

Case in point, Port Everglades. As one of the largest cruise ships and container ports in the Nation, Port Everglades recognized the need to improve its security long before September 11, 2001. Nearly 2 years ago, the port invested millions of dollars into establishing a new security plan. In fact, in June of 1999, the Presidential Commission on Seaport Crime and Security visited Port Everglades and recognized many of the port's "best practices" as examples for ports throughout the country to follow.

Prior to September 11, the Port Everglades security improvement plan was to be implemented over several years. However, in response to September 11, Broward County, Florida, made security at Port Everglades its top priority. The County is committed to spending more than \$25 million for security improvements at the port in fiscal year 2003 alone, and the Ports of Palm Beach and Miami have similar investments in progress.

Under the report, Port Everglades will be able to be reimbursed for the security improvements it has made since September 11, as well as those it will make in the following year. However, I am appalled that Port Everglades, as well as the Ports of Palm Beach and Miami, will not be eligible to be reimbursed for the planning and implementation of various security improvements that they made prior to September 11, 2001. South Florida's three major ports and some others around the Nation were ahead of the game and made security improvements 18 months ago that Congress is just now getting around to requiring today.

Specifically, Port Everglades is an example of the intuitive thinking that ports should have been doing a long time ago, and to penalize it for being ahead of the game is just plain wrong.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I have major reservations about the level of funding authorized in the report. Clearly, the amount authorized is not enough to meet the security needs of our Nation's ports. In the next 18 months, South Florida's three international ports will spend more than \$60 million on security improvements. Under the 50/50 or 75/25 cost-sharing agreements laid out in the report, Port Everglades, Port Palm Beach and Port of Miami could easily command nearly half of the total amount authorized in this legislation.

Realistically, the \$75 million authorized in the report just is not enough to fund security improvements for all U.S. ports. I encourage my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations to consider this reality when appropriating funds over the next 6 years.

In the end, Mr. Speaker, this rule is typical of one for a conference report, and I will be supporting it. Additionally, I will also be supporting the underlying conference report. I urge my colleagues to do the same, but, as I previously mentioned, the report has flaws and Congress must remain intent on

revisiting these issues that are critical to our Nation's security.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for having initiated this discussion today on this very important rule.

I think it is important that we realize that the conference report before us is a very important piece of legislation. I know of few pieces of legislation that have ever been flawless that I have voted on, and so I would simply tell my friend that perhaps this piece of legislation could be improved as well, as any human endeavor, because I have seen some things that are perfectible but very few that are perfect.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Florida agree that Port Everglades and Port Miami are deserving of consideration?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Of course.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. And that the funding level, although we have problems in the Nation, may not be enough to cover the ports of the United States?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the gentleman. In the House bill before it went to conference we had a provision for reimbursement for ports for acts taken for security after September 11, and in the Senate there was no such provision. The inclusion of the House provision is something we should commend. We should keep in mind there are important provisions in this legislation which I think make it not only a conference report that we should support but that we should support with pride and enthusiasm.

I thank the conferees and all of the Members who have worked so hard to bring this important piece of legislation forward, specifically the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), as well as the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) for their work on this critical issue of port security. This is a fundamental aspect of national security, of homeland security, to improve the protections for our ports that are obviously so important to our economy.

Mr. Speaker, with that of mind, cognizant of the importance of the underlying legislation and the fairness of this rule, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. 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.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3210, TERRORISM RISK PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SESSION. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 607 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 607

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3210) to ensure the continued financial capacity of insurers to provide coverage for risks from terrorism. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution is the standard rule for consideration of conference reports and waives all points of order against consideration of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 2001, the collective memories of Americans were altered forever. The terrorist attacks resulted in an incalculable loss, both in loss of life and the destruction of buildings and businesses.

While America has begun its recovery and is healing from last September, we must be mindful of the threat that continues to exist. Just yesterday, our intelligence officials indicated that terrorist groups may be planning a new wave of attacks against our homeland. Exposure to terrorism is not only a threat to our national security but is also a threat to the U.S. and the global economy.

There is no doubt that these terrorist attacks have resulted in the most costly, catastrophic loss in the history of property and casualty insurance. However, the ripple effects of the attacks continues to last and will linger on.

