shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 11563, a bill declaring an emergency in the housing condition in the District of Columbia; creating a Rent Commission for the District of Columbia; prescribing powers and duties of the commission, and for other purposes; and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. General debate on said bill shall be considered as closed, and the bill shall be considered as having been read the second time. Amendments may be offered to any section of the bill, but debate under the 5-minute rule shall be closed within one hour and a half. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

§ 6. One-minute Speeches

Although not provided for in the order of business specified in the rules of the House, one-minute speeches, for the purpose of debate only, are usually entertained by the Speaker immediately following the approval of the Journal and before any legislative business.[18] Members obtain recognition for one-minute speeches by requesting unanimous consent to address the House for one minute; speeches made under the procedure may not exceed one minute or 300 words (if the word-limit is exceeded, the speech will be printed in the Extensions of Remarks or Appendix of the Record).[19] One-minute speeches are distinguished from "special-order" speeches, which may extend up to one hour and which follow the legislative program of the day.[20]

The normal procedure for one-minute speeches may be varied where necessary; such speeches may, for example, exceed one-minute, in the discretion of the Speaker, when no legislative business is scheduled.[1] And the Speaker may decline to recognize for one-minute speeches before proceeding to pressing business.[2] The Speaker has on occasion rec-

18. For discussion of the evolution of the practice of allowing one-minute speeches, see § 6.1, infra. For discussion of the principle that orders to address the House for more than one minute must follow the legislative business of the day, see § 7.1, infra.

19. See § 6.1, infra. See also Ch. 29, infra (consideration and debate) and Ch. 5, supra (discussing the *Congressional Record*), for the relationship of one minute speeches to recognition, debate, and the printing of the *Congressional Record*.

20. See § 7, infra.

1. See §§ 6.1, 6.5, infra.

2. See §§ 6.6, 6.7, infra.

ognized for one-minute speeches after business has been conducted, where circumstances so permitted.[3]

Generally, the "one-minute rule" is followed on each day that the House is in session, in order to give Members the opportunity to express themselves on a variety of subjects while no business is under discussion.

In Order Before Legislative Business

§ 6.1 The Speaker discussed in the 79th Congress the modern practice permitting speeches of up to one minute following the approval of the Journal and before the legislative business of the day, and the practice of allowing such speeches to extend beyond one minute where no legislative business is scheduled.

On Mar. 6, 1945,[4] Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, responded to a parliamentary inquiry on the place of "one-minute" speeches in the order of business:

THE SPEAKER: The Chair can reiterate what he has said many times. If he can go back, there was a time here when Members rose the day before and asked unanimous consent that after the approval of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk they might proceed for 20 minutes or 30 minutes or an hour. As chairman of a committee in those days I would sit here ready to go along with my bill, and probably it would be 3 o'clock in the afternoon before legislation was reached.

When I became majority leader, I made the statement to the House, after consulting with the minority leader, who I think at that time was Mr. Snell, of New York, that if anyone asked to proceed for more than 1 minute before the legislative program of the day was completed we would object. Since then Members have not asked to proceed for more than a minute before the legislative program.

Then Members began speaking for a minute and putting into the Record a long speech, so that 10 or a dozen pages of the Record was taken up before the people who read the Record would get to the legislative program of the day, in which I would think they would be the most interested. So we adopted the policy—there is no rule about it—of asking that when Members speak for a minute, if their remarks are more than 300 words, which many times can be said in a minute, their remarks or any extension of their remarks go in the Appendix of the Record. The Chair has on numerous occasions spoken to those who control the Record and asked them to follow that policy.

MR. [JOHN E.] RANKIN [of Mississippi]: Mr. Speaker, I take issue of course with that policy, because these

3. See § 6.3, infra.

4. 91 CONG. REC. 1788, 1789, 79th Cong. 1st Sess.

1-minute speakers do not abuse the Record, as a rule. The only question that has been raised about any abuse of the Record in regard to these 1-minute speeches was with reference to a speech made on the 5th of February, I believe, wherein the 1-minute speaker used several pages.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair might state also that when there is no legislative program in the House for the day, such speeches may go in, and they will go in as 1-minute speeches.

