

On July 15, 1968,⁽¹⁴⁾ Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, recognized Mr. William L. Hungate, of Missouri, to make a one-minute speech. Mr. Hungate then asked unanimous consent that a bill previously stricken from the Private Calendar be restored thereto, and the Speaker ruled that he could not entertain that request. Mr. Hungate then proceeded for one minute and yielded to Mr. Thomas J. Meskill, of Connecticut, who moved that the same bill be restored to the Private Calendar. The Speaker ruled that he had not recognized Mr. Hungate for the purpose of yielding to Mr. Meskill for the motion, and that the motion was not in order.

§ 31. — For Debate

Cross References

- Duration of debate, see §§67 et seq., *infra* (in the House) and §§74 et seq., *infra* (in the Committee of the Whole).
 Power of Chair over recognition for debate, see §9, *supra*.
 Unanimous consent for control or allocation of yielded time, see §§29.30, 29.31, *supra*.
 Yielded time charged to Member with the floor, see §§29.5–29.7, *supra*.
 Yielding balance of time, see §§29.9, 29.10, 29.16, *supra*.

14. 114 CONG. REC. 21326, 90th Cong. 2d Sess.

Yielding by Members in control, see §§24, *supra* (role of manager) and 26, *supra* (management by reporting committee).

Yielding during special order speeches, see §29.18, *supra*.

Yielding for Debate Is Discretionary

§ 31.1 Yielding time for general debate is discretionary with the Members having control thereof.

On Aug. 12, 1959,⁽¹⁵⁾ the Committee of the Whole was considering H.R. 8342, the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 338, placing control of general debate with the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. Chairman Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, answered a parliamentary inquiry on the yielding of time:

MR. [ROMAN C.] PUCINSKI [of Illinois]: Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state it.

MR. PUCINSKI: Mr. Chairman, in view of the disparity of time, whereby the proponents of the Landrum-Griffin bill have 4 hours while the proponents

15. 105 CONG. REC. 15678, 86th Cong. 1st Sess.

of the committee bill and the Shelley bill have 1 hour each, is it possible under the rules for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kearns] who controls the time on the other side to share some of that time with some of us here who would like to ask some questions about the Landrum-Griffin bill?

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, that is entirely possible, but that is in the discretion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

§ 31.2 A Member having the floor for debate may exercise discretion in yielding to other Members; and there is no rule of the House requiring a Member having the floor in debate to yield to another Member to whom he has referred during debate.

The following proceedings occurred in the House on Aug. 2, 1984:⁽¹⁶⁾

MR. [ROBERT S.] WALKER [of Pennsylvania]: Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry. Is it not within the traditions of the House that when gentlemen on the floor are engaging in debate, and engaging in debate in a way in which they make constant references to particular individuals that they would then yield to those individuals in order to be able to reply to the charges and statements that are being made?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽¹⁷⁾ There is no rule requiring that a Mem-

ber yield to another Member when that Member has the floor.

MR. WALKER: Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. [WILLIAM B.] RICHARDSON [of New Mexico]: Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The parliamentary inquiry has been responded to.

MR. WALKER: Further parliamentary inquiry.

MR. RICHARDSON: I believe we should follow the rules of the House. I believe I had explained my position for not yielding, and it is based on similar treatment that I have received on the floor of the House when in this kind of special order with I believe one of the three gentlemen present I asked to be recognized and I do not recall that I was recognized. In fact, I was not recognized.

Member Recognized To Debate Amendment May Yield

§ 31.3 A Member recognized under the five-minute rule in the Committee of the Whole to debate an amendment may yield to another if he so desires.

On June 22, 1945,⁽¹⁸⁾ the Committee of the Whole was considering a House joint resolution under the five-minute rule. Chairman Jere Cooper, of Tennessee, recognized for five minutes Mr.

16. 130 CONG. REC. 22241, 98th Cong. 2d Sess.

17. John McK. Spratt, Jr. (S.C.).

18. 91 CONG. REC. 6548, 79th Cong. 1st Sess.

Forest A. Harness, of Indiana, who then yielded his time to Mr. Fred L. Crawford, of Michigan, who had just consumed five minutes in debate. Mr. Wright Patman, of Texas, made a point of order on the ground that one Member could not yield another Member his time under the five-minute rule. The Chairman overruled the point of order and stated:

Any Member can yield to another Member, or decline to yield, as he desires.

Parliamentarian's Note: Mr. Crawford had just consumed five minutes and Mr. Harness yielded to him to complete his remarks. Mr. Harness remained standing while Mr. Crawford completed his speech.

§ 31.4 A Member recognized to strike out the last word under the five-minute rule may yield to another Member, even if the latter has just spoken.

On Mar. 21, 1960,⁽¹⁹⁾ Chairman Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, ruled that a Member recognized on a pro forma amendment under the five-minute rule could yield to another Member:

THE CHAIRMAN: The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

19. 106 CONG. REC. 6162, 86th Cong. 2d Sess.

MR. [EMANUEL] CELLER [of New York]: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

MR. [CLARE E.] HOFFMAN of Michigan: I object, Mr. Chairman.

MR. [SIDNEY R.] YATES [of Illinois]: Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler].

MR. CELLER: I thank the gentleman.

MR. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Just a minute. I make a point of order on this.

MR. CELLER: Mr. Chairman, deprivation of the State's ballot is wrong.

MR. YATES: Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to yield to the gentleman from New York.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Illinois was recognized, and he yielded to the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from New York is continuing in order.

Control of Time Where Time for Debate in Committee of the Whole Has Not Been Fixed

§ 31.5 When the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of a bill without fixing time for debate, the Member first recognized is entitled to one hour and may yield such portions of that time as he desires (and after that hour another Member is recognized for an hour).

On Mar. 24, 1947,⁽²⁰⁾ Mr. Frank B. Keefe, of Wisconsin, moved that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of H.R. 2700, making appropriations for the Department of Labor and other agencies. He proposed a unanimous-consent request for the duration of general debate on the bill and the request was objected to. Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, then answered a parliamentary inquiry:

MR. KEEFE: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. KEEFE: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that on the adoption of the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that there will be 1 hour for general debate for each side?

THE SPEAKER: Under the rule, whoever is first recognized is entitled to 1 hour and, of course, the Member can yield such portions of that time as he wishes. . . .

MR. [JOHN J.] ROONEY [of New York]: Mr. Speaker, is it understood that the minority is to have an equal division of the time for debate this afternoon?

THE SPEAKER: After the first hour has been used by the majority, the minority then can have 1 hour under the rule.

