

at this point prior to the calling up of the bill.

§ 9. To a Day Certain; Three-day Limit

The House, in adjourning for not more than three days, must take into the count either the day of adjourning or the day of the meeting. Sunday is not taken into account in making this computation unless the House, by special order, provides for a session on a Sunday.⁽¹⁾

The House has declared itself in a series of recesses subject to the constraint that the House not adjourn for more than three days without the consent of the Senate.⁽²⁾ The Committee on Rules also has reported a rule authorizing the Speaker to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair, each consistent with the constitutional requirement that neither House adjourn or recess for more than three days without the consent of the other House.⁽³⁾

The House has adopted a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules providing that the

1. *House Rules and Manual* § 83 (2007). See also §§ 9.7–9.10, *infra*; and 5 Hinds' Precedents §§ 6673, 6674.
2. See Ch. 39, § 2.21, *supra*.
3. See § 9.1, *infra*.

House meet only Tuesdays and Fridays for a stipulated period, whereupon the Speaker advised the House that no business on those days would be conducted, including recognition for unanimous consent.⁽⁴⁾

§ 9.1 The House adopted a privileged rule reported by the Committee on Rules to authorize, *inter alia*, the Speaker to declare the House in recesses subject to the call of the Chair during five discrete periods, each consistent with the constitutional constraint that neither House (recess or) adjourn for more than three days without consent of the other House.

On Jan. 5, 1996,⁽¹⁾ the following proceedings occurred:

Ms. [Deborah W.] PRYCE [of Ohio]. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 330 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 330

Resolved, That (a) the Speaker may declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair on the calendar days of Friday, January 5, 1996,

4. See § 9.6, *infra*.
1. 142 CONG. REC. 357, 104th Cong. 2d Sess.

through Tuesday, January 9, 1996. A recess declared pursuant to this subsection may not extend beyond the calendar day of Tuesday, January 9, 1996.

(b) The Speaker may declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair on the calendar days of Tuesday, January 9, 1996, through Friday, January 12, 1996. A recess declared pursuant to this subsection may not extend beyond the calendar day of Friday, January 12, 1996.

(c) The Speaker may declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair on the calendar days of Friday, January 12, 1996, through Tuesday, January 16, 1996. A recess declared pursuant to this subsection may not extend beyond the calendar day of Tuesday, January 16, 1996.

(d) The Speaker may declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair on the calendar days of Tuesday, January 16, 1996, through Friday, January 19, 1996. A recess declared pursuant to this subsection may not extend beyond the calendar day of Friday, January 19, 1996.

(e) The Speaker may declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair on the calendar days of Friday, January 19, 1996, through Tuesday, January 23, 1996. A recess declared pursuant to this subsection may not extend beyond the calendar day of Tuesday, January 23, 1996.

SEC. 2. The requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported from that committee before the calendar day of Wednesday, January 24, 1996, and providing for consideration or disposition of any of the following measures: . . .

The SPEAKER pro tempore.⁽²⁾ The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE. . . .

By recessing rather than adjourning, the House will effectively be on standby, ready to return should the White House come to meet its responsibility and submit legislation, as promised, that achieves a balanced budget and puts the Government back into full operation.

Parliamentarian's Note: Similarly, as in Ch. 39, § 2.21, *supra*, an "overlap" between three-day periods (one ending and another beginning on the same calendar day) is considered not infirm under art. I, § 5 clause 4 of the Constitution. The resolution was within the authority of the Committee on Rules to report. It did not violate any procedural restriction in the Constitution. It did not permit the House to be in adjournment or uninterrupted recess for more than three days (excepting Sundays).

§ 9.2 The House adopted a privileged concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the two Houses on any of three days to a day certain in excess of three days on motions of respective Majority Leaders or designees, and the House by

² Jack Kingston (GA).

unanimous consent permitted an adjournment for three days contingent upon Senate action on the concurrent resolution.