MR. [DANIEL A.] REED of New York: Mr. Speaker, verifying the statement, which, of course, needs no verification, I remember going to the Speaker and asking if it would be proper to put the speech in the body of the Record, and the Speaker said that there was no legislative program for the day and there was no reason why a Member could not do it. I assume that was on the 5th of February.

THE SPEAKER: That is correct.

MR. RANKIN: Let me say to the gentleman from New York that on yesterday one of the Members made a speech that you will find in the Record almost or quite as long as the speech of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Bunker], or the one of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Gathings], or the one that I made. It was placed in the body of the Record, and it was in excess of 300 words. I can go back through the Record here and find numerous occasions.

If we are going to adopt the policy that everybody who speaks in the well of the House and uses over 300 words must have his speech printed in the Appendix, it should apply to all of us.

I notice sometimes the Presiding Officer occasionally allows some people more than a minute. Some people have long minutes. We had one rise to speak the other day. I drew my watch. I believe it was 3 minutes. If you will check back you will find every word of it went in the body of the Record. I think this should be a matter to be settled by the membership of the House. Where they make these 1-minute speeches with the right to extend their own remarks, it should go in the body of the Record and not be shifted to the Appendix of the Record to make it appear as if it were an extension of remarks.

THE SPEAKER: The House has that within its entire control at any time it desires to act upon the question.

The practice regarding such speeches was also discussed on Feb. 6, 1945 (Speaker Rayburn presiding): (5)

MR. [ROBERT F.] RICH [of Pennsylvania]: I wish to ask the Chair how it is that if a Member on this side asks for a minute in which to address the House he is permitted to insert 300 words or less, but that when some Members on the other side of the aisle make similar requests they are permitted to put in 7⅓ pages, or some 8,000 words? How does the discrimination come about?

THE SPEAKER: There is no discrimination because there was no legislative program on yesterday and anyone had the right to extend his remarks "at this point" in the Record.

MR. RICH: I am glad to hear that.

THE SPEAKER: There is no discrimination; that has been the custom for

5. *Id.* at pp. 839–41.

several years. The gentleman will learn it now if he does not already know it from previous rulings of the Chair. . . .

MR. RANKIN: The question has been raised by two Members, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hoffman] about certain matter that was inserted in the Record on yesterday, by another Member. The contention has been made that it was in violation of the rules of the House.

May I ask the Speaker if it would not be the proper procedure, if any Member feels that the rule has been violated, for him to make a point of order against the insertion, and if his point of order is sustained, then to move to strike the matter from the Record?

THE SPEAKER: That could be done. Let the Chair explain the whole situation.

In the first place, the 1-minute rule was adopted in order that no Member could proceed for more than 1 minute prior to the business of the day on any day when there was a legislative program. The Chair has instructed the official reporters that if such a 1-minute speech and whatever extension is made of it amounts to more than 300 words, it must appear in the Appendix of the Record.

As to the matter on yesterday, when a Member asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record, whether or not he addresses the House in connection therewith and whether or not there is a legislative program for that day, if the extraneous matter covers more than two pages it is the duty of the Public Printer under regulation promulgated by the Joint Committee on Printing to return it, unless the Member having first obtained an estimate of the cost from the Public Printer and included that estimate in his request, has obtained the unanimous consent of the House that the whole extension may be included in the Record. The Chair has tried to enforce the 300-word rule, and intends to, but he does not have any way of looking into what goes to the Printing Office in the extension of remarks.

Parliamentarian's Note: When there is a legislative program for the day, any one-minute speeches which contain more than 300 words are printed in the *Congressional Record* following the business of the day or in the Appendix.(6) And extensions of remarks on one-minute speeches are not printed at that point in the Record where there is a legislative program for the day, but in the Appendix of the Record.(7)

---

6. See Speaker Rayburn's announcement of Jan. 17, 1949, 95 CONG. REC. 403, 81st Cong. 1st Sess.

7. 84 CONG. REC. 8779, 76th Cong. 1st Sess., July 10, 1939; and 84 CONG. REC. 7108, 76th Cong. 1st Sess., June 13, 1939.

