AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

mittee amendment and was not agreed to in Committee. . . .

MR. YATES: Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. YATES: Mr. Speaker, may a separate vote be taken on a portion of a committee amendment, namely section 206(a) and (b) on page 83?

THE SPEAKER: A separate vote cannot be had on a portion of the amendment reported by the Committee of the Whole. The amendment must be voted on in its entirety as reported by the Committee of the Whole.[10]

§ 52. Motions To Recede and Concur

The divisibility of the motion to recede and concur may alter the preferential nature of certain motions following such division. The motion to recede and concur in a Senate amendment, for example, takes precedence over a motion to recede and concur with an amendment,[11] since, after the stage of disagreement has been reached, the motion which most quickly brings the two Houses together is preferential. But if the House recedes from its disagreement, then a motion to amend takes precedence over concurring.

In a Senate Amendment

§ 52.1 A motion that the House recede and concur in a Senate amendment is divisible upon request of any Member, and the House does not vote on whether to divide the motion.[12]

10. Similar, though less explicit, rulings may be found in later Congresses. See, for example, the following: 114 CONG. REC. 24242, 90th Cong. 2d Sess., July 30, 1968; 114 CONG. REC. 21546, 90th Cong. 2d Sess., July 16, 1968; 114 CONG. REC. 1421, 90th Cong. 2d Sess., Jan. 30, 1968; 113 CONG. REC. 29317, 90th Cong. 1st Sess., Oct. 18, 1967; and 104 CONG. REC. 16264, 85th Cong. 2d Sess., Aug. 5, 1958.

11. It is to be noted that the phrase "a motion to recede and concur with an amendment" is a term of art in parliamentary parlance and refers to a motion that the House recede from its disagreement to a Senate amendment and concur therein *with a further House amendment.* It must be distinguished from the "motion to recede and concur"—which refers to a simple motion that the House recede from its disagreement to a Senate amendment and decide to concur *in that Senate amendment.*

12. This precedent is well established. For similar instances, see 109 CONG. REC. 8506, 88th Cong. 1st Sess., May 14, 1963; 107 CONG. REC. 16325, 87th Cong. 1st Sess., Aug. 10, 1961; 106 CONG. REC. 14074, 86th Cong. 2d Sess., June 23, 1960; 91 CONG. REC. 4492, 79th Cong. 1st Sess., May

On June 28, 1972,[13] Mr. Robert R. Casey, of Texas, called up the conference report on a bill (H.R. 13955) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fis-cal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes. The vote was taken on the conference report, and it was agreed to.

Thereafter, the Speaker directed the Clerk to report the amendments remaining in disagreement between the Houses. Among those was Senate amendment No. 36, as to which the following discussion took place:

THE SPEAKER:[14] The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 36: Page 24, line 20, insert:

EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL

Funds available under this appropriation may be used for the preparation of preliminary plans for the extension of the west central front: *Provided, however,* That no funds may be used for the preparation of the final plans or initiation of construction of said project until specifically approved and appropriated therefor by the Congress.

MR. CASEY of Texas: Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Casey of Texas moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36.

MR. [SAMUEL S.] STRATTON [of New York]: Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Stratton moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 36 and concur therein.

MR. CASEY of Texas: Mr. Speaker, I request a division of the question.

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

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. STRATTON: Is the request for a division of the question presumably to recede on one part and concur on the other part? Is this subject to a vote or something?

THE SPEAKER: All of the motion is subject to a vote. The question is on the matter of receding from disagreement.

MR. STRATTON: A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If a Member is in favor of accepting the Senate amendment, then he would oppose the motion to divide on the vote. Is that correct?

THE SPEAKER: This is not a question of voting on the division but a question of voting on the motion to recede.

MR. STRATTON: A further parliamentary inquiry. My understanding is that if the motion to divide succeeds and passes, then it is possible parliamentarily to offer an amendment to the Senate amendment rather than

---

11, 1945; and 89 CONG. REC. 5899, 78th Cong. 1st Sess., June 15, 1943.