On Nov. 20, 1987,⁽¹⁾ the following occurred in the House:

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1987, OR MONDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1987, OR TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1987, TO MONDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1987, AND OF THE SENATE FROM FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1987, OR MONDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1987, OR TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1987, TO MONDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1987

Mr. [Thomas S.] FOLEY [of Washington]. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 220) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 220

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Friday, November 20, 1987, or Monday, November 23, 1987, or Tuesday, November 24, 1987, pursuant to a motion made by the majority leader, or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, November 30, 1987, and that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, November 20, 1987, or Monday, November 23, 1987, or Tuesday, November 24, 1987, pursuant to a motion made

by the majority leader, or his designee, in accordance with the resolution, it stand adjourned until 10 o'clock ante meridiem on Monday, November 30, 1987.

The SPEAKER pro tempore.⁽²⁾ Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. [Steven] GUNDERSON [of Wisconsin]. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 181, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 447] . . .

PROVIDING FOR POSSIBLE ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1987

Mr. [Tony] COELHO [of California]. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, unless it adjourns pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 220, that it stand adjourned to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER.⁽³⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

1. 133 CONG. REC. 33029, 33030, 100th Cong. 1st Sess.

2. James J. Howard (NJ).

3. James C. Wright, Jr. (TX).

Mr. [Robert F.] WALKER [of Pennsylvania]. Reserving the right to object, is that a change in the schedule as previously announced?

Mr. COELHO. No. This is just in case something would happen that we are protected and can meet if necessary.

Mr. WALKER. I would like to have an explanation of this.

The SPEAKER. Let the Chair respond to the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

This is only a stand-by in the event that the Senate failed to complete the action on the adjournment resolution so that we would have a pro forma session. We do not expect that to occur.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

§ 9.3 On consecutive privileged motions of the Majority Leader, pursuant to clause 4 of Rule XVI⁽¹⁾ and at the Speaker's discretion, the House voted that when it adjourned on that day it adjourn to meet at 3:15 p.m. for a second legislative day on that calendar day, and then adjourned [in order to reconvene a new session and consider a special order re-

1. *House Rules and Manual* § 911 (2007).

ported by the Committee on Rules on the first legislative day without a two-thirds vote on "same-day" consideration].

On Oct. 29, 1987,⁽²⁾ the House was concluding consideration of a special order reported from the Committee on Rules, as follows:

Mr. [Butler] DERRICK [of South Carolina]. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore.⁽³⁾ The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. [Trent] LOTT [of Mississippi]. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 203, noes 217, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 385] . . .

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

So the resolution was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

2. 133 CONG. REC. 29918, 29919, 29932–35, 100th Cong. 1st Sess.

3. Harold L. Volkmer (MO).

THE VOTE ON HOUSE
RESOLUTION 296

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. [Robert H.] MICHEL [of Illinois]. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this 1-minute for the purpose to say that under somewhat otherwise normal conditions, noting our unanimous vote on this side, we would be elated with this victory.

Mr. Speaker, we do not look upon it that way. The majority in this House has said here there ought not be a quick rush to judgment, that we recognize the urgency of the overall objective, but this procedure would do it harm. It has been my feeling for the last week or so in view of what the President has said and in view of some of our colleagues meeting over in the other body as they have, that men of good will could bring their divergent thoughts together, and reach agreement. Had this scenario unfolded this afternoon the way it was originally described, however, I am just afraid the tenor of that debate would have given the wrong signal.

I think from the few remarks we might have made earlier and some of the others, this feeling was shared by Members on both sides of the aisle and, so, yes, I for one am grateful for that vote to defeat the rule, but we are not gloating over it.

I just want to say to the distinguished Speaker that there might be an inclination to quickly go to the Rules Committee, come back with a stripped-down version, but it should be known now the Members have attempted to express their desire to give

this bipartisan negotiating team a chance. The distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] serves on that negotiating team. I think he would probably buttress what I have said from the standpoint that there is some movement. There is a good feeling, and frankly maybe in a shorter time span than one might feel is possible, I think agreement can be reached.