See also the statement of Majority Leader Rayburn on June 10, 1939, 84 CONG. REC. 6949, 6950, 76th Cong. 1st Sess., that he would thereafter object to extensions of remarks "at this point in the Record" where a Member has addressed the House for one minute before the legislative program of the day.

§ 6.2 The Speaker stated that when Members are recognized after approval of the Journal to extend remarks and to proceed for one minute and then a point of order of no quorum is made to start the consideration of legislation, it is not proper to begin over again recognition to extend remarks and proceed for one-minute speeches.

On Mar. 7, 1941,[8] Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, made a statement as to one-minute speeches:

> Let the Chair make a statement. When the House meets and Members are recognized to extend their remarks or to proceed for 1 minute and all who are on the floor and so desire have been recognized, and then a point of no quorum is made in order to start the business of legislation for the day, the Chair thinks it is hardly proper to begin all over again in recognizing Members to extend their own remarks or to proceed for 1 minute, but the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Gifford].

§ 6.3 While one-minute speeches are normally entertained at the beginning of the legislative day, immediately following the approval of the Journal, the Speaker sometimes recognizes Members to proceed for one minute after business has been conducted.

On Oct. 15, 1969,[9] one-minute speeches had been concluded following the approval of the Journal and Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, had recognized several Members for business requests by unanimous consent before recognizing Mr. Spark M. Matsunaga, of Hawaii, to call up the first scheduled legislative business of the day. Before Mr. Matsunaga took the floor, Mr. Arnold Olsen, of Montana, rose to a question of personal privilege and asked for recognition to proceed for one minute, in order to respond to the last one-minute speech. The Speaker recognized him for a one-minute speech (rather than ruling on a question of personal privilege).

§ 6.4 The rule (Rule XXVII clause 4) providing that motions to discharge committees shall be in order "immediately" after the reading of the Journal on the second and fourth Mondays was construed not to prohibit the Speaker from recognizing for unanimous-consent requests (including one-minute

8. 87 CONG. REC. 2008, 77th Cong. 1st Sess.

9. 115 CONG. REC. 30080, 91st Cong. 1st Sess.

speeches) prior to recognition for an eligible motion to discharge.

On Oct. 12, 1942,[10] which was the second Monday of the month and therefore a day, under Rule XXVII clause 4,[11] eligible for motions to discharge committees, Mr. Joseph A. Gavagan, of New York, called up such a motion to discharge. Mr. Howard W. Smith, of Virginia, made a point of order against the consideration of the motion on the ground that the rule required such motions to be brought immediately after the reading of the Journal, and that a variety of unanimous-consent requests (including sending bills to conference and administering the oath to a new Member) had been entertained before the motion was called up. Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, overruled the point of order:

> THE SPEAKER: The Chair is ready to rule.
>
> The Chair anticipated certain points of order both today and tomorrow. He has ruled with reference to the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama.
>
> The Chair recognized all the time that the word "immediately" is in this rule, as he has read the rule every day for the past 6 days.
>
> In ruling on a matter similar to this some time ago, the Chair had this to say, although the matter involved was not exactly on all-fours with this point of order, but it is somewhat related:
>
> > The Chair thinks the Chair has a rather wide range of latitude here and could hold, being entirely technical, that a certain point of order might be sustained.
>
> The Chair is not going to be any more technical today than he was at that time. The Chair recognized the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Doughton] on a highly important matter in order to expedite the business of the Congress, not only the House of Representatives but the whole Congress.
>
> The Chair does not feel that the intervention of two or three unanimous-consent requests would put him in a position where he could well hold that the word "immediately" in the rule was not being followed when he recognized the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gavagan].
>
> The Chair holds that in recognizing the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gavagan] when he did, he was complying with the rule which states that it shall be called up immediately upon approval of the Journal.
>
> The Chair therefore overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith].

When No Business Is Scheduled

§ 6.5 The Speaker pro tempore announced that he would recognize Members to address the House for longer

10. 88 CONG. REC. 8066, 8067, 77th Cong. 2d Sess.
11. *House Rules and Manual* § 908 (1979).

than one minute (up to one hour) on a day where the House had no scheduled business pending the filing of conference reports.

