mean that only a Member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the majority or minority party can control the time?

Mr. DREIER. It is not our intention to make that decision as far as recognition. It will be up to the Chair. Again, there are Members of both the majority and the minority on the Committee on Ways and Means who are on both sides of this question, but it is clear that another Member could be recognized. In fact, the author of the resolution of disapproval is not, in fact, a Member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and it is quite possible that he could be recognized.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for his clarification.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and would encourage acceptance of my unanimous consent request and again look forward to a vigorous debate.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 26, 1999

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 507) to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 798

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 798.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1074, REGULATORY RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT OF 1999

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 258 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 258

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1074) to provide Government-wide accounting of regulatory costs and benefits, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Government Reform now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1745

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this amendment, all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us is a modified open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1074, the Regulatory Right-To-Know Act of 1999.

This open rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform.

The rule provides that it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purposes of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Government Reform now printed in the bill.

The bill provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be open for amendment at any point.

The rule provides for the consideration of only those amendments preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or that designee, and pro forma amendments offered for the purpose of debate only.

The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation, the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act is important legislation. The purpose of this legislation is to increase public awareness about the costs and benefits of Federal regulations to increase accountability of the government and to improve the Federal program and rules.

The bill achieves these goals by requiring the Office of Management and Budget to prepare an annual accounting statement containing cost and benefit estimates of Federal regulatory programs.

Furthermore, this report would require an analysis of the cumulative impact of regulations on various sectors and functional areas, including the private sector.

The Regulatory Right-To-Know Act is yet another significant step towards making this government more efficient and more accountable. A more efficient and accountable government provides

us with a Nation with more freedom, liberty, and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, since 1995, Congress has changed the direction of the Federal Government from the endless burden of more taxes and spending to the new fiscal discipline of balance and responsibility and accountability.

Congress has passed legislation to prevent unfunded mandates from being passed from the Federal Government to State and local governments. This legislation is now law.

Congress has passed the Small Business Paperwork Reduction Act as another incremental step toward relieving governmental burdens on small businesses and their employees.

The Regulatory Right-To-Know Act builds on these successes and provides a straight cost benefit analysis of Federal regulations.

Finally, a full and accurate accounting of regulations and their impact on the economy will now be readily available. The United States has become the global leader in technological development which, in turn, has created efficiencies in our economy and made life better for all of us.

But the Federal Government remains the largest impediment to continued growth and development. Federal regulatory programs impose tremendous cost and restrictions on innovation in the private sector and on State and local governments. That is why this legislation is so important.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue the bipartisan manner in which this legislation was crafted and support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count for a quorum.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1074, REGULATORY RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentelwoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this is an almost open rule, for the majority has again relied on a preprinting requirement for amendments which may affect some Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1074 is a bill which sorely needs improvement. Amendments to protect taxpayers from runaway spending and to analyze the cost/benefit ratio of corporate welfare were not included in the bill during its consideration in the Committee on Government Reform.

My friends on the other side are more than willing to belabor the value of and insist on a bottom line for rules which protect the life, the health, and the safety of the American people.

But when the question is restated to ask how much corporate America benefits from Federal programs, the majority is far less interested in the answer. I expect we will see that issue revisited when we take up the Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment.

H.R. 1074, the Regulatory Right-To-Know Act, has a ''feel good'' title to disguise the potential harm buried in its details.

As envisioned by my friends on the other side, every time the Federal Government proposes to take even the most routine action, it would be viewed through 1,000 different green eye shades.

There is little if any leeway given for action which is clearly necessary, decisions which are ''no-brainers.''

It is like the pedestrian whose reflex is to leap from the crosswalk to avoid a car running a red light, but first he asks how many calories will be burned and how much shoe leather will be used and how the impact of the car would impact their productivity at the office.

Now, if our pedestrian is faced with a different set of circumstances, such as deciding whether to buy a car so that they do not have to walk to work, then that requires a different approach, and rightly so. Because, by Executive Order, we already analyze the cost and benefits of the 60 or more major rules which are proposed each year. That is sensible and reasonable.

My concern is that my friends on the other side who so often talk about government which is small and smart are now proposing to make government big and dull.

A cost benefit analysis is useful when applied in the appropriate circumstances. But with the approach advanced by this legislation, they are killing the dog to stop the fleas.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking today in support of the rule for a bipartisan bill to promote the public's right to know the cost benefits and impacts of Federal regulatory programs, H.R. 1074, Regulatory Right-To-Know Act of 1999.

This bill is the product of the leadership of the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman BLILEY) from the Committee on Commerce over the last several years. He really deserves a great deal of credit for bringing forward the basic idea of this bill. It also builds on the provisions offered by Senator STEVENS and Senator THOMPSON in the 1997, 1998, 1999 Treasury, General Government and Postal Appropriations Act. They put in a temporary 1-year provision very similar to what this bill does.

This bill, along with the companion bill, S. 59, also designed to establish a permanent and stronger regulatory accounting requirement, would make that year-by-year appropriations bill unnecessary.

H.R. 1074 is a good government bill, which requires the Office of Management and Budget to prepare an annual accounting statement and an associated report. This accounting statement, which is the core provision of this bill, would provide estimates ever the costs and benefits of Federal regulatory programs in the aggregate, by agency, by agency program, by program component, and by major rule.

The bill requires that accurate information be provided for the same 7-year time series as the budget of the United States, the current year, 2 years preceding this year, and the 4 years following.

The associated report would analyze the impacts of Federal rules and all the paperwork that goes along with these rules on various sectors in our economy, for example, on small businesses and on functional areas, for example, in the health care and our public health in this country.

In the associated report, OMB would identify and analyze overlaps, duplications, and potential inconsistencies among the Federal regulatory programs and offer recommendations to reform inefficient or ineffective regulatory programs.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), who is Vice Chairman of our Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs, will go into more detail about some of the examples of those overlapping and duplicative regulations.

Now, currently, there is no report that analyzes the cumulative impact of Federal regulations. Americans, we believe, have a right to know what are the cumulative costs, what are the benefits, and what is the impact of Federal regulations on their sector of the economy and on various areas throughout the United States.

Current estimates of the ''off budget,'' if you will, compliance costs on Americans by Federal regulatory programs are close to $700 billion each