AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

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 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.

16. William H. Natcher (Ky.).

17. See §§ 32.4–32.7, 32.14, infra.

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).

Seeking Permission To Interrupt

§ 32.1 A Member desiring to interrupt another in debate should address the Chair for the permission of the Member speaking.

On June 29, 1956,[2] Chairman Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, sustained a point of order that a Member desiring to interrupt another in debate, by asking him to yield, should properly address the Chair for the permission of the Member speaking:

> MR. [RALPH W.] GWINN [of New York]: We had no exact testimony on the point before our committee.
>
> MR. [CLEVELAND M.] BAILEY [of West Virginia]: Will the gentleman yield?
>
> MR. GWINN: I would like to answer the question of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania first.
>
> MR. [CLARE E.] HOFFMAN of Michigan: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.
>
> THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state it.
>
> MR. HOFFMAN of Michigan: The point of order is that a Member who seeks recognition must first address the Chair rather than inquire of the Member whether he will yield or not.
>
> THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is sustained. The practice which has grown up here is not a good one. When a request is made for a Member to yield, the request should be made to the Chair and the Chair in turn submits the request to the speaker having the floor.

§ 32.2 A Member may interrupt another Member in debate only if the Member who has the floor yields for that purpose.

On Oct. 14, 1978,[3] the following exchange occurred in the Committee of the Whole:

> MR. PHILLIP BURTON [of California]: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Would the gentleman talk a little more slowly so we could absorb these very simple questions he is asking?
>
> THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:[4] The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Ashley) has the time.
>
> MR. PHILLIP BURTON: Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have another copy of these questions and answers?
>
> THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman from Texas (Mr. Charles Wilson) has the floor.
>
> MR. CHARLES WILSON of Texas: Mr. Speaker, I do not yield.
>
> MR. [JOHN D.] DINGELL [of Michigan]: Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
>
> MR. CHARLES WILSON of Texas: I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

—When Remarks of Member Interrupting May Be Stricken; Charging Time

§ 32.3 Where a Member interrupts another Member dur-

2. 102 CONG. REC. 11455, 84th Cong. 2d Sess.

3. 124 CONG. REC. 38378, 95th Cong. 2d Sess.

4. William H. Natcher (Ky.).

ing debate without being yielded to and without making a point of order, the time consumed by his remarks will not be charged against the debate time of the Member controlling the floor and his remarks will not be printed in the Record.

On Feb. 7, 1985,[5] the House had under consideration House Resolution 52, directing the prima facie seating of a Member-elect, who had been denied seating pending a committee report on the question of the final right to the seat in the 99th Congress. A motion was made to refer the resolution:

MR. [JAMES C.] WRIGHT [Jr., of Texas]: Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to refer.

THE SPEAKER:[6] The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Wright moves to refer the resolution to the Committee on House Administration.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Wright] is recognized for 1 hour.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Frenzel] or his designees, and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume. . . .

MR. [BILL] FRENZEL [of Minnesota]: Now, Mr. Speaker, there is not time to do everything. First let us talk about the 5,000 invalidated votes that Republicans stole; 96 percent of the invalidated votes in the recount were done by a recount commission appointed with 2-to-1 Democrats, by a Democrat judge, hardly a Republican shenanigan. . . .

This is a blockbuster vote. This is murder. This is a rape of a system. The issue is the ultimate abuse of representative government. We have an elected, certified Member. . . .

[Mr. Wright interjected remarks at this point.]

MR. FRENZEL: Mr. Speaker, I did not yield to the gentleman. Was he making a point of order?

THE SPEAKER: The Chair would probably understand, as does the gentleman, what the gentleman from Texas was doing. He was questioning whether the words should be taken down or not. But no point of order was made.

The gentleman from Minnesota will continue.

MR. FRENZEL: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Speaker if I might get an appropriate amount of time extra, as the gentleman from Texas did?

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will continue.

MR. FRENZEL: I thank the Speaker. If I may continue.

THE SPEAKER: The remarks of the gentleman from Texas are not taken out of the time of the gentleman from Minnesota. . . .

MR. FRENZEL: Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

5. 131 CONG. REC. 2220, 2229, 2231, 99th Cong. 1st Sess.

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

MR. FRENZEL: Mr. Speaker, my inquiry is will the Speaker protect my request to strike the intrusion into my discussion by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Wright], under Deschler's Precedents, and this is volume 8, section 24.65, which says that—

> A Member desiring to interrupt another in debate should address the Chair for permission. If the Member having the floor declines to yield, he may strike from the record.

