

them for one and one-half hour each on the remaining reports.

On Oct. 14, 1978,⁽⁴⁾ the following proceedings occurred in the House:

MR. [THOMAS L.] ASHLEY [of Ohio]: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1434, I call up the conference reports on the bills [H.R. 4018, Public Utility Rates; H.R. 5037, Energy Conservation; H.R. 5146, Coal Conversion; H.R. 5289, Natural Gas Policy; and H.R. 5263, Energy Tax]. . . .

The Clerk read the titles of the bills.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽⁵⁾ Pursuant to House Resolution 1434, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Ashley) will be recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Anderson) will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Ashley) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Anderson) for 30 minutes to debate the conference report on H.R. 5289. . . .

MR. [ROBERT E.] BAUMAN [of Maryland]: May I . . . inquire of the Chair whether the first hour of debate is to be directed to the natural gas conference report and not to the other four conference reports?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman is correct.

MR. BAUMAN: Only to the natural gas conference report?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman is correct.

4. 124 CONG. REC. 38349, 38350, 95th Cong. 2d Sess.

5. William H. Natcher (Ky.).

MR. BAUMAN: Would it be out of order to discuss the other parts during that time?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair would like to advise the gentleman that the Chair would have to rule as points along that line are brought to the attention of the Chair.

MR. BAUMAN: I thank the Speaker.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair would like to advise the gentleman that the resolution provides the first hour of which shall be confined solely to the conference report on the bill H.R. 5289.

§ 29. Yielding Time

Where the Member with the floor desires to allow another Member to speak during the former's own time, he yields, and the time yielded is taken out of his time.⁽⁶⁾ Yielding is discretionary with the Member in control. And a Member yielded time may speak as many times as yielded to, despite the prohibition against speaking more than once to the same subject.⁽⁷⁾ The Mem-

6. See §§ 29.5–29.7, *infra*.

Where a Member who is yielded time does not consume it, the remaining time reverts to the Member who yielded it (see § 29.16, *infra*).

If the Member with the floor yields the "balance" of his time in the House without moving the previous question, he loses the floor (see §§ 29.9, 29.10, *infra*).

7. See § 29.4, *infra*.

ber yielding time should stand to protect his right to the floor,⁽⁸⁾ and the Member who seeks yielded time should address the Chair and request the permission of the Member speaking.⁽⁹⁾

A Member with the floor generally yields for debate only, since in yielding for a motion or amendment he may lose the floor.⁽¹⁰⁾

The principle that a Member may not, in time yielded for debate, make a motion or offer an amendment is based on the reasoning that if amendments or mo-

tions were allowed in time yielded for debate, control would shift and the Chair would be deprived of his power of recognition.

A Member yielded time in debate cannot allocate and control that time, except by unanimous consent.⁽¹¹⁾ A Member yielded a specific amount of time for debate may not in turn yield a specific amount of time for debate to another Member, although he may yield for questions and statements.⁽¹²⁾ A Member recognized under the five-minute rule may not yield to another to offer an amendment, although he may yield to another for debate while remaining on his feet.⁽¹³⁾

Although not required to do so by standing rule, majority Members controlling all the time under the hour rule, frequently yield one-half the time to the minority in order that full debate may occur.⁽¹⁴⁾ Under that special procedure, the minority manager may yield specific amounts of time to other Members without remaining on his feet.

Cross References

Allocation and use of yielded time, see § 31, *infra*.

11. See §§ 31.21, 31.22, 31.27, *infra*.
12. See §§ 31.19, 31.20, 31.27, *infra*, for restrictions on yielding yielded time.
13. See §§ 31.10, 31.11, *infra*.
14. See, for example, §§ 29.15, 29.30, *infra*.

The Member in control is not required to consume or yield all the time he possesses (see § 29.13, *infra*).

8. See § 29.8, *infra*.
9. See §§ 29.1, 29.2, *infra*.
10. A Member always loses the floor in yielding for an amendment (see §§ 30.7–30.10, *infra*), unless control of debate on amendments has been placed by unanimous consent in managers, in which case a manager may yield for an amendment without losing control (see § 30.26, *infra*).

