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

year. By the way, that is a 25 percent increase from 10 years ago.

□ 1800

Broken down for each family in the United States, they pay, on average, $6,900 in additional costs simply because of the compliance with Federal regulations. By the way, to put that in perspective, that is more than the typical family pays in Federal taxes, which we cut earlier today here on the House floor.

The bill requires OMB to issue guidelines to standardize agency estimates of the costs and the benefits and to use an accounting format that can be analyzed across different sectors. The bill also requires OMB to quantify the net benefits or the net costs for each alternative considered in a regulatory impact analysis accompanying a major rule. By the way, this is already required under President Clinton's executive order on regulatory review.

This information will help the public understand how and why major decisions affecting them are made by the executive branch. It will disclose that the Federal agencies chose the most effective, least costly regulatory approach.

To ensure a fair and balanced estimate of the costs and benefits, the bill also requires that this report by OMB be peer-reviewed by two or more experts and that the public have an opportunity to comment on a draft report relating to the impact of sectors. This way the bill ensures that the public can know whether OMB is doing its job to keep a lid on the stupid, silly, sometimes costly regulations that are often promulgated.

Mr. Speaker, our oversight hearings in my subcommittee, and the GAO reports, show that OMB, quite frankly, in recent years, has not done a very good job of supervising these type of regulatory impact analyses. So this bill will make that a legal mandate for OMB.

H.R. 1074 requires that they compile some new and improved information about these regulatory programs. However, we believe that fundamentally the bill will not pose an undue burden on OMB if they are doing their job under the current executive order, since much of the needed information is already available.

Since Ronald Reagan issued his historic executive order in 1981, Federal agencies have been required to perform cost-benefit analyses on major rules. These are the rules that constitute the bulk of that $700 billion of cost for the regulatory programs. Also, OMB can use many other sources of information, including private regulatory accounting studies and government studies done by the agencies.

The bill, as it was reported by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the Chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, made many changes on the initial draft that we have proposed to lessen the burden on the Office of Management and Budget and to address some of the Clinton administration's concerns, including a phase-in of several of the key requirements. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the cost of this bill will be in its lowest category, less than $500,000 each year.

Frankly, I think that is a pretty good deal. For less than $500,000, we have the potential to save the American citizens billions of dollars in unnecessary, duplicative, and costly regulatory burdens.

There is wide support for this bill, Mr. Speaker. It is bipartisan, and it has been endorsed by many organizations, including the seven major bipartisan State and local organizations: the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the Council of State Governments, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, and the International City/County Management Association.

Some other organizations, Mr. Speaker, that are endorsing this bill include Alliance USA; the American Farm Bureau Federation; Americans For Tax Reform; Associated Builders and Contractors; the Business Roundtable; the Center for Study for American Business; the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which has key voted this bill on its legislative calendar; the Chemical Manufacturers Association; Citizens for a Sound Economy, which has also key voted this bill; National Association of Manufacturers; National Federation of Independent Businesses; the Seniors Coalition; the 60 Plus Association; and the Small Business Survival Committee, which, once again, has key voted this bill on their legislative calendar.

Now, unfortunately, there have been some views that have been stated about this bill that ended up being reflected in the minority report, and so we had to issue a correction and clarification on some of those. But I want to stress, for example, that some of the opposition to this bill incorrectly states that it would ''require a cost-benefit analysis of every major and minor rule.''

This bill, quite frankly, does not require any new regulatory impact analyses, RIAs, no new rule-by-rule cost-benefit analyses, and no new rule-by-rule impact analyses. So that the exceptions that are currently in place under President Clinton's executive order for minor routine regulations would also apply for this bill.

Instead, the bill provides for combining a set of related rules into broad categories. Except for the regulatory impact analysis already required for major rules, the various analytical requirements relate to information after the rules are issued. So it should not require any greater regulatory burden in actually issuing those rules.