□ 1215

Then out of that meeting I would think would come a much better signal, the kind that all of us would like to project.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to say other than I would hope that it would signal our intention and certainly our ability to work together, hand and glove, in a bipartisan way to come to a final resolution.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. [James C.] WRIGHT [Jr., of Texas]. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to speak to the question of the schedule and program for the balance of the week.

I appreciate what my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the minority leader, has suggested. He has been consistent, suggesting all along that we delay, and see if we can get some signal as to what the President will accept before we try to pass anything.

If we do that, it puts the total initiative in the hands of the executive

branch of Government over something that the Constitution declared was the primary business of the House of Representatives.

I bow to the majority. That is a part of the business of this chamber. We recognize that when a majority speaks, we owe them our respect. The majority quite obviously did not want to vote on this particular rule. At least 25 or 30 Members have told me personally in the last couple of days that they just did not believe it appropriate to be considering this deficit reduction bill at the same time and in the same package that we were considering a welfare reform bill. A great many of those Members professed that they liked the welfare reform bill and that they believe we need welfare reform, but they thought it inappropriate to consider the two somewhat different matters together.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois made that suggestion to me, as a matter of fact, 2 weeks ago. Obviously a substantial number of Members feel that way.

Therefore, the Rules committee will convene at 12:45 and we will be seeking another rule which separates those two somewhat distinguishable items and takes welfare reform out of it.

I do believe that we have the responsibility as the U.S. House of Representatives to do our best to come forward with a reasonable, fair, constructive deficit reduction package so that we have something that represents our majority to take and put on the table when we negotiate with the White House. Otherwise, we go bereft of any suggestions, having said in effect that the House cannot make up its mind and has no suggestions to offer.

Therefore, I am going to ask that the Rules Committee meet and bring us back a rule that bows to the express wishes of a great many Members of the House. I have had a great many Members say to me that they cannot imagine a fairer revenue measure than the one that we have to consider. We will give the House that opportunity and see if a majority of the Members wish to go forward with at least that much deficit reduction action. And we will stay in session here until we do that.

So I do implore my colleagues, the minority party, to work with us. You have chosen throughout this year a course that I recognize has been a difficult one for you. I could have wished that we would have had more bipartisan cooperation when the Budget Committee was trying to come to a mix. For reasons of your own—and I do not criticize you for it—you chose to stay out of these meetings, to boycott them. And then we invited you to participate and wished you had participated along with other Members of the Ways and Means Committee in putting together a revenue package. And it was your choice and decision to boycott those meetings.

Notwithstanding that, exactly half the revenues in that bill are out of the President's request—things that he specifically requested. So we do want to be reasonable: we want to be bipartisan. We want to fulfill the wishes of the responsible majority of this House. That is what we have tried to so that we do not go home this week having said that we are incapable or unwilling to face the reality of the need for real deficit reduction.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETING OF RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Rules

has authorized me to announce that the Committee on Rules will meet at 1:15 this afternoon to consider H.R. 3545. . . .

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3545, BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1987

Mr. FROST, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 100-411) on the resolution (H. Res. 298) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3545) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 4 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year 1988, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed. . . .

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNTIL 3:15 P.M. TODAY

Mr. [Thomas S.] FOLEY [of Washington]. Mr. Speaker, I move, pursuant to clause 4 of rule XVI, that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 3:15 p.m. today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VOLKMER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

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

Mr. [Trent] LOTT [of Mississippi]. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 166, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 386] . . .

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FOLEY was allowed to proceed out of order for 1 minute.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the Members on both sides of the aisle of what we intend for the program this afternoon. The Committee on Rules has reported and the rule to provide for consideration of the Guaranteed Deficit Reduction Reconciliation Act has been filed. Because the Rules of the House require a two-thirds vote for it to be brought up on the same day, it was our intention to ask for unanimous consent so that this might occur. Since I have been advised, however, that will not be granted, we now intend to move that the House adjourn today, and, should that motion be adopted, we would reconsider the rule, the general debate, and complete action on the Guaranteed Deficit Reduction Reconciliation Act.

