976, establishing a select committee to investigate U.S. military involvement in Southeast Asia. After the previous question was moved, Mr. Jonathan Bingham, of New York, rose with a parliamentary inquiry:

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

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:[4] The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

MR. BINGHAM: Will the Chair entertain a motion to recommit with an amendment to the resolution?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that a motion to recommit is not in order on a resolution from the Committee on Rules.[5]

Divisibility of Motion

§ 25.12 A motion to recommit with instructions is not divisible.

On June 27, 1947,[6] the House was considering the conference report on H.R. 3737, a bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia. Mr. Joseph P. O'Hara, of Minnesota, offered a motion to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference with certain instructions to the House conferees. Mr. Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois, then rose with a parliamentary inquiry:

MR. DIRKSEN: Would not the motion be divisible?

THE SPEAKER:[7] A motion to recommit is not divisible.

§ 26. Purpose and Effect

Expression of Minority Opinion

§ 26.1 One purpose of the motion to recommit is to give those Members opposed to the bill an opportunity to call for a final expression of opinion by the House on the bill.

On May 15, 1939,[8] the following occurred on the floor of the House:

THE SPEAKER:[9] The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill (H.R. 6260) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, for civil

4. Carl Albert (Okla.).
5. See also 101 CONG. REC. 1076–79, 84th Cong. 1st Sess., Feb. 2, 1955; 97 CONG. REC. 11394, 11397, 11398, 82d Cong. 1st Sess., Sept. 14, 1951; 89 CONG. REC. 233, 78th Cong. 1st Sess., Jan. 19, 1943; 88 CONG. REC. 6544, 77th Cong. 2d Sess., July 23, 1942; and 8 Cannon's Precedents §§ 2270, 2753. See *House Rules and Manual* § 729(b) (1981), for discussion of recommittal of special orders if the previous question is defeated.
6. 93 CONG. REC. 7845, 80th Cong. 1st Sess.
7. Joseph W. Martin, Jr. (Mass.).
8. 84 CONG. REC. 5535, 5536, 76th Cong. 1st Sess.
9. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).

functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The bill was read the third time.

MR. [D. LANE] POWERS [of New Jersey]: Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

THE SPEAKER: Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

MR. POWERS: I am, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman qualifies, and the Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Powers moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with amendments reducing the total amount of the bill $50,000,000.

MR. [ROSS A.] COLLINS [of Mississippi]: Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion to recommit undertakes to do indirectly what cannot be done directly.

The amount carried in this bill, with these amendments, totals $305,000,000. Part of it is for the Panama Canal, part for cemeterial expense, part for the Signal Corps and Alaskan Communications Commission, part for rivers and harbors, part for flood control, and part for the United States Soldiers' Home. Of the amount of $305,000,000, $277,000,000 is for rivers and harbors and flood control, leaving only $28,000,000 for all these other governmental activities. A reduction of $50,000,000 would take away a large part of the money carried in the two amendments voted in the House last Wednesday. A motion to recommit to do this cannot be done. This motion to recommit attempts to do indirectly what cannot be done directly. It proposes a second vote on the same propositions that were voted on last Wednesday; therefore is subject to a point of order.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair may state, in connection with the point of order made by the gentleman from Mississippi, that the Chair understands the purpose of the motion to recommit, one motion to recommit always being in order after the third reading, is to give to those Members opposed to the bill an opportunity to have an expression of opinion by the House upon their proposition. It is true that under the precedents it is not in order by way of a motion to recommit to propose an amendment to an amendment previously adopted by the House, but the motion now pending does not specifically propose to instruct the Committee on Appropriations to do that. The Chair is inclined to the opinion that the motion to recommit in the form here presented is not subject to a point of order.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Committee Action

§ 26.2 The House may, through use of the motion to recommit, instruct one of its committees to take certain actions which are not contrary to the rules of the House.

On Aug. 22, 1966,[10] the House was considering H.R. 16340, prohibiting picketing within 500 feet

10. 112 CONG. REC. 20119, 89th Cong. 2d Sess.

of any church in the District of Columbia. The following then occurred:

MR. [DON] EDWARDS of California: Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:[11] Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

MR. EDWARDS of California: I am, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Edwards of California moves to recommit H.R. 16340 to the District of Columbia Committee with instructions to hold public hearings and to request a report of the Department of Justice and the testimony of the Attorney General.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

MR. [WAYNE L.] HAYS [of Ohio]: Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit. We cannot tell a committee who to call as witnesses and what kind of hearings to hold.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The House has authority to instruct the committee. The motion is in order.