13. 118 CONG. REC. 22959, 22974, 92d Cong. 2d Sess.

14. Carl Albert (Okla.).

to accept the Senate amendment. Is that not correct?

THE SPEAKER: If the motion to recede from disagreement is adopted, then a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment is in order. . . .

MR. STRATTON: Mr. Speaker, I am confused. My original question was whether the proposal to divide the question into two parts was subject to a vote.

THE SPEAKER: Division of a question is a right which any Member of the House enjoys.

MR. [SIDNEY R.] YATES [of Illinois]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. At what point is it in order for the gentleman from New York to offer his motion to recede and concur with the Senate.

THE SPEAKER: The motion is pending. The gentleman from Texas asked for a division.

MR. YATES: Is it in order at this point for the gentleman from New York to offer his motion to recede and concur?

THE SPEAKER: That motion is pending. The question is shall the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

§ 52.2 A preferential motion to recede and concur having been divided, the House agreed first to recede and subsequently to concur.

On Aug. 10, 1961,[15] Mr. George H. Mahon, of Texas, called up the conference report on a bill (H.R. 7851) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. The report was agreed to, and the House then proceeded to consider the Senate amendments remaining in disagreement.

One of these amendments (No. 26) provided for $207,600,000 to be utilized for civil defense activities, including the hiring of motor vehicles and the providing of fallout shelters in government-owned or leased buildings. Mr. Mahon moved that the House recede from its disagreement to this amendment and concur therein.

Mr. John Taber, of New York, requested the question be divided and upon so doing, the Speaker Pro Tempore[16] put the question to the House.

The House having decided to recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 26, Mr. Taber subsequently moved to concur in the amendment with an amendment.

After some discussion of the proposed Taber amendment which called for a reduction in the funding by $93 million, Mr. Mahon moved the previous question and the House rejected Mr. Taber's motion.

15. 107 CONG. REC. 15320, 15325, 15326, 15331, 15336, 87th Cong. 1st Sess.

16. Carl Albert (Okla.).

The motion to concur with an amendment having failed, the previously offered Mahon motion to concur in the Senate amendment was then put before the House. The motion was agreed to.[17]

§ 52.3 A motion to recede and concur in a Senate amendment having been divided, the House receded from disagreement, rejected both a motion to concur with an amendment and a motion to concur, and decided thereafter to insist on disagreement.

On May 14, 1963,[18] the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill of 1963 (H.R. 5517) having been agreed to, Mr. Albert Thomas, of Texas, moved that the House recede from its disagreement to a Senate amendment No. 76, and concur therein with an amendment. Mr. Robert R. Barry, of New York, then offered a preferential motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. Mr. Thomas having demanded a division of the proposition, the motion to recede was entertained and subsequently agreed to.

Immediately thereafter, Mr. Thomas moved that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the same amendment which had been incorporated in Mr. Thomas' original motion. Since the House had already receded, this motion was now preferential to the remaining portion of the Barry motion. The Thomas proposal was rejected, however.

The question then recurred on the second part of the Barry motion (i.e., to concur in the Senate amendment) which was also rejected. Mr. George Meader, of Michigan, then moved that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment. This motion was agreed to, without discussion.

§ 52.4 A motion that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in a Senate amendment with an amendment is divisible only as between receding and then concurring with an amendment.

On Mar. 21, 1946,[19] the House had under consideration a conference report pertaining to the independent offices appropriation bill of 1947. Among those Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 5201) which remained in disagreement were Nos. 10 and 18. After

17. See also 106 CONG. REC. 14081, 86th Cong. 2d Sess., June 23, 1960.

18. 109 CONG. REC. 8504, 8505, 8506, 8509–11, 88th Cong. 1st Sess.

19. 92 CONG. REC. 2521, 2523, 2525, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.

the conference report was agreed to, the aforementioned amendments were discussed.

The first amendment remaining in disagreement was read to the House at the Speaker's[20] request.

