THE CHAIRMAN:[3] The gentleman . . . has made a motion. He has moved. But the gentleman should make a unanimous-consent request to allocate time.

MR. DICKINSON: Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close within 30 minutes, that the 30 minutes be divided half and half between the proponents and the opponents and that the gentleman from Texas be allowed to close.

MR. [G. V.] MONTGOMERY [of Mississippi]: Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I agree with the gentleman's first part with respect to 30 minutes but over the years the House procedure is I believe, and I will have the Chair correct me if I am wrong, that when an amendment is offered and the chairman of the committee objects to that amendment, that he has the right to close debate. Is that proper?

THE CHAIRMAN: Normally when the Committee of the Whole divides the time on an amendment the person handling the bill, the chairman, has the right to end the debate. That is normal.

There has been a unanimous-consent request to alter that, which can be done, to permit the gentleman from Texas to close the debate.

MR. MONTGOMERY: Mr. Chairman, I will not object. I withdraw my reservation of objection. The chairman has no problem with it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then without objection the unanimous-consent request is granted. All time on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Armey) and all amendments thereto will expire 30 minutes from now; that under the unanimous-consent request the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Hertel) will be recognized to control time for 15 minutes as an opponent of the amendment and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Armey) will be recognized for 15 minutes as the proponent of the amendment.

3. Harold L. Volkmer (Mo.).

§ 8. In General; Seeking Recognition

In order to address the House or speak in relation to any matter, or to make a motion or objection, a Member must first secure recognition from the Speaker in the House or from the Chairman in the Committee of the Whole. Rule XIV clause 1 provides the proper method of seeking recognition:

> When any Member desires to speak or deliver any matter to the House, he shall rise and respectfully address himself to "Mr. Speaker," and, on being recognized, may address the House from any place on the floor or from the Clerk's desk, and shall confine himself to the question under debate, avoiding personality.[4]

4. *House Rules and Manual* § 749 (1995). For parliamentary law on seeking recognition, see Jefferson's Manual, *House Rules and Manual* § 354 (1995). Proper forms of address are discussed in § 42, infra.

As indicated by the rule, a recognized Member may be taken off the floor by a point of order that he is indulging in disorderly or irrelevant language.[5]

A Member may not be interrupted without his consent or taken off his feet for ordinary motions.[6] A Member seeking to interrupt another must secure recognition from the Chair, and the remarks of a Member who has not gained recognition may be stricken from the Record.[7]

Rule XIV clause 2 provides:

> When two or more Members rise at once, the Speaker shall name the Member who is first to speak. . . .[8]

Under the rule, the Speaker or the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole has the power and discretion to determine who will be recognized, and for what purpose.[9] To determine a Member's claim to the floor, the Chair may ask for what purpose a Member rises, and recognition is granted only for the specific purpose indicated.[10]

The Chair's power of recognition is not unlimited, and recognition or refusal thereof may be dictated by House rule or by established practice and precedent.[11]

Recognition is governed in specific instances and in specific parliamentary situations by principles and rules too extensive to be completely covered in this chapter. The reader is advised to consult those portions of this work dealing with the order of business, with motions, and with the relative privilege of motions and questions.

Except at the convening of the Congress, a Member-elect (such as one elected to fill a vacancy) may not be recognized until he has been administered the oath.

Cross References

Effect of special orders on recognition, see § 28, infra.

Interruption of Member with the floor, see § 32, infra.

Manner of address and interruptions generally, see § 42, infra.

---

5. See §§ 43 et seq., infra, for disorderly language and §§ 35 et seq., infra, for relevancy in debate.

6. See § 32, infra, for control of debate and interruptions of a Member with the floor.

7. See §§ 8.2, 8.3, 8.10, infra.

8. *House Rules and Manual* § 753 (1995). This rule modified the parliamentary practice that the Member who first rises has the right to be recognized [see Jefferson's Manual, *House Rules and Manual* § 393 (1995)].

9. See, generally, § 9, infra.

10. See §§ 8.9, 8.12, 8.13, infra.

11. For limitations on recognition, see § 11, infra. The order of recognition in specific parliamentary situations is discussed in §§ 12–15, infra.

Recognition before adoption of rules, see Ch. 1, supra.

Recognition in voting, see Ch. 30, infra.

Recognition on questions of privilege, see Ch. 11, supra.

Recognition in relation to quorums and calls of the House, see Ch. 20, supra.

Recognition for specific motions and questions, see §§ 16 et seq., infra.

Member Must Seek Recognition To Obtain Floor

§ 8.1 No Member has the floor until the Chair has recognized him for the purpose of proceeding.

For example, on Mar. 16, 1934,[12] Speaker Henry T. Rainey, of Illinois, ruled that until a Member seeking to make an announcement or to proceed in debate had been recognized by the Chair for that purpose, the Member could not proceed:

> MR. [WILLIAM P.] CONNERY [Jr., of Massachusetts]: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. Condon, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. Mead, are unavoidably absent. If they were here, they would vote "aye."
>
> MR. [BERTRAND H.] SNELL [of New York]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.
>
> MR. SNELL: Is there any provision in the rules for such an announcement as has just been made by the gentleman from Massachusetts?
>
> THE SPEAKER: There is no provision in the rules for an announcement of that character.
>
> MR. SNELL: I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order. If the rules are going to be invoked, let us abide by all of them.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The point of order is sustained.
>
> MR. CONNERY: Mr. Speaker, the Chair just ruled that all remarks uttered on the floor of the House must go in the Record; therefore my announcement must go in the Record.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose under the rules.
>
> MR. [CARL E.] MAPES [of Michigan]: Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a Member has no right to make a speech until he is recognized by the Chair.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The point of order is sustained.

§ 8.2 The Speaker has repeatedly ruled that under the rules and procedures of the House a Member who wishes to interrupt another who has the floor must first obtain recognition from the Chair.

On June 7, 1961,[13] while Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan,

12. 78 CONG. REC. 4691, 73d Cong. 2d Sess. See also 78 CONG. REC. 4700, 73d Cong. 2d Sess., Mar. 16, 1934; 77 CONG. REC. 2413, 73d Cong. 1st Sess., Apr. 26, 1933.

13. 107 CONG. REC. 9681, 87th Cong. 1st Sess.

had the floor, he yielded to Mr. Albert Thomas, of Texas, who thereafter attempted to interrupt Mr. Hoffman and to yield to a third Member. Mr. Hoffman made a point of order:

> Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. It has become customary here—and I only make this because having served under Speaker Byrns, a man of great ability and dignity who said there was a rule in effect—that Members had to address the Chair or the Speaker before making a request that the Member speaking could yield to anyone. Is that right?
>
> THE CHAIRMAN:[14] That is the rule and practice of the House and Committee.
>
> MR. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Pardon me, then. I had not noticed that the practice was being observed.

Similarly, on July 16, 1935,[15] Speaker Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, ruled as follows on a point of order:

> The point of order has already been made, and the Chair is about to make a ruling. . . .
>
> The rules of the House provide that Members of the House shall observe proper decorum in debate. This is the only way in which matters may be discussed in a sound, sensible, sane manner, and a proper conclusion arrived at. Those Members particularly who have been here for years, it seems to the Chair, should be doubly careful to strictly conform to the rule.
>
> The rules provide that when a Member rises to interrupt another he shall address the Chair and do it respectfully and secure the consent of the Member who is talking.