The shortage of terrorism insurance has left any number of our hospitals, stadiums, shopping malls, apartments, and office buildings either with astronomical rates for insurance or none at all.

It goes without saying that the attacks have been a real threat not only to our homeland but also to our economic security. The United States Chamber of Commerce estimates that the economy has suffered a loss of

more than \$15 billion and 300,000 jobs in the construction industry alone.

Mr. Speaker, insurance has been described as the glue which holds our economy together. Without reinsurance for the risk of terrorism, some insurance companies have been forced to specifically exclude it from their future policies. Without this terrorism coverage, lenders are unlikely to underwrite loans for major projects. This sequence of events could result in dangerous disruptions to the marketplace and further hurt our economy.

In April of this year, a Washington Post article cited two real-life examples. One, J.W. "Bill" Marriott, chairman and chief executive officer of Marriott International, said that although the hotel company remained insured for terrorism, he was expecting a 300 percent increase in premiums when it had to renew its new policies.

Another example was from Baylor University, which is located in Waco, Texas. According to David Brooks, vice president for finance and administration at Baylor University, the University had to go to 23 insurance companies searching for terrorism coverage.

These snapshots from around the country form a composite picture of a dire situation that requires action from this body, the United States Congress.

Heeding President Bush's call for Congress to act, the House passed H.R. 3210, the Terrorism Risk Protection Act, shortly after the September 11, 2001, attacks. The Terrorism Risk Protection Act provides a Federal backstop for financial losses in the event of future terrorism attacks.

□ 1330

This bill establishes a system of shared public/private compensation for insured losses resulting from acts of terrorism to protect consumers and create a transitional period for the private insurance markets to stabilize.

The Federal backstop is triggered when the Secretary of the Treasury determines that an act of terrorism has occurred with losses in excess of \$5 million. The Federal Government would pay 90 percent of the insured losses that exceeded the insured deductibility, which increases each year of the program, up to \$100 billion each year.

The conference report provides for full payback protection for the American taxpayer by guaranteeing that the first 10- to \$15 billion in losses would be paid by the insurance marketplace. The Secretary would retain the authority to fully recoup any additional costs as necessary.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues are fully aware, much of the recent attention has been focused on the tort provisions in this bill. The Joint Economic Committee released a study this May that estimated that lawsuits stemming from the September 11 attacks were already estimated to cost as much as \$20 billion. These lawsuits typically pay 33

to 40 percent of the award to the plaintiff's lawyers.

The 1993 World Trade Center bombing, which killed six people, resulted in 500 lawsuits by 700 individuals, businesses and insurance companies. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 8 years and the cases are only now just getting to the trial stage, where hundreds of plaintiffs have yet to even receive one cent of compensation. Mr. Speaker, this is not a circumstance or a situation that we want to repeat.

Though this bill does not solve the woes of our legal system, it does take the first solid steps towards reform. By providing reasonable reforms, victims of terrorism will more quickly and equitably receive compensation while also reducing the substantial uncertainty facing the insurance industry when pricing terrorism risk.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to commend the conferees who have labored to produce this fine work. I would also like to recognize the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), who has been so instrumental in the success of this critically important bill. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support me in not only supporting this rule but also the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the tragic events of September 11, 2001, will remain fresh in our minds for years to come. The shroud of terrorism continues to surround us and terrorists around the world continue to regroup, plan and carry out attacks on innocent civilians. The economic consequences of another terrorist attack on the United States are real and, without proper preparation, could be economically devastating.

After September 11, there was no question whether the insurance industry needed financial backing in case of another terrorist attack on the United States. We all agreed that another attack could potentially cripple the American economy. In response, the Committee on Financial Services produced a truly bipartisan bill that was approved unanimously by the full committee. It was not perfect, there were real disagreements over specific provisions in the original risk insurance bill, but it was a good start.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the majority leadership decided it had to meddle in the process and inserted language drastically changing the tort system in this country. The original bill was made worse and in the process bipartisanship was thrown aside.

Mr. Speaker, this conference gets us back to the land of bipartisanship. All the Democratic conferees signed the conference report and, after initially threatening to veto it, the White House

is now indicating that the President will sign the bill into law.