> The Clerk read as follows:
>
> Senate amendment No. 10: Page 4, line 21, insert the following:
>
> EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT
>
> Emergency fund for the President: Not to exceed $5,000,000 of the appropriation "Emergency fund for the President," contained in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, as supplemented and amended, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of such fund shall be available for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a Budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate and House of Representatives or by the Committees on Appropriations of both bodies.

Mr. Joseph E. Hendricks, of Florida, then moved to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with the following amendment:

> After the word "Senate" in line 12 of said amendment strike out the remainder of the line and all of lines 13 and 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or House of Representatives or by the Committee on Appropriations of either body."

20. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

Mr. Richard B. Wigglesworth, of Massachusetts, asked for a division of the question. Mr. Hendricks having risen to a point of order that the question could not be divided, the Speaker ruled to the contrary. Thereafter, the motion, as divided, (i.e., to recede) was put to the House and agreed to.[1]

Effect of Division on Determining the Question

§ 52.5 The motion to recede and concur having been divided, the first vote applies only to the motion to recede.

On May 14, 1963,[2] Mr. Albert Thomas, of Texas, called up the conference report on a bill (H.R. 5517) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. Following adoption of the report, the House considered Senate amendment No. 76.

This was a proposal to authorize the payment of some $73 million to the Government of the Republic of the Philippines in accordance with previously passed legislation dealing with war dam-

1. See also 80 CONG. REC. 7616, 74th Cong. 2d Sess., May 20, 1936.

2. 109 CONG. REC. 8502, 8505, 8506, 88th Cong. 1st Sess.

age claims and in conjunction with certain newly proposed conditions. Mr. Thomas moved that the House recede from its disagreement with the amendment and concur with an amendment.

Mr. Robert Barry, of New York, then offered a preferential motion that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment. This motion, in turn, was followed by a demand from Mr. Thomas that the question be divided. The Speaker[3] then indicated that the first concept in the motion, that is, whether the House would recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment, was the question under consideration.

§ 52.6 Where both the motion to adhere and the motion to recede and concur are pending, and a division of the latter motion is demanded, the vote comes first on the motion to recede.

On June 23, 1960,[4] Mr. J. Vaughan Gary, of Virginia, called up a bill (H.R. 10569) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto. Immediately after so doing, the stage of disagreement having been reached, Mr. Gary moved that the House adhere to its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, then offered a preferential motion that the House recede from its disagreement and concur therein. Mr. Gary sought a division of the question on the preferential motion, and the Speaker Pro Tempore[5] recognized him for an hour to control the debate.

After some discussion of the matter, which pertained to how the franking privilege was to be used, Mr. John Taber, of New York, initiated the following exchange:

> MR. TABER: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.
>
> THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:[6] The gentleman will state it.
>
> MR. TABER: Is not the parliamentary situation this: The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hoffman] has offered a motion to recede and concur. The gentleman from Virginia asked for a division of the question. The parliamentary situation is this: We first vote on the question of receding, and if that carries we can vote on the other part of the motion?
>
> THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: On the question of concurrence?

3. John W. McCormack (Mass.).
4. 106 CONG. REC. 14074, 14081, 86th Cong. 2d Sess.
5. Wilbur Mills (Ark.).
6. Francis E. Walter (Pa.).

MR. TABER: Yes.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: That is correct.

MR. TABER: If the motion to recede is not agreed to, then that is the end of it?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: No. The vote then would be on the motion to adhere.

The motion to adhere was not voted upon, however, as the motion to recede carried by a substantial margin.