The Speaker then cited Rule XIV clause 1, governing the subject of address.[16]

The Speaker has ruled on numerous other occasions that it is not in order in debate for a Member to interrupt another who has the floor without first addressing the Chair and obtaining consent of the Member who has the floor.[17]

—Remarks of Member Not Recognized May Be Stricken

§ 8.3 Members are required to seek recognition from the Chair in order to question a Member or address the House, and the remarks of Members who have not secured recognition are not included in the Record.[18]

---

14. Richard Bolling (Mo.).

15. 79 CONG. REC. 11256, 74th Cong. 1st Sess.

16. See *House Rules and Manual* § 749 (1995).

17. See also 102 CONG. REC. 11455, 84th Cong. 2d Sess., June 29, 1956; 83 CONG. REC. 591, 592, 75th Cong. 3d Sess., Jan. 15, 1938; 80 CONG. REC. 2201, 74th Cong. 2d Sess., Feb. 17, 1936; 80 CONG. REC. 1665, 1666, 74th Cong. 2d Sess., Feb. 7, 1936; 79 CONG. REC. 5461, 74th Cong. 1st Sess., Apr. 11, 1935; and 78 CONG. REC. 10630, 73d Cong. 2d Sess., June 6, 1934.

18. See, for example, 91 CONG. REC. 10032, 79th Cong. 1st Sess., Oct. 24,

On Apr. 14, 1936,[19] Speaker Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, ruled in response to a point of order that remarks made by a Member without having secured recognition from the Chair are properly deleted from the *Congressional Record:*

MR. [THOMAS L.] BLANTON [of Texas]: I make the point of order that when a Member is speaking on the floor, as the gentleman from New York was yesterday, and someone attempts to interrupt him and he states he refuses to yield, and he does not yield, no Member then has the right to make remarks and to put them in the Record without being recognized by the Chair or getting permission of the House.

I think the gentleman from New York would have been well within his rights if he had taken a pencil and wiped out the remarks himself, because the gentleman from Washington did not have any right to make a remark in the Record unless he got permission of the House or permission of the Chair. Mr. Speaker, I make that point of order. . . .

THE SPEAKER: The Chair may say to the gentleman that no Member of the House has the right to have his remarks inserted in the Record unless he has obtained the consent of the House or the Chair or the gentleman addressing the House.

The present occupant of the chair was not presiding at the time, but the Chair understands from the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Zioncheck) that when he asked the gentleman from New York (Mr. Boylan) for permission to interrupt him the gentleman from New York declined to yield. Thereupon the gavel fell, and the gentleman's remarks were made after the gavel had fallen and without recognition from the Chair or the permission of the gentleman from New York.

MR. [MARION A.] ZIONCHECK: That is right. I admit I was wrong.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair, under such circumstances, holds that the remarks were not proper for the Record.

On Apr. 19, 1937,[20] Speaker William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, stated in response to a parliamentary inquiry by Mr. Edward W. Curley, of New York, that the Speaker could order stricken, from the notes of the reporters of debates, the remarks of a Member who had not been recognized and to whom the Member having the floor had declined to yield:

THE SPEAKER: This is a rather important inquiry that the gentleman

---

1945 (making point of order); 81 CONG. REC. 3588, 75th Cong. 1st Sess., Apr. 19, 1937 (interjecting remarks into another's speech); and 79 CONG. REC. 11256, 74th Cong. 1st Sess., July 16, 1935 (interrogating Member having the floor).

See Rule XIV clause 1, *House Rules and Manual* § 749 (1995): "When any Member desires to speak or deliver any matter to the House, he shall rise and respectfully address himself to 'Mr. Speaker,' and, on being recognized, may address the House from any place on the floor or from the Clerk's desk. . . ."

19. 80 CONG. REC. 5478, 74th Cong. 2d Sess.

20. 81 CONG. REC. 3588, 3589, 75th Cong. 1st Sess.

from New York (Mr. Curley) has submitted. It has not been raised, so far as the Chair recalls, during the present session of Congress. In order that the rights of Members may be protected, and that the Members may know what the rules and precedents are with respect to this proposition, the Chair will read from section 3466, volume 8, of Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, the following statement:

> The Speaker may order stricken from the notes of the reporters remarks made by Members who have not been recognized and to whom the Member having the floor has declined to yield.

Before interpreting this statement it is the recollection of the Chair, who was sitting in the Chamber at the time, that when the gentleman from New York now occupying the floor addressed the Chair and asked the gentleman from New York (Mr. Wadsworth) to yield, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Wadsworth) declined to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Curley).

On August 4, 1911, Mr. Charles N. Fowler, of New Jersey, rising to a parliamentary inquiry, asked if remarks made by a Member who had not received recognition from the Chair and to whom the Member having the floor had declined to yield, were properly incorporated in the Record.

The Speaker, Mr. Champ Clark, replied:

> The rule has been that if the gentleman from Illinois, for instance, is addressing the House, and some other Member asks leave to interrupt him, and the gentleman from Illinois declines to be interrupted, and the other Member persists in talking, the Speaker has the right to strike out what the interrupting Member said after he had been notified that interruptions were not desired. . . .

In this particular instance the Speaker did not authorize the reporter to strike out the interjection of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Curley) now occupying the floor, because the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole was at that time presiding.

The Chair may say that in conformity with this precedent, and what the Chair conceives to be sound procedure, the rule should be reiterated that when a Member is occupying the floor and a Member after addressing the Chair and asking the Member then occupying the floor if he will yield for a question or for an interruption, and the gentleman then speaking declines to yield, it is not proper for a Member nevertheless to interject into the Record some remark which he desires to make. . . .

MR. [CASSIUS C.] DOWELL [of Iowa]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. DOWELL: When a Member has the floor and declines to yield, and no one is recognized to propound a parliamentary inquiry or direct an inquiry to the gentleman having the floor, and the other Member, not being recognized by the Chair, makes some statement, has not the Member who has the floor the right to leave those injected remarks out of the Record?

THE SPEAKER: Under the decision referred to by the Chair, undoubtedly the Member interrupted would have the right to strike those remarks from the Record.

How To Seek Recognition

§ 8.4 A Member must be on his feet and must address the Chair at the appropriate time in order to be recognized.

On Dec. 17, 1974,[1] during consideration of the Rice Act of 1975[2] in the House, the principle stated above was demonstrated as follows:

> THE SPEAKER:[3] Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.
>
> The question is on the amendment.
>
> The amendment was agreed to.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.
>
> The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The question is on the passage of the bill.
>
> MR. [BILL] ALEXANDER [of Arkansas]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I was on my feet, and I would ask at what point is a demand for a separate vote on the amendment in order.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the question was put on that, and the action has been taken and has been announced.
>
> MR. ALEXANDER: I was on my feet, Mr. Speaker.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Arkansas did not address the Chair.
>
> MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.
>
> MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I sought a record vote on the amendment that was adopted in the committee, and the Speaker did not announce a separate vote procedure on the committee amendment.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The Speaker followed the proper procedure. He definitely remembers saying:
>
> > The question is on the adoption of the amendment. As many as are in favor, vote aye; those opposed, vote no. The ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.
>
> That was announced by the Chair, and the Chair then proceeded to put the questions on engrossment and third reading and on final passage, before the gentleman sought recognition.
>
> The Chair acknowledges Members by recognition. However, if he is bound by everybody standing up all over the room, he is bound 100 times.
>
> The question is on the passage of the bill.

§ 8.5 Pursuant to clause 1 of Rule XIV, a Member desiring to speak must rise and address the Chair, and may not remain seated on the committee table while engaging in debate.

