

Science and Astronautics, I can advise the gentleman, after having consulted with him about his amendment under the circumstances, we have no objection to the amendment passing. . . .

Mr. Chairman, on the amendment that we have just been discussing, it was stated that there would be no objection on either side of the aisle. Has there been any action taken on that amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽²⁾ No, there has not been any action taken on the amendment.

The Chair would advise the gentleman that the Chair is trying to determine whether or not the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Collier) desires to speak on the amendment.

MR. [HAROLD R.] COLLIER: Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask a parliamentary inquiry—the fact that they have not voiced any objection still leaves it open for discussion inasmuch as they have not accepted the amendment; is that correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment must be voted upon by the members of the committee, the Chair would advise the gentleman from Illinois. . . .

MR. FULTON of Pennsylvania: Mr. Chairman, when it is stated by both sides of the aisle that there is no objection, it would seem to me that the obvious effect of that is that the amendment is agreed to and it is acceptable to both sides. Of course, as the Chairman pointed out, it has to be passed on by the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair states that any Member desiring recognition

to discuss the amendment will be recognized.

Amendment Considered as Original Bill

§ 26.11 A unanimous-consent request has been made that the Committee of the Whole consider a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for purposes of amendment and that a separate vote in the House be allowed on any amendment to the original bill or to the committee substitute.⁽³⁾

§ 27. Considering Amendments En Bloc

Amendments may be considered en bloc only by unanimous consent,⁽⁴⁾ or where specified by special rule.⁽⁵⁾ Such amendments are voted on en bloc.⁽⁶⁾

Where amendments reported to the House have been considered en bloc in Committee of the Whole and a separate vote thereon is demanded in the House, the Chair puts the question on the amendments en bloc where no Member demands a division of the question in the House.⁽⁷⁾

3. See § 36.22 *infra*.

4. See §§ 27.2, 27.3, *infra*.

5. See §§ 27.14–27.16, *infra*.

6. See § 27.12, *infra*.

7. For discussion of House consideration of amendments reported from

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

Unanimous-Consent Requirement—Amendments to More Than One Section

§ 27.1 To a bill being read for amendment by sections, amendments to more than one section may be considered en bloc by unanimous consent only.

On Oct. 5, 1977,⁽⁸⁾ the Committee of the Whole having under consideration H.R. 8410,⁽⁹⁾ the Chair responded to a parliamentary inquiry concerning the procedure for offering amendments to two sections of the bill:

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹⁰⁾ Are there further amendments to section 7? . . .

MR. [JOHN N.] ERLBORN [of Illinois]: Mr. Chairman, I have amendments that amend both sections 7 and 8. The amendment to section 7 is technical and conforming in nature. The substance of the amendments is to section 8.

I would ask the Chairman if I might offer my amendments now, or should I wait until section 8 has been read?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will advise the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Erlborn) that if the gentleman desires to offer his amendments as one

Committee of the Whole, and demands for a separate vote on amendments, see § 36, *infra*.

8. 123 CONG. REC. 32523, 32524, 95th Cong. 1st Sess.
9. The Labor Reform Act of 1977.
10. William H. Natcher (Ky.).

amendment, he will have to obtain unanimous consent to do so, either now or when section 8 is read.

—Committee Amendment Required by Special Rule To Be Considered First

§ 27.2 Unanimous consent is required to consider en bloc separate committee amendments printed in a bill, even where a special order adopted by the House provides that the bill is considered as having been read for amendment and that said committee amendments are considered before other committee or individual amendments.

On Aug. 10, 1978,⁽¹¹⁾ the Committee of the Whole was considering H.R. 13511, the Revenue Act of 1978, pursuant to House Resolution 1306,⁽¹²⁾ a “modified closed” rule which provided that the bill be considered as read, allowed only designated amendments (including committee amendments), and prescribed the order of consideration for such amendments.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹³⁾ All time has expired for general debate.

11. 124 CONG. REC. 25453, 95th Cong. 2d Sess.
12. *Id.* at pp. 25415, 25416.
13. Philip R. Sharp (Ind.).

Pursuant to the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments shall be in order except the following amendments which shall not be subject to amendment except amendments recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, and which shall be considered in the following order:

First. The committee amendments printed in the bill (except for section 404);

Second. The committee amendment adding a new section 404. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

MR. [AL] ULLMAN [of Oregon]: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, in the interest of saving time, that the committee amendments as printed in the bill, except for section 404, be considered en bloc, considered as read, and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

En Bloc Amendments Where Motion To Strike Pending

§ 27.3 While there is pending a motion to strike out a title of a bill, only one perfecting amendment to that title may be offered at a time; however, a series of perfecting amendments may be considered en bloc by unanimous consent.