THE SPEAKER: As to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Wright], which were not a point of order in view of the fact that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Frenzel] had the time and did not yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Wright], the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Wright] will not be printed in the Record.

Similarly, the question of the effect of remarks interjected into debate by one not properly recognized arose on Apr. 19, 1937,(7) on which date Speaker William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, answered a parliamentary inquiry on the requirement that Members seeking to interrupt a Member with the floor obtain recognition from the Chair and obtain consent of the Member with the floor:

MR. [EDWARD W.] CURLEY [of New York]: Last Thursday, April 15, during the discussion of the antilynching bill, I submitted two questions to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wadsworth]. Upon reading the Congressional Record the following day I found they were omitted. . . .

What I wish to know Mr. Speaker, is whether or not I can have the permanent Record corrected so as to include the two questions and the offside remark that went with them?

THE SPEAKER: Will the gentleman from New York allow the Chair to ask him a question before ruling on the gentleman's inquiry?

MR. CURLEY: Certainly.

THE SPEAKER: Did the gentleman from New York address the Chair and ask whether or not the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wadsworth], then occupying the floor, would yield?

MR. CURLEY: I did, Mr. Speaker. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Connor] was presiding on both occasions.

THE SPEAKER: Did the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wadsworth] yield?

MR. CURLEY: The gentleman from New York [Mr. Wadsworth] did not yield, and so stated. But not long thereafter the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gavagan] asked the same questions, received the same reply, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wadsworth] did not yield; yet the questions and remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gavagan] are incorporated in the Congressional Record.

THE SPEAKER: This is a rather important inquiry that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Curley] has submitted. It has not been raised, so far as the Chair recalls, during the present session of Congress. In order that the rights of Members may be

7. 81 CONG. REC. 3588, 3589, 75th Cong. 1st Sess.

protected, and that the Members may know what the rules and precedents are with respect to this proposition, the Chair will read from section 3466, volume 8, of Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, the following statement:

> The Speaker may order stricken from the notes of the reporters remarks made by Members who have not been recognized and to whom the Member having the floor has declined to yield. . . .

The Chair may say that in conformity with this precedent, and what the Chair conceives to be sound procedure, the rule should be reiterated that when a Member is occupying the floor and a Member after addressing the Chair and asking the Member then occupying the floor if he will yield for a question or for an interruption, and the gentleman then speaking declines to yield, it is not proper for a Member nevertheless to interject into the Record some remarks which he desires to make.

Speaker Bankhead also answered a parliamentary inquiry on the right of Members, when revising the *Congressional Record*, to delete from their remarks statements interposed by other Members not yielded time:

MR. [CASSIUS C.] DOWELL [of Iowa]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. DOWELL: When a Member has the floor and declines to yield, and no one is recognized to propound a parliamentary inquiry or direct an inquiry to the gentleman having the floor, and the other Member, not being recognized by the Chair, makes some statement, has not the Member who has the floor the right to leave those injected remarks out of the record?

THE SPEAKER: Under the decision referred to by the Chair, undoubtedly the Member interrupted would have the right to strike those remarks from the Record.[8]

Interruption by Motions—To Close Debate

§ 32.4 A Member having the floor in debate on his amendment may not be interrupted without his consent by a motion to close debate.

On Aug. 21, 1940,[9] Mr. John C. Schafer, of Wisconsin, offered an amendment under the five-minute rule in the Committee of the Whole and was recognized for five minutes. The proceedings were as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN:[10] The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

MR. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Mr. Chairman——

8. If a Member with the floor declines to yield for a statement or question but then responds to such an interruption, he may not in his revision of remarks delete the interpolation. See 81 CONG. REC. 3669, 3670, 75th Cong. 1st Sess., Apr. 20, 1937.
9. 86 CONG. REC. 10698, 76th Cong. 3d Sess.
10. Abe Murdock (Utah).

MR. [HENRY B.] STEAGALL [of Alabama]: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

MR. [JESSE P.] WOLCOTT [of Michigan]: Mr. Chairman, I object.

MR. STEAGALL: Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section——

MR. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state it.

MR. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Mr. Chairman, I did not yield to the gentleman from Alabama to submit a unanimous-consent request or to make a motion. I have some rights here under the rules of the House. I demand the regular order, and that is that I be permitted to continue without interruption.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes, but there is a motion before the House.