We feel frankly, that this is in the interest of Members on both sides of the aisle since it avoids the possibility of a prolonged session tomorrow and the inconvenience this would cause because of commitments made earlier on the assumption the House would not be in session this Friday.

So the purpose of this announcement is to suggest to Members on both sides of the aisle that, assuming adoption of

the motion, the adjournment of the House will not signal the end of business today. We will reconvene at 3:15.

Mr. [Edward R.] MADIGAN [of Illinois]. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN].

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the purpose of our having 2 legislative days in 1 calendar day is so that the House avoids the necessity of having a two-thirds majority to be able to consider this and can consider it only with a simple majority, is that the gentleman's point?

Mr. FOLEY. Actually, there is not any requirement for a special vote to consider it on the next legislative day. A two-thirds vote is required to consider it on the same day. The rule could be adopted under these circumstances with a majority vote. . . .

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VOLKMER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 236, nays 171, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 387] . . .

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, October 29, 1987, at 3:15 p.m.

Parliamentarian's Note: Because the Majority Leader held the floor beyond 3 p.m. before moving to adjourn, even though the House was to reconvene at 3:15 p.m., the east clock (facing the chair) had to be stopped to permit the 15-minute vote by electronic device on the motion to adjourn to remain open for 15 minutes before 3:15 p.m., the precise time at which the House had voted to reconvene.

§ 9.4 A motion that when the House adjourns, it stand adjourned to a day and time certain under clause 4 of Rule XVI⁽¹⁾ is only in order if offered on the legislative day to which the adjournment applies and may not merely set a different time for convening on a subsequent day beyond the next legislative day.

1. *House Rules and Manual* §§ 911, 912 (2007).

On Sept. 23, 1976,⁽²⁾ the following unanimous-consent request was made:

Mr. [John M.] MURPHY [of New York]. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House convenes on Tuesday, September 28, 1976, it convene at 10 o'clock a.m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore.⁽³⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. [Clarence E.] MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House convenes on Tuesday next, it convene at 10 o'clock a.m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the motion is not in order at this time.

Parliamentarian's Note: Upon adjourning on Sept. 23, 1976, the House met on Monday, Sept. 27, 1976, on which day the motion to set the convening time for Sept. 28, 1976, would have been in order.

§ 9.5 The motion that the adjournment on that day be one to a day and time certain requires a quorum for adoption.⁽¹⁾

2. 122 CONG. REC. 32104, 94th Cong. 2d Sess.

3. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (MA).

1. *House Rules and Manual* §§911, 912 (2007). See also 4 Hinds' Precedents

On June 19, 1975,⁽²⁾ the following occurred in the House:

Mr. [Thomas P.] O'NEILL [Jr., of Massachusetts]. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. . . .

The SPEAKER.⁽³⁾ The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. [John M.] ASHBOOK [of Ohio]. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device; and there were—yeas 384, nays 13, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 321] . . .

So the motion was agreed to.

Serial Adjournments to Days Certain

§ 9.6 The House agreed to a resolution providing that the House meet only Tuesdays and Fridays for a stipulated

§ 2954. See also § 7, *supra*, for additional information on quorum requirements.

2. 121 CONG. REC. 19789, 19790, 94th Cong. 1st Sess.

3. Carl Albert (OK).

period. The Speaker advised the membership that when the House met on those days, it would meet only to adjourn.

On Aug. 25, 1949,⁽¹⁾ the House, by two-thirds vote, agreed to consider on that same day a resolution reported out from the Committee on Rules. The proceedings on the resolution were as follows:

Mr. [Edward E.] COX [of Georgia], from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 345), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That until Wednesday, September 21, 1949, the House shall meet only on Tuesday and Friday of each week unless otherwise ordered.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER.⁽²⁾ The question is, Will the House consider the resolution?

The question was taken; and (two thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House decided to consider the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 345) as follows:

Resolved, That until Wednesday, September 21, 1949, the House shall meet only on Tuesday and Friday of each week unless otherwise ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A Member then asked whether business would be permitted on those Tuesdays and Fridays.