A motion or amendment may not be made by a Member unless the Member with the floor yields for that purpose (see §§ 29.20–29.22, *infra*). If a Member yields for the motion to adjourn (or the motion that the Committee of the Whole rise), he may resume when the subject matter is again resumed (see 5 Hinds' Precedents §§ 5009–5013. For general discussion of proceedings in the Committee of the Whole, see Ch. 19, *supra*).

Interruptions in debate, see § 42, *infra*.
 Losing control generally, see § 33, *infra*.
 Power of Chair over recognition, see § 9, *supra*.
 Yielding of time by committee managers, see § 26, *supra*.
 Yielding of time by manager of proposition, see § 24, *supra*.
 Yielding of time under limitation on five-minute debate, see § 22, *supra*.

Seeking Yielded Time

§ 29.1 A Member desiring the Member with the floor to yield to him should address the Chair for the permission of the Member speaking.

On June 29, 1956,⁽¹⁵⁾ Chairman Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, sustained a point of order that a Member desiring to interrupt another in debate, by asking him to yield, should properly address the Chair for the permission of the Member speaking:

MR. [RALPH W.] GWINN [of New York]: We had no exact testimony on the point before our committee.

MR. [CLEVELAND M.] BAILEY [of West Virginia]: Will the gentleman yield?

MR. GWINN: I would like to answer the question of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania first.

MR. [CLARE E.] HOFFMAN of Michigan: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

15. 102 CONG. REC. 11455, 84th Cong. 2d Sess.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state it.

MR. HOFFMAN of Michigan: The point of order is that a Member who seeks recognition must first address the Chair rather than inquire of the Member whether he will yield or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is sustained. The practice which has grown up here is not a good one. When a request is made for a Member to yield, the request should be made to the Chair, and the Chair in turn submits the request to the speaker having the floor.

—Recognition by Chair

§ 29.2 Members are not entitled to the floor until recognized by the Chair even though they may have been yielded time by the Member in charge of the time.

On Feb. 28, 1931,⁽¹⁶⁾ Speaker Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio, recognized Mr. Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio, to move to suspend the rules and pass a bill. Mr. John J. O'Connor, of New York, objected that he had already been recognized for 30 minutes on a special rule which had been called up and read but not debated. The Speaker stated that Mr. O'Connor had not been recognized by the Chair for debate and had no right to the floor. (Mr. O'Connor had been

16. 74 CONG. REC. 6675-77, 71st Cong. 3d Sess.

yielded time by the Member in charge of the special rule who had not been recognized for debate by the Speaker.)

Parliamentarian's Note: It is no longer the practice to entertain motions to suspend the rules while other business is pending before the House.

Speaking From Floor During Yielded Time

§ 29.3 In propounding a question in debate to a Member speaking from the well of the House, a Member should speak from a microphone at the majority or minority tables.

On Mar. 7, 1957,⁽¹⁷⁾ Chairman Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, sustained a point of order that a Member seeking to ask a question of a Member with the floor and in the well should not seek to propound his question from the well:

MR. AUGUST H. ANDERSEN [of Minnesota]: I will yield for a question, but I refuse to yield for a speech.

MR. [GEORGE N.] CHRISTOPHER [of Missouri]: I would like to ask a question.

MR. [CLARE E.] HOFFMAN [of Michigan]: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state it.

MR. HOFFMAN: I ask that the well be cleared.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Michigan makes a point of order that the well should be cleared. The gentleman will step back to the seats to ask his question.

MR. CHRISTOPHER: I want to ask a question about the 51 million acre base.

MR. HOFFMAN: Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Missouri will suspend. We want to comply strictly with the rules. The gentleman will stand back out of the well, please, while the question is propounded.

Yielding Repeatedly to Same Members

§ 29.4 Members may speak in debate on a bill as many times as they are yielded time by those in control of the debate.

On July 11, 1946,⁽¹⁸⁾ Chairman William M. Whittington, of Mississippi, answered a parliamentary inquiry as follows:

MISS [JESSIE] SUMNER of Illinois: Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry?

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentlewoman will state it.

MISS SUMNER of Illinois: The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Hays] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] have spoken two or three times

17. 103 CONG. REC. 3268, 85th Cong. 1st Sess.

