

appropriations to carry out the Commodity Exchange Act for each fiscal year through 2000 and I strongly support its passage.

In the legislative activity leading up to the enactment of the Futures Trading Practices Act of 1992 (FTPA; Public Law 102-546), Congress considered and ultimately enacted a number of new responsibilities and authorities for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission [CFTC]. Those changes were designed to enhance the effectiveness of our futures regulatory system, while accommodating the evolutionary processes which are transforming world financial markets. Our philosophy has been and should continue to be that fair markets are efficient markets, and that a sound, rational and independent regulatory system contributes to their efficiency.

The CFTC has made extraordinary progress in carrying out the mandates of the 1992 Act. The Commission's pace demonstrates clearly that it shares the same sense of importance that we had in Congress when those important changes to the Commodity Exchange Act were adopted.

As a few examples, since the FTPA was enacted the CFTC has: Approved final rules exempting swap transactions, hybrid securities, and energy contracts meeting specified criteria from the exchange-trading and other requirements of the CEA; Approved final rules prohibiting dual trading on high-volume contract markets that do not have adequate systems for monitoring trading activity; Proposed rules to allow existing futures exchanges to sponsor trading among entities meeting qualifying criteria with relief from some of the regulatory strictures that otherwise would apply; and Approved final rules regarding procedures for exchange emergency actions.

In addition, the Commission has submitted five mandated reports to Congress. Notable among these was The Study of Swaps and Off-Exchange Derivatives—one of the more complete and informative discussions of that issue available.

Meanwhile, our Nation's futures markets have continued to grow and innovate. During fiscal year 1994 alone, the Commission approved trading in 28 new futures and options contracts. Futures and options volume on the exchanges increased by 27 percent to 510 million trades in fiscal year 1994 from the fiscal year 1993 level of 402 million.

While the increased use of U.S. futures exchanges demonstrates the confidence that financial risk managers have in these markets, trading on offshore futures markets—which in many cases trade contracts similar to those on U.S. exchanges—has grown even more rapidly. In its report to Congress, A study of the Global Competitiveness of U.S. Futures Markets, April 1994, the CFTC noted U.S. exchanges' declining share of global futures trading. That trend is largely explained as the initial growth stage in the relatively new, foreign futures markets rather than a reflection of significant cost advantages. It should, however, make us aware in our regulatory policy decisions that we need to balance our efforts to ensure that the markets are sound and fair, with a recognition of the potential for excessive regulatory burdens to disadvantage U.S. futures markets vis-a-vis their foreign competitors.

In their efforts to modernize and to comply with trade monitoring requirements in the Commodity Exchange Act, U.S. exchanges

continue to work towards the development and implementation of automated audit trail systems. These systems promise to greatly enhance the ability of exchange and Commission enforcement officials to prevent fraud and punish cheaters.

Finally, Commission Chairman Schapiro, other Commissioners, and Commission staff continue to be actively engaged in interagency policy coordination regarding securities and securities derivatives markets, over-the-counter derivatives, and other matters of importance in market regulation. In this effort, the Commission has rightfully asserted itself as the expert regulatory agency where derivative markets are concerned.

Given the agency's substantial progress in carrying out the will of Congress expressed through the FTPA, I strongly support passage of this bill to extend the Commission's reauthorization through fiscal year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 178

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "CFTC Reauthorization Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 12(d) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 16(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act for each of fiscal years 1995 through 2000."

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 831, PROVIDING FOR RETURN OF ENROLLED BILL, H.R. 831, AND FOR ITS REENROLLMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] rise?

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] may proceed.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do take up House Concurrent Resolution 55, requesting the President to return the enrolled bill (H.R. 831) and providing for its reenrollment without the targeted tax benefit contained therein. Mr. Speaker, this deals with a provision, a tax provision, that was put in the bill providing \$63 million to Mr. Murdoch.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). In accord with the policy first announced on December 15, 1981, and applied consistently ever since, the Chair will confer recognition for a

unanimous-consent request for consideration of an unreported measure only when assured that the majority leader, the minority leader, and the chairman and the ranking minority members of the committees of jurisdiction have no objection.