Investigation of Election Contest

§ 26.3 A resolution pertaining to an election contest may be recommitted to an elections committee with an instruction calling for a further investigation of the issues involved.

On Aug. 19, 1937,[12] Mr. John H. Kerr, of North Carolina, called up House Resolution 309, relating to the election contest of Roy v Jenks.

The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Arthur B. Jenks is not entitled to a seat in the House of Representatives in the Seventy-fifth Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of New Hampshire.

Resolved, That Alphonse Roy is entitled to a seat in the House of Representatives in the Seventy-fifth Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of New Hampshire. . . .

MR. [J. MARK] WILCOX [of Florida]: Mr. Speaker——

THE SPEAKER:[13] For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida rise?

MR. WILCOX: Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Wilcox moves that this resolution be recommitted to the committee; that the committee be and hereby is authorized, empowered, and directed to take or cause to be taken the testimony of the 458 Newton residents shown by the town election records to have voted there in person on November 3, 1936, and such further testimony as the committee may consider relevant to better enable it to determine the issue

11. Carl Albert (Okla.).

12. 81 CONG. REC. 9356, 9374, 75th Cong. 1st Sess.

13. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).

raised by this case; and that the committee be authorized to expend such sums in its investigation as it may deem necessary, and report its findings and recommendations to this House at the next session of Congress.

MR. KERR: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

THE SPEAKER: The question is on the motion to recommit. . . .

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 231, nays 129, answered "present" 3, not voting 66. . . .

So the motion was agreed to.

Authority of Speaker as to Committee Instructions

§ 26.4 Where the House adopts a motion to recommit it is not within the province of the Speaker to advise or direct a committee in the performance of its duty under the terms of the motion.

On Aug. 19, 1937,[14] the House was considering House Resolution 309, relating to the election contest of Roy v Jenks. Mr. Jack Nichols, of Oklahoma, rose with a parliamentary inquiry:

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

THE SPEAKER:[15] The gentleman will state it.

MR. NICHOLS: Mr. Speaker, we of the committee are in a quandary in reference to the motion to recommit just adopted by the House and would ask that the Speaker examine the motion, if that is possible, and advise us what we are directed to do under the motion to recommit.

THE SPEAKER: It is not within the province of the Chair to undertake to direct the committee. The Chair feels the House itself, under the terms of the motion, has directed the committee as to the procedure.

Effect of Special Order

§ 26.5 A motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report a bill back to the House with the recommendation that it be recommitted to the committee from which reported is not in order where the Committee of the Whole is considering the bill under a resolution setting out conditions which do not permit such motion.

On Aug. 10, 1950,[16] the Committee of the Whole was considering H.R. 9176, the Defense Production Act of 1950. Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, rose with a preferential motion:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rankin moves that the Committee do now rise and report the

14. 81 CONG. REC. 9374, 9375, 75th Cong. 1st Sess.

15. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).

16. 96 CONG. REC. 12219, 81st Cong. 2d Sess.

bill back to the House with the recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency for further hearings and study.

MR. [WRIGHT] PATMAN [of Texas]: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

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

MR. PATMAN: Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this being a straight motion to recommit, without instructions, it is not permissible under the rule under which we are considering the bill in Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is ready to rule.

That motion is not in order in Committee of the Whole, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

MR. RANKIN: Mr. Chairman, it is in order to make a motion that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency for further study and hearing.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the consideration of this bill the Committee of the Whole is operating under a special rule which lays down the conditions under which the bill is to be considered. The motion of the gentleman from Mississippi is not in order at this time.

Parliamentarian's Note: The special rule [H. Res. 740 agreed to Aug. 1, 1950] provided:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9176) to establish a system of priorities and allocations for materials and facilities, authorize the requisitioning thereof, provide financial assistance for expansion of productive capacity and supply, strengthen controls over credit, regulate speculation on commodity exchanges, and by these measures facilitate the production of goods and services necessary for the national security, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

17. Howard W. Smith (Va.).

Effect of Recommittal on Amendments

§ 26.6 Where a bill reported to the House with committee amendments is recommitted, it is again before the committee in its original form—that is, as introduced or referred to that committee in the first instance. The committee must again vote on any amendments before reporting the measure.

