

The gentlewoman's request is not in order.

Parliamentarian's Note: Under Rule XXXII clause 1, the Speaker

does not have the authority to entertain a request to waive the rule pertaining to the privilege of admission to the floor.

B. GENERAL PROCEDURES ASSOCIATED WITH PASSAGE OF LEGISLATION

§ 11. Readings

The reading of a bill or joint resolution is an essential step leading to passage. It is read the first time by title (which requirement is now complied with upon introduction of the bill or joint resolution by printing the title in the Journal and Record), the second time in full, and the third time by title. The applicable rule, Rule XXI clause 1, was amended in 1965⁽¹¹⁾ to eliminate the right of any Member to demand the reading in full of the engrossed copy.

The second reading, which is a reading in full, may be dispensed with only by unanimous consent.⁽¹²⁾ It may not be dispensed with by motion.⁽¹³⁾ And when a

bill is read in full for the first time the text of the bill as originally introduced is read. Proposed committee amendments are not reported at that time.⁽¹⁴⁾

The three readings referred to in Rule XXI clause 1 do not include the actual procedure for reading for amendment. Reading for amendment is actually yet another reading that, although not specifically provided for in that rule, is conducted pursuant to a practice of the House derived from an earlier version of the present Rule XXIII clause 5,⁽¹⁵⁾ or pursuant to the terms of a special order or rule which may be adopted to govern the consideration of a particular bill.

Cross Reference

Reading bills for Amendment and reading of amendments, Ch. 27, *infra*.

11. H. Res. 8, 111 CONG. REC. 21-25, 89th Cong. 1st Sess., Jan. 4, 1965.

12. See § 11.1, *infra*.

13. Compare 4 Hinds' Precedents § 4738 where Chairman Albert Hopkins (Ill.), ruled that a bill that had been read in full in the House may be again read in full on the demand of

a Member in the Committee of the Whole ". . . unless its reading is dispensed with by the action of the Committee."

14. See 75 CONG. REC. 8139, 72d Cong. 1st Sess., Apr. 13, 1932.

15. *House Rules and Manual* § 872 (1981).

Reading in Full**§ 11.1 A motion to dispense with the full reading of a bill in the Committee of the Whole is not in order.**

On June 4, 1951,⁽¹⁶⁾ the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the District of Columbia Law Enforcement Act of 1951 (H.R. 4141). The Chairman⁽¹⁷⁾ stated that without objection the first (full) reading of the bill would be dispensed with. Objection was heard from Mr. Herman P. Eberharter, of Pennsylvania, and the Chairman ordered the Clerk to read the bill.

During the reading of the bill a parliamentary inquiry was raised:

MR. [W. STERLING] COLE of New York (interrupting the reading of the bill): Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state it.

MR. COLE of New York: Mr. Chairman, is it possible under the rules of the Committee of the Whole to by motion dispense with the further reading of a bill?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will say that it requires unanimous consent to suspend the further reading of the bill.

MR. COLE of New York: It is not possible to do that by motion?

16. 97 CONG. REC. 6099-101, 82d Cong. 1st Sess.

17. Herbert C. Bonner (N.C.).

THE CHAIRMAN: That motion is not privileged.⁽¹⁸⁾

Interruption by Point of No Quorum**§ 11.2 A point of no quorum may interrupt the reading of a resolution.**

For example, on Mar. 1, 1967,⁽¹⁾ Mr. Porter Hardy, Jr., of Virginia, interrupted the reading of a House resolution (H. Res. 278) relating to the seating of Representative-elect Adam C. Powell, of New York, to make the point of order that a quorum was not present.

Noting that evidently a quorum was not present, the Speaker⁽²⁾

18. *Parliamentarian's Note*: In this instance the Committee of the Whole directed the reading in full of the bill on its first reading. The bill was read by title only on the next day when the Committee of the Whole reconvened to resume consideration of it. Although the procedure followed was somewhat unorthodox, it illustrates the point that any Member may demand a full reading of a bill before general debate thereon begins, provided the bill has not previously been read in full.

The House can dispense with the first reading in Committee of the Whole by motion if the motion is made privileged, as when reported from the Committee on Rules. A special order reported by the Committee on Rules can also *waive* the first reading.

1. 113 CONG. REC. 4997, 90th Cong. 1st Sess.

2. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

recognized a Member to move a call of the House.

Reading as Related to Motion to Recommit

§ 11.3 A motion to recommit is properly made in the House after the third reading of a bill.

On Aug. 13, 1959,⁽³⁾ during consideration in the House of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (H.R. 8342) the previous question was ordered on an amendment agreed to in the Committee of the Whole. Mr. Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey, raised a parliamentary inquiry:

Is it my understanding that the vote about to be taken is on whether or not the substitute will be accepted, and that it is not a vote on final passage?

THE SPEAKER:⁽⁴⁾ It will be a vote on the amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

MR. [THOMAS P.] O'NEILL [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. O'NEILL: Will a vote to recommit then be in order?