1. 95 CONG. REC. 12287, 12288, 81st Cong. 1st Sess.
2. Sam Rayburn (TX).

Mr. [Earl C.] MICHENER [of Michigan]. Mr. Speaker, it is understood that the House will take 3-day recesses as provided in the resolution.

What business will be permitted on the days the House meets?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, that if the Senate had agreed to cooperate with us and had passed the resolution as the House passed it yesterday, of course, there would have been an adjournment from tomorrow until September 21. The Senate did not see fit to cooperate with us in that. Of course, during that time there would have been no business whatever transacted.

The Chair thinks, under the circumstances, that when the House meets on Tuesdays and Fridays it will meet only to adjourn. No public business will be transacted; there will be no 1-minute speeches or extensions of remarks.

And, as the gentleman made this inquiry, the Chair takes the opportunity to give all Members assurance that there will be no business of any kind transacted until the 21st of September.

Adjournments to Sunday Session

§ 9.7 By unanimous consent, the House established a Sunday as a legislative day.

On Aug. 20, 1994,⁽¹⁾ the following occurred:

1. 140 CONG. REC. 23367, 103d Cong. 2d Sess.

ADJOURNMENT TO SUNDAY,
AUGUST 21, 1994

Mr. [Richard A.] GEPHARDT [of Missouri]. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Sunday, August 21, 1994.

The SPEAKER.⁽²⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri.

There was no objection.

§ 9.8 By unanimous consent the House ordered a legislative session to convene on a Sunday, ordinarily a “dies non”.

On Nov. 17, 1989,⁽¹⁾ the following occurred in the House:

ADJOURNMENT TO SUNDAY,
NOVEMBER 19, 1989

Mr. [Richard A.] GEPHARDT [of Missouri]. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Sunday, November 19, 1989.

The SPEAKER.⁽²⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

§ 9.9 By unanimous consent, the House may provide for a session of the House on a Sunday, traditionally a “dies non” under the precedents of the House.⁽¹⁾

2. Thomas S. Foley (WA).

1. 135 CONG. REC. 30029, 101st Cong. 1st Sess.

2. Thomas S. Foley (WA).

1. 5 Hinds' Precedents §§ 6673, 6674.

On Dec. 18, 1987,⁽²⁾ the following proceedings occurred in the House:

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE
FROM SATURDAY, DECEMBER
19, 1987, TO SUNDAY, DECEMBER
20, 1987

Mr. [Thomas S.] FOLEY [of Washington]. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns from any session on Saturday, December 19, 1987, that it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Sunday, December 20, 1987.

The SPEAKER pro tempore.⁽³⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

§ 9.10 By unanimous-consent request of the Majority Leader, a session of the House on Sunday (a “dies non” under the precedents of the House) was made in order (thus permitting a subsequent motion to adjourn from Saturday until Sunday).

On Dec. 17, 1982,⁽¹⁾ the following occurred in the House:

AUTHORIZING THE HOLDING OF
A SESSION ON SUNDAY, DE-
CEMBER 19, 1982

Mr. [James C.] WRIGHT [Jr., of Texas]. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order for a session to be held on Sunday next.

2. 133 CONG. REC. 36352, 100th Cong. 1st Sess.

3. Kenneth J. Gray (IL).

1. 128 CONG. REC. 31946, 31948, 97th Cong. 2d Sess.

The SPEAKER pro tempore.⁽²⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? . . .

Mr. [Manuel] LUJAN [Jr., of New Mexico]. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.⁽³⁾

-
2. John P. Murtha, Jr. (PA).
 3. *Parliamentarian's Note*: The House has, in recent history, continued in

session beyond midnight Saturday into the calendar day of Sunday, but this appears to be the first instance since that recorded in 5 Hinds' Precedents §§ 6732 (June 29, 1902), 7168 (Feb. 1, 1903), 7169 (Apr. 10, 1904), and 7246 (Feb. 8, 1903), where the House met on separate legislative days on Sundays for eulogies to deceased Members, although those days were counted as legislative days.