On Dec. 16, 1971,[12] Speaker pro tempore J. Edward Roush, of Indiana, made an announcement relative to the order of business and one-minute speeches:

> THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair would advise Members that since there is no legislative business before the House, if Members desire to speak for more than 1 minute, the Chair will recognize them for that purpose.

Parliamentarian's Note: The Speaker generally refuses recognition for extensions of one-minute speeches when legislative business is scheduled,[13] but the evaluation of the time consumed is a matter for the Chair to determine and is not subject to question or challenge by parliamentary inquiry.[14]

When Not Entertained

§ 6.6 Recognition for one-minute speeches is within the discretion of the Speaker, and when the House has a heavy legislative schedule, he sometimes refuses to recognize Members for that purpose.

On Oct. 19, 1966,[15] Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, made a statement on the order of business, following the approval of the Journal and the receipt of several messages from the Senate and President:

> The Chair will receive unanimous-consent requests, after the disposition of pending business.
>
> The unfinished business is the vote on agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 1062) certifying the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities as to the failures of Jeremiah Stamler to give testimony before a duly authorized subcommittee of said committee.
>
> The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

On June 17, 1970,[16] Speaker McCormack in responding to a statement by Mr. H. R. Gross, of Iowa, relative to the fact that the Speaker had declined to recognize for one-minute speeches before legislative business on that day, stated as follows:

> The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that earlier in the

12. 117 CONG. REC. 47429, 92d Cong. 1st Sess.

13. 117 CONG. REC. 13724, 92d Cong. 1st Sess., May 6, 1971; and 116 CONG. REC. 42192, 42193, 91st Cong. 2d Sess., Dec. 17, 1970.

14. 118 CONG. REC. 16288, 92d Cong. 2d Sess., May 9, 1972.

15. 112 CONG. REC. 27640, 89th Cong. 2d Sess.

16. 116 CONG. REC. 20245, 91st Cong. 2d Sess.

day the Chair did make the statement that the Chair would not entertain unanimous-consent requests for 1-minute speeches to be delivered until later on in the day.

I am sure that the gentleman from Iowa clearly understood that statement on the part of the Speaker. At that particular time the Chair stated that the Chair would recognize Members for unanimous-consent requests to extend their remarks in the Record or unanimous-consent requests to speak for 1 minute with the understanding that they would not take their time but would yield back their time.

I think the Chair clearly indicated that the Chair would recognize Members for that purpose at a later time during the day. As far as the Chair is concerned the custom of the 1-minute speech procedure is adhered to as much as possible because the Chair thinks it is a very healthy custom.

The Chair had the intent, after the disposition of the voting rights bill, to recognize Members for 1-minute speeches or further unanimous-consent requests if they desired to do so.

On July 22, 1968,[17] Speaker McCormack discussed, from the floor, recognition for one-minute speeches:

MR. [LESLIE C.] ARENDS [of Illinois]: Might I throw out a suggestion here that may or may not have merit in the eyes of the distinguished Speaker—I do not know. But it seems to me that every day we start early for one reason or another almost an hour is gone before we get down to the legislative process.

Would it be proper if Members were permitted to extend their remarks and make their 1 minute speeches at the end of the legislative day in order that we might just get started right away on the legislative program when we meet.

MR. MCCORMACK: I call the 1-minute period "dynamic democracy." I hesitate to take away the privilege of a Member as to speaking during that period and it has become a custom and a practice of the House. I think it is a very good thing to adhere to that custom and practice.

It is only on rare occasions that Members have not been recognized for that purpose. How would the gentleman feel if he had a 1-minute speech to make and he had sent out his press release and then found out that the Speaker was not going to recognize him? Surely, I think, the gentleman would feel better if the Speaker did recognize him; would he not?

MR. ARENDS: According to a person's views—I think it would be the reverse.

MR. MCCORMACK: Does the gentleman mean at the end of the day?

MR. ARENDS: You said that this might be "dynamic democracy." I would rather it would be started when we have the time rather than be started at noon.