Parliamentarian's Note: On Sept. 20, 1972,[18] the House by unanimous consent recommitted the bill S. 1316, to amend section 301 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, to the Committee on Agriculture. Upon recommittal, the Parliamentarian advised the Committee on Agriculture that the Senate bill in the form passed by the Senate was pending before the committee, and that the committee would be required to act again upon the amendments in order to report the bill with committee amendments.

§ 26.7 Where the Senate recommits a bill to the committee which reported it such action nullifies all amendments agreed to on the floor, and, if this happens to a House bill, it goes back to the Senate committee in the same form in which it came from the House.

On May 11, 1949,[19] the Senate was considering H.R. 3083, a Treasury and Post Office appropriations bill for fiscal 1950. The following discussion took place on the floor of the Senate:

> THE VICE PRESIDENT:[20] The Chair will advise Senators that when a bill is recommitted to the committee from which it emanates, such action nullifies all amendments that have been agreed to on the floor of the Senate, and the bill goes back to the committee—if it happens to be a House bill—in the same shape in which it came to the Senate from the House, regardless of the intention of any Senator.

Status of Recommitted Conference Report

§ 26.8 When a conference report is recommitted to the conference committee the entire matter is again before that committee for consideration.

On Sept. 11, 1940,[1] the House was considering the conference re-

18. 118 CONG. REC. 31370, 31371, 92d Cong. 2d Sess.

19. 95 CONG. REC. 6039, 81st Cong. 1st Sess.

20. Alben W. Barkley (Ky.).

1. 86 CONG. REC. 11938, 76th Cong. 3d Sess.

port on S. 3550, making unlawful the transportation of convict-made goods in interstate commerce. Mr. Earl C. Michener, of Michigan, offered a motion to recommit the conference report and then posed the following parliamentary inquiry:

> MR. MICHENER: If this motion should carry, the conferees would then be permitted to go back and cut out all the exemptions which they have included here if they wanted.
>
> THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:[2] The whole matter would be before the conferees.

§ 26.9 Notwithstanding recommittal of a conference report to a committee of conference with instructions, the subsequent conference report is filed as privileged, given a new number, and otherwise treated as a new and separate report.

On May 8, 1963,[3] the House agreed to recommit the conference report (H. Rept. No. 275) on the supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 5517) for fiscal 1963 to the committee of conference.

On May 14, 1963,[4] the new conference report on H.R. 5517, renumbered House Report No. 290, was submitted for consideration to the House.

§ 26.10 Where a conference report is recommitted to the committee of conference, and a second report is then filed by the conferees, this second report is numbered and otherwise treated by the House as a new and separate report.

Parliamentarian's Note: On June 30, 1962,[5] the conferees on the part of the House filed House Report No. 1955, the second conference report on S. 3161, to continue authority for the control of exports. The original conference report, House Report No. 1949, had been recommitted to the committee of conference. When the second report was filed, the question arose as to whether it should be given a new number, or numbered as part II of House Report No. 1949. It was given a new number, and the first report was not acted upon.

Recommittal of Improperly Reported Bills

§ 26.11 Where the chairman of a committee admits that a bill was reported when a

2. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).
3. 109 CONG. REC. 8043, 88th Cong. 1st Sess.
4. *Id.* at pp. 8502, 8503.
5. 108 CONG. REC. 12355, 87th Cong. 2d Sess.

quorum was not present in the committee, and a point of order is sustained against the bill on that ground, the bill is recommitted by order of the Speaker.

On Oct. 11, 1968,[6] the House was considering S. 2511, to maintain and improve the income of producers of crude pine gum. Mr. Paul Findley, of Illinois, made a point of order against the consideration of the bill on the grounds that it had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture sitting without a quorum being present.

THE SPEAKER:[7] The Chair would like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture if a quorum was present when the bill was reported.

MR. [WILLIAM R.] POAGE [of Texas]: Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture was not present the day this bill was reported. The record indicates that there were only 14 members of the committee present at the time it was reported.

THE SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Texas state that the record of his committee shows there were 14 members present when the bill was acted upon and reported out?