On June 11, 1975,⁽¹⁴⁾ the Committee of the Whole having under

14. 121 CONG. REC. 18435, 18437, 18438, 94th Cong. 1st Sess.

consideration H.R. 6860,⁽¹⁵⁾ motion to strike out a title of the bill was offered. The proceedings, described above, were as follows:

MR. [BILL] ALEXANDER [of Arkansas]: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Alexander: Strike out title II (relating to energy conservation taxes), beginning on line 1 of page 29, and ending on line 24 of page 57. . . .

MR. [AL] ULLMAN [of Oregon]: Mr. Chairman, the amendment to strike will not be voted on until there is opportunity to vote on all of the perfecting amendments to title II?

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹⁶⁾ The gentleman is correct. . . .

MR. [FORTNEY H.] STARK [of California]: Mr. Chairman, I offer several amendments, and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Stark: Page 30, strike out line 1 and all that follows down through line 5 on page 31.

Page 32, strike out line 20 and all that follows down through line 25. . . .

Page 124, line 25, strike out "section 44D(c)(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "section 44B(c)(2)".

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

There was no objection.

MR. ULLMAN: Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California has offered

15. Energy Conservation and Conversion Act of 1975.

16. William H. Natcher (Ky.).

an amendment which would strike part B. The gentleman from Arkansas has offered an amendment which would strike the whole title.

I would assume, after part B is perfected, as the gentleman's amendment to strike part B asks, it would come before the amendment to strike the whole title. Am I correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would like to advise the chairman of the committee that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Stark) is a perfecting amendment and will be voted on first. . . .

MR. STARK: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this point to withdraw my amendment and offer it later, after the gentleman from Ohio offers his amendment.

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

MR. [HERMAN T.] SCHNEEBELI [of Pennsylvania]: Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will ask what the parliamentary procedure is. In the event the gentleman withdraws his amendment, where do we stand?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would like to advise the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Schneebeli) that if the unanimous-consent request is approved, we are back then to the Alexander amendment, which would be the amendment before the Committee, to strike the whole title, and other perfecting amendments to the title, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows, would be in order one at a time.

MR. SCHNEEBELI: Mr. Chairman, if it is withdrawn and we get back to the Alexander amendment, does that mean other amendments of a lesser tax cut would be considered first?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

MR. SCHNEEBELI: Mr. Chairman, I object because I want to vote on the Stark amendment before I vote on any other alternative amendments.

Points of Order While Request Pending

§ 27.4 Where unanimous consent is requested that two amendments to different provisions in a bill be considered en bloc, points of order against such amendments may be made or reserved pending agreement to the request.

On Feb. 19, 1970,⁽¹⁷⁾ he following proceedings took place:

MR. [JAMES G.] O'HARA [of Michigan]: Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹⁸⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that the amendments be considered en bloc?

MR. GERALD R. FORD [of Michigan]: Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendments as legislation on an appropriation bill. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Michigan, the respected minority leader, reserves a point of order.

17. 116 CONG. REC. 4028, 91st Cong, 2d Sess. Under consideration was H.R. 15931.

18. Chet Holifield (Calif.).

Point of Order Against Part

§ 27.5 Where several amendments are offered en bloc by unanimous consent, they are considered as one amendment, and a point of order against any portion thereof renders the entire amendment subject to a point of order.

On Apr. 20, 1972,⁽¹⁾ The following proceedings took place:

MR. [LES] ASPIN [of Wisconsin]: Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered as read.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽²⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The amendments offered by Mr. Aspin are as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "\$1,094,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$894,000".

Page 3, strike out lines 16 and 17, and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

Page 6, line 24, strike out "(15)" and insert in lieu thereof "(14)".

Page 7, line 11, strike out "(16)" and insert in lieu thereof "(15)".

Page 11, insert the following new section after line 25 (and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly):

"Sec. 7. The Administrator, acting through the National Academy of Sciences, is authorized and directed

to conduct a full and complete study of the proposed Space Transport System (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Space Shuttle"), and to report thereon to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate, in order to assist the Congress in determining whether and to what extent funds should be included for the Space Shuttle in a subsequent authorization Act. Such study shall include—

"(1) a determination and evaluation of the military applications of the Space Shuttle; . . .