MR. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that motion. I did not yield for the gentleman to make a motion. I had the floor. The gentleman did not ask me to yield and I did not yield. I have some rights under the rules of the House and I ask that they be respected by the gentleman who has interrupted even though he is chairman of the important committee in charge of the pending legislation.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

—*To Rise*

§ 32.5 In the Committee of the Whole, a Member may not be interrupted by a motion to rise while he has the floor, unless he yields for that purpose.

On Mar. 12, 1964,[11] Chairman Chet Holifield, of California, stated in response to a parliamentary inquiry that unless the Member with the floor yielded for that purpose, another Member could not move that the Committee rise:

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

MR. [ROBERT J.] CORBETT [of Pennsylvania]: I yield to the gentleman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman is recognized.

MR. [AUGUST E.] JOHANSEN [of Michigan]: Would a motion that the Committee rise be in order at this time?

THE CHAIRMAN: If the gentleman from Pennsylvania yields for that purpose.

MR. CORBETT: Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further.

—*To Adjourn*

§ 32.6 A Member holding the floor may not be interrupted by a motion to adjourn unless he yields for the motion.

On Apr. 24, 1956,[12] Mr. Carl Vinson, of Georgia, was speaking under a special-order agreement.

---

11. 110 CONG. REC. 5101, 88th Cong. 2d Sess.

12. 102 CONG. REC. 6891, 84th Cong. 2d Sess.

Mr. Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio, moved that the House adjourn after Mr. William M. Colmer, of Mississippi, had made a point of no quorum. Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, ruled:

> If the gentleman from Georgia retains the floor, that motion is not in order.[13]

Parliamentarian's Note: This principle does not hold true if a point of order of no quorum is made during debate and the Chair announces that a quorum is not present; Rule XV, clause 6, has been amended, however, to prohibit points of order of no quorum during debate only.

Parliamentary Inquiries

§ 32.7 A Member may not be taken from the floor for a parliamentary inquiry.

On May 26, 1960,[14] Mr. Donald R. Matthews, of Florida, had the floor in the Committee of the Whole and Mr. Cleveland M. Bailey, of West Virginia, attempted to state a parliamentary inquiry. Chairman Aime J. Forand, of Rhode Island, ruled that Mr. Matthews could not be interrupted by Mr. Bailey for a parliamentary inquiry without his consent.[15]

§ 32.8 A Member may not be interrupted by another Member for a parliamentary inquiry without his consent and if the Member who has the floor refuses to yield and demands regular order the Chair will not recognize another Member to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

On July 8, 1975,[16] the proceedings described above occurred in the Committee of the Whole, as follows:

> MR. [JOHN D.] DINGELL [of Michigan]: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.
>
> The Clerk read as follows:
>
> > Amendment offered by Mr. Dingell to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Hébert: . . .
>
> MR. DINGELL: Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment about which my colleagues have received communications in the last few days from the Sierra Club and from other nationwide conservation organizations. . . .

---

13. For an occasion where a Member recognized for one hour on a special order was interrupted, with his consent, for a motion to suspend the rules made by another Member, see § 73.19, infra.

14. 106 CONG. REC. 11267, 11268, 86th Cong. 2d Sess.

15. See also 114 CONG. REC. 30217, 90th Cong. 2d Sess., Oct. 8, 1968; and 110 CONG. REC. 1998, 88th Cong. 2d Sess., Feb. 5, 1964.

16. 121 CONG. REC. 21628, 94th Cong. 1st Sess.

MR. [DON] YOUNG of Alaska: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order to the germaneness of this amendment.

MR. DINGELL: Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for the point of order. The point of order is too late.

THE CHAIRMAN:[17] The Chair rules that the point of order is too late.

MR. YOUNG of Alaska: Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

MR. DINGELL: Mr. Chairman, may we have the regular order. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) refuses to yield.

MR. YOUNG of Alaska: Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: That could only be made before the gentleman from Michigan was recognized with respect to his amendment. . . .

MR. DINGELL: Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) refuses to yield.

Under regular order, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) is recognized.

§ 32.9 A Member may not interrupt another Member in debate by a parliamentary inquiry unless the Member having the floor yields for that purpose.

The following exchange occurred in the House on Feb. 25, 1985:[18]

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:[19] Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Gingrich) is recognized for 60 minutes.