On June 28, 1976,[4] the Committee of the Whole was considering the Transportation appro-

1. 120 CONG. REC. 40509, 93d Cong. 2d Sess.
2. H.R. 15263.
3. Carl Albert (Okla.).
4. 122 CONG. REC. 21021, 94th Cong. 2d Sess.

priations for fiscal 1977 (H.R. 14234) when the following exchange occurred:

MR. [BARRY] GOLDWATER [Jr., of California]: Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. Goldwater asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. GOLDWATER: Madam Chairman, it amuses me that the gentleman from Virginia would seek the supersonic Concorde as the issue on which to wage his campaign against airport noise.

MR. [HERBERT E.] HARRIS [II, of Virginia]: Madam Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not standing.

THE CHAIRMAN:[5] The gentleman from California may proceed, if he should desire to rise as required by the rules.

§ 8.6 A Member must be on his feet and must address the Chair at the appropriate time in order to be recognized.

On Aug. 4, 1978,[6] during consideration of the foreign aid appropriation bill for fiscal 1979 (H.R. 12931) in the Committee of the Whole, it was demonstrated that, in recognizing Members under the five-minute rule, the Chair attempts to give preference to members of the committee reporting the bill; but the Chair may recognize another where a committee member is standing but not actively seeking recognition by addressing the Chair:

THE CHAIRMAN:[7] The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT SALES

FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT SALES

For expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of sections 23 and 24 of the Arms Export Control Act, $648,000,000. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there amendments to title II?

For what purpose does the gentleman from Iowa rise?

MR. [THOMAS R.] HARKIN [of Iowa]: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Harkin).

MR. [CLARENCE E.] MILLER of Ohio: Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Harkin).

MR. MILLER of Ohio: Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet at the time.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will tell the gentleman that he might have been on his feet, but the Chair was not aware that he addressed the Chair. . . .

5. Barbara Jordan (Tex.).

6. 124 CONG. REC. 24439, 95th Cong. 2d Sess.

7. Abraham Kazen, Jr. (Tex.).

> Let the Chair make this announcement for the last time during the consideration of this bill. On yesterday twice the Chair admonished the members of this Committee that if they had amendments pending, it was their duty to be standing and to address the Chair seeking recognition. Otherwise the Chair would have no way of knowing that they had an amendment to offer. The Chair is for the third and last time admonishing the Committee that those who have amendments not only be on their feet but seek recognition. On this particular occasion the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Miller) did not seek the Chair's attention, and the Chair did recognize the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Harkin), who did seek the Chair's attention.

Rule on Recognition as Barring Badges Carrying Messages

§ 8.7 Clause 1 of Rule XIV, requiring Members desiring to "speak or deliver any matter to the House" to rise and address the Speaker to be recognized, proscribes, in effect, the wearing of badges by Members to communicate messages; thus, the Speaker, exercising his authority to preserve order and decorum, has advised Members that the wearing of badges is inappropriate under the rules of the House.

The following statement was made by the Speaker[8] during proceedings on Apr. 15, 1986:[9]

> All Members wearing yellow badges should be advised that they are inappropriate under the rules of the House.

The badges in question urged support of military assistance to the Nicaraguan Contras. In recent years, some Members and staff have worn various badges on the floor to convey political messages to their colleagues and to the TV audience. Under the definition of decorum and debate in clause 1 of Rule XIV, a Member must first seek recognition and then speak his message, or use exhibits as provided in Rule XXX subject to approval of the House if objection is made.

Point of Order That Member Has Not Properly Sought Recognition

§ 8.8 A point of order that a Member has not properly sought recognition under the five-minute rule comes too late after that Member has been recognized and has begun debate.

During consideration of the Alaska Natural Gas Transpor-

---

8. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (Mass.).

9. 132 CONG. REC. 7525, 99th Cong. 2d Sess.

tation Act (S. 3521) in the Committee of the Whole on Sept. 30, 1976,[10] the following proceedings occurred:

THE CHAIRMAN:[11] . . . Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, now printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

It shall also be in order to consider an amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs if offered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act of 1976."

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MELCHER

MR. [JOHN] MELCHER [of Montana]: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Melcher:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act of 1976". . . .

MR. [JOHN D.] DINGELL [of Michigan]: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dingell to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Melcher: Page 1 of the amendment, strike out line 6 and all that follows down through line 9 on page 35 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 2. The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) a natural gas supply shortage exists in the contiguous States of the United States. . . .

MR. [CLARENCE J.] BROWN of Ohio: Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Interior Committee substitute, and in support of the Dingell amendment which was offered to it.

MR. [JOHN F.] SEIBERLING [of Ohio]: Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state his point of order.

MR. SEIBERLING: Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that the gentleman from Ohio in the well said that he rose in opposition to the Interior Committee substitute, but the pending amendment is not the Interior Committee substitute but the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell), which completely wipes out the Interior Committee substitute.

10. 122 CONG. REC. 34132, 34139, 34145, 94th Cong. 2d Sess.

11. William H. Natcher (Ky.).

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Ohio has been recognized. The point of order comes too late.

Recognition for a Specific Purpose

§ 8.9 Where the Chair recognizes a Member for a specific purpose, the Member has the right to the floor only for that purpose.

On Jan. 26, 1944,[12] Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, the Minority Leader, asked unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. When Mr. Martin attempted to ask the unanimous-consent consideration of a bill, Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, held that he had not been recognized for that purpose:

MR. MARTIN 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.

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.

On July 28, 1965,[13] the Committee of the Whole was reading H.R. 77 for amendment. Chairman Leo W. O'Brien, of New York, recognized William H. Ayres, of Ohio, the majority member of the committee reporting the bill, to debate a pro forma amendment to strike out the last word. Mr. Ayres then offered a substantive amendment during his remarks. The Chairman ruled:

The Chair has not recognized the gentleman for that purpose.

Does any other Member offer an amendment at this time?

Parliamentarian's Note: Several majority members of the committee were seeking recognition for amendments.[14]

---

12. 90 CONG. REC. 746, 747, 78th Cong. 2d Sess.

13. 111 CONG. REC. 18631, 89th Cong. 1st Sess.

14. Exceptions to the principle that Members are recognized for a specific purpose are the motion to adjourn and the motion that the Com-

§ 8.10 Members are not entitled to the floor until recognized by the Chair for debate even though they may have called up a matter for consideration in the House.

On Feb. 28, 1931,[15] Mr. Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio, moved to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 500, restricting for two years immigration into the United States, and Speaker Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio, recognized Mr. Jenkins for that purpose. Mr. John J. O'Connor, of New York, objected that he had the floor, on a resolution from the Committee on Rules, which had been called up and read but not debated, making in order the consideration of the same measure, House Joint Resolution 500. Mr. O'Connor stated that he had yielded 30 minutes' debate to another Member on the resolution prior to the motion to suspend the rules.

Speaker Longworth ruled that neither Mr. O'Connor nor the Member to whom he had yielded time were entitled to the floor since the Chair had recognized Mr. Jenkins for the motion to suspend the rules but had not recognized Mr. O'Connor for debate on the resolution.

Parliamentarian's Note: Although under the precedents a motion to suspend the rules is in order even while another matter is pending, it is the better practice to first require the withdrawal of the pending matter in order that two proposals not be pending simultaneously.

§ 8.11 A motion is not pending until the Chair has recognized a Member, who then offers the motion.

On Oct. 27, 1983,[16] during consideration of H.R. 4139 (Department of the Treasury and Postal Service appropriations, fiscal 1984) in the Committee of the Whole, the following proceedings occurred:

> MR. [BRUCE A.] MORRISON of Connecticut: Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that this amendment constitutes a limitation on an appropriation and cannot be considered by the House prior to the consideration of a motion by the Committee to rise.
>
> THE CHAIRMAN:[17] The Chair must indicate to the gentleman that no such preferential motion has yet been made.