The policy is recorded on page 527 of the House Rules Manual.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry: Are you required to tell this Chamber who in fact has objected to the discretionary decision of the Speaker to take up this particular motion that the Speaker himself had said he would favor taking out but has not been taken out?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not aware of the clearance of the parties that are requested to be consulted.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Again, are you required to say which particular people have not cleared it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Again, the Chair is not aware that the necessary parties have been conferred with.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—RESOLUTION PRESERVING THE CONSTITUTIONAL ROLE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO ORIGINATE REVENUE MEASURES

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege under rule IX of the House rules and I offer a House Resolution No. 131.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 131

Whereas rule IX of the Rules of the House of Representatives provides that questions of privilege shall arise whenever the rights of the House collectively are affected:

Whereas, under the precedents, customs, and traditions of the House pursuant to rule IX, a question of privilege has arisen in cases involving the constitutional prerogatives of the House;

Whereas section 7 of Article I of the Constitution requires that revenue measures originate in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the conference report on the bill H.R. 831 contained a targeted tax benefit which was not contained in the bill as passed the House of Representatives and which was not contained in the amendment of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and transmit, within 7 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, a report to the House of Representatives containing the opinion of the Comptroller General on whether the addition of a targeted tax benefit by the conferees to the conference report on the bill H.R. 831 (A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the

deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals, to repeal the provision permitting nonrecognition of gain on sales and exchanges effectuating policies of the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes) violates the requirement of the United States Constitution that all revenue measures originate in the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] wish to be heard on whether the question is one of privilege?

Mr. DEUTSCH. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. DEUTSCH. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, article I, section 7 of the Constitution specifically states that revenue measures must originate in this Chamber, in the House of Representatives. It is an infringement of the House prerogatives when that is not done, and in fact this House has consistently ruled that as a question of privilege when that occurs. It consistently occurs when the other body does a revenue provision.

What occurred in this case, as most Members at this point are well aware, is that this revenue measure which did originate in the House, then went to the other body, went to a conference committee.

A provision was put in in the conference committee which clearly did not originate in the House, which provided for a direct benefit of \$63 million to Mr. Rupert Murdoch. And then at that point the Constitution of the United States and the prerogatives of this House were violated because that provision did not originate in this Chamber.

The House has consistently held that that type of instance is a violation of our prerogatives.

Furthermore, the Chair has consistently ruled that on issues of this nature the House has the right, and the appropriate action is for the House to decide itself what is a prerogative and what is a violation in terms of the privileges of the House.

Mr. Speaker, if I might, if I may yield to at least one or two other Members.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There will be order in the House. Does any other individual Member wish to be heard on the question of privilege?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. I thank the chair.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the argument that basically concludes that indeed the tax measure giving the tax benefit to Mr. Rupert Murdoch did not originate in this House. It is no question. One may raise a question about the kind of debate that we attempted to have yesterday where we were denied the opportunity to really explain what had taken place on this. And I think that having heard Mr. DEUTSCH's

explanation today, no one in this House can disagree that indeed the measure did originate on the other body's side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman shall suspend.

The House will be in order. The gentleman deserves the courtesy of being heard. The House will be in order.

The gentleman may proceed.

Does the gentleman from Mississippi wish to be heard on the question of privilege?

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House with regard to questions of privilege very clearly state that whenever something that questions the integrity of the proceedings of this body is called into question, then it is the privilege of any Member of this body to try to resolve that issue.

And, of course, the entire reason for the motion was to expedite a ruling on something that could well result in a mammoth tax decrease for one individual, something that many Members of this body think brings the integrity of this body into question.

When we are granting tax relief to someone who apparently has had very lucrative book deals with the heads of state of many countries, who offered a lucrative book deal—though rejected—to the Speaker of the House and then just within 91 days of that offer gets an enormous tax break, I think is *prima facie* evidence that would bring the integrity of the proceedings of this House into question.

Therefore, I speak on behalf and in defense of the gentleman's motion that this be a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD] wish to be heard on this question of privilege?

Mr. WARD. I do, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, I wish to speak in favor of the gentleman's privileged motion.

I would ask the Speaker, and I would make the point that this seems to be just business as usual. This seems to be the way that it was not supposed to be done when the changes in the election were held in 1994. The people said they did not want things done as they had been done, and my question speaks to that.

Mr. WALKER. Regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair rules that the resolution does not constitute a question of privilege under rule IX.

The resolution offered by the gentleman from Florida collaterally questions actions taken by a committee of conference on a House-originated revenue bill by challenging the inclusion in the conference report of additional revenue

matter not contained in either the House bill nor the Senate amendment committed to conference. The resolution calls for a report by the Comptroller General on the propriety under section 7 of article I of the Constitution of those proceedings and conference actions on a bill that has already moved through the legislative process.

In the opinion of the Chair, such a resolution does not raise a question of the privileges of the House. As recorded in Deschler's Precedents, volume 3, chapter 13, section 14.2, a question of privilege under section 7 of article I of the Constitution may be raised only when the House is "in possession of the papers." In other words, any allegation of infringement on the prerogatives of the House to originate a revenue measure must be made contemporaneous with the consideration of the measure by the House and may not be raised after the fact.

The Chair rules that the resolution does not constitute a question of the privileges of the House.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the ruling then that the objection about the interference with the prerogatives of the House has to be made contemporaneously with the action complained of? Is that the ruling of the Chair?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When the House is in possession of the papers, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. DOGGETT. Well, in this case, of course, no one in the House was informed that this special deal had been put in for Mr. Murdoch. So how could that right have been exercised?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has ruled.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] wish to be recognized?