§ 52.7 The motion to recede and concur having been divided, and the House having receded from its disagreement to a Senate amendment, the motion to concur with an amendment takes precedence over the motion to concur.[7]

On May 14, 1963,[8] the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill of 1963 was before the House. Among those Senate amendments remaining in disagreement was a provision calling for some $73 million to be paid to the Philippine government for the purposes of war-damage compensation. Mr. Albert Thomas, of Texas, moved that the House recede from its disagreement to this amendment (No. 76) and concur with an amendment. After some discussion, Mr. Robert R. Barry, of New York, offered the preferential motion that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 76. A division being demanded by Mr. Thomas, the motion to recede was agreed to, and Mr. Thomas then moved to concur with an amendment, which was part of his original motion. This motion now occupying a preferential status, it was entertained before the remaining portion of the Barry motion. Mr. Thomas' proposal was rejected, however, and the Speaker[9] then indicated that the question before the House was Mr. Barry's motion to concur.

§ 52.8 A motion to recede from disagreement to a Senate amendment and concur therein being divided, and the House having receded, if a preferential motion to concur with an amendment is offered and rejected, the question recurs on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

A motion to recede from disagreement to a Senate amendment and concur therein having

7. For more information about the disposition of amendments between the Houses, see Ch. 32, infra.

8. 109 CONG. REC. 8502, 8505, 8506, 8509, 8510, 88th Cong. 1st Sess.

9. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

been divided,[10] the motion to recede was agreed to.

Thereafter, a preferential motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment was offered by Mr. Albert Thomas, of Texas. After some debate thereon, the Speaker put the question on that motion:

> THE SPEAKER:[11] The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas that the House concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment.
>
> The motion was rejected.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The question now is on the second part of the motion offered by the gentleman from New York that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

Thus, the rejection of the preferential motion revives the second portion of the previously divided motion to recede and concur[12] unless another preferential motion is offered.

Effect of Division When Followed by Rejection of Motion To Recede

§ 52.9 The motion to recede and concur in a Senate amendment having been divided, the Chair informed a Member that the effect of voting down the motion to recede from disagreement to the Senate amendment would permit the offering of a motion to insist on disagreement.

On May 14, 1963,[13] the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill of 1963 (H.R. 5517) having been agreed to, Mr. Albert Thomas, of Texas, moved that the House recede from its disagreement to a Senate amendment No. 76, and concur therein with an amendment. A preferential motion to recede and concur having been offered, Mr. Thomas demanded the division of the latter motion, and subsequently moved the previous question on the motion to recede.

Mr. George Meader, of Michigan, then rose and the following exchange took place:

> MR. MEADER: Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.
>
> THE SPEAKER:[14] The gentleman will state it.
>
> MR. MEADER: Would it be in order, either before the previous question is agreed to or thereafter, to offer a motion to further disagree with the Senate amendment?

10. 109 CONG. REC. 8506, 8509, 8510, 88th Cong. 1st Sess., May 14, 1963.
11. John W. McCormack (Mass.).
12. See also 93 CONG. REC. 9319, 80th Cong. 1st Sess., July 18, 1947.
13. 109 CONG. REC. 8504–06, 8508, 88th Cong. 1st Sess.
14. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state that that can be accomplished, if desired, by voting down the motion to recede.

Parliamentarian's Note: It is in order, following the refusal of the House to recede, to entertain a motion to insist on disagreement.[15] They are not equivalent questions, since the House, upon refusing to recede, could also adhere.

§ 52.10 There being two motions currently pending—one to recede and concur in a Senate amendment with an amendment and the other a preferential motion to recede and concur—if the House refuses to recede when the motion to recede and concur is divided, both motions are then inoperable. The House has in effect reiterated its disagreement to the Senate amendment and a motion to further insist on (or a motion to adhere to) that position is in order.

On Dec. 16, 1943,[16] Mr. Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, called up the conference report on a supplemental defense appropriation bill for 1944 (H.R. 3598). The House subsequently agreed to the report, and discussion ensued with respect to those amendments remaining in disagreement between the Houses.

Among them was a Senate amendment No. 49, as to which Mr. Cannon offered a motion to recede and concur with an amendment. The Senate amendment dealt with a supplemental appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation. Mr. Cannon's proposal read as follows:

In lieu of the sum of "$2,800,000" named in such amendment, insert "$700,000"; and in lieu of the sum of "$800,000" named in such amendment, insert "$200,000".