***Time Yielded for Debate Only—
No Amendment Without
Unanimous Consent***

§ 31.6 A Member to whom time is yielded for debate only in the House on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules and who seeks unanimous consent to offer an amendment is not entitled to have the amendment read by the Clerk where another Member objects to the offering of the amendment.

The following proceedings occurred in the House on May 14, 1985,⁽¹⁾ during consideration of House Resolution 157 (providing for consideration of H.R. 1157, maritime authorization for fiscal 1986):

MR. [JOHN JOSEPH] MOAKLEY [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 157, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 157

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1157) to authorize appro-

20. 93 CONG. REC. 2464, 2465, 80th Cong. 1st Sess.

1. 131 CONG. REC. 11713, 99th Cong. 1st Sess.

priations for fiscal year 1986 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation and the Federal Maritime Commission. . . .

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽²⁾ The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

MR. MOAKLEY: Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Lott), and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume. . . .

MR. [TRENT] LOTT [of Mississippi]: Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. . . .

Mr. Speaker, I send an amendment to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. . . .

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Moakley) did not yield for that purpose. . . .

MR. LOTT: This is a unanimous-consent request.

MR. MOAKLEY: I object to the unanimous-consent request. . . .

MR. [ROBERT S.] WALKER [of Pennsylvania]: Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. . . .

What has the gentleman from Massachusetts objected to? The amendment has not been read at this point.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: He is objecting to the offering and consideration of the amendment, including the reading.

MR. WALKER: It was my understanding that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Lott) simply asked unanimous consent that he be allowed to offer an amendment. The Clerk was

about to read the amendment. Could not the gentleman withhold until the amendment at least was read? . . .

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair has very clearly stated that the Clerk does not have to read the amendment. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Moakley) objected to the offering of the amendment. The Clerk is under no obligation to read the amendment.

Parliamentarian's Note: In this instance, the minority Member controlling debate time on the special rule sought unanimous consent to offer a (nongermane) amendment to require all Budget Act waivers recommended by that committee to be explained in the accompanying reports for the remainder of the 99th Congress.

Control of Time Where Time Under Five-minute Rule Has Been Limited and Divided

§ 31.7 Where the time for debate under the five-minute rule in the Committee of the Whole has been limited and divided by the Chair among those seeking recognition, a Member who has been recognized may retain the floor and yield to whomever he pleases.

On July 22, 1965,⁽³⁾ during consideration under the five-minute

3. 111 CONG. REC. 17928-30, 89th Cong. 1st Sess.

2. Dale E. Kildee (Mich.).

rule of H.R. 8283, the economic opportunity amendments, Mr. Adam C. Powell, of New York, moved that all debate on the pending amendment and on amendments thereto close at a certain time, which was agreed to by the Committee. Chairman John J. Rooney, of New York, recognized Mr. John H. Dent, of Pennsylvania, under the limitation and Mr. Dent yielded to Mr. Arnold Olsen, of Montana. Mr. H. R. Gross, of Iowa, objected and the Chairman stated "The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor and he may yield to whomever he pleases."

§ 31.8 Where debate has been limited on a pending amendment to a time certain and the Chair has divided the remaining time among those Members desiring to speak, a Member may, by unanimous consent, yield all his allotted time to another Member who may while remaining on his feet yield back to that Member for debate.

On June 24, 1971,⁽⁴⁾ the Committee of the Whole was proceeding under a limitation on five-minute debate, and Chairman Thomas G. Abernethy, of Mis-

4. 117 CONG. REC. 21884, 92d Cong. 1st Sess.

issippi, had divided the remaining time among those Members desiring to speak. A point of order was made against use of such time by yielding:

MR. [JOHN B.] ANDERSON of Illinois: Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me his time. . . .

MR. [JAMES H.] SCHEUER [of New York]: Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. ANDERSON of Illinois: I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Scheuer).

MR. SCHEUER: Mr. Chairman, I think it is beneath the dignity of our great Nation to renege and welsch on its dues. There are many gentlemen in this Chamber who have had more experience with international organizations than I, but I have had some. Before I was a Congressman, I attended international organization meetings as a delegate on housing and planning—

MR. [H. R.] GROSS [of Iowa]: Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from New York (Mr. Scheuer) is out of order at this time.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. Scheuer) yielded his time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Anderson).

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will state that what happened was that the gentleman from New York (Mr. Scheuer) yielded his time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Anderson). Therefore the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Anderson) has control of the time.

§ 31.9 Where debate under the five-minute rule has been

limited to 10 minutes by unanimous consent, with the final five minutes reserved to the committee, the Chair divides the first five minutes among those Members indicating a desire to speak, and a Member recognized during that time may yield to other Members for debate.

On May 18, 1972,⁽⁵⁾ the Committee of the Whole agreed to a unanimous-consent request by Mr. John J. Rooney, of New York, that debate under the five-minute rule be limited to 10 minutes, with the last five minutes reserved to the reporting committee (Committee on Appropriations). Chairman Richard Bolling, of Missouri, ruled that a Member recognized during the first five minutes could yield to others for debate:

THE CHAIRMAN: As one of the two Members standing when the unanimous-consent request was agreed to the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Yates).

MR. [ROBERT L. F.] SIKES [of Florida]: Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to get recognition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Time for debate has been fixed. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Yates) for 5 minutes.

MR. [SIDNEY R.] YATES: Does the gentleman from Florida desire to share my time?

5. 118 CONG. REC. 18025, 18026, 92d Cong. 2d Sess.

MR. SIKES: Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. It was my understanding that the time was fixed with the last 5 minutes reserved to the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the gentleman from Illinois yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

MR. YATES: I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

MR. SIKES: Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding the time had been fixed, with the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee. Presumably that time would be controlled by the chairman of the subcommittee.

THE CHAIRMAN: There will be 5 minutes remaining after the time of the gentleman from Illinois.

MR. ROONEY of New York: Mr. Chairman, may I say it is my understanding there would be 10 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from New York propounded a unanimous-consent request that at the conclusion of the remarks by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Fascell) the time be limited to 10 minutes and that 5 minutes be reserved to the committee. The unanimous-consent request was granted. There were two Members standing, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Yates) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. Rooney).

The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Illinois, and the time is now running. If the gentleman cares to yield to any Member, that is his privilege.

§ 31.10 Where by unanimous consent debate on a pending amendment in Committee of the Whole has been equally

divided between the proponent and an opponent of the amendment, those Members control all the remaining time and the Chair does not divide the time among Members standing.