---

mittee of the Whole rise, which are highly privileged and may be made, if in order at the time, by a Member securing recognition for any purpose, except that a Member recognized for purposes of general debate in the Committee of the Whole may not move that the Committee rise, where general debate is governed by the terms of a special rule.

15. 74 CONG. REC. 6575–77, 71st Cong. 3d Sess.

16. 129 CONG. REC. 29630, 29631, 98th Cong. 1st Sess.

17. Philip R. Sharp (Ind.).

The gentleman is correct that a motion that the Committee rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted takes precedence over an amendment proposing a limitation.

MR. MORRISON of Connecticut: Mr. Chairman, then I move that the committee do now rise.

MR. [EDWARD R.] ROYBAL [of California]: Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state it.

MR. ROYBAL: Mr. Chairman, where does the committee stand at this moment with regard to the motion that has been made to rise?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair must indicate that he had actually recognized the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Morrison) on a point of order, and in the process the gentleman concluded his remarks by attempting to offer a simple motion to rise.

It would be more appropriate if a motion to rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as have been adopted, pursuant to clause 2(d), rule XXI were offered instead.

Does the gentleman have such a motion?

MR. ROYBAL: Mr. Chairman, first of all, the gentleman must withdraw his motion; is that not correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Morrison) has not yet been recognized for the purpose of making a motion, to begin with. That is what the Chair is trying to indicate.

MR. ROYBAL: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments.

—Chair May Inquire as to Purpose

§ 8.12 Where two or more Members rise seeking recognition the Speaker may inquire into their purpose and determine from their reply which Member he will recognize.

On Apr. 26, 1933,[18] the following parliamentary situation and ruling by Speaker Henry T. Rainey, of Illinois, occurred:

Mr. Snell and Mr. Rayburn rose.

MR. [BERTRAND H.] SNELL [of New York]: Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time I desire to be recognized against the motion to recommit. This is the unfinished business before the House.

MR. [SAM] RAYBURN [of Texas]: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

MR. SNELL: Mr. Speaker, I am on my feet demanding recognition. The previous question has not been ordered.

MR. [JOHN J.] O'CONNOR [of New York]: Mr. Speaker, I certainly shall object to the establishment of any precedent of debating motions to recommit.

MR. SNELL: This is not a precedent. Motion to close debate by ordering the previous question has not been made. This is the unfinished business before the House.

MR. RAYBURN: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. I think I have the right to make this motion.

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

---

18. 77 CONG. REC. 2413, 73d Cong. 1st Sess.

MR. [ROBERT F.] RICH [of Pennsylvania]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. RICH: Mr. Speaker, is it proper procedure, when one Member has obtained recognition, for another Member to be recognized? The gentleman from New York [Mr. Snell] had the floor and was recognized.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair recognized the gentleman from New York [only] to ascertain for what purpose he rose.[19]

§ 8.13 The fact that the Speaker or Chairman asks a Member "for what purpose does the gentleman rise" does not confer recognition on the Member.

On Apr. 13, 1946,[20] Mr. Dewey Short, of Missouri, sought recognition from Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, after the engrossment and third reading of the pending bill had been ordered. The Speaker inquired of Mr. Short "for what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?" and Mr. Short stated that he was offering a motion to recommit the bill.

The Speaker recognized Mr. Edward E. Cox, of Georgia, to demand the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill. Mr. Vito Marcantonio, of New York, made the point of order that Mr. Short had been recognized to offer a motion to recommit. The Speaker stated:

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Short] was not recognized. The Chair asked the gentleman for what purpose he rose, and then recognized the gentleman from Georgia.

On June 26, 1951,[1] Chairman Albert A. Gore, of Tennessee, ruled in the Committee of the Whole that his inquiry as to the purpose for recognition did not confer recognition:

Mr. Celler rose.

THE CHAIRMAN: For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

MR. [HAROLD D.] COOLEY [of North Carolina]: Mr. Chairman, I move——

MR. [EMANUEL] CELLER [of New York]: Mr. Chairman, was I not recognized?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair inquired for what purpose the gentleman rose; that does not entail recognition.

—Inquiry as to Purpose Does Not Confer Recognition

§ 8.14 The fact that the Chair inquires of a Member for what purpose he seeks recognition does not confer rec-

19. See Rule XIV clause 2, *House Rules and Manual* § 753 (1995): "When two or more Members rise at once, the Speaker shall name the Member who is first to speak. . . ."

20. 92 CONG. REC. 3669, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.

1. 97 CONG. REC. 7174, 82d Cong. 1st Sess.

ognition, and the Chair may recognize another Member who was previously on his feet seeking recognition.

On Apr. 22, 1980,[2] during consideration of House Joint Resolution 521 (making additional funds available by transfer for the Selective Service System), the following exchange occurred in the Committee of the Whole:

THE CHAIRMAN:[3] The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 5, strike "$4,709,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$13,295,000". . . .

MR. [ROBERT] DUNCAN of Oregon: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Duncan of Oregon to the committee amendment: On page 5, line 2:

Strike "$13,295,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$21,000,000."

(Mr. Duncan of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

THE CHAIRMAN: For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Gonzalez) rise?

MR. [HENRY B.] GONZALEZ [of Texas]: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Duncan) to the committee amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will state that that would be in the third degree, and that amendment to the Duncan amendment is not proper.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Maryland rise?

MR. [ROBERT E.] BAUMAN [of Maryland]: Mr. Chairman, I have a substitute to the committee amendment at the desk.

MR. GONZALEZ: Mr. Chairman, may I then be recognized to speak against the amendment?

MR. BAUMAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Chairman has already recognized the gentleman from Maryland.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair has not really recognized the gentleman from Maryland. The Chair is determining whether he could recognize the gentleman from Texas.

MR. BAUMAN: The gentleman from Maryland thought the Chairman said, "For what purpose does the gentleman from Maryland rise?" and then the gentleman from Maryland said, "I have a substitute to the committee amendment at the desk." Perhaps I just misheard all of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: No. The gentleman heard correctly. It does not mean that the Chair has recognized the gentleman for the purpose of offering an amendment. . . .

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Gonzalez).

Seeking Recognition To Offer Amendment

§ 8.15 In order to obtain recognition to offer an amendment, a Member must not

2. 126 CONG. REC. 8596, 8601, 8602, 96th Cong. 2d Sess.

3. Dan Rostenkowski (Ill.).

only be standing but must also actively seek recognition by addressing the Chair at the appropriate time.

The following proceedings occurred in the Committee of the Whole on Oct. 26, 1983,[4] during consideration of the Department of Defense appropriations for fiscal year 1984 (H.R. 4185):

THE CHAIRMAN:[5] The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows: . . .

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment including ordnance . . . and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants . . . $9,994,245,000. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Nichols) seek recognition?

MR. [WILLIAM] NICHOLS [of Alabama]: Yes; I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment relating to page 20, line 9, of the bill.

The Clerk proceeded to read the page and line numbers of the amendment.

MR. [JOSEPH P.] ADDABBO [of New York] (during the reading): Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the amendment. We have already passed that section.

MR. NICHOLS: Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet at the time.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes the gentleman was on his feet but did not know that he was seeking recognition.