The difference may be that the administration currently, under OMB's guidance, does not always follow their own executive order. And so some of these regulatory impact analyses that are required under the President's Executive Order, in fact, are not being done. But the bill provides OMB with substantial discretion in ways to address the various analytical requirements. It makes no changes in the standard of law. It cannot slow down a rulemaking, since the analysis will be done in the aggregate, after those rules are issued; but what it will do is give the American people a very precise comprehensive view of what the benefits and what the costs are of our Federal regulations.

I strongly support the rule that has come forth from the Committee on Rules, and I believe fundamentally the public has a right to know what are the impact of our Federal regulations. We need to have open and accountable government. OMB's accounting statement and associated report will give Americans the tools to fully analyze how legislation on regulatory matters will affect them and how rules today are, in fact, impacting their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and vote for the bill when it comes up on Monday.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I use the time to ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) whether it is not correct that there is now an understanding that the House will not be in session on Wednesday so that we can attend the memorial service for the distinguished former Member from California, Mr. Brown.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, to respond to the gentleman, and I am going to read what I have been given, it is my understanding the House will be in pro forma session and that no votes will be held, in accommodation of Republican and Democrat Members who wish to attend services for our colleague, George Brown.

Mr. OBEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is correct, then, that there will be no committees asked to be running bills on the floor while that is going on?

Mr. SESSIONS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, it is my understanding that there will not be any legislative business on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I thank the leadership for reconsidering that position. I am sorry to take the time of the House, but given the fact that George Brown was the ranking member of a committee, that he served here 35 years, and that he was one of the two people who were driving forces behind the

first teach-ins in Vietnam, a very historic occasion in our Nation's history, and I think that is very important.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman for his concern and feel like we have responded appropriately.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the Chairman of the Committee on Rules, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking minority member, as well as the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), for their work on this rule for H.R. 1074, the so-called Regulatory Right-to-Know Act of 1999.

I also want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH), the committee on which I serve as the ranking member. The gentleman from Indiana and I have developed a good working relationship. We do not always agree on the substance of some of the bills, but I think we have been able to at least have an exchange of ideas, which I hope has resulted in a better bill. We are pleased on this side of the aisle that we will have the opportunity to offer our amendment, which we believe significantly improves the bill.

While I support the underlying goal of the bill to give taxpayers information on the costs and benefits of government regulations, with the hope of improving government accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness, I am concerned that the bill, as offered, fails to adequately protect the taxpayers. That is why, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), and myself will be offering the Taxpayer Protection and Corporate Welfare Disclosure Amendment.

This amendment will improve the bill in three ways. First, it will require the Office of Management and Budget to identify and analyze the costs and benefits of corporate subsidies given out by the Federal Government. H.R. 1074 is supposed to provide the American people with better information about how much money Federal laws and regulations cost American businesses and what benefits are derived from those programs.

But this misses the fact that each year the Federal Government provides billions of dollars in corporate welfare to regulated businesses. This amendment would require corporate welfare to be disclosed to the American public so that they can have a complete accounting of the cost and benefits imposed on businesses by the Federal Government, not just the cost and benefits of regulations.

Second, this amendment would cap reporting expenditures by the Office of Management and Budget and Federal agencies required by H.R. 1074 to $1 million a year. According to the Congressional Budget Office, H.R. 1074 should only cost $500,000 a year to implement. So limiting these expenditures to double that amount, or $1 million, should provide plenty of funds for both the regulatory and the corporate welfare components of the bill, while making sure the taxpayers do not pay the price if programs end up costing much more than anticipated by Congress.

Third, the Hoeffel amendment, the amendment that I am pleased to sponsor with that gentleman and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), would sunset the bill after 4 years. Let us make sure that the information we are asking for is actually useful before we make this an open-ended requirement. If we find that the accounting required under H.R. 1074 is worthwhile, Congress can reauthorize the report at that time and make changes to it to make it better.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank those on the other side of the aisle who have worked on this, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and all the others who have worked on it, and we look forward to the debate on Monday.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), who is the vice chairman on the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time, and I also want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), who is the ranking member of this subcommittee. I must admit that as a new Member of Congress it is nice to see people who really like to cooperate on a bipartisan basis, and I think the gentleman from Ohio is a person who is of strong conscience and serves this body very well, and I just wanted to commend him for his attitude in working with us on passage of this legislation. We may disagree on some of these amendments, but I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio for his attitude on this.