"(5) and analysis of whether and in what ways the expenditure of an equivalent amount for housing, education, mass transportation, and similar purposes might produce a larger or smaller net benefit to the Nation."

MR. ASPIN: Mr. Chairman, today we are considering the authorization for NASA, and a part of that authorization is \$200 million for the space shuttle.

MR. [OLIN E.] TEAGUE of Texas: Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

MR. ASPIN: Yes, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

MR. TEAGUE of Texas: Do I understand the gentleman has two amendments?

MR. ASPIN: No; they are both one amendment.

MR. TEAGUE of Texas: Is it not the intention of the gentleman to ask unanimous consent to have the two amendments considered together?

MR. ASPIN: I did not make such a request, but I intend for them to be put together. They are on two pieces of

1. 118 CONG. REC. 13641, 13642, 92d Cong. 2d Sess. Under consideration was H.R. 14070.

2. John J. Rooney (N.Y.).

paper, but they are supposed to be one amendment. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair has examined the amendments and determines that this is indeed more than one amendment and, without unanimous consent, could not be joined. . . .

MR. ASPIN: Mr. Chairman, I make that request at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there objection to considering the gentleman's amendments en bloc?

MR. TEAGUE of Texas: Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection to combining the amendments and then, Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the whole amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc. . . .

The gentleman from Texas will state his point of order.

MR. TEAGUE of Texas: Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that the gentleman's amendment directs the Administrator of NASA to make a study of housing and, for sure, this is not germane to the space authorization bill. The last paragraph of his second amendment, I assume, directs the Administrator of NASA to make a study of housing. . . .

MR. ASPIN: Mr. Chairman, what the amendment does is ask the people in NASA to instruct the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study, and I would like to see a rather broader application of some of these questions with reference to the money being spent in the Space Agency. It does not instruct the Administrator of NASA to conduct the study, but asks that the National Academy of Science

conduct the study and then provides for a broader spectrum of the questions that they should study.

MR. TEAGUE of Texas: Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further on the point of order?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Teague).

MR. TEAGUE of Texas: May I read the exact language that is in the amendment. It says:

The Administrator, acting through the National Academy of Science is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study—

And it gets down to housing.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is prepared to rule.

The final paragraph of the amendment requires studies, investigations, and analyses of subjects which are not carried in the bill under consideration and not even within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Astronautics which reported this bill.

The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

§ 27.6 If a point of order is sustained against any portion of a package of amendments considered en bloc to a general appropriation bill, all the amendments are ruled out of order and must be re-offered separately, or those which are not subject to a point of order may be considered en bloc by unanimous consent.

An example of the proposition described above occurred on Sept.

16, 1981,⁽³⁾ during consideration of H.R. 4241, the military construction appropriation bill for fiscal year 1982. The proceedings in the Committee of the Whole were as follows:

MR. [BO] GINN [of Georgia]: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point. . . .

There was no objection. . . .

MR. [M. CALDWELL] BUTLER [of Virginia]: Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be considered en bloc.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽⁴⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection. . . .

Amendments offered by Mr. Butler: Page 2, line 11, strike out "\$1,029,519,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,009,276,400".

Page 3, line 6, strike out "\$1,404,883,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,354,096,100". . . .

MR. [THOMAS F.] HARTNETT [of South Carolina]: . . . My inquiry is: Is this amendment being offered as one amendment, and if it is, would the point of order be in order that the amendment was not properly drawn and that I was being precluded from voting for—I would have to vote for or against all of them where, in fact, I may want to vote for one or the other?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will respond to the gentleman's inquiry by

3. 127 CONG. REC. 20735–37, 97th Cong. 1st Sess.
4. Philip R. Sharp (Ind.).

stating that the gentleman from Virginia has already gotten unanimous consent to offer his amendments en bloc. However, if a point of order is sustained against those amendments or any portion thereof, under the precedent the remaining amendments will have to be reoffered, at which point the gentleman from Virginia will again have to ask permission to have them offered en bloc. If that is denied, then the amendments would have to be offered individually.

MR. HARTNETT: Mr. Chairman, what you are telling me is, in order for the gentleman from Virginia to offer a series of amendments like that, the gentleman has to obtain unanimous consent prior to doing that or, in fact, he would have to offer each one of them individually?

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman is correct.