MR. NICHOLS: Mr. Chairman, I was at the microphone. I was standing. I was prepared to offer my amendment had the Chairman recognized me.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will have to make the observation that the gentleman from Alabama was not seeking active recognition. The Chair recognized the gentleman was on his feet but did not notice that he was seeking recognition by any vocal expression. . . .

MR. NICHOLS: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to offer my amendment at this point.

[Objection was heard.]

§ 8.16 A Member desiring to offer an amendment under the five-minute rule in Committee of the Whole must seek recognition from the Chair, and a Member recognized under the five-minute rule may not yield to another Member to offer an amendment.

On Sept. 8, 1976,[6] the Committee of the Whole had under consideration the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1976 (H.R. 10498) when the following exchange occurred:

MR. [PAUL G.] ROGERS [of Florida]: Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

4. 129 CONG. REC. 29430, 98th Cong. 1st Sess.

5. Dan Rostenkowski (Ill.).

6. 122 CONG. REC. 29243, 94th Cong. 2d Sess.

MR. [ELLIOTT] LEVITAS [of Georgia]: Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. ROGERS: I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

MR. LEVITAS: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I would like to offer at this point.

THE CHAIRMAN:[7] The Chair will advise the gentleman from Georgia that the gentleman will have to seek recognition on his own time and in due order.

MR. LEVITAS: I thank the Chairman.

MR. ROGERS: I yield back the balance of my time.

§ 8.17 Where numerous amendments which might be offered to a bill had been left with the Reading Clerk, the Chair requested all Members seeking to offer amendments not only to stand but to address the Chair seeking recognition at the appropriate time.

During consideration of the foreign assistance appropriation bill (H.R. 12931) in the Committee of the Whole on Aug. 3, 1978,[8] Chairman Abraham Kazen, Jr., of Texas, made the following statement:

THE CHAIRMAN: Let the Chair make this request. There are approximately 70 amendments on the desk. This bill will be read paragraph by paragraph. The Chair requests those Members who have amendments not only to be standing, but to address the Chair at the proper time. . . . The Chair has no way of knowing whether or not these amendments will all be presented, so the Chair will request that all Members who have amendments be standing and seek recognition at the proper time.

§ 8.18 As the reading of appropriation bills for amendment is "scientifically" done by heading and appropriation amount in each paragraph, a Member desiring to amend a paragraph must stand and seek recognition when that paragraph is read, but is not too late if the Clerk has not concluded the reading of the heading of the subsequent paragraph.

During consideration of the foreign aid appropriations for 1979 (H.R. 12931) in the Committee of the Whole on Aug. 3, 1978,[9] the following proceedings occurred:

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Military assistance: For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, including administrative expenses and purchase of passenger motor

7. J. Edward Roush (Ind.).

8. 124 CONG. REC. 24227, 95th Cong. 2d Sess.

9. 124 CONG. REC. 24219, 95th Cong. 2d Sess.

vehicles for replacement only for use outside of the United States, $64,500,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds contained in this paragraph shall be available for the purchase of new automotive vehicles outside of the United States.

MR. [LEO J.] RYAN [of California]: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Ryan: Page 9, line 13, strike out "$64,-500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$59,500,000". . . .

MR. [DAVID R.] OBEY [of Wisconsin]: Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN:[10] The gentleman will state it.

MR. OBEY: I make a point of order that the gentleman's amendment comes too late. The Clerk had already read through the next section of the bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Clerk had begun to read the next section, but he had not completed reading that section. The Chair did observe the gentleman from California (Mr. Ryan) on his feet, and the Chair would hold that he was timely recognized.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. Ryan).

Seeking Recognition To Offer Motion

§ 8.19 A Member desiring to offer a motion in the House must actively seek recognition from the Chair before another motion to dispose of the pending question has been adopted, and the fact that he may have been standing at that time is not sufficient to confer recognition.

During consideration of House Joint Resolution 357 (further continuing appropriations) in the House on Nov. 22, 1981,[11] the following proceedings occurred:

THE SPEAKER:[12] The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 37. . . .

MR. [VIC] FAZIO [of California]: Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Fazio moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37.

THE SPEAKER: The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. Fazio). All those in favor say "aye," opposed "no."

The ayes have it. The motion is agreed to.

The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

MR. [SILVIO O.] CONTE [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk. I have a motion. I was standing, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: To what amendment does the gentleman have a motion?

MR. CONTE: Senate amendment No. 37.

10. Abraham Kazen, Jr. (Tex.).

11. 127 CONG. REC. 28751, 97th Cong. 1st Sess.

12. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (Mass.).

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the House has already disposed of that amendment.

MR. CONTE: I was standing here seeking recognition, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what was the decision?

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman may have been standing, but he was not seeking recognition, in the opinion of the Chair.

MR. CONTE: What was the outcome of that, Mr. Speaker?

THE SPEAKER: Senate amendment No. 37 was disagreed to.

MR. CONTE: And I was standing with a motion, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair recognized that there were three or four others standing, and the gentleman was in a conversation with one of his colleagues, and was not asking for recognition.

Seeking Recognition To Demand Recorded Vote

§ 8.20 A Member seeking to demand a recorded vote must actively request recognition from the Chair, and the fact that the Member was merely standing at the time a vote is announced is not sufficient to secure recognition.

On July 9, 1981,[13] during consideration of H.R. 3519 (Department of Defense authorization) in the Committee of the Whole, it was demonstrated that it is too late to demand a recorded vote on an amendment after the Chair has announced the result of a voice vote thereon, where the Member making the demand is not on his feet seeking recognition at the time the result is announced. The proceedings were as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE:[14] The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. Hansen).

As many as are in favor will say "aye"; as many as are opposed will say "no."

The ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: Are there further amendments to title II?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Price).

MR. [MELVIN] PRICE [of Illinois]: Madam Chairman, I demand the yeas and nays on the Hansen amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The Chair will advise the gentleman that his request for a recorded vote comes too late.

MR. PRICE: The Chairman was on his feet and waiting for the commotion to die down.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The Chair wishes to advise the gentleman from Illinois that he may be able to demand a separate vote in the House at a later time but his request comes too late at this time. . . .

MR. [SAMUEL S.] STRATTON [of New York]: Madam Chairman, the House was not in order at the time that the

13. 127 CONG. REC. 15202, 97th Cong. 1st Sess.

14. Marilyn Lloyd Bouquard (Tenn.).

Chair put the vote on the Hansen amendment. Is it in order for a vote to be taken when the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill does not even know that a vote is being taken?

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The Chair put the question to the committee, looked to the committee, and then announced the result of the vote.

MR. STRATTON: But there had been no final announcement of the vote on the Simon amendment before the vote on the Hansen amendment was taken.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The Chair wishes to advise the gentleman that the Chair did announce the vote on the Simon amendment and then on the Hansen amendment and that no Member was standing at the time seeking recognition when the voice vote was announced on the Hansen amendment. . . .

MR. [WILLIAM L.] DICKINSON [of Alabama]: Madam Chairman, I was on my feet. I was deferring to the chairman, who would normally make such a request. I did not make the request.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The Chair will advise the gentleman that no one was seeking recognition at the time. Merely standing is not enough.

—*Motion To Recommit*

§ 8.21 While a Member desiring to offer a motion to recommit must normally be on his feet seeking recognition when the Speaker states the question to be on passage of the bill, it is not too late to seek recognition where another minority Member has qualified as opposed to the bill but where his motion has not been read by the Clerk.

On Apr. 24, 1979,[15] during consideration of the State Department authorization bill in the House, it was demonstrated that until a Member desiring to offer a motion to recommit has had his motion read by the Clerk, he is not entitled to the floor so as to prevent another Member from seeking recognition to offer another recommittal motion. The proceedings were as follows:

THE SPEAKER:[16] The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

THE SPEAKER: The question is on the passage of the bill.