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully appeal the ruling of the Chair.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, do the rules provide for a 3-day notice on a conference report?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That question is not relevant here. All points of order were waived before the conference report was considered, and were debatable at that time.

Ms. WATERS. The question is raised, Mr. Speaker, because if there was a waiver, then I wonder how does that impact the ruling of the Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The issue brought up by the gentleman from California is not relevant at this point.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has appealed the ruling of the Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I believe I am recognized for an hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALKER moves to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from the State of Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] is recognized.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, since the rules of the House clearly state that when the question of the integrity of the proceedings of this House have been violated, that is indeed a privileged resolution. Now, I realize that the Chair responded to the written request of my colleague, but I have also asked the Chair to respond to whether or not it is prima facie evidence that a question relating to the integrity of the proceedings of this body are called into question when one individual who earlier this session offered the Speaker of the House an over \$4 million book deal which the Speaker turned down, but he still offered it and with—that is a parliamentary inquiry. I have just as much right as the Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order. This is a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman will suspend. The Chair has ruled previously on all points on this issue as textually raised by the resolution. We now have the motion before the House.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] may state a legitimate parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I do not think the Chair responded—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi shall suspend. The gentleman from Mississippi may state a legitimate parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I do not feel like the Chair has responded to my question of whether or not they felt like—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The gentleman has a right to be heard.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. A question of the integrity of the proceedings of this House has been brought into play.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The Chair has ruled that the resolution as read does not constitute a question of privilege. The Chair has ruled.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening when there was an appeal of the ruling of the Chair; then there was from the other side of the aisle a request to table. Following that, there were questions raised on this side of the aisle about why is it so difficult to get a vote on an appeal of the ruling of the Chair?

Now, I recognize that the majority has the right to lay it on the table. But if every time there is an appeal of the Chair, a motion is laid on the table and defeated because of the numerical advantage the majority has, it denies not just this side but the entire House an opportunity to vote on the ruling of the Chair. It is a legitimate appeal.

□ 1615

The gentleman has legitimately appealed it and ought to, at least at some point in time, have a vote, so I would say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that, while we will vote on the motion to table the appeal, that there may in fact be another motion to appeal the Chair, and another one after that, and, if that is what it is going to take to get one vote on the appeal of the Chair, then this side is prepared to do that. I would rather not do it. They will win in either case, but this side is just asking for a clean vote on the appeal of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). It is the Chair's ruling that the motion that is currently pending is, in fact, a proper motion under the rules of the House.

Mr. MFUME. I do not dispute that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question before the House is the motion to table.

Are there further parliamentary inquiries?

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] to lay on the table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

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

Mr. WALKER. 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. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 192, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

YEAS—230

Allard	Gallegly	Myers
Archer	Ganske	Myrick
Armey	Gekas	Nethercutt
Bachus	Geren	Neumann
Baker (CA)	Gilchrest	Ney
Baker (LA)	Gillmor	Norwood
Ballenger	Gilman	Nussle
Barr	Goodlatte	Oxley
Barrett (NE)	Goodling	Packard
Bartlett	Goss	Parker
Barton	Graham	Paxon
Bass	Greenwood	Petri
Bateman	Gunderson	Pombo
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Porter
Bilbray	Hancock	Portman
Bilirakis	Hansen	Pryce
Bliley	Hastert	Quillen
Blute	Hastings (WA)	Quinn
Boehlert	Hayworth	Radanovich
Boehner	Hefley	Ramstad
Bonilla	Heineman	Regula
Bono	Herger	Riggs
Brownback	Hilleary	Roberts
Bryant (TN)	Hobson	Rogers
Bunn	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Hoke	Ros-Lehtinen
Burr	Horn	Roth
Burton	Hostettler	Roukema
Buyer	Houghton	Royce
Callahan	Hunter	Salmon
Calvert	Hutchinson	Sanford
Camp	Hyde	Saxton
Canady	Inglis	Scarborough
Castle	Istook	Schaefer
Chabot	Johnson (CT)	Seastrand
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Chenoweth	Johnston	Shadegg
Christensen	Jones	Shaw
Chrysler	Kasich	Shays
Clinger	Kelly	Shuster
Coble	Kim	Skeen
Coburn	King	Smith (MI)
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Smith (NJ)
Combest	Klug	Smith (TX)
Cooley	Knollenberg	Smith (WA)
Cox	Kolbe	Solomon
Crane	LaHood	Souder
Crapo	Largent	Spence
Creameans	Latham	Stearns
Cubin	LaTourette	Stockman
Cunningham	Lazio	Stump
Davis	Leach	Talent
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Tate
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	Lightfoot	Thomas
Dornan	Linder	Thornberry
Dreier	Livingston	Tiahrt
Duncan	LoBiondo	Torkildsen
Dunn	Longley	Upton
Ehlers	Lucas	Vucanovich
Ehrlich	Manzullo	Waldholtz
Emerson	Martini	Walker
English	McCollum	Walsh
Ensign	McCrery	Wamp
Everett	McDade	Watts (OK)
Ewing	McHugh	Weldon (FL)
Fawell	McInnis	Weldon (PA)
Fields (TX)	McIntosh	Weller
Flanagan	McKeon	White
Foley	Metcalf	Whitfield
Forbes	Meyers	Wicker
Fowler	Mica	Wolf
Fox	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)
Franks (NJ)	Molinari	Young (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Montgomery	Zeliff
Frisa	Moorhead	Zimmer
Funderburk	Morella	