My concern is with the unnecessary delay here. This bill should have been completed last year. Without the tort language in the original House-passed bill, a conference report could have been easily agreed to and, with hard work, this bill might have been signed into law before the first of the year. By making this a political process rather than the truly bipartisan process it should have been and it started out to be, the majority showed us that they will bend over backward for special interests, especially before an election. Thankfully the other body was able to stand up to these special interests and, a year later, the result is a good bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and I support this conference report which, as I said in the beginning, represents a bipartisan compromise. I would urge my colleagues to support the rule and support the conference report.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services.

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the gentleman from Texas for his usual excellent work as a member of the Committee on Rules that handles legislation coming from the Committee on Financial Services. I do rise in support of the rule. The efforts that the committee and the entire Congress made in antiterrorism legislation clearly is one of the most important bills that will pass the Congress this year.

It is no secret that after 9/11, the reinsurance industry, which is mostly offshore, indicated they would no longer write terrorism insurance. Since they are the insurers of the insurers, it meant that the domestic-based insurance companies were unable to spread their risk and as a result we have a crisis in insurance coverage for terrorism. That crisis has evidenced itself in many ways, not the least of which is a recent study that indicated over \$15 billion in valuable projects are on hold, not going forward, because of the lack of terrorism insurance; and because they cannot get terrorism insurance, they cannot get lending for those projects.

We are not just talking, Mr. Speaker, about New York City. I was recently in Chicago. There is a major project going on in Chicago that is simply now just a hole in the ground that will employ several hundred people. The President has indicated that their studies indicate some 300,000 jobs are at stake in the construction industry, the realtors, lenders and the like. So in many, many ways this is an economic issue and a jobs issue. That is why the President

has been so outspoken in virtually every opportunity that he has had asking the Congress for this important legislation. I suspect that the President has mentioned this issue perhaps more than any other issue in my memory and about the only time that he did not make a public statement about terrorism insurance was at the United Nations. But overall this issue, this crisis in insurance coverage, has been a major factor, I suggest, in the slowdown of the economy.

The Secretary of the Treasury was quoted as saying that it could very well knock 1 percent off our gross domestic product. That is a significant amount. We are fortunate today because we stand on the threshold of passing this important legislation that the President will willingly and gladly sign.

Let me just talk about the key elements briefly of this bill. The conference report provides full payback protection for American taxpayers, guaranteeing that the first 10- to \$15 billion in losses will be paid by the insurance marketplace with the Secretary fully able to recoup any additional amounts necessary. This was a critical component in the House bill that Chairman BAKER and I and others insisted upon, that if the taxpayers were going to be involved in this backup, it is important that those tax dollars be repaid. Even though it was not in the Senate version, we prevailed in the conference. It is important to point that out to my colleagues in the House.

Secondly, we have incorporated a transition period that provides immediate full commercial terrorism coverage for all American business consumers while long-term contracts under the bill are being negotiated; in other words, an immediate start at getting these projects up and running and 300,000 people back to work.

Three, the Federal backstop has been simplified and requires that insurers have to pay a sizable deductible before they are eligible for the Federal backstop. This deductible is increased from 7 to 15 percent of their premiums over the program to phase out the taxpayer exposure and foster the reemergence of a private insurance market for terrorism. It insures that only truly catastrophic events trigger any Federal involvement while continuing to provide equal protection for small and rural insurers.

Fourth, we have provided more disclosures and information to consumers, with more options to insure that terrorism coverage is available in all commercial policies.

In addition, we continue to provide strong penalties to punish insurers who defraud the government. State insurance and reinsurance programs can be fully covered by the Treasury Secretary to provide equivalent protections for Americans who are unable to obtain insurance in the private markets. And we continue to give victims

of terrorist attacks the ability to enforce court judgments against terrorists' assets.

Finally, while I would note that the legal protections may not be as strong as I or others would desire, they are all improvements over existing law and are very similar to those strongly approved in the Committee on Financial Services over 1 year ago.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is timely and critical for America. We need it to protect jobs, protect our economy and protect the American people against future terrorist attacks. I urge all of our colleagues and friends to support the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit.

