More from our blogs >](#)

### Products & events

#### Stay informed today and every day

Subscribe to *The Economist's* free e-mail newsletters and alerts.

[✉ Get e-mail newsletters](#)

Subscribe to *The Economist's* latest article postings on Twitter

[🐦 Follow \*The Economist\* on Twitter](#)

See a selection of *The Economist's* articles, events, topical videos and debates on Facebook.

[📘 Follow \*The Economist\* on Facebook](#)

authorises them.

More important, rules need to be much simpler. When regulators try to write an all-purpose instruction manual, the truly important dos and don'ts are lost in an ocean of verbiage. Far better to lay down broad goals and prescribe only what is strictly necessary to achieve them. Legislators should pass simple rules, and leave regulators to enforce them.

Would this hand too much power to unelected bureaucrats? Not if they are made more accountable. Unreasonable judgments should be subject to swift appeal. Regulators who make bad decisions should be easily sackable. None of this will resolve the inevitable difficulties of regulating a complex modern society. But it would mitigate a real danger: that regulation may crush the life out of America's economy.

from the print edition | Leaders

Recommend 393
 Like Confirm
 Tweet 568
 reddit
 Share 157
 +1 59

View all comments (396)

Add your comment

### Related items

**TOPIC: Barack Obama »**

- Barack Obama's budget: Dealing with the debt Politics this week
- Measuring the impact of regulation: The rule of more

**TOPIC: United States »**

- Taxes and transport: Taxes pay for things
- American telecoms: Reverse auctions move forward
- Urban development: Remember opportunity costs

**TOPIC: Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act »**


- Looking closely at Dodd-Frank: This is only an outline
- The Dodd-Frank act: Too big not to fail
- Too big to fail: Fright simulator

### Classified ads

 THE IDEAS ECONOMY  
**Innovation**  
 STIMULATING ECONOMIC GROWTH  
 March 28th 2012  
 Berkeley, California

 **Fitch Training**  
 Exclusive Early Bird Offer  
 50% off 2nd place  
**Book Now**  
 www.fitchtraining.com

 **Cambridge General Management Programme**  
 UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
 Judge Business School  
 Executive Education

 THE IDEAS ECONOMY  
**Innovation**  
 STIMULATING ECONOMIC GROWTH  
 March 28th 2012  
 Berkeley, California

**The Open University**  
 Business School