

of Oklahoma, as the Speaker pro tempore):

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Van Zandt].

MR. [CLARENCE] CANNON [of Missouri]: Mr. Speaker, I move that the motion to instruct conferees be laid on the table.

MR. [CHARLES A.] HALLECK [of Indiana]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman will state it.

MR. HALLECK: Under the rules of the House, is this motion to table in order?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The motion is in order.

MR. HALLECK: If the motion to table is voted down, will the vote then come on the motion itself?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: On ordering the previous question on the motion. . . .

MR. [CHET] HOLIFIELD [of California]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman will state it.

MR. HOLIFIELD: Mr. Speaker, a yeas vote on this motion would dispose of this matter and defeat the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Van Zandt]?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: It would have that effect.

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

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman will state it.

MR. HALLECK: Mr. Speaker, a vote against tabling the motion offered by

the gentleman from Pennsylvania would give us the right then to vote on the motion which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman has properly stated the situation.

MR. VAN ZANDT: Mr. Speaker, is it not a rule of the House that a motion must be at the Clerk's desk in writing?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: It must be submitted in writing if a Member at the time insists, but such a demand is not in order at this time. . . .

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 164, nays 235, not voting 38.

§ 11. When in Order

Offering Motion to Table Prior to Debate

§ 11.1 The motion to lay a resolution on the table may be made when the resolution is under consideration but before the Member entitled to recognition on the resolution has obtained the floor for debate.

On Jan. 17, 1933,⁽²⁾ Mr. Louis T. McFadden, of Pennsylvania, offered a resolution proposing an investigation into the possible impeachment of President Herbert Hoover. After the reading of the

2. 76 CONG. REC. 1965-68, 72d Cong. 2d Sess.

resolution had been interrupted by several parliamentary inquiries, and after Mr. McFadden had sought to determine whether his hour's time for debate would be protected, the following occurred:

The Clerk concluded the reading of the resolution.

MR. [HENRY T.] RAINEY [of Illinois]: Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution of impeachment on the table.

THE SPEAKER:⁽³⁾ The gentleman from Illinois moves to lay the resolution of impeachment on the table.

May the Chair be permitted to make a statement with reference to the rules applying to that motion. The parliamentarian has examined the precedents with reference to the motion. Speaker Clark and Speaker Gillette, under identical conditions, held that a motion to lay on the table took a Member off the floor of the House, although the general rules granted him one hour in which to discuss the resolution of impeachment or privileges of the House. Therefore the motion is in order.

§ 11.2 A motion to table is a preferential motion, and is in order before a Member begins debate on a motion to expunge from the Record words ruled out of order.

On June 16, 1947,⁽⁴⁾ Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, demanded that certain words read

3. John N. Garner (Tex.).

4. 93 CONG. REC. 7065, 80th Cong. 1st Sess.

from a telegram by Mr. Chet Holifield, of California, be taken down. After the Speaker ruled the words out of order as being unparliamentary, the following occurred:

MR. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the entire statement from the Record, and on that I ask for recognition.

MR. [VITO] MARCANTONIO [of New York]: Mr. Speaker, I move to lay that motion on the table.

MR. RANKIN: Mr. Speaker, I have already been recognized.

THE SPEAKER:⁽⁵⁾ A motion to table is preferential and not debatable.

The question is upon the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Marcantonio] that the motion be tabled. . . .

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Marcantonio) there were—ayes 10, noes 147.

So the motion to table was rejected.

Application to Resolution Disapproving Reorganization Plan

§ 11.3 A motion to proceed to the consideration of a resolution disapproving a reorganization plan is not subject to the motion to table.

On June 8, 1961,⁽⁶⁾ Mr. H. R. Gross, of Iowa, had moved that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on

5. Joseph W. Martin, Jr. (Mass.).

the state of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 303, disapproving a reorganization plan transmitted to the Congress by the President. Mr. Byron G. Rogers, of Colorado, rose to his feet with a parliamentary inquiry:

MR. ROGERS of Colorado: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽⁷⁾ The gentleman will state it.

MR. ROGERS of Colorado: Mr. Speaker, is a motion to lay this motion on the table in order?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: It would not be in order at this time.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The motion was rejected.

§ 12. As Related to Other Motions; Precedence

As Related to the Previous Question

§ 12.1 The motion to lay on the table takes precedence over the motion for the previous question; pending the demand for the previous question the motion to lay on the table is preferential and in order.

On Dec. 14, 1970,⁽⁸⁾ the House was considering House Resolution

7. Oren Harris (Ark.).

8. 116 CONG. REC. 41372-74, 91st Cong. 2d Sess.

1306, asserting the privileges of the House relating to printing and publishing of a report of the Committee on Internal Security. The following then occurred:

THE SPEAKER:⁽⁹⁾ The gentleman from Missouri moves the previous question on the resolution.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY
MR. STOKES

MR. [LOUIS] STOKES [of Ohio]: Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Stokes moves to lay the resolution on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

MR. [RICHARD H.] ICHORD [of Missouri]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

MR. ICHORD: This is a preferential motion to lay the previous question on the table. What would be the parliamentary situation if the previous question is laid on the table? This is not the adoption of the resolution, but a motion with respect to the previous question.

THE SPEAKER: If the motion to lay the resolution on the table is not agreed to, then the question would be on ordering the previous question. Then the next vote would be on the adoption of the resolution.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Stokes) to lay the resolution on the table. . . .

9. John W. McCormack (Mass.).