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing today is simply a part of both responding to the terrorist attacks of September 11 and defending our country from continuing damage from those terrorist attacks. It is a very prudent thing that we do today. It is a part of the defense of our homeland and of our economy, for if our economy continues to be weakened by the terrorist attack, then the terrorists win. The President has called on us repeatedly to respond with legislation.

I commend this House. This House has passed, and passed last November, good legislation to address the problem. And what is the problem? Mr. Speaker, before the terrorist attack, normally, as a matter of course, protection against terrorist attacks was included in commercial property and casualty insurance policies. After the losses on September 11, which amounted to 40- or \$50 billion, it was impossible for insurance companies to predict when and if and the extent of these terrorist attacks in the future. It is impossible for us as a government to predict when and where and to what extent these attacks will occur. So there is no way for the insurance companies to assess that damage and to make reserves and charge premiums in an adequate amount.

So what have the insurance companies done? They have done two things. They have either in most cases not extended coverage or, two, they have simply picked a very high number for a premium and extended coverage at a very substantial amount for what, in all probability, will not occur at a specific location because of the actions that this government and this administration has taken since September 11. However, because terrorist insurance coverage has not been extended, billions of dollars of projects have been put on hold or canceled. In fact, a recent, and this is very recent, real estate group estimated that the lack of affordable terrorist insurance has resulted in the delaying or the cancella-

tion of more than \$15.5 billion worth of new commercial building projects just in the past few months. The Federal Reserve, in fact, Chairman Greenspan recently said that as a result of terrorist insurance coverage not being provided, not being available, it is producing as much as a 1 percent drag on our gross domestic product.

□ 1345

We talk about percentages of 1 percent. We talk about figures of \$20 or \$15 billion. What we are really talking about here is layoffs. We are talking about construction workers not working. We are talking about buildings not being built. We are talking about employees who work for companies that supply the office furniture for those buildings, who supply the goods that were to be sold in those buildings, the equipment in those buildings not being sold. As the President said, we have to respond comprehensively to what happened September 11. Thus, this bill.

Let us talk about the liability provisions of this bill, because there was in fact an unwillingness on the part of some to endorse this legislation simply because of what was proposed.

What is proposed here today is that, in the event of a large-scale terrorist attack upon this country in any location, one Federal court, one jurisdiction will take control and be charged with the administration of handling all the claims as a result of that attack, instead of having State and Federal courts all over the United States handling thousands of claims. Instead of that situation, which I think we all agree would be unmanageable, one Federal court picked for the convenience of those who had been hurt by this terrorist attack and picked for the efficient handling of the claims would be picked within 90 days of the terrorist attack, a Federal cause of action.

The lawsuits under this legislation would be tried in Federal court, Federal rules of procedure. However, the substantive law of the State or where the attack occurred would be the applicable law.

Finally, there has been a lot said about punitive damages. I for one have contended, and this bill makes it very clear, that punitive damages are not insured losses. Let me repeat that. Punitive damages are not insured losses. The taxpayers will not have to pay punitive damages under this legislation, and that is very important because the people that will be responsible for these attacks that ought to be punished will be the terrorists, not the American people.

All the legal reforms, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) said, are an improvement over the current law. The Federal Government of the American taxpayers will not be forced to re-insure any punitive damage claims. Private rights of action for punitive damages are unchanged.

In conclusion, let me simply commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr.

OXLEY), chairman, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER), chairman of the subcommittee, who have worked long and hard on this. I urge all Members of this conference, let us get on with strengthening our country, recovering from the attack of September 11 and doing everything we can do to prepare for other attacks, hoping they will not occur, but we have to act in self-defense.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I inquire about the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has 27½ minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman of Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, it is the standard rule for conference reports, but also in opposition to the conference report itself because it fails to include critical liability protections for victims of terrorism, which are particularly important because the conference report creates a Federal indemnification program that puts the American taxpayer on the hook for damages caused by terrorists.

It is important to note what the trial lawyers did first to mark the first anniversary of the terrorist attacks on September 11. They are suing American companies that were victims of terrorist attacks themselves. According to the Washington Post: "Things really are returning to normal a year after the terrorist attacks. Trial lawyers—surprise!—are headed back to the courthouse, [and] there is a rush by lawyers to sue airport operators, airlines, security companies, the builders of the World Trade Center and others."