During consideration of the military procurement authorization for fiscal year 1983 (H.R. 6030) in the Committee of the Whole on July 21, 1982,⁽⁶⁾ the Chair responded to inquiries regarding recognition for debate time. The proceedings were as follows:

MR. [SAMUEL S.] STRATTON [of New York]: Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield for a unanimous-consent request. After consultation with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks) and with Members on our side, I would like to ask unanimous consent that we agree to vote on the Dicks amendment and all amendments thereto at 7 o'clock, with 1 hour of debate to be controlled by the gentleman from Washington and 1 hour of debate to be controlled by the Member from New York representing the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE:⁽⁷⁾ The request is for 2 hours of debate time equally divided between the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. Stratton)?

MR. STRATTON: That is correct.

6. 128 CONG. REC. 17345, 97th Cong. 2d Sess.

7. Les AuCoin (Oreg.).

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MR. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry. . . .

[I]f time is to be controlled by the gentleman from Washington and by myself, is it required that those who wish to participate should stand at this time?

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The recognition of Members is totally at the discretion of the managers of the time.

MR. [ROBERT E.] BADHAM [of California]: Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry. . . .

Am I given to understand that on this side we have no time; we are not able to have any time? . . .

[T]he gentleman from Washington has 1 hour and the gentleman from New York has 1 hour. I was inquiring as to what time this side had.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: Under the unanimous-consent request the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks) is recognized for 1 hour, and under the same unanimous-consent request the gentleman from New York (Mr. Stratton) is recognized for 1 hour.

Both managers of time may yield to members of the minority or members of the majority.

—Yielding Time Allocated Is by Unanimous Consent

§ 31.11 Where time for debate on an amendment and all amendments thereto has been limited and the time remaining has been allocated

by the Chairman to Members seeking recognition, a Member may, by unanimous consent yield his time to another Member but a motion to that effect is not in order.

On June 25, 1975,⁽⁸⁾ during consideration of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations for fiscal year 1976 (H.R. 8069) in the Committee of the Whole, Mr. Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania, made a motion as follows:

MR. FLOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close . . . in 10 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽⁹⁾ The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. . . .

So the motion was agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Members standing at the time the motion was made will be recognized for approximately one-half minute each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. Downey).

MR. [THOMAS J.] DOWNEY of New York: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey)....

MR. [JOHN M.] ASHBROOK [of Ohio]: Mr. Chairman, I object to any yielding.

THE CHAIRMAN: Objection is heard.

The gentleman from New York will be given the opportunity to speak for 30 seconds.

MR. DOWNEY of New York: Mr. Chairman, I move that my time be given to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey).

THE CHAIRMAN: That is an improper motion. The Chair would suggest that the gentleman from New York might yield for a question to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

MR. [DAVID R.] OBEY [of Wisconsin]: Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. DOWNEY of New York: I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Unanimous Consent Required if Member Yielded to Speaks on Matter Not Relevant

§ 31.12 A Member who has been recognized under the five-minute rule may yield all or a portion of his time to another Member for the purpose of debate, but a Member yielded to may speak out of order, on a matter not relevant to the pending measure or amendment, by unanimous consent only.

On Apr. 28, 1983,⁽¹⁰⁾ during consideration of House Joint Resolution 13 (nuclear weapons freeze)

8. 121 CONG. REC. 20839, 94th Cong. 1st Sess.

9. James C. Wright, Jr. (Tex.).

10. 129 CONG. REC. 10432, 10433, 98th Cong. 1st Sess.

in the Committee of the Whole, the following exchange occurred:

MR. [JAMES G.] MARTIN of North Carolina: Will the gentleman yield?

MR. [CLEMENT J.] ZABLOCKI [of Wisconsin]: Mr. Chairman, I already promised to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Gonzalez) to speak out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹¹⁾ Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Gonzalez) is recognized for the balance of the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

MR. [NEWT] GINGRICH [of Georgia]: Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

MR. GINGRICH: Does the gentleman have the power to yield that time out of order for that purpose?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would advise that the gentleman may by unanimous consent yield to another Member to speak out of order.

MR. GINGRICH: I object, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Zablocki) has 4½ minutes remaining. . . .

MR. [HENRY B.] GONZALEZ [of Texas]: Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

MR. GONZALEZ: Mr. Chairman, this request does not require unanimous consent, does it?

THE CHAIRMAN: If the gentleman from Wisconsin yielded to the gen-

tleman from Texas, no unanimous consent is required, as long as the debate relates to the pending amendment.

Two Members Shared Time Yielded

§ 31.13 On one occasion in the Committee of the Whole, two Members were recognized jointly for general debate and shared the time yielded them by the Members controlling the time, the acting chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

On May 12, 1958,⁽¹²⁾ John M. Vorys, of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and Mr. Thomas E. Morgan, of Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member, yielded time as follows in general debate on a bill under their control:

MR. VORYS: Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as may be necessary to announce the next part of general debate.

Our colleagues from the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Carnahan] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Merrow], have gone all over the United States talking to thousands of people, explaining with charts what this program is about. We asked them to do it before our committee and we were so impressed that

11. Matthew F. McHugh (N.Y.).

12. 104 CONG. REC. 8429, 85th Cong. 2d Sess.

we have asked them to do it for the Committee of the Whole today; and it is for that purpose I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Merrow]. I understand a similar amount of time will be yielded to the gentleman from Missouri, so that they may give us this explanation from the charts that has been so useful.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹³⁾ The gentleman from New Hampshire is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri for 25 minutes.

The gentleman from Missouri may proceed.

MR. [ALBERT S. J.] CARNAHAN: Mr. Chairman, of the 25 minutes allotted to me I now allot to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Merrow], such part of it as he may use, and I ask that he now come to the floor.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from New Hampshire has 20 minutes time in his own right.

MR. CARNAHAN: Mr. Chairman, neither of us is going to use the entire time allotted to us in one continuous speech. We are going to talk back and forth and it is his intention to yield a portion of his time to me.

With the assistance of several charts we have here the gentleman from New Hampshire and I will attempt to explain some of the issues involved in the mutual-security program as we have been attempting to explain the program in several sections of the country. We are not going to speak simulta-

neously, although that might be doing you a favor, for we would get through a little sooner. At this time I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Yielding Time on Motion To Discharge

§ 31.14 A Member recognized for debate in opposition to a motion to discharge a committee may yield a portion of his time to other Members.

On Dec. 13, 1937,⁽¹⁴⁾ Mr. Edward E. Cox, of Georgia, recognized for 10 minutes of debate in opposition to a motion to discharge, yielded his full 10 minutes to another Member after Speaker William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, stated that he could yield all or part of his time, the proponents of the motion having the right to open and close debate.

§ 31.15 A Member recognized to control half of the 20 minutes' debate on a motion to discharge may yield any part of it.

On June 15, 1960,⁽¹⁵⁾ the House was considering a motion to discharge called up by Mr. T. Ashton Thompson, of Louisiana. Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, stated he

14. 82 CONG. REC. 1387, 75th Cong. 2d Sess.