MR. [ROBERT E.] BAUMAN [of Maryland]: Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair is aware that the gentleman is standing and the Chair intends to recognize the gentleman. . . .

Is there any member of the committee that desires to make a motion to recommit on the minority side? . . .

MR. BAUMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

THE SPEAKER: Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

15. 125 CONG. REC. 8360, 8361, 96th Cong. 1st Sess.

16. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (Mass.).

MR. BAUMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

THE SPEAKER: The Clerk will——

MR. BAUMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was recognized.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair under the precedents of the House, will recognize the gentleman from Michigan to make a motion if he qualifies. . . .

MR. BAUMAN: Mr. Speaker, had not the Speaker said to the gentleman from Maryland, "Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?"

And the gentleman from Maryland was thus recognized.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair appreciates that the gentleman is opposed to the bill; but under the precedents of the House, the Clerk has not reported the motion. . . .

MR. BAUMAN: I make a point of order against recognizing the gentleman from Michigan or anyone else, because he did not rise in a timely fashion to make the motion. Once the Chair recognizes a Member, the precedents will support the fact that he has the right to offer the motion.

THE SPEAKER: On the point of order, the gentleman's motion has not been read yet; so the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan, a senior member of the committee, who is standing. . . .

MR. [WILLIAM S.] BROOMFIELD [of Michigan]: Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

THE SPEAKER: Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

MR. BROOMFIELD: Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker. . . .

THE SPEAKER: The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Broomfield moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3363, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. . . .

MR. BAUMAN: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman makes a point of order that the gentleman is not in order in making the motion, since another Member had already been recognized. The Chair has already conferred that recognition and had inquired whether or not the gentleman from Maryland was opposed.

THE SPEAKER: In the opinion of the Chair, until the motion has been read, the gentleman has not been recognized for that purpose.

MR. BAUMAN: Well, the gentleman did not yield to anyone else to offer a motion.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman had not been recognized for that purpose and consequently—the Chair asked the gentleman if he was in opposition. The gentleman replied. The gentleman was not then recognized for that purpose. That is the statement and the opinion of the Chair. The Chair did not recognize the gentleman by directing the Clerk to report the motion. The Chair is trying to follow the precedents of the House.

Now, the Chair has ruled on the gentleman's point of order and the gentleman from Michigan is entitled to 5 minutes. The Chair so recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Broomfield).

Minority Leader Recognized in Opposition to Motion To Recommit

§ 8.22 The Speaker recognized the Minority Leader to call

up a reported bill in the House, pursuant to unanimous consent previously obtained by the Minority Leader permitting its consideration under the hour rule, and subsequently recognized the Minority Leader in opposition to a motion to recommit with instructions offered by the ranking minority member of the reporting committee.

The following proceedings took place in the House on Sept. 29, 1982,[17] during consideration of the Export Administration Act Amendments (H.R. 6838):

MR. [ROBERT H.] MICHEL [of Illinois]: Mr. Speaker, under the special order granted on Tuesday, September 28, 1982, I call up the bill (H.R. 6838) to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to terminate certain export controls imposed on December 30, 1981, and June 22, 1982, and ask for its immediate consideration. . . .

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6838

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Termination of Certain Controls.—Those export controls imposed under this section on December 30, 1981, and June 22, 1982, on goods or technology shall not be effective on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection.".

THE SPEAKER:[18] Under the agreement, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Michel) is recognized for 1 hour. . . .

MR. MICHEL: Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:[19] The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MR. [WILLIAM S.] BROOMFIELD [of Michigan]: Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

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

MR. BROOMFIELD: I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Broomfield) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of the motion to recommit. . . .

MR. MICHEL: Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

§ 8.23 A Member must be on his feet actively seeking recognition to demand a recorded vote when the Chair puts the question on agreeing to an amendment, and the demand comes too late

17. 128 CONG. REC. 26019, 26031–33, 97th Cong. 2d Sess.

18. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (Mass.).

19. Joseph G. Minish (N.J.).

after the Chair has inquired as to the purpose of another Member rising and an amendment has been tendered.

On July 21, 1983,[20] during consideration of H.R. 2969 (Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1994) the following proceedings occurred in the Committee of the Whole:

> The amendment was agreed to.
>
> THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE:[1] For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Gore) rise?
>
> MR. [ALBERT A.] GORE [Jr., of Tennessee]: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.
>
> MR. [RAYMOND J.] MCGRATH [of New York]: Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, and I demand a recorded vote on the last amendment.
>
> THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman's request comes too late on the last amendment.
>
> MR. MCGRATH: Mr. Chairman, I was standing.
>
> THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman was not seeking recognition for that specific purpose.
>
> MR. MCGRATH: I was on my feet, Mr. Chairman.
>
> THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The Clerk will report the Gore amendment. The Chair did not see the gentleman on his feet and the gentleman was not actively seeking recognition when the Chair put the question on the amendment.

20. 129 CONG. REC. 20187, 98th Cong. 1st Sess.

1. Marty Russo (Ill.).

§ 8.24 A Member must be on his feet seeking recognition to demand a recorded vote when the Chair announces the result of a voice vote on an amendment to an amendment, and the demand comes too late when the Chair has then put the question on an amendment to the substitute.

On Sept. 6, 1979,[2] during consideration of the foreign assistance appropriations for fiscal year 1980 (H.R. 4473) in the Committee of the Whole, the following proceedings occurred:

> The Clerk read as follows:
>
> Amendment offered by Mr. Miller of Ohio: On page 23, after line 12, insert the following section:
>
> Sec. 527. Of the total budget authority provided in this Act, for payments not required by law, 5 per centum shall be withheld from obligation and expenditure: . . .
>
> MR. [DAVID R.] OBEY [of Wisconsin]: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.
>
> The Clerk read as follows:
>
> Amendment offered by Mr. Obey as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Miller of Ohio: On page 23, after line 12, insert the following:
>
> "Sec. 527. Of the total budget authority provided in this Act, except

2. 125 CONG. REC. 23351, 23353, 23355, 96th Cong. 1st Sess.

for payments required for law two percentum shall be withheld from obligation and expenditure: . . .

MR. [CLARENCE E.] MILLER of Ohio: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Miller of Ohio to the amendment offered by Mr. Obey as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Miller of Ohio: In line 2, in lieu of "two per centum" insert "five per centum". . . .

MR. [MATTHEW F.] MCHUGH [of New York]: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McHugh to the amendment offered by Mr. Miller of Ohio:

Strike out "five" appearing in the first sentence and insert in lieu thereof "two". . . .

THE CHAIRMAN:[3] The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHugh) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Miller).

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now is on the Miller amendment to the Obey substitute. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Miller) rise?

MR. MILLER of Ohio: Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will state to the gentleman that his request comes too late. The Chair held back as long as he could on the announcement, and the gentleman was not on his feet before the Chair put the question on the next amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Miller) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Miller).

Seeking Recognition To Ask for Yeas and Nays

§ 8.25 Where the Chair has put a question to a voice vote, announced the result and by unanimous consent laid the motion to reconsider on the table, it is then too late to ask for the yeas on that question where the Member was not seeking recognition at the time the question was put.