MR. [NEWT] GINGRICH [of Georgia]: Mr. Speaker, I am going to insert in the Record today and read into the Record several editorials, one from the Atlanta Journal and Constitution yesterday, Sunday, February 24, and one this morning from the Wall Street Journal. . . .

MS. [MARY ROSE] OAKAR [of Ohio]: Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. . . .

MR. GINGRICH: Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman has not asked me to yield, and I was in fact making an inquiry myself to the Chair. I was asking the Chair to rule in this sort of setting if one is reporting to the House on the written opinion of a columnist in which the columnist has said very strong things, is it appropriate for the House to be informed of this and, if so, what is the correct procedure?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The ruling of the Chair is that the gentleman should not read into the Record things which would clearly be outside the rules of this House. . . .[20]

MS. OAKAR: I am going to ask my own parliamentary inquiry. . . .

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Will the gentleman yield to the gentlewoman for a parliamentary inquiry?

MR. GINGRICH: Not at the present moment. . . .

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Let the gentleman continue with his parliamentary inquiry.

---

17. Neal Smith (Iowa).

18. 131 CONG. REC. 3344, 3346, 99th Cong. 1st Sess.

19. Sam B. Hall, Jr. (Tex.).

20. For discussion of the prohibition against reading in debate of press accounts which are personally critical of a sitting Member, see § 83, infra.

MR. GINGRICH: I might tell the gentlewoman that since this is a special order that she cannot get the floor unless I yield it to her.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair will make the rulings. . . .

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Gingrich) is recognized.

—*Parliamentary Inquiry and Point of Order*

§ 32.10 A Member having the floor may not be interrupted by another Member raising a parliamentary inquiry unless he yields for that purpose, but the Chair must permit an interruption to rule on any point of order raised during debate.

On Dec. 18, 1987,[1] during consideration of a privileged resolution (H. Res. 335, disciplining a Member) in the House, the following proceedings occurred:

MR. [JULIAN C.] DIXON [of California]: Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 335) in the matter of Representative Austin J. Murphy, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 335

Resolved, That the House of Representatives adopt the report by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct dated December 16, 1987, in the matter of Representative Austin J. Murphy of Pennsylvania. . . .

MR. [NEWT] GINGRICH [of Georgia]: Mr. Speaker, I commend the committee for its report and its recommendation. . . .

This committee's earlier report on the gentleman from Rhode Island should be reexamined with this new yardstick. The committee's letter on the gentlewoman from Ohio should be scrutinized with this new yardstick. The admission of $24,000 in election law violations by the gentleman from California should be held up to this new yardstick.

Finally, the numerous allegations about the Speaker must be——

MR. [TOMMY F.] ROBINSON [of Arkansas]: Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:[2] The gentleman will state it.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Speaker, I thought we were here today to hear a very serious charge against one of our colleagues from Pennsylvania, not from California or other States.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Will the gentleman suspend? Does the gentleman from Georgia yield?

MR. GINGRICH: No, I do not yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman will state his point of order.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that we are here to consider the committee's report against our colleague Austin Murphy and not

1. 133 CONG. REC. 36266, 36271, 100th Cong. 1st Sess.

2. Dave McCurdy (Okla.).

against other Members today that the charges have not been substantiated or presented to the committee.

MR. GINGRICH: Would the Chair——

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Will the gentleman suspend?

The [gentleman] will yield on the point of order.

On the debate currently ongoing, there can be references made to other cases reported by the committee, not by individual or by name. The gentleman from Georgia, as the Chair understands, has not mentioned other individuals and the gentleman from Arkansas——

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Speaker, he has, too.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman may compare disciplinary actions reported by the committee and should confine his remarks to the matters before the House.

Point of Order and Call of the House

§ 32.11 A Member stating a question of privilege may be interrupted by a point of order relating thereto.

On June 30, 1939,[3] Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, was in the process of stating a point of personal privilege based on an insertion in the *Congressional Record*. Mr. Hoffman was interrupted by several points of order on the grounds that a question of privilege was not stated and on the grounds that Mr. Hoffman was not confining his remarks to the question of privilege. Mr. Hoffman objected to the interruptions and stated that he did not yield for a point of order. Speaker William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, ruled that a Member making a point of order was entitled to recognition while the question of privilege was being stated.

—Special Order Interrupted by Call of the House; Member Regains Floor After Motion To Dispense With Proceedings

§ 32.12 When a Member holding the floor under a special order is interrupted by a call of the House, he is again entitled to the floor when a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call has been agreed to.