I rise in support of the rule, Mr. Speaker, for H.R. 1074. I would also like to voice my support for passage of H.R. 1074, the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act. This is a bipartisan initiative. This point is made obvious by the groups that have voiced their support of this bill. It has the support of numerous groups, from the National Governors' Association to the Seniors Coalition. The U.S. Conference of Mayors, the American Farm Bureau and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce have all publicly endorsed this legislation. These diverse groups have endorsed this bill because they recognize the benefits this legislation could provide to Congress and to the citizens of this country.

This legislation will increase understanding and, therefore, public confidence in all Federal regulations and agencies. The public has the right to know the factors that affect agency decision-making. The Congress has the right to know that the intent of the legislation we pass here in Congress is being carefully considered by the agencies who promulgate these regulations, taking into account and implementing the laws we pass here in this body.

□ 1815

Through this legislation, the public will have access to information regarding the cost and benefits including the social health, safety, environment, and economic effects of major agency action.

Mr. Speaker, the key to accountability in Government is providing information. Information is vital to effective governing. The more accessible information is to the public and to the Congress, the more efficient and productive our system of Government will be.

This bill does not change the existing process for adopting agency regulations. Moreover, it helps us change the environment in which these agencies adopt regulations by fostering an atmosphere of openness and accountability.

Some groups have likened this to the annual accounting most companies do for their shareholders. Well, Mr. Speaker, the American people are the shareholders of our Government of our country and they deserve to be provided an accounting of the impact of Federal regulations.

But I would like to make one more point that is very important in the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act, which will require OMB to do an annual study looking at duplicative regulations. And believe me, Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of duplicative regulations in our Federal Government today.

Just to point out a few examples: Agriculture's Natural Resource and Conservation Service and the Army Corps of Engineers had conflict requirements over wetlands regulations. I am going to go into that in just a second.

The grantees for so many different programs are required by Federal rules to provide nearly identical information to many Federal grant-making agencies for similar grant programs, including the same type of information to various agencies.

The USDA and FDA have issued overlapping food safety regulations regarding tainted food products. Many agency programs, and thus their regulatory requirements, sometimes overlap. Just in the area of job training and employment there are 14 departments that delve into this area.

Among the 14 departments and agencies that have programs, rules, and regulations with respect to job training and employment are the Agriculture Department, the Commerce Department, the Education Department, HHS, HUD, Interior, Justice, Labor, Transportation, Treasury, Veterans' Affairs, EPA, the NRC, and the SSA.

All of these agencies promulgate regulations on job training and employment. Many of them duplicate and

overlap each other. An accounting of these regulations is going to do nothing but help us get good Government, get good information to the citizens we represent.

Going back to the area of wetlands regulations, there is a great example of how overlapping and duplicative regulations can actually do a lot of harm to our constituents when we are simply trying to make sure that they comply with the Federal law.

I would like to take an example of a turf fight between two agencies over wetlands regulations. The turf fight is between the Army Corps of Engineers and the Natural Resources Conservation Service. There is a farmer named Dave Pechan who farms near Linden, California. He wanted to convert 40 acres of his land into a vineyard.

In accordance with the law, Mr. Pechan asked the Natural Resources Conservation Service to evaluate his property for possible wetlands. The Conservation Service is one of those Federal agencies that is charged with enforcing wetlands regulations.

After inspecting Mr. Pechan's land on two occasions, the Conservation Service determined that only a .3 acre swale could be considered a wetland. He was instructed to go ahead with his vineyard plans as long as he plowed around that tiny little wetland.

Well, that seemed to settle the matter. Until one week later, when Mr. Pechan saw representatives from the Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on his property taking pictures. They told Mr. Pechan that he may be violating the law when he farmed in wetlands.