En Bloc Amendments Subject to Amendment

§ 27.7 Amendments considered en bloc (by unanimous consent) are subject to germane amendment.

On Mar. 9, 1978,⁽⁵⁾ during consideration of H.R. 50⁽⁶⁾ in the Committee of the Whole, an amendment to an amendment was pending which prompted the following exchange concerning the proposition described above:

MR. [RONALD A.] SARASIN [of Connecticut]: Mr. Chairman, I offer

5. 124 CONG. REC. 6281, 6282, 95th Cong. 2d Sess.
6. Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978.

amendments and ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽⁷⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Sarasin: Page 58, line 3, strike out "reasonable price stability" and insert in lieu thereof "the absence of inflation".

Page 59, strike out line 1 and everything that follows through line 5, and redesignate the following paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively. . . .

MR. [JAMES C.] WRIGHT [Jr., of Texas]: Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments to the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Wright to the amendments offered by Mr. Sarasin: On line 2 of the Sarasin amendment, strike all that follows the word "thereof," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the effective control of inflation."

Page 64, line 16, strike out "and productivity" and insert in lieu thereof "productivity and reasonable price stability". . . .

MR. [ROBERT H.] MICHEL [of Illinois]: Mr. Chairman, do I understand the majority leader's proposal is an amendment to the amendment or is it in the form of a substitute?

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The Chair would like to advise the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Michel) that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Wright) offers an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut.

7. William H. Natcher (Ky.).

Multiple Changes to Single Section Not Considered Separate Amendments

§ 27.8 A single amendment may make several related changes in a section of a bill, and each change in the section need not be considered as a separate amendment.

On Aug. 6, 1969,⁽⁸⁾ the following proceedings took place:

MR. [WAYNE L.] HAYS [of Ohio]: Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer two amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Hays:
On Line 6, strike out "\$26,000;" and insert in lieu thereof "\$27,000;".
On line 7, strike out "\$25,000." and insert in lieu thereof "\$26,000."

THE SPEAKER:⁽⁹⁾ The Chair will state it is not necessary to ask unanimous consent to consider the amendments en bloc. All the amendments relate to one section of the bill.

Amendments to Committee Amendment and to Bill

§ 27.9 By unanimous consent, obtained prior to the adoption of a committee amendment, a Member was per-

8. 115 CONG. REC. 22545, 91st Cong. 1st Sess. Under consideration was H. Res. 502.

9. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

mitted to offer, en bloc, several amendments which were, in part, amendatory of a committee amendment previously adopted.

On Aug. 18, 1959,⁽¹⁰⁾ the following proceedings took place:

MR. [MERWIN] COAD (of Iowa): Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹¹⁾ Is this an amendment to the committee amendment?

MR. COAD: I have an amendment to the bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on the committee amendment. . . .

MR. COAD: Mr. Chairman, my amendment will also embrace an amendment to the amendment. Is this the appropriate time to offer it?

THE CHAIRMAN: May the Chair say to the gentleman from Iowa if it is an amendment to the committee amendment it may be offered now.

MR. [OREN] HARRIS [of Arkansas]: Mr. Chairman, in order to assist and to expedite the matter, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to offer his amendments en bloc, which necessarily go to the basic provision of section 315, also to the committee amendment. . . .

There was no objection. . . .

The committee amendment was agreed to.

MR. COAD: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

10. 105 CONG. REC. 16244, 86th Cong. 1st Sess. Under consideration was H.R. 7985.

11. James W. Trimble (Ark.).

On page 1, line 6 after the word "office" add the following: . . .

Amendments to Committee Amendments Not Yet Reported

§ 27.10 Where a Member has amendments to each of several committee amendments, he must offer such amendments singly, as each committee amendment is reported; and it is not in order to consider "en bloc" amendments to committee amendments which have not been reported.

On Feb. 20, 1964,⁽¹²⁾ the following proceedings took place:

MR. [JEFFERY] COHELAN [of California]: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows: . . .

MR. COHELAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if at this time I should offer my amendments en bloc, as I have two other amendments to the bill.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹³⁾ There is pending now only the first committee amendment to this section.

MR. COHELAN: Very well. I will introduce the others at the appropriate time.

12. 110 CONG. REC. 3217, 88th Cong. 2d Sess. Under consideration was H.R. 9637.