15. 106 CONG. REC. 12691-93, 86th Cong. 2d Sess.

13. Hale Boggs (La.).

would, pursuant to Rule XXVII providing for 10 minutes for and 10 minutes against the motion, recognize Mr. Thompson and Mr. Edward H. Rees, of Kansas, for that purpose.

In response to parliamentary inquiries, the Speaker stated that Mr. Thompson and Mr. Rees could yield any part of their 10 minutes that they desired.

§ 31.16 A Member recognized in opposition to a motion to discharge a committee may not yield his time for debate to another to be yielded by the other Member.

On June 11, 1945,⁽¹⁶⁾ Mr. Edward E. Cox, of Georgia, was recognized by Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, for 10 minutes in opposition to a motion to discharge a committee. Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, asked Mr. Cox to yield him the balance of his time and Mr. Cox stated he would so yield if no other members of the reporting committee desired time. Mr. Rankin then inquired of the Speaker whether he would be permitted to yield the time yielded him as he saw fit. The Speaker responded that Mr. Cox and not Mr. Rankin had control of the time.

16. 91 CONG. REC. 5892, 5895, 5896, 79th Cong. 1st Sess.

Previous Question Terminates Time Yielded to Minority

§ 31.17 The Member recognized to control one hour of debate in the House may, by moving the previous question, terminate utilization of debate time he has previously yielded to the minority.

On Mar. 9, 1977,⁽¹⁷⁾ it was demonstrated that a Member calling up a privileged resolution in the House may move the previous question at any time, notwithstanding his prior allocation of debate time to another Member:

THE SPEAKER:⁽¹⁸⁾ The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Bolling) is recognized for 1 hour.

MR. [RICHARD] BOLLING [of Missouri]: Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Anderson), for the minority, pending which I yield myself 5 minutes. . . .

Mr. Speaker, the other amendment that the gentleman offers proposes to give the House the opportunity to vote up or down in a certain period of time regulations proposed by the select committee. What that does, and it really demonstrates an almost total lack of understanding of the rules, is to upgrade regulations into rules. The Members of the House will have the opportunity to deal with all laws and rules. That is provided in the resolution. . . .

17. 123 CONG. REC. 6816, 95th Cong. 1st Sess.

18. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (Mass.).

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. . . .

MR. [JOHN B.] ANDERSON of Illinois: I have time remaining. Do I not have a right to respond to the gentleman from Missouri?

THE SPEAKER: Not if the previous question has been moved, and it has been moved.

MR. ANDERSON of Illinois: Even though the gentleman mentioned my name and made numerous references to me for the last 10 minutes?

THE SPEAKER: The Chair is aware of that.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

Member Who Offered Preferential Motion To Dispose of Senate Amendment Does Not Move Previous Question

§ 31.18 A Member who has offered a pending preferential motion to dispose of a Senate amendment in disagreement may not, during time yielded to him for debate only, move the previous question on his motion, thereby depriving the Members in charge of control of the time.

The proceedings of Dec. 4, 1975, during consideration of the conference report on H.R. 8069, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal 1976, are discussed in §33.12, *infra*.

Yielding Yielded Time

§ 31.19 Where a Member is yielded time in the House for debate only, he may not yield to a third Member for purposes other than debate.

On Aug. 10, 1970,⁽¹⁹⁾ Speaker Pro Tempore Chet Holifield, of California, answered a parliamentary inquiry on the yielding of time for debate:

MR. GERALD R. FORD [of Michigan]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

MR. GERALD R. FORD: As I recollect, Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths] yielded to the gentleman from New York only for the purpose of debate.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: That is right.

MRS. [MARTHA W.] GRIFFITHS: That is right.

MR. GERALD R. FORD: Now, if the gentleman from New York yields time to any one or more Members, is he yielding solely on that basis as well?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair will state that would be the situation.

MR. GERALD R. FORD: In other words, the gentleman cannot yield for any other purpose except debate?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair will state that that is a correct interpretation of the situation.

¹⁹ 116 CONG. REC. 28005, 28006, 91st Cong. 2d Sess.

§ 31.20 The Member who controls the time under the hour rule may yield a specific amount of time to another Member, and, although the latter may yield for debate, he may not (except by unanimous consent) yield a specific amount of time.

On Feb. 27, 1963,⁽²⁰⁾ Mr. Samuel N. Friedel, of Maryland, called up at the direction of the Committee on House Administration a privileged resolution providing funds for another House committee. Mr. Friedel was recognized for one hour.

Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, answered a parliamentary inquiry on the control of time:

MR. [CHARLES A.] HALLECK [of Indiana]: As I understand it, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Friedel] has said that he would yield time to Members on the minority side, and that is what we want. If there is another minority Member who wants to be recognized at this time, it would be in order under the rules for that Member to be granted time in order that he might make such statement as he might want to make.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state that under the rules of the House and pursuant to custom that has existed from time immemorial, on a resolution

of this kind the Member in charge of the resolution has control of the time and he, in turn, yields time. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Friedel] in charge of the resolution has yielded 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio. If the gentleman from Ohio desires to yield to some other Member, he may do so but he may not yield a specific amount of time.⁽¹⁾

—Unanimous Consent Required

§ 31.21 A Member to whom a specific amount of time is yielded for debate under the hour rule may, in turn, yield a portion of that allotted time to a third Member, but only by unanimous consent.

On Aug. 10, 1970,⁽²⁾ Mrs. Martha W. Griffiths, of Michigan, recognized under the hour rule, yielded to Mr. Emanuel Celler, of New York, for 15 minutes, who yielded for seven minutes to Mr. William M. McCulloch, of Ohio, who yielded for five minutes to Mr. Charles E. Wiggins, of California.

Speaker Pro Tempore Chet Holifield, of California, ruled, in response to a point of order by Mr. H. R. Gross, of Iowa, that Mr. Celler was in control of the 15

1. See also 86 CONG. REC. 4861–63, 76th Cong. 3d Sess., Apr. 22, 1940.

2. 116 CONG. REC. 28005, 28006, 91st Cong. 2d Sess.

20. 109 CONG. REC. 3051, 3052, 88th Cong. 1st Sess.

minutes and that specific times could be yielded to other Members.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentlewoman from Michigan has yielded 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Celler). The gentleman from New York has control of his 15 minutes. He may yield to the gentleman from Ohio, and the Chair will notify the gentleman from New York when the gentleman from Ohio has consumed 7 minutes.

The gentleman from New York must remain on his feet, and he may yield to whomever he wishes.

MR. CELLER: That I will do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. McCULLOCH: That I will do also, Mr. Speaker.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Wiggins).