On June 4, 1963,[4] two special-order speeches were scheduled, the first by Mr. Clark MacGregor, of Minnesota. Mr. MacGregor was repeatedly interrupted by quorum calls which demonstrated a quorum as being present. Mr. MacGregor retained the right to the floor pending each quorum call,

3. 84 CONG. REC. 8468, 8469, 76th Cong. 1st Sess.

4. 109 CONG. REC. 10151–65, 88th Cong. 1st Sess.

and he resumed after a motion to dispense with further proceedings under a call had been agreed to.

Point of No Quorum

§ 32.13 A point of no quorum is a privileged matter and is in order at any time, even when a Member has the floor in debate.

On May 4, 1949,[5] in the Committee of the Whole, Chairman Henry M. Jackson, of Washington, ruled that a motion to adjourn was not in order and that the motion that the Committee rise could not be made unless the Member with the floor yielded for that purpose. Mr. Donald W. Nicholson, of Massachusetts, then made the point of order that a quorum was not present. Mr. Monroe M. Redden, of North Carolina, objected that Mr. Nicholson was out of order since he had not asked the Member with the floor [Mr. Miller] to yield for that purpose. Chairman Jackson ruled:

> The Chair will state that a point of order based on no quorum is a privileged matter and is in order at any time.

On July 12, 1949,[6] in the Committee of the Whole, Mr. William R. Poage, of Texas, who had the floor, declined to yield to Mr. Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio. Mr. Hays then made the point of order that a quorum was not present. Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, objected that Mr. Poage had not yielded for that purpose, but Chairman Charles M. Price, of Illinois, overruled the point of order:

> MR. RANKIN: Mr. Chairman, a point of order: A Member has no right to interrupt the speaker to make a point of no quorum.
>
> THE CHAIRMAN: A point of no quorum may be made at any time.
>
> MR. RANKIN: The gentleman from Texas did not yield for that point.
>
> THE CHAIRMAN: The point of no quorum is in order at any time.

Question of Personal Privilege

§ 32.14 A Member may not be deprived of the floor by another raising a question of personal privilege.

On July 5, 1945,[7] Mr. Malcolm C. Tarver, of Georgia, offered a motion to correct the Record, in order to accurately record a colloquy occurring between himself and Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi. Mr. Rankin sought recognition to be heard in opposition to the motion, but Speaker Sam

5. 95 CONG. REC. 5616, 5617, 81st Cong. 1st Sess.
6. *Id.* at p. 9312.
7. 91 CONG. REC. 7221–25, 79th Cong. 1st Sess.

Rayburn, of Texas, ruled that Mr. Tarver had the floor. Mr. Rankin then attempted to raise a question of personal privilege. The Speaker ruled:

> The gentleman cannot take the gentleman from Georgia off the floor by a question of personal privilege. The only way he could do it would be by a point of order that a quorum is not present.

§ 32.15 A question of personal privilege cannot take another Member from the floor.

The following proceedings occurred in the House on Sept. 29, 1983:[8]

> MR. [ROBERT H.] MICHEL [of Illinois]: Mr. Speaker, I hope that within the next few minutes I can maintain my balance. I have really become so nauseated by the drivel I have heard from the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Alexander). He leaves out one important component about what contributes to deficits. Blaming the President for deficits is just unconscionable.
>
> No President, Republican or Democrat, whatever, can spend one dime unless this Congress first appropriates. . . .
>
> I am serving my 27th year in this Congress, always as a member of the minority party, and I will tell the Members that I have been down in this well supporting amendments to cut funding, and I will stack that record of mine up against that of the gentleman from Arkansas and any other Member who spoke on the Democratic side tonight. . . .
>
> MR. [BILL] ALEXANDER [of Arkansas]: Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
>
> MR. MICHEL: I will accord the gentleman the same courtesy he gave me. I will wait until the end of my remarks.
>
> MR. ALEXANDER: Well, the gentleman mentioned my name. I assert a point of personal privilege.
>
> MR. MICHEL: I know. And the gentleman referred to my name, too, so we will just accord him the same courtesy.
>
> MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker——
>
> MR. MICHEL: I refuse to yield, Mr. Speaker.
>
> MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I assert a point of personal privilege. The gentleman used my name, and I would like to assert a point of personal privilege.
>
> THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:[9] The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Lott) controls the time and cannot be taken from the floor by a point of personal privilege.
>
> MR. [TRENT] LOTT [of Mississippi]: I do not yield, Mr. Speaker. I yielded to the gentleman from Illinois.
>
> THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The time is that of the gentleman from Mississippi.
>
> MR. LOTT: And I continue to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.
>
> MR. MICHEL: The Democratic Presidential contender, Ernest Hollings, said it best, I think: "Every time a special interest appeared, we responded."