Shortly thereafter, Mr. Compton I. White, of Idaho, offered a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. White moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 49 and concur in the same.

Mr. Cannon then requested a division of the question, and the House refused to recede.

Thereafter, Mr. Cannon moved that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment. This motion prompted a series of parliamentary in-

15. See also 103 CONG. REC. 15519, 85th Cong. 1st Sess., Aug. 21, 1957; 115 CONG. REC. 40902, 40912, 40915, 40921, 40922, 91st Cong. 1st Sess., Dec. 22, 1969.

16. 89 CONG. REC. 10753, 10756, 10777–80, 78th Cong. 1st Sess.

quiries from a number of Members:

MR. [FRANCIS H.] CASE [of South Dakota]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER:[17] The gentleman will state it.

MR. CASE: The first question for division was a division on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. White]. The House has refused to recede on the division of that motion. Then it seems to me that the question recurs on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon] to recede and concur with an amendment. On that motion I ask for a division.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman asks for a division of the question. The House has already refused to recede. Therefore, it would be rather anomalous if we had a division of the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, and voted again on the question of receding.

MR. CANNON of Missouri: Mr. Speaker, I insist on my motion that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

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

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. CASE: Since the motion which was offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. White] was a preferential motion as against the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon], I question whether or not the gentleman can then move to insist. The vote, it seems to me, must recur on the motion previously pending, which was the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to recede and concur with an amendment. A division of the question is entirely different when two different propositions are before the House. The House has refused to recede on the dividing of the question offered by the gentleman from Idaho, but has not refused to recede on dividing the question offered by the gentleman from Missouri in his original motion.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon] has moved to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment. The Chair believes there is nothing to do at this time but to put the gentleman's motion.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri, that the House insist on its disagreement.

Shortly thereafter, the Speaker put the question to a vote. The motion to insist carried, but was objected to on the ground that a quorum was not present. More parliamentary inquiries preceded the vote:

MR. [JOHN R.] MURDOCK [of Arizona]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. MURDOCK: I am confused as to what the question is. Will the Chair restate it?

THE SPEAKER: The motion to recede was voted down. The only motion the gentleman from Missouri had left, therefore, was to further insist on the disagreement to the Senate amendment. That is what we are voting on now.

17. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

MR. [CLINTON P.] ANDERSON of New Mexico: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Did the gentleman from Missouri withdraw his motion to recede and concur with an amendment?

THE SPEAKER: He did not; it was not necessary. Because of the fact that a motion to recede had been voted down, a second motion to recede was not in order.

MR. [JOHN] TABER [of New York]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. TABER: The motion to recede and concur with an amendment having been displaced by a motion to recede and concur, and this motion having been divided so that we voted on the motion to recede alone, the only motion that could possibly be made would be the one the gentleman from Missouri did make, that the House further insist; is that correct?

THE SPEAKER: The Chair has so stated.

The roll was then called, and the motion to insist was agreed to.[18]

Effect of Division on Time Allotted for Debate

§ 52.11 A motion to recede and concur in a Senate amendment having been divided, the proponent of the initial motion retains control of the floor.

On Dec. 22, 1969,[19] the House having called up a conference report on a bill (H.R. 15209) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, certain Senate amendments remained in disagreement between the Houses.

Mr. George H. Mahon, of Texas, moved that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 33 and concur therein. A division of the question having been demanded, the Speaker put the first portion of the question before the House, and the following discussion ensued:

THE SPEAKER:[20] The question is, Will the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33?

MR. [CLARK] MACGREGOR [of Minnesota]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

---

18. See also 89 CONG. REC. 7384, 78th Cong. 1st Sess., July 7, 1943, where the Speaker indicated that "the House cannot concur until it has receded;" and 86 CONG. REC. 5892, 76th Cong. 3d Sess., May 9, 1940, where the Speaker Pro Tempore answered a parliamentary inquiry by stating that the rejection of a motion to recede (which question had been divided from an original motion to recede and concur) would preclude the subsequent offering of a motion to concur with an amendment.