MR. GROSS: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

MR. GROSS: Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this: May the gentleman yield to a third party?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair will state that he may do so only by unanimous consent.⁽³⁾

§ 31.22 The Member in charge of a bill yielded one-half the time to a minority Member and the latter was permitted by unanimous consent to allocate that time.

3. See also 86 CONG. REC. 4861-63, 76th Cong. 3d Sess., Apr. 22, 1940.

On Mar. 12, 1963,⁽⁴⁾ Mr. Emanuel Celler, of New York, asked unanimous consent for the consideration in the House of H.R. 4374, bestowing honorary citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill. Mr. H. R. Gross, of Iowa, inquired under a reservation of objection whether some time for debate would be extended to the minority, and Mr. Celler assured him it would.

The House then agreed to the following unanimous-consent request by Mr. Celler:

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff], and that he may yield such time as he desires.

Parliamentarian's Note: Richard H. Poff was a Member of the minority.

§ 31.23 While the minority member of the Committee on Rules to whom one-half the debate time is yielded may customarily yield portions of that time to other Members without remaining on his feet, another Member to whom a portion of time is yielded may in turn yield blocks of that time only by unanimous consent.

4. 109 CONG. REC. 3993, 88th Cong. 1st Sess.

On Jan. 29, 1976,⁽⁵⁾ during consideration of House Resolution 982 (authorizing the Select Committee on Intelligence to file its final report) the following proceedings occurred:

H. RES. 982

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Intelligence have until midnight Friday, January 30, 1976, to file its report pursuant to section 8 of House Resolution 591, and that the Select Committee on Intelligence have until midnight, Wednesday, February 11, 1976, to file a supplemental report containing the select committee's recommendations.

With the following committee amendment:

Committee amendment: On page 1, after the first sentence, add the following:

Resolved further, That the Select Committee on Intelligence shall not release any report containing materials, information, data, or subjects that presently bear security classification, unless and until such reports are published with appropriate security markings and distributed only to persons authorized to receive such classified information. . . .

THE SPEAKER:⁽⁶⁾ The gentleman from Texas (Mr. Young) is recognized for 1 hour.

MR. [JOHN] YOUNG of Texas: . . . Mr. Speaker, I have agreed to yield 15 minutes en bloc to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Bolling), on the Committee on Rules. Again I say, I yield for the purpose of debate only.

MR. [RICHARD] BOLLING [of Missouri]: Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Young) to yield me 15 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield, for debate, to other Members a portion of that 15 minutes without remaining on my feet.

THE SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

§ 31.24 A Member in control of time for general debate in Committee of the Whole may yield a block of time up to one hour to another Member, but that Member in turn may yield a block of time to a third Member without remaining on his feet only by unanimous consent.

The following proceedings occurred in the Committee of the Whole on May 4, 1981,⁽⁷⁾ during consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 115 (pertaining to the Congressional budget):

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽⁸⁾ When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, May 1, 1981, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Jones) had 2 hours and 59 minutes of general debate remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Latta) had 4 hours and 13 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Jones).

5. 122 CONG. REC. 1632, 94th Cong. 2d Sess.

6. Carl Albert (Okla.).

7. 127 CONG. REC. 8331, 97th Cong. 1st Sess.

8. Martin Frost (Tex.).

MR. [JAMES R.] JONES of Oklahoma: Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 hour to the gentleman from California (Mr. Panetta).

MR. [LEON E.] PANETTA [of California]: Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes. . . .

Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. de la Garza), chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. de la Garza) is recognized for 9 minutes.

There was no objection.

Parliamentarian's Note: The exception to this rule is in the case of general debate on economic goals and policies during debate on the first budget resolution, where the manager may yield for more than an hour to another Member, who may yield blocks of time to Members without remaining standing.

§ 31.25 Where all time for general debate in Committee of the Whole is equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee reporting a bill, a Member to whom a block of time is yielded may not in turn yield a portion of that time to a third Member but must remain on his feet when yielding (except by unanimous consent).

During consideration of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (H.R. 3982) in the Committee of the Whole on June 25, 1981,⁽⁹⁾ the following exchange occurred:

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE:⁽¹⁰⁾ Does the gentleman from Florida wish to retain the floor?

MR. [CHARLES E.] BENNETT [of Florida]: Yes, I retain the floor, and I yield back as much time as I can to the Agriculture Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The Chair will advise the gentleman that if that is the case, the gentleman must remain standing. . . .

The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Simon): How much time has the gentleman granted to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. de la Garza)?

MR. [PAUL] SIMON [of Illinois]: My understanding is that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Bennett) yielded his time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. de la Garza).

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: Under the amended rule, all the time is controlled by the gentleman from Illinois as a member of the Budget Committee.

§ 31.26 Where a special rule adopted by the House divides control of general debate in Committee of the Whole between the chairman and ranking minority member of

9. 127 CONG. REC. 14093, 97th Cong. 1st Sess.

10. Gerry E. Studds (Mass.).

the committee reporting the bill, time yielded to third Members must be utilized or yielded back and may only be reserved for allocation by such third Members by unanimous consent.

During consideration of the Olympic Coin Act (S. 1230) in the Committee of the Whole on May 20, 1982,⁽¹¹⁾ the following proceedings occurred:

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹²⁾ Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. St Germain) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Wylie) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. St Germain).

MR. [FERNAND J.] ST GERMAIN [of Rhode Island]: Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half hour to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Annunzio). . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Annunzio) has consumed 12 minutes.

The Chair would inquire of the gentleman from Rhode Island, would he be amenable to yielding further at a later time to the gentleman from Illinois?

MR. ST GERMAIN: I yielded the gentleman 30 minutes under our agreement.

The gentleman from Illinois may proceed and have his other speakers speak. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would observe from a procedural point of view that the gentleman has been yielded 30 minutes which he may use now or yield back as he so desires.

MR. [FRANK] ANNUNZIO [of Illinois]: Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman is not able to reserve the balance of the time yielded to him by the gentleman from Rhode Island unless the gentleman from Rhode Island agrees to yield further at a later time.

MR. [CHALMERS P.] WYLIE [of Ohio]: Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. . . .

What I had intended to do was yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Paul), who takes a similar position as the gentleman from Illinois. I understand the gentleman from Illinois' position and my parliamentary inquiry is, may I yield 30 minutes of my time, which I had agreed to do, to the gentleman from Texas at this time and allow the gentleman from Illinois to use his 30 minutes in exchange with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Paul)?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair in response would advise the gentleman from Ohio that while he may yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Paul), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Paul) may use that time but may not reserve portions of that time for subsequent yielding except by unanimous consent. . . .