MR. POAGE: That is correct.

THE SPEAKER: Clause 27 of rule XI clearly covers this situation. Paragraph (e) of clause 27 of rule XI states:

> No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present.

Upon the statement of the chairman of the committee, a majority of the committee were not actually present. Therefore, the point of order is sustained; and the bill is recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture.[8]

§ 26.12 Where a report of a committee fails to comply with the provisions of the Ramseyer rule and a point of order is sustained on that ground, the bill is recommitted to the committee reporting it.

On May 3, 1937,[9] the Clerk had just called up S. 709, to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States. Mr. Jesse P. Wolcott, of Michigan, rose with a parliamentary inquiry:

MR. WOLCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if it appears from the report that subsection 2(a) of rule XXIII[10] commonly known as the Ramseyer rule, has not been complied with, is the bill automatically recommitted to the committee from which it was reported?

THE SPEAKER:[11] If the point of order should be sustained, under the

6. 114 CONG. REC. 30739, 90th Cong. 2d Sess.
7. John W. McCormack (Mass.).
8. See also 114 CONG. REC. 30751, 90th Cong. 2d Sess., Oct. 11, 1968.
9. 81 CONG. REC. 4123, 4124, 75th Cong. 1st Sess.
10. Rule XIII clause 3, *House Rules and Manual* § 745 (1981).
11. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).

provision governing such cases the bill would automatically be recommitted to the committee from which it was reported.

MR. WOLCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the consideration of the bill (S. 709) that the so-called Ramseyer rule has not been complied with. . . .

THE SPEAKER: The point of order is sustained, and the bill is recommitted to the Committee on Education.

Resolution Certifying Contumacious Conduct

§ 26.13 The House has adopted a motion recommitting a resolution certifying the contempt of a committee witness to the committee which reported the contumacious conduct.

On July 13, 1971,[12] the House was considering House Resolution 534, certifying the contumacious conduct of Frank Stanton, president of CBS, as a witness before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. After the previous question was ordered on motion by Mr. Harley O. Staggers, of West Virginia, Mr. Hastings Keith, of Massachusetts, rose to his feet:

MR. KEITH: Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

THE SPEAKER:[13] Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

MR. KEITH: I am, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Keith moves to recommit House Resolution 534 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

THE SPEAKER: Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

THE SPEAKER: The question is on the motion to recommit. . . .

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 181, answered "present" 2, not voting 24. . . .

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

Bill on Consent Calendar

§ 26.14 A bill on the Consent Calendar has been recommitted to the committee which reported it.

On Apr. 4, 1949,[14] the House was considering a bill on the Consent Calendar (H.R. 1823), to establish a Women's Reserve as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve. Immediately after the House adopted an amendment, Mr. Herbert C. Bonner, of North Carolina, then rose to his feet:

MR. BONNER: Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

THE SPEAKER:[15] The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

---

12. 117 CONG. REC. 24723, 24752, 24753, 92d Cong. 1st Sess.

13. Carl Albert (Okla.).

14. 95 CONG. REC. 3806, 3807, 81st Cong. 1st Sess.

15. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bonner moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. . . .

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Marcantonio) there were—ayes 107, noes 89. . . .

The motion to recommit was agreed to.

Bill on Private Calendar

§ 26.15 A bill on the Private Calendar was, by unanimous consent, recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

On Dec. 17, 1963,[16] the Clerk of the House called up the bill S. 1272, for the relief of Viktor Jaanimets. The following occurred:

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:[17] Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

MR. [MICHAEL A.] FEIGHAN [of Ohio]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 1272 be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Recommittal of Pending Resolution

§ 26.16 The recommittal of a funding resolution and a privileged report thereon does not prevent the resolution from being called up by unanimous consent.

On Sept. 30, 1966,[18] the House recommitted House Resolution 1028, and its accompanying report No. 2158, providing funds for the Committee on House Administration, to that committee. Mr. Omar T. Burleson, of Texas, then rose to a parliamentary inquiry.

MR. BURLESON: Mr. Speaker, by the report and resolution being recommitted, would that preclude a request on the part of the chairman of the committee to call the [resolution] up under consent?

THE SPEAKER:[19] The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

MR. BURLESON: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 1028. . . .

THE SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

MR. [JONATHAN B.] BINGHAM [of New York]: Mr. Speaker, I object.