When Pechan produced the documentation from the Conservation Service showing that he was in compliance with these regulations, the agencies rudely rejected his claim.

It seems that the Army Corps of Engineers and the Conservation Service are locked into a bureaucratic turf fight over which agency would have the lead role in enforcing wetlands laws.

Well, in 1994, the Corps of Engineers signed a memorandum of agreement that ostensibly recognized the Conservation Service as the lead Federal agency. However, the Corps of Engineers reneged on that agreement because they refused to give up on enforcement of wetlands policy.

The end result is this: The farmer in California, Dave Pechan, is snared in the middle of a bureaucratic turf fight. The Corps has told him that regardless of what the Conservation Service had determined allowing him to go through with his vineyard plans, he will be subjected to civil and criminal penalties if he continues to work his land.

He is now in limbo while the Corps conducts its own wetlands evaluations of his property.

Mr. Speaker, the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act is very common sense. It is bipartisan. This is a good Government bill. This simply says, let us get a handle on all of these regulations we are passing on to our constituents. Let us make sure they do not duplicate each other or overlap or send conflicting messages to our constituents.

Lastly, it does not do one thing to change the regulations. It simply says, let us measure the cost and benefits of these regulations, what are they costing our economy, what are they doing to our constituents.

This is clearly a good Government measure. I urge all of my colleagues to support the rule on this measure. And next week when we vote on this bill, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1074, the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time and I thank her for her cooperation and her leadership.

I compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) the chairman of the Committee on Rules and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) the ranking member for bringing forward this bill with the rule that permits through the preprinting mechanism the opportunity for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and I to offer an amendment that we believe is necessary to improve this bill so that it really provides a good service for the American taxpayer.

H.R. 1074, the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act, is the subject of this rule. As the previous speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) before him have described, this bill is designed to tell Congress and the American people how much it costs to produce regulations pursuant to the laws we pass every year.

A cost benefit analysis of Federal regulation is a concept that has been debated for some time. I am pleased that this bill is before us. I think the bill needs improvement, but I think it is the right thing for Congress to address this and to make sure we have an opportunity to get the information we need to do our jobs properly and to get to the American people a clear statement of the cost of Federal regulation and the benefit of Federal regulation.

I, for one, believe there are many benefits to the rules and regulations that are promulgated based upon our statutes. But we need to know the cost on business and the benefit to business in order to do our job properly.

Unfortunately, I think that there are some areas of this bill that need to be improved. I will be offering, along with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment, entitled the taxpayer protection and corporate welfare disclosure amendment, when we have an opportunity on Monday to debate and amend this bill.

Our amendment is designed to get even more information available to Congress and to the American people regarding the impact of the Federal Government on American business.

If we want to find out the costs and benefits of Federal regulations, then let us also find out the costs and benefits of the so-called corporate welfare, the Federal subsidies, the tax preferences, the below market values of Federal lands that are granted to many of our corporations in this country.

Historically, we have given these kind of corporate benefits to many industries, some of them mature, successful, highly profitable industries. If we are to determine how much the regulations cost these industries to get a fair and complete picture, we surely need to know the benefits, if any, of the corporate welfare they receive.

Secondly, the amendment that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and I will offer will make sure that the cost of this bill will not be unlimited.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that to conduct the regulatory review of the underlying bill will cost something less than $500,000 per year. So we are putting in the Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment an overall cap of $1 million a year to conduct both the regulatory review and the corporate welfare review that the amended bill will call for.

I think this is a wise and sensible limitation to make sure that, in the process of determining costs and benefits, we do not waste the taxpayers' dollars with unnecessary expenditures.

Finally, the Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment will put a 4-year sunset provision on both the regulatory review and the corporate welfare review called for in the amended bill.

I will ask for support of the amendment on Monday.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important as we debate the rule and the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act that we put this in its proper perspective.

We would debate what I would like to call the ''killer Kucinich amendment'' a little bit later when it is up next week.