Does the gentleman from Illinois ask unanimous consent to be able to yield portions of the remaining 18 minutes he has available to him at subsequent times during the course of the general debate?

11. 128 CONG. REC. 10766, 10767, 97th Cong. 2d Sess.

12. Elliott H. Levitas (Ga.).

MR. ANNUNZIO: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

—Debate on Conference Report

§ 31.27 It is contrary to the usual practice for a Member in charge of a conference report to yield time to other Members to be in turn yielded by them.

On July 27, 1939,⁽¹³⁾ Mr. Compton I. White, of Idaho, in charge of the hour of debate on a conference report, attempted to yield to Mr. Charles Hawks, Jr., of Wisconsin, for 20 minutes, to be allocated “on his side.” Speaker William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, stated:

It is contrary to the usual practice for the chairman of a conference to yield time to other Members to be in turn yielded by them. The gentleman may yield such time as he desires to individual Members.

Mr. White withdrew his yielding of time and yielded to Mr. Hawks for five minutes.

13. 84 CONG. REC. 10220, 76th Cong. 1st Sess. The current rule governing division of debate time on a conference report is found in Rule XXVIII, cl. 2(a), *House Rules and Manual* §912a (1995).

Offeror of Motion To Instruct Conferees

§ 31.28 Under a former practice, the Member moving to instruct House managers at a conference had one hour of debate at his disposal and could yield time as he desired.

On Aug. 9, 1949,⁽¹⁴⁾ the House adopted a resolution taking from the Speaker’s table a House bill with Senate amendments, disagreeing to the amendments, and agreeing to a conference requested by the Senate. Mr. Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, then offered a motion to instruct the House managers to insist on disagreement to a certain Senate amendment. In response to a parliamentary inquiry, Speaker Pro Tempore J. Percy Priest, of Tennessee, stated that Mr. Cannon was entitled to one hour on his motion with the right to yield time as he desired.

§ 31.29 The offeror of a motion to instruct conferees controls one hour of debate and may yield half of that time to an opponent.

14. 95 CONG. REC. 11139–45, 81st Cong. 1st Sess. This precedent preceded the rule dividing time on a motion to instruct. See Rule XXVIII, cl. 1(b), *House Rules and Manual* §909a (1995).

During consideration of House Joint Resolution 372 (public debt limit increase) in the House on Oct. 11, 1985,⁽¹⁵⁾ a motion was made by Robert H. Michel, of Illinois, as follows:

MR. MICHEL: Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Michel moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes on the two Houses on the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 372, be instructed to promptly report amendments to the Budget Control and Impoundment Act which provide mechanisms for deficit reductions, including specific and mandatory budget goals for achieving a balanced budget within the next 6 years.

THE SPEAKER:⁽¹⁶⁾ The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Michel) is recognized for 1 hour.

MR. MICHEL: Mr. Speaker, I would not expect to use the complete hour.

THE SPEAKER: Will the gentleman yield a half hour to the Democratic side?

MR. MICHEL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 15 minutes for the moment and 15 minutes for our side and let us see where we go.

THE SPEAKER: Does the gentleman want to ask unanimous consent that the debate be 30 minutes instead of 1 hour?

15. 131 CONG. REC. 27366, 27367, 99th Cong. 1st Sess.

16. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (Mass.).

The debate on a motion to instruct is now divided by Rule XXVIII, *House Rules and Manual* §909a (1995).

MR. MICHEL: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to do anything that is going to upset some Members here, but if we can put a little bit of restraint—

THE SPEAKER: Does the gentleman intend to yield equal time to the opponents of the motion, if there is opposition?

MR. MICHEL: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly intend that the time be equally divided.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Michel) is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rostenkowski) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Additional Time Is Obtained From Members in Control, Not by Unanimous Consent

§ 31.30 During general debate in Committee of the Whole of a bill being considered under a special rule providing that the time be controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee reporting the bill, additional time must be yielded by the members controlling the time and may not be obtained by unanimous consent.

On June 2, 1975,⁽¹⁷⁾ during consideration of the Voting Rights Act extension (H.R. 6219) in the

17. 121 CONG. REC. 16285, 16286, 94th Cong. 1st Sess.

Committee of the Whole, the following proceedings occurred:

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The time of the gentleman has expired.

MR. [HENRY B.] GONZALEZ [of Texas]: Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The Chair will state that the gentleman from California (Mr. Edwards) has control of the time. Does the gentleman from California wish to yield additional time to the gentleman from Texas? . . .

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The time of the gentleman has expired.

MR. GONZALEZ: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman will suspend. The Chair must advise the gentleman that under the rule that request is not in order.

Charging Time Yielded for Parliamentary Inquiry

§ 31.31 Where a Member to whom time has been yielded for general debate poses a parliamentary inquiry, the time consumed to answer the inquiry is deducted from his time for debate.

On Sept. 25, 1975,⁽¹⁸⁾ the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole responded to a parliamentary inquiry, as follows:

MR. [EDWARD J.] DERWINSKI [of Illinois]: Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes

18. 121 CONG. REC. 30196, 94th Cong. 1st Sess.

to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Buchanan).

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

MR. [JOHN] BUCHANAN [of Alabama]: Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹⁹⁾ The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

MR. BUCHANAN: May I ask whether the making of this parliamentary inquiry is taken out of my time?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will state that it will be taken out of the gentleman's time.

Member Offering Motion To Recommend Striking Enacting Clause May Yield Part of Time

§ 31.32 A Member offering a motion in the Committee of the Whole that the Committee rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken may yield part of his time to another while he has the floor, but he may not yield all of his five minutes of debate to another to discuss the motion.

On Sept. 27, 1945,⁽²⁰⁾ Chairman Aime J. Forand, of Rhode Island,

19. J. Edward Roush (Ind.).

20. 91 CONG. REC. 9095, 79th Cong. 1st Sess.

ruled as follows on the yielding of time under the five-minute rule:

MR. [ANDREW J.] MAY [of Kentucky]: Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. May moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill, H.R. 2948, back forthwith to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

MR. MAY: Mr. Chairman, I yield my 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, if I may.

MR. [ROBERT] RAMSPECK [of Georgia]: The gentleman cannot do that, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: He can yield time while he is holding the floor.

MR. MAY: I yield part of my time, then, to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Member Opposed to Motion To Strike Enacting Clause May Not Extend Time Beyond Five Minutes by Using Yielded Time

§ 31.33 Debate on the preferential motion to strike the enacting clause is limited to two five-minute speeches, and the Member recognized in opposition to the motion may not extend his time by using time yielded to him by unanimous consent under an allocation of time on the remainder of the bill.