On Oct. 13, 1978,[4] during consideration of House Resolution 1434 (providing for consideration of several conference reports) in the House, the following proceedings occurred:

H.R. 1434

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, it shall be in order in the House to consider en bloc the conference reports on

3. Abraham Kazen, Jr. (Tex.).

4. 124 CONG. REC. 36966, 36975, 36976, 95th Cong. 2d Sess.

the bills H.R. 4018, H.R. 5146, H.R. 5037, H.R. 5289 (and H.R. 5263 if first adopted by the Senate), and all points of order against said conference reports are hereby waived. After debate in the House on said conference reports, which shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Ad Hoc Committee on Energy, the first hour of which shall be confined solely to the conference report on the bill H.R. 5289, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on said conference reports to one vote on their final adoption, and the vote on said conference reports shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question or to a motion to reconsider. . . .

MR. [RICHARD] BOLLING [of Missouri]: . . . Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

THE SPEAKER:[5] The question is on ordering the previous question.

MR. [JOHN B.] ANDERSON of Illinois: Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 207, nays 206. . . .

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

THE SPEAKER: The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table. . . .

MR. [ROBERT E.] BAUMAN [of Maryland]: Mr. Speaker, has the question on the passage of the rule been put?

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the Chair has put the question and announced that the ayes had it and the resolution was agreed to and that the motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The gentleman from Maryland must be fully aware of what took place.

MR. BAUMAN: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland was listening for the question and failed to hear it.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the Chair waited and nobody asked for a vote on the rule.

MR. BAUMAN: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland was on his feet and did not hear the question being put. I wish to ask for the yeas and nays.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman was given ample time to ask for a vote on the rule. The Chair has been nothing but patient.

The House appreciates the seriousness of the pending motions and would appreciate having the Members take their seats.

Members Seeking Allocation of Time Under Limitation

§ 8.26 Members seeking an allocation of time under a limitation of debate in Committee of the Whole should stand when the limitation is agreed to, and not after a Member recognized before the limitation was agreed to has concluded his remarks.

5. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (Mass.).

On Aug. 1, 1978,[6] the Committee of the Whole had under consideration the foreign aid authorization bill (H.R. 12514) when the following proceedings occurred:

MR. [CLEMENT J.] ZABLOCKI [of Wisconsin]: Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto conclude at 4:30. . . .

So the motion was agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN:[7] The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Yatron) is recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair will allocate the time to the standing Members after the gentleman from Pennsylvania concludes.

MR. [BENJAMIN S.] ROSENTHAL [of New York]: Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state it.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Mr. Chairman, when is it appropriate for Members requesting time to stand? Now, or at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Members will stand now.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Yatron) has the floor and may proceed.

Objecting to Unanimous-consent Request

§ 8.27 A Member who is objecting to a unanimous-consent request must stand to be recognized by the Chair.

On Apr. 28, 1976,[8] the following proceedings occurred in the Committee of the Whole during consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 611, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1977:

MR. [ROBERT L.] LEGGETT [of California]: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE:[9] Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

MR. [CLARENCE D.] LONG of Maryland: Mr. Chairman, I object.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman from Maryland is not standing to make the objection.

§ 8.28 A Member must stand and address the Chair to object to a unanimous-consent request.

During consideration of the Nuclear Fuel Assistance Act (H.R. 8401) in the Committee of the Whole on July 30, 1976,[10] the following occurred:

MR. [ABRAHAM] KAZEN [Jr., of Texas]: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted

6. 124 CONG. REC. 23716, 95th Cong. 2d Sess.
7. Don Fuqua (Fla.).
8. 122 CONG. REC. 11622, 94th Cong. 2d Sess.
9. Gillis W. Long (La.).
10. 122 CONG. REC. 24768, 94th Cong. 2d Sess.

to yield my time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Waggonner).

THE CHAIRMAN:[11] Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

MR. [RICHARD L.] OTTINGER [of New York]: Mr. Chairman, I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Objection is heard.

MR. [MELVIN] PRICE [of Illinois]: Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the objection is not in order since the gentleman from New York was not standing at the time he made the objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Kazen) to yield his time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Waggonner)?

There was no objection.

§ 8.29 A Member must stand when objecting to a unanimous-consent request.

On Oct. 13, 1978,[12] the following proceedings occurred in the Committee of the Whole during consideration of S. 2727 (the Amateur Sports Act of 1978):

MR. [HAROLD L.] VOLKMER [of Missouri]: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN:[13] Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

MR. [JAMES F.] LLOYD of California: Mr. Chairman, I object. . . .

MR. [JOHN M.] ASHBROOK [of Ohio]: Mr. Chairman, under the rules of the House, I understand that a Member must stand in order to object.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will state that the gentleman from California (Mr. Lloyd) did stand at the time.

§ 8.30 In order to object to a unanimous-consent request, a Member must rise and be identified.

The following proceedings occurred in the House on Oct. 2, 1984,[14] during consideration of H.R. 6300, the balanced budget bill:

MR. [GUY V.] MOLINARI [of New York]: I would like to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Weber) be permitted to proceed in order.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:[15] Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? . . .

[Objection was heard, but the Member making the objection was not identified.]

MR. [ROBERT S.] WALKER [of Pennsylvania]: Mr. Speaker, who is the objector? Can we identify the objector, please?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair states that objection was heard.

MR. WALKER: The Record would have to reflect the objection. Who objected, Mr. Speaker?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair placed the request and objection was heard.

---

11. Otis G. Pike (N.Y.).

12. 124 CONG. REC. 37071, 95th Cong. 2d Sess.

13. John H. Krebs (Calif.).

14. 130 CONG. REC. 28522, 98th Cong. 2d Sess.

15. Richard A. Gephardt (Mo.).

MR. MOLINARI: A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. . . .

Mr. Speaker, we have others in this room besides Members of the House. It is conceivable that somebody who is not a Member of this House could have uttered those statements and I think we are entitled to know who it is, if anybody is a sitting Member of this body that has raised an objection.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman is correct. Is there objection?

MR. [LEON E.] PANETTA [of California]: Mr. Chairman, I object.

MR. [ANTHONY L.] COELHO [of California]: I object.

§ 8.31 While a Member must be on his feet to object to a unanimous-consent request, the Chair may, in his discretion, entertain a parliamentary inquiry to permit an explanation of a unanimous-consent order to which no Member objected in timely fashion.

The following proceedings occurred in the Committee of the Whole on June 19, 1985,[16] during consideration of H.R. 1872 (Department of Defense authorization for fiscal 1986):

MR. [LES] ASPIN [of Wisconsin]: . . . I would propose that we limit time on these two amendments until 5:30, with the time to be divided equally between the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Porter) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Fascell), who would have half of the time, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Skelton) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. Byron), who would have half of the time, and that if additional amendments are offered after that, we have an equal division of time after the amendments are offered, and that there be 10 minutes on that side for the amendment and 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE:[1] Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

MR. [JOHN EDWARD] PORTER [of Illinois]: Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I might suggest to the chairman of the committee that we simply make it an hour on each side rather than try to divide it up in any other way.

MR. ASPIN: In other words, an hour on each side.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The unanimous-consent request, then, is that there be 1 hour of debate on each side of the two pending amendments, followed by 20 minutes, equally divided, on any other amendment offered to the Porter amendment or to a substitute therefor.

MR. ASPIN: On the pending amendments, Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Porter) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Fascell) controlling 1 hour and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Skelton) and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. Byron) controlling 1 hour. At that point we will proceed to vote on

16. 131 CONG. REC. 16367, 16368, 99th Cong. 1st Sess.

1. Richard J. Durbin (Ill.).

those amendments. If at that point other amendments are offered, Members will have 10 minutes on that side to debate those amendments at the time.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: Is the gentleman proposing that there be 10 minutes allowed for each side for each other amendment to the Porter amendment or to a substitute amendment therefor?