13. Harold D. Donohue (Mass.).

Voting Upon**§ 27.11 When amendments are offered and considered en bloc, by unanimous consent, the question is put on all the amendments at the same time in the Committee of the Whole.**

On July 18, 1969,⁽¹⁴⁾ the following proceedings took place:

MR. [EDWARD J.] DERWINSKI [of Illinois]: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to offer the two amendments en bloc to this section. . . .

There was no objection. . . .

MR. [JOHN W.] McCORMACK [of Massachusetts]: As I understand it the two amendments are being considered en bloc and will be voted upon en bloc?

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹⁵⁾ that is correct.

Time Allowed for Debate on En Bloc Amendments**§ 27.12 Where consideration en bloc is granted, by unanimous consent, of several amendments which had been printed in the Record, the proponent is entitled only to five minutes of debate on the amendments.**

14. 114 CONG. REC. 22082, 90th Cong. 2d Sess. Under consideration was H.R. 15263.

15. Charles M. Price (Ill.).

On July 25, 1974,⁽¹⁶⁾ during consideration in the Committee of the Whole of the bill H.R. 11500, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1974, the Chair responded to a unanimous-consent request as described above. The proceedings were as follows:

MR. [CRAIG] HOSMER [of California]: . . . I offer in addition my amendments Nos. 121, 127, 118, and 142 to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and I ask unanimous consent that all of these amendments be considered en bloc and considered as read and printed in the Record.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹⁷⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MR. HOSMER: Mr. Chairman, I make the additional unanimous-consent request that instead of the 25 minutes to which I might be entitled because of the application of rule XXIII, consisting of 5 minutes for each one of these amendments, notwithstanding that rule, I be recognized only for 5 minutes in toto.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will advise the gentleman that 5 minutes on his amendments considered en bloc is all the time the gentleman is entitled to in any event.

16. 120 CONG. REC. 25244, 93d Cong. 2d Sess.

17. Neal Smith (Iowa).

Special Rule Providing for Consideration of Committee Amendments En Bloc

§ 27.13 Where a bill is being considered under a special rule providing for consideration en bloc of certain committee amendments printed in the bill, the Chair directs the Clerk to report the amendments en bloc and they need not be offered from the floor.

On July 8, 1975,⁽¹⁸⁾ the Committee of the Whole having under consideration H.R. 49 (a bill relating to petroleum reserves on public lands, referred jointly to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Armed Services) pursuant to a special rule, the following proceedings occurred:

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹⁹⁾ Under the rule, it shall now be in order to consider en bloc the amendments recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 3, between lines 19 and 20 insert the following: "TITLE I".

Page 3, line 20, strike out "That in" and insert "Sec. 101. In". . . .

Sec. 201. (a) Chapter 641 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows—

18. 121 CONG. REC. 21630, 94th Cong. 1st Sess.

19. Neal Smith (Iowa).

(1) Immediately before section 7421 insert the following new section:

§7420. Definitions

“(a) In this chapter—

“(1) ‘National defense’ includes the needs of, and the planning and preparedness to meet, essential defense industrial and military emergency energy requirements relative to the national safety, welfare, and economy particularly resulting from foreign military or economic actions. . . .

MR. [JOHN] MELCHER [of Montana] (during the reading): Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments en bloc may be considered as read, printed in the Record and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

MR. [F. EDWARD] HÉBERT [of Louisiana]: Mr. Chairman, I will not offer the amendments of the Armed Services Committee as described in the rule.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will advise the gentleman from Louisiana that under the rule the amendments are offered and presented en bloc. They have been presented.

MR. HÉBERT: Mr. Chairman, if they have been presented, under the parliamentary situation I ask for a vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any Member wish to debate the committee amendments?

MR. MELCHER: Mr. Chairman, I rise to explain to the House that the amendments that are now before us are almost identical to H.R. 5919, the Armed Services bill that we have just voted down. I would encourage the

House to reject these amendments, so that then we could get on under the rule to considering our Interior bill, H.R. 49, as presented by the Interior Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on the committee amendments.

The amendments were rejected.

§ 27.14 In accordance with the procedure for considering committee amendments to a bill under the five-minute rule in Committee of the Whole, pursuant to a special order providing that said committee amendments be considered en bloc and be considered as having been read, the Chairman instructs the Clerk to designate the page and line number of the amendments.

On Aug. 2, 1977,⁽²⁰⁾ during consideration of H.R. 8444, the National Energy Act, the proceedings described above were as indicated:

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽²¹⁾ The Clerk will designate the page and line number of the ad hoc committee amendments, the first group of the amendments recommended by the ad hoc committee to be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 183, line 11 through page 184, line 19 . . . and on page 208, line 4 through page 209, line 2, and

20. 123 CONG. REC. 26172, 95th Cong. 1st Sess.