During debate in the Committee of the Whole on an appropriation

for public works for water and power development and energy research (H.R. 8122) on June 24, 1975,⁽¹⁾ the following proceedings occurred:

MR. [JOE L.] EVINS of Tennessee: Mr. Chairman, I now move that all debate on the remaining portion of the bill and all amendments thereto conclude in 30 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽²⁾ The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Evins). . . .

So the motion was agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Members standing at the time the motion was made will be recognized for 40 seconds each. . . .

MR. [SILVIO O.] CONTE [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Conte moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Conte) for 5 minutes. . . .

MR. [EDWARD P.] BOLAND [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

(By unanimous consent, Messrs. Perkins, James V. Stanton, Moakley, and Burke of Massachusetts yielded their time to Mr. Boland). . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair will advise the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Boland, that

1. 121 CONG. REC. 20618, 20619, 94th Cong. 1st Sess.
2. Richard H. Ichord (Mo.).

the Chair will now put the question on the preferential motion, and after that time the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Boland) for the remainder of the time.

The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Conte).

The preferential motion was rejected.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Boland) for 2 additional minutes.

Member in Control Under Reservation of Objection May Yield

§ 31.34 Debate under a reservation of objection to a unanimous-consent request is controlled by the Member reserving the right to object.

On Sept. 30, 1976,⁽³⁾ Mr. Jack Brooks, of Texas, made the following motion with respect to a Senate amendment to H.R. 13367, extending the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972:

MR. BROOKS: Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Brooks moves that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment to the House bill (H.R. 13367) to extend and amend the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 and for

other purposes, with an amendment as follows: . . .

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: . . .

SEC. 5. Extension of Program and Funding

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 105 (relating to funding for revenue sharing) is amended—

(1) by inserting “or (c)” immediately after “as provided in subsection (b)” in subsection (a)(1): . . .

MR. BROOKS (during the reading): Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the Record.

THE SPEAKER:⁽⁴⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

MR. [FRANK] HORTON [of New York]: Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Brown) has reserved a point of order against the amendment.

Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to make the point of order?

MR. HORTON: Mr. Speaker, I am reserving the right to object on the unanimous-consent request to have the motion considered as read.

I wanted to ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks) whether he is going to explain the motion to the House.

MR. BROOKS: Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I look forward to that opportunity to explain it as my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Horton) desires.

MR. [CLARENCE J.] BROWN of Ohio: Mr. Speaker, my reservation of the

3. 122 CONG. REC. 34080, 34085, 94th Cong. 2d Sess.

4. Carl Albert (Okla.).

point of order relates to the fact that I have not seen the amendment of the gentleman; and if suspension of the reading of the amendment is to be undertaken, that is, if we are not going to hear it, there will be some necessity for me, in order to be able to make a point of order, to see the amendment or to hear an explanation of it from the gentleman from Texas. I would like to see the amendment, if I could.

MR. BROOKS: Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. BROWN of Ohio: I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas on my reservation of objection.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Texas can make his explanation under the reservation of objection which has already been made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Horton), of the reservation of objection of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Brown). . . . Does the gentleman from Texas desire to make a brief explanation of the amendment? If not, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Brown) desires to have the amendment read.

MR. BROOKS: Mr. Speaker, as soon as I am recognized, I will be pleased to explain the amendment in detail.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state that at this time the gentleman from Texas can be recognized only if the gentleman from Ohio yields under his reservation.

MR. BROWN of Ohio: I yield.

Time Yielded Back Reverts to Member in Control

§ 31.35 A Member to whom time was yielded under the hour rule in the House may

not, except by unanimous consent, reserve a portion of that time to himself; the unused time reverts to the Member controlling the hour who may subsequently yield further time to that Member.

The following proceedings occurred in the House on Feb. 8, 1972,⁽⁵⁾ during consideration of House Resolution 164 (creating a select committee on privacy, human values, and democratic institutions):

MR. [RAY J.] MADDEN [of Indiana]: Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 164 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 164 . . .

Whereas the full significance and the effects of technology on society and on the operations of industry and Government are largely unknown. . . .

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on Privacy, Human Values, and Democratic Institutions. . . .

MR. MADDEN: Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Gallagher).

MR. [CORNELIUS E.] GALLAGHER [of New Jersey]: Mr. Speaker, may I take 5 minutes now and reserve 5 minutes to the end of the debate since it is my bill?

5. 118 CONG. REC. 3181-84, 92d Cong. 2d Sess.

THE SPEAKER:⁽⁶⁾ The gentleman may do that. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. [DURWARD G.] HALL [of Missouri]: Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object . . . is it in order to have a unanimous-consent request at a time like this when the time is controlled by the members of the Committee on Rules . . . ?

MR. GALLAGHER: . . . It was my understanding that I would have the time at the conclusion of debate.

MR. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I submit this is between the gentleman and the man handling the rule, and therefore I must object.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will notify the gentleman when 5 minutes are up. . . .

The gentleman from New Jersey has consumed 5 minutes.

MR. GALLAGHER: Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

THE SPEAKER: . . . The gentleman from Indiana has control of the time. . . .

If the gentleman from Indiana desires to yield further time at this time he can do so.

§ 31.36 Debate time yielded back by a Member to whom time was yielded under the hour rule reverts to the Member in control of the hour.

During consideration of House Resolution 97 (to seat Richard D. McIntyre as a Member from Indiana) in the House on Mar. 4,

6. Carl Albert (Okla.).

1985,⁽⁷⁾ the following proceedings occurred:

MR. [ROBERT H.] MICHEL [of Illinois]: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 97) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 97

Whereas a certificate of election to the House of Representatives always carries with it the presumption that the State election procedures have been timely, regular, and fairly implemented; and . . .

Whereas the presumption of the validity and regularity of the certificate of election held by Richard D. McIntyre has not been overcome by any substantial evidence or claim of irregularity; Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker is hereby authorized and directed to administer the oath of office to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Richard D. McIntyre.

Resolved, That the question of the final right of Mr. McIntyre to a seat in the 99th Congress is referred to the Committee on House Administration.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽⁸⁾ . . . The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Alexander).

MR. [WILLIAM V.] ALEXANDER [of Arkansas]: Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on House Administration. . . .

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman is entitled to 1 hour under

7. 131 CONG. REC. 4277, 4282, 4283, 99th Cong, 1st Sess.

8. James C. Wright, Jr. (Tex.).

that motion, during which time the gentleman from Arkansas controls the time. . . .

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I would yield 30 minutes for purposes of debate only, to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Michel). . . .

MR. MICHEL: Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. . . .

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 10 minutes. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Michel) has 20 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Alexander) has 10 minutes remaining.

Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to yield additional time?