MR. ASPIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Hearing none, it is so ordered.

MR. [THOMAS F.] HARTNETT [of South Carolina]: Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman——

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman was not on his feet seeking recognition when the Chair asked for any objection to the request.

MR. HARTNETT: There are only two microphones, Mr. Chairman, and we cannot have them all. I was on my feet——

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: Even if the gentleman was not at the microphone, if he had been standing on his feet at that time, the Chair would have recognized him, the Chair will say to the gentleman from South Carolina. The Chair was looking in his direction and saw the gentleman sitting in his chair. . . .

MR. HARTNETT: Mr. Chairman, if I might make a parliamentary inquiry. . . .

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that when a gentleman or gentlewoman wishes to be recognized, they must rise from their seat. I was in my seat, and I was rising to be heard. I do not think you have to be standing at all times in order to be recognized. I was in my seat, I asked to be recognized, and I rose to a point of recognition. . . .

MR. ASPIN: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Chair to ask the gentleman from South Carolina if he would tell us what his concern is with the unanimous-consent request?

MR. HARTNETT: I did not understand it, Mr. Chairman. That is what I wanted to ask.

MR. ASPIN: Mr. Chairman, if I could, I would like to try to answer the gentleman's question.

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE: For the purpose of clarification of what the unanimous-consent agreement was, the Chair will then ask the gentleman from Wisconsin to restate what his request was. . . .

Just for the clarification of the members of the Committee, the unanimous-consent request was already agreed to. The gentleman from Wisconsin was clarifying the unanimous-consent request for the benefit of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Member Permitted by Unanimous Consent To Take Seat After Yielding for Debate

§ 8.32 A Member recognized to offer an amendment (to a substitute) under the five-minute rule was permitted, by unanimous consent, to take his seat while yielding to another Member for purposes of debate.

On July 28, 1983,[2] during consideration of H.R. 2760 (prohibition on covert assistance to Nicaragua) in the Committee of the Whole, the following proceedings occurred:

MR. [EDWARD P.] BOLAND [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Boland to the amendment offered by Mr. Mica as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Young of Florida: . . .

MR. BOLAND: . . . Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Solarz).

MR. [STEPHEN J.] SOLARZ [of New York]: Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding once more.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Boland) may sit while I engage in my remarks.

THE CHAIRMAN:[3] Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection. . . .

MR. [E. THOMAS] COLEMAN of Missouri: Mr. Chairman . . . does the gentleman have the time or does the chairman have the time?

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Boland) has the time.

MR. BOLAND: Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

MR. COLEMAN of Missouri: I yield.

MR. BOLAND: My understanding is that the gentleman from New York (Mr. Solarz) asked unanimous consent that I be permitted to sit and there was no objection to it. So I yielded the time to the gentleman from New York so he could continue.

Member-elect Permitted by Unanimous Consent To Debate

§ 8.33 During debate on a privileged resolution disposing of the question of the right of a Member-elect to be sworn, the Member-elect may participate in the debate only by unanimous consent.

On Jan. 3, 1985,[4] during the organization of the House, the following proceedings occurred:

THE SPEAKER:[5] According to the precedents, the Chair will swear in all Members of the House at this time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Wright).

MR. [JAMES C.] WRIGHT [Jr., of Texas]: Mr. Speaker, upon my responsibility as a Member-elect of the 99th Congress, I object to the oath being administered to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. McIntyre, and I base this upon facts and statements which I consider to be reliable. . . .

Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution at the Clerk's desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

2. 129 CONG. REC. 21413, 21414, 98th Cong. 1st Sess.

3. William H. Natcher (Ky.).

4. 131 CONG. REC. 380–82, 99th Cong. 1st Sess.

5. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (Mass.).

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1

Resolved, That the question of the right of Frank McCloskey or Richard McIntyre to a seat in the Ninety-ninth Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana shall be referred to the Committee on House Administration, when elected, and neither Frank McCloskey nor Richard McIntyre shall be sworn until the Committee on House Administration reports upon and the House decides such question. . . .

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Texas (Mr. Wright), under the precedents, is recognized for 1 hour.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Frenzel), and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume. . . .

MR. [BILL] FRENZEL [of Minnesota]: Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. McIntyre.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman does not have the right to participate in debate unless the House agrees. If there is an objection from the House, the gentleman may not speak.(6)

Without objection, the gentleman is entitled to 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

MR. [RICHARD] MCINTYRE [of Indiana]: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

6. See also 1 Hinds' Precedents § 474.

In Seeking Recognition on Point of Personal Privilege, Member Must Inform Chair of the Basis for His Question Before the Chair Will Bestow Recognition

§ 8.34 A Member was recognized for one hour on a question of personal privilege based on violation of his rights as a Member, arising from unauthorized printed alterations in his statements made during subcommittee hearings in the prior Congress.

On June 28, 1983,(7) Mr. Judd Gregg, of New Hampshire, rose to a question of personal privilege, as follows:

MR. GREGG: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:(8) The gentleman will state the question.

MR. GREGG: Mr. Speaker, on July 21 and July 22, of last year, I participated as a member of the Science and Technology Committee in joint hearings before that committee. The printed hearing record of those hearings was not received until April 27, of this year. Upon review of that official record, I discovered that several statements which I had made during the course of those hearings were materially altered in such a way as to reflect upon my in-

7. 129 CONG. REC. 17674, 17675, 98th Cong. 1st Sess.

8. George E. Brown, Jr. (Calif.).

tegrity and conduct during those hearings.

While the falsification of a House document is clearly a matter involving the integrity of the proceedings of this body, the alterations of my remarks, without my permission, affects my rights as an individual Member in my representative capacity. I therefore rise to a question of privilege in order to clarify the record on this matter.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman states an appropriate point of personal privilege, and the gentleman is therefore recognized for 1 hour.

Parliamentarian's Note: Questions of personal privilege under Rule IX normally involve cases where a Member's reputation has been damaged, particularly in press accounts; but Rule IX describes as the second category of privileged questions, the "rights, reputation, and conduct of Members, individually."

§ 9. Power and Discretion of Speaker or Chairman

The rules of the House give the Chair considerable discretion in deciding whom to recognize, and a decision on recognition is not subject to appeal.[9] The Chair is governed in the exercise of his power of recognition by the standing rules, which in some cases prohibit recognition for specific purposes[10] or which extend priority to Members with certain qualifications.[11] The Chair is also governed by the usages and precedents of the House which establish priorities of recognition based on a fixed order of business.[12]

Cross References

Chair's discretion as to recognition on specific questions and motions, see §§ 16 et seq., infra.

Chair's discretion over recognition for unanimous-consent requests, see § 10, infra.

Chair's discretion over yielding of time, see §§ 29–31, infra.

Chair's recognition for interruptions, see § 32, infra.

Chair's recognition of Member to control debate, see §§ 24 (role of manager), 26 (management by reporting committee),

9. See Rule XIV clause 2, *House Rules and Manual* § 753 (1995). See also §§ 9.5, 9.6, and 9.61, infra, for further discussion of the principle that decisions on recognition are not subject to appeal. For the parameters of the Chair's discretion, see *House Rules and Manual* §§ 753–757 (1995).

10. See, for example, §§ 11.14–11.16, infra.

11. See, for example, Rule XIV clause 3, *House Rules and Manual* § 759 (1995) (right of committee member to open and close debate). For prior rights of committee members to recognition, see § 13, infra.

12. See § 12, infra, for the order of recognition.