But let us put this in proper perspective. Regulations are good. They are necessary. But regulations do pose what we often call a hidden tax on the American economy. It is widely estimated that Federal regulations cost the American taxpayers about $700 billion annually.

This is a tax that we do not see right on our paychecks. We do not see it in front of our faces in our businesses. This is a tax that comes to us through

the various overlapping and duplicative rules and regulations, costing our American families and businesses about $700 billion annually.

So when we talk about the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act, it is really let us see what these taxes are costing us, let us get openness in Government, let us make sure that we know when we are imposing $700 billion of hidden tax on our Government, let us make these open taxes so we actually see really what these taxes are, what the cost and benefits of these hidden taxes on our families and businesses impose.

Placing a cap on that to me seems to be very, very much disingenuous in the spirit of the public's right to know. We will debate the merits of that amendment next week.

But I think it is very important to put this whole thing in perspective, that the Regulatory Right-to-Know Act is a bipartisan solution at getting openness in Government at taking a look at what really is this hidden tax being placed on our families and our businesses.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

If I could just respond quickly to my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) who spoke about the ''killer Kucinich amendment''.

Many people have said that I am a pretty tough guy, but no one has ever called me ''killer'' before. It is actually the ''Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment.''

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEFFEL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I said ''killer Kucinich,'' not ''killer Hoeffel.''

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, we will debate this amendment Monday, known as the ''Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment.'' I look forward to the debate with the gentleman.

If I would simply add, he appropriately identified the estimated cost of regulations on American business. Let me add to this debate today that Time Magazine has estimated that the cost of corporate welfare to the Federal Government is $125 billion a year, which they describe as being the equivalent of the income taxes paid each year by 60 million Americans. Or another way of looking at it, the equivalent of two weeks' pay for every working American is distributed and paid by the Federal Government in corporate welfare.

So I simply stand with the Hoeffel-Kucinich amendment for the proposition that we ought to know where that $125 billion goes when we find out where the $700 billion that the gentleman is concerned about and that I am concerned about goes.

We ought to see the whole package at the same time to get a clear picture.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) said about the corporate welfare costing us $125 billion a year. That is handed out despite the fact that the economy has been strong and that corporate profits have totaled more than $4.5 trillion this decade.

Proponents of corporate welfare say that it encourages economic development and job growth. A good example is a tax break for a company that relocates to the inner city. But the biggest recipients are Fortune 500 companies that have cut, Mr. Speaker, more jobs than they created this decade.

As stated by Time, ''The rationale to curtail traditional welfare programs was compelling because the old system did not work. It was unfair and destroyed incentive and perpetuated dependence and distorted the economy.''

□ 1830

''The same indictment, almost to the word, applies to corporate welfare. In some ways, it represents pork-barrel legislation of the worst order. The difference, of course, is that instead of rewarding the poor, it rewards the powerful.''

I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that corporate welfare deserves all the attention we can give it to bring it into the light.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like to echo the comments that were made by the gentleman from Wisconsin and give a quote so that we know where the figure came from. Professor Thomas D. Hopkins, Interim Dean, College of Business at the Rochester Institute of Technology is the gentleman that estimated the total regulatory cost in the United States will be over $700 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this fair rule so that the House may continue this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed from cosponsorship of H.R. 798.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 26, 1999

Mr. SESSIONS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. SESSIONS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

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 in the House.

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?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 507

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Water Resources Development Act of 1999''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definition of Secretary.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Sec. 101. Project authorizations.
Sec. 102. Project modifications.
Sec. 103. Project deauthorizations.
Sec. 104. Studies.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Flood hazard mitigation and riverine ecosystem restoration program.
Sec. 202. Shore protection.
Sec. 203. Small flood control authority.
Sec. 204. Use of non-Federal funds for compiling and disseminating information on floods and flood damages.
Sec. 205. Aquatic ecosystem restoration.
Sec. 206. Beneficial uses of dredged material.
Sec. 207. Voluntary contributions by States and political subdivisions.