Let us face the facts. Terrorist-inspired litigation is not a garden variety tort case. A banana peel is an accident waiting to happen, but a terrorist is a suicidal fanatic bent upon killing individuals, innocent people, and causing mass destruction of property. Even the most diligent property owners cannot always guard against such attacks.

To protect innocent Americans, the provisions in the terrorism insurance legislation the House passed a year ago provided that, in a lawsuit for damages arising out of a terrorist attack, no punitive damages would be allowed against victims of terrorism. The bill before us today fails to include that basic protection; and, in doing so, it fails to ensure that Americans do not become the victims of terrorists twice: first during the initial wave of death and destruction caused by the terrorists and second by the legal aftershocks caused by the unquantifiable and unpredictable damage claims brought by the plaintiffs' bar.

While the bill before us today excludes punitive damages awarded in

court from insured losses paid by the United States taxpayer, the mere allegation of punitive damages always boosts the settlement value of the cases, and this bill leaves U.S. taxpayers paying the inflated costs of those cases settled out of court. So what the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), my friend, said, he is right, we taxpayers do not pay punitive damages, but knowing that there is a punitive damage award hovering over there means that the settlement value which is paid by the taxpayers ends up costing the taxpayers' money. So it requires the American taxpayers to engage in an egregious form of national self-flagellation. American taxpayers are punished for the evil acts of foreign enemies.

Even the Washington Post's editorial page has stated: "On insurance, the Democrats are objecting to Republican proposals to ban punitive damages in the event of terrorist attacks, which seems a reasonable proposal. The Democratic position on terrorism insurance smacks of the trial bar, which never saw a disaster that didn't justify a lawsuit."

And just a few weeks ago, the Washington Post stated that "the Democrats should indeed be embarrassed" by their efforts to defend lawyers at the expense of the American economy.

It is no surprise to me that all Democratic conferees signed this conference report.

The terrorism insurance bill the House passed last year also provided the defendants could only be liable for the amount of damages for pain and suffering in direct proportion to the defendant's percentage of responsibility for harm. That provision allows Americans who are victims of terrorists to rely, at the very least, on their own innocence to protect them from liability. My colleagues may remember that in the No Child Left Behind Act, which overwhelmingly passed both the House and the Senate, the very same rule was applied to protect teachers. If that provision is good enough for teachers, it should be good enough for victims of terrorism.

The bill that the House passed last year also provided that fees for attorneys suing victims of terrorism could not be greater than 20 percent of the damages awarded or any amount of the settlement received. That provision is simply a continuation of the longstanding Federal policy behind the Federal Tort Claims Act, namely that lawyers should not profit excessively when they are paid from the United States Treasury.

Especially today, in a time of war, excessive lawyer fees drawn from the U.S. Treasury should not be allowed to result in egregious war profiteering at the expense of victims, jobs, and businesses; and this bill, unfortunately, will allow this one segment of our society to legally, with the blessing of the United States Congress, engage in war profiteering.

This conference report does not include these protections for the victims of terrorism that were in the bill the House passed a year ago. It gives the plaintiffs' bar the keys to the United States Treasury, and it gives lawyers a license to further prey on the victims of terrorism.

We passed a compensation program the week after 9/11 for the survivors of the victims of those attacks, and some of the proceedings that have gone on under that law have resulted in embarrassment to the public and to the authors of that act and grist for investigative reporters. Should, God forbid, there be another terrorist attack and the provisions of this bill come into play, that same embarrassment will apply. There is an old adage "Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me." Let us not shame us by passing this bill. It should be voted down.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the chairman; and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), ranking member; and all the members of the Committee on Financial Services for all of their work on this issue. As I said in my opening remarks, they initially came up with an okay bill that, unfortunately, as a result of some meddling from the majority leadership, turned into a very bad bill in my opinion.

What we have before us today in this conference report is a bill that represents bipartisan concerns and deserves bipartisan support, and I would urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I would urge my colleagues to support final passage of the conference report.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this rule and of course the underlying legislation which is so critically important not only to this country but to the economy of this country for consumers and for men and women who own businesses and have money invested in this country.

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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.