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

MR. ALEXANDER: How much time do I have remaining?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman has 25 minutes remaining.

MR. ALEXANDER: I thank the Chair.

MR. MICHEL: Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right with one remaining speaker.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman yielded back the balance of his time.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Let the Chair state that the gentleman from Illinois—the Chair understood the gentleman from Illinois to yield back the balance of his time.

Majority Leader Recognized on Privileged Resolution Yielded One-half Time to Minority Leader

§ 31.37 Where the Majority Leader was recognized for

one hour of debate on a privileged resolution creating an ad hoc legislative committee pursuant to Rule X, clause 5(c), he yielded one-half of the time to the Minority Leader.

Proceedings in the House relating to consideration of House Resolution 508 (creating an ad hoc committee on energy) on Apr. 21, 1977,⁽⁹⁾ were as follows:

MR. [JAMES C.] WRIGHT [Jr., of Texas]: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 508

Resolved, (a) that pursuant to rule X, clause 5, the Speaker is authorized to establish an Ad Hoc Committee on Energy to consider and report to the House on the message of the President dated April 20, 1977. . . .

THE SPEAKER:⁽¹⁰⁾ The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Wright).

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

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. This resolution authorizes the Speaker to appoint an ad hoc committee to

9. 123 CONG. REC. 11550, 95th Cong. 1st Sess.

10. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (Mass.).

receive the messages and the recommendations of the President of the United States with respect to the energy problems of this country. . . .

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, or such part of that time as he may consume, and reserve to myself the remainder of the time. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona for purposes of debate only.

More Than One Hour May Be Yielded Under Budget Act

§ 31.38 While normally the “hour” rule (clause 2 of Rule XIV) prohibits a Member controlling the floor from yielding more than one hour to another Member, a statutory provision constituting a House rule which specifically allocates larger amounts of time may permit more than one hour to be yielded.

Pursuant to section 305(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344, as amended by Public Law 95-523), a period of up to four hours for debate on economic goals and policies follows the presentation of opening statements on the first concurrent resolution on the budget by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. Thus, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget (or his designee managing

the resolution) may yield for more than one hour to another Member to control a portion of the time for such debate, which is equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority. The following exchange occurred on Apr. 30, 1981:⁽¹¹⁾

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹²⁾ The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Gephardt).

MR. [RICHARD A.] GEPHARDT [of Missouri]: It is my wish now to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Hawkins) for a discussion of the provisions of Humphrey-Hawkins which relate to this entire debate.

THE CHAIRMAN: How much time does the gentleman from Missouri wish to yield?

MR. GEPHARDT: It is my understanding under the previously arranged rule that I yield 4 hours; is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: Two hours, under the statute. Two on each side.

MR. GEPHARDT: I yield 2 hours to the gentleman from California (Mr. Hawkins).

Parliamentarian’s Note: Although section 305(a)(3) does not specify that the four hours of debate is equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority, such has been the practice, which is consistent with the management of other general debate on the resolution.

11. 127 CONG. REC. 8016, 97th Cong. 1st Sess.

12. Martin Frost (Tex.).

Special Order Speech—Yielding Portion of Time

§ 31.39 By unanimous consent, a Member recognized for one hour in the House for a “special-order speech” may yield a designated portion of that time to another Member, to be yielded in turn by that Member.

The following proceedings occurred in the House on July 17, 1985:⁽¹³⁾

MR. [WILLIAM F.] CLINGER [Jr., of Pennsylvania]: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be joined in this special order by my distinguished chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Howard), and by my distinguished leader of the Economic Development Subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Nowak).

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Howard) 30 minutes of my special order time.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽¹⁴⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MR. CLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I yield to my chairman.

MR. [JAMES J.] HOWARD [of New Jersey]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to yield a

portion of the time yielded to me by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Clinger) to other Members of the House.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Member Permitted by Unanimous Consent To Take Seat While Yielding

§ 31.40 A Member recognized to offer an amendment (to a substitute) under the five-minute rule was permitted, by unanimous consent, to take his seat while yielding to another Member for purposes of debate.

On July 28, 1983,⁽¹⁵⁾ during consideration of H.R. 2760 (prohibition on covert assistance to Nicaragua) in the Committee of the Whole, the following proceedings occurred:

MR. [EDWARD P.] BOLAND [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Boland to the amendment offered by Mr. Mica as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Young of Florida: . . .

MR. BOLAND: . . . Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Solarz).

13. 131 CONG. REC. 19474, 19475, 99th Cong. 1st Sess.

14. Richard A. Gephardt (Mo.).

15. 129 CONG. REC. 21413, 21414, 98th Cong. 1st Sess.

MR. [STEPHEN J.] SOLARZ [of New York]: Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding once more.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Boland) may sit while I engage in my remarks.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹⁶⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection. . . .

MR. [E. THOMAS] COLEMAN of Missouri: Mr. Chairman . . . does the gentleman have the time or does the chairman have the time?

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Boland) has the time.

MR. BOLAND: Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

MR. COLEMAN of Missouri: I yield.

MR. BOLAND: My understanding is that the gentleman from New York (Mr. Solarz) asked unanimous consent that I be permitted to sit and there was no objection to it. So I yielded the time to the gentleman from New York so he could continue.

§ 32. Interruption of Member With the Floor

A Member with the floor may not be interrupted, without his consent, for ordinary motions, inquiries, or questions of privilege.⁽¹⁷⁾ He may be interrupted by a point of order but is entitled to

16. William H. Natcher (Ky.).

17. See §§ 32.4–32.7, 32.14, *infra*.

the floor when the point of order is disposed of,⁽¹⁸⁾ unless the point of order is directed towards the failure of the Member with the floor to observe the rules of debate, in which case the Member may be called to order and required to take his seat.⁽¹⁹⁾ Messages and conference reports have interrupted Members in debate, usually by the request of the Chair that the Member speaking suspend his remarks.⁽²⁰⁾

A Member who seeks to interrupt another in debate, by requesting him to yield, should address the Chair and through the Chair gain the consent of the Member with the floor.⁽¹⁾

Cross References

Disorderly interruptions in debate, see § 42, *infra*.

Points of order interrupting consideration and debate, see Ch. 31, *infra*.

Quorum calls interrupting consideration and debate, see Ch. 20, *supra*.

Reception of messages, see Ch. 32, *infra*.

Yielding for interruptions, see §§ 29–31, *supra*.

18. See §§ 32.11–32.13, *infra*.

19. See §§ 33.1, 33.2, *infra*.

20. See § 32.18, *infra*.

1. See § 32.1, *infra*. Unauthorized interruptions may be stricken from the *Congressional Record* (see § 32.3, *infra*).