NAYS—192

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Ortiz
Andrews	Gordon	Orton
Baesler	Green	Owens
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Pallone
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Hall (TX)	Payne (NJ)
Becerra	Hamilton	Payne (VA)
Beilenson	Harman	Peterson (FL)
Bentsen	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Hefner	Pickett
Bevill	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Bishop	Hinchey	Poshard
Bonior	Holden	Rahall
Borski	Hoyer	Rangel
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Reed
Brewster	Jacobs	Richardson
Browder	Jefferson	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rose
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX)	Kennedy (MA)	Rush
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Clay	Kennelly	Sanders
Clayton	Kildee	Sawyer
Clement	Klecza	Schroeder
Clyburn	Klink	Schumer
Coleman	LaFalce	Scott
Collins (IL)	Lantos	Serrano
Collins (MI)	Laughlin	Sisisky
Condit	Levin	Skaggs
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Costello	Lincoln	Slaughter
Coyne	Lipinski	Spratt
Cramer	Lofgren	Stark
Danner	Lowey	Stenholm
de la Garza	Luther	Stokes
Deal	Maloney	Studds
DeFazio	Manton	Stupak
DeLauro	Markey	Tanner
Dellums	Martinez	Tauzin
Deutsch	Mascara	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	Matsui	Tejeda
Dingell	McCarthy	Thompson
Dixon	McDermott	Thornton
Doggett	McHale	Thurman
Dooley	McKinney	Torres
Doyle	McNulty	Torricelli
Durbin	Meehan	Towns
Edwards	Meek	Traficant
Engel	Menendez	Velazquez
Eshoo	Mfume	Vento
Evans	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Farr	Mineta	Volkmer
Fattah	Minge	Ward
Fazio	Mink	Waters
Fields (LA)	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Filner	Mollohan	Waxman
Flake	Moran	Williams
Foglietta	Murtha	Wilson
Ford	Nadler	Wise
Furse	Neal	Woolsey
Gejdenson	Oberstar	Wyden
Gephardt	Obey	Wynn
Gibbons	Olver	Yates

NOT VOTING—12

Ackerman	Franks (CT)	Pelosi
Chapman	Frost	Reynolds
Dickey	Hayes	Schiff
Frank (MA)	Kaptur	Tucker

□ 1635

Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. DINGELL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BAUCUS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to lay on the table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM FRIDAY, APRIL 7, 1995, TO MAY 1, 1995, AND FROM WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1995, TO TUESDAY MAY, 9, 1995, AND ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF SENATE FROM THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1995, OR THEREAFTER, TO MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1995

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 58) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 58

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, April 7, 1995, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Monday, May 1, 1995, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate adjourns or recesses at the close of business on Thursday, April 6, 1995, Friday, April 7, 1995, Saturday, April 8, 1995, Sunday, April 9, 1995, or Monday, April 10, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, in accordance with this concurrent resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, April 24, 1995, or such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 2. When the House adjourns on the legislative day of Wednesday, May 3, 1995, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 9, 1995, or until noon on second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 3. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBERS TO EXTEND THEIR REMARKS IN THE RECORD FOR TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for today, April 6, 1995, and tomorrow, April 7, 1995, all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in that section of the RECORD entitled extension of remarks.

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

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, this change was cleared with the Democrat leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

MEDICARE SELECT EXPANSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 130 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 483.

□ 1641

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 483) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare Select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes, with Mr. BONILLA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

(Mr. BLILEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the extension of the Medicare Select Program. The bill before the House was worked out between the members of the Commerce and Ways and Means Committees. The bill provides for a 5-year extension of the program and permits it to be offered in all 50 States. The bill also requires the secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to conduct a study comparing the health care costs, quality of care, and access to services under Medicare select policies with other Medigap policies. The secretary is required to establish Medicare select on a permanent basis unless the study finds that: First, Medicare select has not resulted in savings to Medicare select enrollees, second, it has led to significant expenditures in the Medicare program, or third, it has significantly diminished access to and quality of care. I think the bill provides for a reasonable balance that will permit a valuable and innovative program for