THE SPEAKER: Objection is heard.

Instructions to Modify Amendment

§ 26.17 Absent a special rule, a motion to recommit may not include instructions to mod-

16. 109 CONG. REC. 24796, 88th Cong. 1st Sess.
17. Carl Albert (Okla.).
18. 112 CONG. REC. 24548, 89th Cong. 2d Sess.
19. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

ify any part of an amendment previously agreed to by the House.

On May 4, 1960,[20] Mr. Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana, rose with the following parliamentary inquiry:

> MR. HALLECK: Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I addressed a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair to which response was made. The parliamentary inquiry went to the question as to whether or not, as the Senate bill has been reported by the committee, a motion to recommit with instructions would be in order. Mr. Speaker, to further clarify the matter, the committee struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substituted a complete amendment, which I take it would be offered if and when the bill were to be read for consideration. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the fact that what some of us refer to as the administration bill, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kilburn] is now on the calendar, the parliamentary inquiry is whether or not under the rules of the House a motion to recommit with instructions would be in order in order that a record vote could be had on such amendment as a substitute.
>
> THE SPEAKER:[1] The gentleman from Indiana has been kind enough to discuss this with the Chair.
>
> On further examining the rules and precedents of the House, under the situation as it exists, when we go into the Committee of the Whole and the amendment is adopted, and then agreed to in the House, the rules are that a motion to recommit with instructions will not be in order.[2]

Parliamentarian's Note: If an amendment in the nature of a substitute is agreed to in Committee of the Whole and ratified by the House, that text cannot thereafter be changed by a motion to recommit with instructions.

§ 26.18 Where the House has adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, such amendment cannot, absent a special rule, be further amended by way of a motion to recommit; and only a simple motion to recommit would be in order.

On June 17, 1952,[3] the House was considering S. 658, to amend the Communications Act of 1934. Mr. Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana, rose with the following parliamentary inquiry:

> MR. HALLECK: In view of the fact that the matter before us is a Committee amendment, a complete amendment to the whole bill, would any motion to recommit, except a straight motion to recommit, be in order?

20. 106 CONG. REC. 9416, 9417, 86th Cong. 2d Sess.

1. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

2. See also 99 CONG. REC. 6156, 83d Cong. 1st Sess., June 5, 1953.

3. 98 CONG. REC. 7421, 82d Cong. 2d Sess.

THE SPEAKER:[4] That is the only motion that would be in order under the rule.[5]

Amendment Reported in Disagreement by Conferees

§ 26.19 A motion to recommit an amendment reported in disagreement by the conferees is not in order.

On Oct. 17, 1967,[6] the House was considering the conference report and amendments in disagreement on H.R. 11476, appropriations for the Department of Transportation for fiscal 1968. After the conference report had been agreed to, the House proceeded to consider the amendments reported in disagreement, when Mr. Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois raised the following parliamentary inquiry:

MR. YATES: Mr. Speaker, is it in order to move to recommit this particular amendment to conference?

THE SPEAKER:[7] The Chair will state to the gentleman from Illinois that at this point it would not be in order to do so.

4. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).
5. See also 106 CONG. REC. 9416, 9417, 86th Cong. 2d Sess., May 4, 1960.
6. 113 CONG. REC. 29044, 29048, 29049, 90th Cong. 1st Sess.
7. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

§ 27. Priorities in Recognition

Speaker's Power of Recognition

§ 27.1 On one occasion the Speaker took the floor in the Committee of the Whole to state that it was his prerogative to recognize any member of the minority for a motion to recommit when no member of the committee offers a motion.

On Feb. 3, 1944,[8] the Committee of the Whole was considering S. 1285, relating to voting by members of the armed forces. Mr. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., a Republican from Massachusetts, had indicated that he would be glad to have either Mr. Eugene Worley, a Democrat of Texas, or Mr. John Z. Anderson, a Republican of California, recognized to offer a motion to recommit. Mr. John J. Cochran, of Missouri, then yielded the floor to Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas:

MR. RAYBURN: I trust that this colloquy will not take away from the Speaker what has always been his prerogative, to recognize any member of the minority to offer a motion to recommit when no member of the committee offers a motion.

8. 90 CONG. REC. 1221, 1222, 78th Cong. 2d Sess.