MR. MCCORMACK: It is an integral part of the procedure of the House and I like to adhere to it. Very seldom have I said to Members that I will accept only unanimous-consent requests for extensions of remarks. I hesitate to do it. I think every Member realizes that I am trying to protect their rights. . . .

17. 114 CONG. REC. 22633, 22634, 90th Cong. 2d Sess.

MR. [DURWARD G.] HALL [of Missouri]: I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the question is not that of eliminating the 1-minute speeches after the Members have their news releases out. But it is a question of not going back after the second or third rollcall and rerecognizing speeches. In this connection does "dynamic democracy" mean the same thing as benign but beneficial dictatorship—which does have merit?

MR. MCCORMACK: The gentleman from Missouri has raised a very interesting question. Many times I have said to myself, I am going to announce that the 1-minute speeches will have to be at 12 o'clock and not thereafter. But I have not come to the making of that resolution because I just could not bring myself to it. It is somewhat late in this session to do it and when, of course, we Democrats control the House in the next Congress, and I hope I will be Speaker, then I might do it. I am not promising it, but I may do it. But there is something to what the gentleman from Missouri says.

§ 6.7 The Speaker refused to recognize for one-minute speeches before proceeding with a special-order speech eulogizing a deceased Member.

On July 13, 1967,[18] Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, before recognizing Mr. Glenard P. Lipscomb, of California, for a special-order speech (before legislative business) eulogizing deceased Member J. Arthur Younger, of California, made the following announcement:

The Chair will not receive unanimous-consent requests at this time, except for Members making a unanimous-consent request for committees to sit during general debate today.

Recognition for Debate Only

§ 6.8 The Minority Leader having been recognized to proceed for one minute and in that time having asked unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill, the Speaker held that the gentleman was not recognized for that purpose.

On Jan. 26, 1944,[19] Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, held that recognition for a one-minute speech was limited to that purpose:

MR. [JOSEPH W.] MARTIN [Jr.] of Massachusetts: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will not recognize any other Member at this time for that purpose but will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts.

MR. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the generosity of the Chair.

18. 113 CONG. REC. 18639, 90th Cong. 1st Sess.

19. 90 CONG. REC. 746, 747, 78th Cong. 2d Sess.

I take this minute, Mr. Speaker, because I want to make a unanimous consent request and I think it should be explained.

I agree with the President that there is immediate need for action on the soldiers' vote bill. A good many of us have been hoping we could have action for the last month. To show our sincerity in having action not next week but right now, I ask unanimous consent that the House immediately take up the bill which is on the Union Calendar known as S. 1285. the soldiers' voting bill.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Massachusetts was not recognized for that purpose.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

§ 7. Special-order Speeches

Like one-minute speeches, special-order speeches are not specifically provided for by the rules of the House. Special orders to address the House (for the purpose of debate only) may extend up to one hour and must follow the legislative business for the day.[1] Such speeches must be distinguished from one-minute speeches, which under normal practice are limited to one minute and precede the legislative business of the day.[2] The order of special-order speeches may be varied. For example, where further legislative business is scheduled but is not yet ready for consideration, the Speaker may recognize for special-order speeches with the understanding that legislative business will be resumed.[3] Once special orders have begun, the Speaker generally declines to recognize for legislative business, although there is no rule to prohibit the resumption of business.[4]

Special orders are taken up in the sequence in which they were

1. For discussion of the evolution of the present practice as to special-order speeches, see § 7.1, infra.

Special-order speeches are strictly limited to one hour (see § 7.5, infra).

For further discussion of special-order speeches as related to recognition and debate, see Ch. 29, infra. And for discussion of the recently adopted prohibition on points of no quorum during special-order speeches, see supplements to this edition.

2. On occasion, one-minute speeches have followed the legislative business (see § 6.3, supra) and where there is no legislative business, one-minute speeches, like special orders, have extended for one hour (see § 6.5, supra).

3. See §§ 7.3, 7.4, infra.

4. See § 7.4, infra.

House Rule XV, clause 6, as amended in the 93d Congress (Apr. 9, 1974, H. Res. 998), now prohibits points of order of no quorum when the Speaker is recognizing Members to address the House under special orders with no measure pending.