THE SPEAKER: After the third reading.

MR. O'NEILL: And then a vote would be in order on the final passage?

3. 105 CONG. REC. 15859, 86th Cong. 1st Sess.

4. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

THE SPEAKER: That is correct.

MR. [JAMES] ROOSEVELT [of California]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. ROOSEVELT: If the amendment is defeated, what is then the parliamentary situation?

THE SPEAKER: Then the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the so-called committee bill.

Parliamentarian's Note: The "so-called committee bill" would be the original text as introduced.

§ 11.4 A motion to recommit was held not to be in order before the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

On June 11, 1959,⁽⁵⁾ after debate on the bill (H.R. 7246) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 the Speaker announced:

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time. . . .

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

THE SPEAKER:⁽⁶⁾ The gentleman will state it.

MR. HALLECK: Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to vote on the motion to recommit at this time?

THE SPEAKER: It would not be in order until after the reading of the engrossed copy. . . .

5. 105 CONG. REC. 10561, 86th Cong. 1st Sess.

6. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

MR. [HAROLD D.] COOLEY [of North Carolina]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. COOLEY: As I understand the situation, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Belcher] had submitted a motion to recommit. Why should we not vote on that this afternoon?

THE SPEAKER: It is not time to vote on it. We have got to have the engrossed copy of the bill here before the motion to recommit can be offered.

Parliamentarian's Note: This precedent reflects the earlier practice regarding the engrossed copy of a bill, which had to be available and was subject to a demand for full reading. Under the new rule, bills on their passage are read the first time by title and the second time in full, when, if the previous question is ordered, the Speaker states the question to be: Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time? If the question is decided in the affirmative, the bill is read the third time by title and the question then put upon its passage. Rule XXI clause 1, *House Rules and Manual* (1981). (The provision permitting a Member to demand a third reading in full was eliminated from the rule in 1965.)

Reading in the Senate

§ 11.5 In the Senate a bill messaged from the House may

not be read twice in the same legislative day without unanimous consent, but the Senate may adjourn for a brief period (thus creating a new legislative day) and then proceed to the second reading of the bill.

On Mar. 24, 1960,⁽⁷⁾ there was received in the Senate the civil rights bill of 1960 (H.R. 8601) messaged from the House of Representatives. When the bill had been read the first time, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, asked unanimous consent that the bill be read the second time. Senator Richard B. Russell, of Georgia, objected. Senator Johnson then moved that the Senate adjourn for three minutes, and the motion was agreed to.

Thus, the Senate adjourned for three minutes from 1:32 p.m. to 1:35 p.m. of the same day, and upon reconvening the civil rights bill was read a second time and referred to committee.

§ 11.6 In the Senate, by unanimous consent, a bill may be

7. 106 CONG. REC. 6451, 6452, 6454, 6455, 86th Cong. 2d Sess.

Under Senate Rule XIV clause 2, every bill and joint resolution receives three readings prior to its passage, which readings must be on three different days, unless the Senate unanimously directs otherwise.

read the second time on the same day it is received by message from the House.

On Mar. 14, 1962,⁽⁸⁾ the proceedings below were recorded in the Senate:

MR. [EVERETT MCKINLEY] DIRKSEN [of Illinois]: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 10079, which came over from the House and is now on the table—

MR. [JOHN C.] STENNIS [of Mississippi]: A point of order, Mr. President. Is the Senate in the morning hour?

MR. DIRKSEN: Yes, it is.

I ask that the bill be advanced to a second reading and be permitted to lie on the desk.

THE VICE PRESIDENT:⁽⁹⁾ Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to a second reading, and was read the second time.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Without objection the bill will be printed, and will lie on the table.

§ 12. Engrossment

Engrossment is the process by which a bill or resolution or a House amendment to a Senate measure is printed on special paper by direction of the enrolling

8. 108 CONG. REC. 4097, 87th Cong. 2d Sess.

9. Lyndon B. Johnson (Tex.).

clerk under supervision of the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate. After House action, House bills and resolutions are engrossed on a distinctive blue paper, as are House amendments to measures received from the Senate. This blue paper indicates that it is the official copy of the measure as passed by the House.⁽¹⁰⁾ Senate bills and Senate amendments to House bills are engrossed on white paper. The engrossed copies of the bill, when signed by the Clerk of the House (in the case of a bill originating in the House) or by the Secretary of the Senate (on a Senate bill), become the nucleus of the official papers which go from one house to the other during the various actions on a bill. A Senate bill cannot be acted on in the House, e.g., until the House is in possession of the signed copy of the engrossed Senate bill.

Star Prints

§ 12.1 The engrossed copy of a bill may be “star printed” (that is, reprinted with a star to indicate the reprinting) to rectify clerical errors; and an

10. *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives* (97th Cong.), Ch. 24 § 5.1.