Interruption To Reserve Objection

§ 32.16 Where a Member has been recognized for one hour

8. 129 CONG. REC. 26508, 26509, 98th Cong. 1st Sess.

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

of debate, and makes a unanimous-consent request, any time consumed by a Member who reserves the right to object to that request is not charged to the Member who has been recognized for an hour.

On Apr. 15, 1970, Mr. Louis C. Wyman, of New Hampshire, was recognized for one hour of debate for a special-order speech. As he began his remarks, he asked unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter. Mr. Phillip Burton, of California, reserved the right to object and made several remarks on the pending resolution. In response to a parliamentary inquiry, Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, ruled that Mr. Wyman still had one hour of debate available on his unanimous-consent request and that the time consumed by Mr. Burton would not be charged to Mr. Wyman's hour.(10)

Perfecting Amendment May Not Be Offered While Member Debating Motion To Strike

§ 32.17 While a motion to strike a pending portion of a bill will be held in abeyance until perfecting amendments to that portion are disposed of, a Member who has been recognized to debate his motion to strike may not be deprived of the floor by another Member who seeks to offer a perfecting amendment, but the perfecting amendment may be offered and voted on before the question is put on the motion to strike.

During consideration of H.R. 10024 (Depository Institutions Amendments of 1975) in the Committee of the Whole on Oct. 31, 1975,(11) the following proceedings occurred:

> MR. [JOHN H.] ROUSSELOT [of California]: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
>
> The Clerk read as follows:
>
> > Amendment offered by Mr. Rousselot: Beginning on page 10, line 18, strike all that follows through page 188, line 10.
>
> MR. [FERNAND J.] ST GERMAIN [of Rhode Island]: Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry. . . .
>
> I believe that under the rules of the House since this amendment involves a motion to strike the title, that perfecting amendments that are at the desk take precedence over such a motion to strike a title. Is that not correct?

10. 116 CONG. REC. 11917, 11918, 91st Cong. 2d Sess.

11. 121 CONG. REC. 34564, 34565, 34566, 94th Cong. 1st Sess.

THE CHAIRMAN:[12] That is true, if any are offered. . . .

MR. [JOHN J.] MOAKLEY [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Chairman, I might state that I was standing when the Chairman recognized the gentleman from California (Mr. Rousselot), and I have a perfecting amendment at the desk.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will state that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, Mr. Rousselot, is pending now, and that the gentleman from California has been recognized. The gentleman may offer his perfecting amendment after the gentleman from California has completed his five minutes in support of his amendment to strike.

Messages and Conference Reports

§ 32.18 Both the reception of a message from the Senate and the consideration of a conference report are highly privileged matters and may interrupt the consideration of a bill, even though the previous question has been ordered thereon.

On May 3, 1961,[13] the Committee of the Whole rose and reported back to the House H.R. 6441, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, stated that pursuant to the rule the previous question was ordered.

The Speaker then interrupted the further consideration of the bill to receive a message from the Senate that the Senate had agreed to a conference report on H.R. 3935 (to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act), and to recognize Mr. Adam C. Powell, of New York, to call up the conference report on H.R. 3935.

Parliamentarian's Note: When a Member with the floor suspends temporarily for the reception of a message or conference report or other pressing legislative business, the time consumed by the interruption is not charged to his time. See, for example, § 73.19, infra, where a Member occupying the floor for a "special order speech" suspended for a motion to suspend the rules and consumed the remainder of his time following adoption of the motion.[14]

---

12. Spark M. Matsunaga (Ha.).

13. 107 CONG. REC. 7172, 87th Cong. 1st Sess.

14. The Speaker may request the Member with the floor to suspend for the reception of a message [see *House Rules and Manual* § 561 (1995)]. The presentation and consideration of a conference report is highly privileged [see Rule XXVIII clause 1(a) and comments thereto, *House Rules and Manual* § 909 (1995)], and takes precedence over the operation of the previous question on another measure.