19. 115 CONG. REC. 40902, 40915, 91st Cong. 1st Sess.

20. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. MACGREGOR: I should like to ask the Speaker if the time for debate on the motion of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Mahon) is under the control of the gentleman from Texas and if it is in order for me at this time to ask the gentleman from Texas to yield to me for 5 minutes?

MR. MAHON: I have agreed to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota for 5 minutes for the purpose of debate.

MR. MACGREGOR: Am I recognized, Mr. Speaker?

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Texas will be recognized for 1 hour, but the question before the House now is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The Speaker having confirmed Mr. Mahon's control of the time for debate, Mr. Mahon then yielded the floor to Mr. MacGregor for 5 minutes.

§ 52.12 Debate on a motion that the House recede from its disagreement to a Senate amendment and concur in the same is under the hour rule, and if the question is divided, the hour rule applies to each motion separately, unless the previous question has been ordered on the motion prior to the division of the question.

On May 9, 1940,[1] Mr. Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, moved that the House recede from its disagreement to a Senate amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill of 1941 and concur therein with an amendment which he sent to the Clerk's desk. Mr. Malcolm C. Tarver, of Georgia, then offered a preferential motion that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment, itself. The question having been divided by request, the House entertained the motion to recede.

During the course of that debate, the following occurred:

MR. [WILLIAM M.] WHITTINGTON [of Mississippi]: Mr. Speaker, as I understand, there is 1 hour debate allowed on the motion to recede and concur. Request has been made for a division. My inquiry is this: Will there be 1 hour of debate on each motion?

THE SPEAKER:[2] The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon] controls the time. If one is demanded on the motion to recede, that hour is granted. Then an hour will be granted on the motion to concur.

MR. WHITTINGTON: That satisfies my inquiry.

Parliamentarian's Note: Under Rule XXVIII clause 2(b)(1), debate on a motion to dispose of an

1. 86 CONG. REC. 5887, 5889, 76th Cong. 3d Sess.
2. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).

amendment in disagreement is divided between the majority and minority parties—or divided three ways if both floor managers are in support of the motion and if another Member demands 20 minutes in opposition. See H. Res. 7, 131 CONG. REC. 393, 99th Cong. 1st Sess., Jan. 3, 1985.

E. POSTPONING VOTES; CLUSTERING VOTES; REDUCED VOTING TIME; SEPARATE VOTES

§ 53. Evolution of House Rules on Postponement and Reduced Voting Time

Introduction

The concepts of postponing votes, clustering a series of votes, and of reducing voting times were introduced into the rules by the adoption of House Resolution 5 on the first day of the 96th Congress.[1] Amendments were made to Rules I, XV, XXIII, and XXVII.[2] The first instance where the Speaker utilized his new authority to postpone a series of votes to another day occurred on Feb. 21, 1979,[3] when the debate on a series of 10 committee funding resolutions was conducted but where the votes were postponed until Feb. 26, 1979.[4]

Although the Speaker may not on his own volition and discretion reduce the times in which votes are taken with the electronic system, the House may authorize such action by unanimous consent or special order.

The Development of the Speaker's Postponement Authority and Its Place in the Rules

§ 53.1 In the 96th Congress, the Speaker was given discretionary authority to postpone record votes on the final passage of bills, the adoption of resolutions and conference reports to a time certain within two legislative days. In separate amendments to Rules XI and XXVII, the authority to postpone and "cluster" votes on resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules and on motions to suspend the rules

1. 125 CONG. REC. 7–10, 12, 13, 96th Cong. 1st Sess., Jan. 15, 1979.
2. *Id.* at pp. 8, 9.
3. 125 CONG. REC. 2906, 96th Cong. 1st Sess.
4. *Id.* at pp. 3255, 3256.