21. Edward P. Boland (Mass.).

an amendment inserting on page 188, line 11, the word "domestic" before the word "crude".

En Bloc Consideration Pursuant to Special Rule: Separate Vote in House

§ 27.15 En bloc consideration of amendments in Committee of the Whole pursuant to a special order results in a vote en bloc in the House upon a demand for a separate vote on those amendments in their perfected form.

On Sept. 7, 1978,⁽²²⁾ during consideration of H.R. 7308,⁽¹⁾ the situation described above occurred as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Murtha, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7308) to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize applications for a court order approving the use of electronic surveillance to obtain foreign intelligence information, pursuant to House Resolution 1266, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

22. 124 CONG. REC. 28423, 28424, 95th Cong. 2d Sess.

1. The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

THE SPEAKER:⁽²⁾ Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

MR. [EDWARD P.] BOLAND [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote en bloc on the McClory amendments agreed to on September 6. . . .

THE SPEAKER: Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment to the Committee amendment? The Clerk will report the amendments en bloc on which a separate vote has been demanded.

MR. [ROBERT E.] BAUMAN [of Maryland]: Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. BAUMAN: Mr. Speaker, is it proper for the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Boland) to demand a separate vote en bloc on the amendments, or must he ask for a vote on each one of these amendments?

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the rule provides that it shall be in order to consider the amendments en bloc, so under the rule the vote on the amendments would be considered as on the amendments en bloc.

Parliamentarian's Note: En bloc consideration of amendments in Committee of the Whole pursuant to a unanimous-consent request therein does not result in an en bloc vote in the House upon de-

2. Thomas P. O'Neill (Mass.).

mand for a separate vote, since that is an order of the Committee not binding on the House. Moreover, even amendments considered en bloc pursuant to a special rule are subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House if divisible, unless prohibited by the rule.

Separate Consideration Where Opposition Arises

§ 27.16 Where amendments are permitted en bloc by unanimous consent they are normally voted upon en bloc, but where opposition develops to one of the amendments during their consideration, the Chairman (recognizing that the amendments could be divided for a vote) may put the question separately on that amendment.

On July 18, 1973,⁽³⁾ the following proceedings took place:

MR. [CLEMENT J.] ZABLOCKI [of Wisconsin]: Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments may be considered en bloc. . . .

There was no objection. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽⁴⁾ The question is on the committee amendments.

3. 19 CONG. REC. 24682, 93d Cong. 1st Sess. Under consideration was H.J. Res. 542.

4. Martha W. Griffiths (Mich.).

MR. [PETER H. B.] FRELINGHUYSEN [of New Jersey]: Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment on page 7 line 4, inserting section 9.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there objection to the other committee amendments? If not the Chair will put the question on the remaining committee amendments. . . .

The remaining committee amendments were agreed to. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: All other committee amendments have been agreed to. The gentleman will be recognized in opposition to the committee amendment.

Division of Question Where Amendment Proposes To Strike Out Two Sections

§ 27.17 An amendment proposing to strike out two sections of a pending committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was, on demand of a Member, subjected to a division of the question in order to obtain separate votes on the proposals to strike out each section.

On July 25, 1974,⁽⁵⁾ during consideration in the Committee of the Whole of the bill H.R. 11500, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1974, the proceedings, described above, were as follows:

MR. [CRAIG] HOSMER [of California]: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment

5. 120 CONG. REC. 25238, 25239, 93d Cong. 2d Sess.

to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Amendment offered by Mr. Hosmer to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute: Page 252, line 15, through page 256, after line 19, strike out sections 404 and 405.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽⁶⁾ Does the gentleman ask for a division of the question?

MR. HOSMER: I do, Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent for a division of the question as to sections 404 and 405. . . .

There was no objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question will be divided.

The first question is upon the part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Hosmer) referring to section 404.

The portion of the amendment, referring to section 404, to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on the portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Hosmer) referring to section 405.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hosmer) there were—ayes 7, noes 29.

So the portion of the amendment referring to section 405, of the amendment to the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

§ 28. Debating Amendments

Debate Until Chair Puts Questions

§ 28.1 An amendment cannot be “accepted” by the major-

6. Neal Smith (Iowa).