18. 92 CONG. REC. 8694, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.

on this bill during general debate. Is that permissible under the rules of the House?

THE CHAIRMAN: The time is within the control of the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee.

MISS SUMNER of Illinois: May the same person speak two or three times in general debate on the same bill?

THE CHAIRMAN: General debate on this bill has been fixed at 16 hours, the time equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee. They may yield, once, twice, or as many times as they desire to whom they desire.

Yielded Time Charged to Member With Floor

§ 29.5 Yielded time is taken out of the time of the Member with the floor, except for points of order.

On Apr. 8, 1937,⁽¹⁹⁾ Mr. Arthur H. Greenwood, of Indiana, had the floor, having called up by direction of the Committee on Rules a privileged resolution. Mr. Carl E. Mapes, of Michigan, asked Mr. Greenwood to yield for the propounding of a parliamentary inquiry, thereby raising a question as to how such time should be charged:

MR. MAPES: Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may submit

19. 81 CONG. REC. 3283, 75th Cong. 1st Sess.

a parliamentary inquiry, not to be taken out of the gentleman's time?

MR. GREENWOOD: I yield for that purpose.

THE SPEAKER:⁽²⁰⁾ If the gentleman yields, it comes out of his time.

MR. GREENWOOD: Then I prefer to make my statement. I will not yield for that purpose at this time.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Mapes] that the only exception where interruptions are not taken out of the time of the speaker is on points of order.⁽¹⁾

§ 29.6 During consideration of a bill under the five-minute rule, a Member who has the floor may yield to another for a unanimous-consent request or a motion to limit debate, but the time consumed thereby comes out of the time of the Member holding the floor.

On June 11, 1968,⁽²⁾ Mr. Daniel J. Flood, of Pennsylvania, was recognized on a pro forma amendment under the five-minute rule in the Committee of the Whole. He then yielded to Mr. George H. Mahon, of Texas, who asked unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and

20. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).

1. For interruptions of the Member with the floor, see § 32, *infra*.

2. 114 CONG. REC. 16699, 90th Cong. 2d Sess.

the substitute amendments there-to close at 5:30. Chairman James G. O'Hara, of Michigan, stated, in response to a parliamentary inquiry by Mr. Flood, that the time consumed by the unanimous-consent request came out of his (Mr. Flood's) time, since he had yielded for the purpose.

On June 1, 1972,⁽³⁾ Chairman Robert N. Giaimo, of Connecticut, stated that time for interruptions, for which a Member with the floor under the five-minute rule had yielded, would be taken out of his time:

MR. [WILLIAM V.] CHAPPELL [Jr., of Florida]: Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. . . .

MR. [HARLEY O.] STAGGERS [of West Virginia]: Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

MR. CHAPPELL: I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

MR. STAGGERS: I have asked the gentleman from Florida to yield to me in order to ascertain if we could set a limit of debate on this amendment.

Having heard the amendment read, it is a very simple amendment, and it can be read again if needed.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

MR. [DURWARD G.] HALL [of Missouri]: Mr. Chairman, I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Objection is heard.

MR. STAGGERS: Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

MR. [H. R.] GROSS [of Iowa]: Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

MR. GROSS: Mr. Chairman, is this coming out of the gentleman's time?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will state that that is correct.

§ 29.7 If a Member yields for a parliamentary inquiry, the time consumed by the inquiry and the reply is taken out of his time.

On May 26, 1960,⁽⁴⁾ while Mr. Donald R. Matthews, of Florida, had the floor, the following proceedings occurred:

MR. MATTHEWS: Mr. Chairman, the poet, Robert Frost, in his poem "Road Not Taken," starts out with these lines—

MR. [CLEVELAND M.] BAILEY [of West Virginia]: Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽⁵⁾ Does the gentleman from Florida yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

3. 118 CONG. REC. 19476, 92d Cong. 2d Sess.

4. 106 CONG. REC. 11267, 11268, 86th Cong. 2d Sess.

5. Aime J. Forand (R.I.).

MR. MATTHEWS: Will it be taken out of my time?

THE CHAIRMAN: It will be taken out of the gentleman's time.

MR. MATTHEWS: I regret I cannot yield to my beloved colleague.⁽⁶⁾

Member Yielding Time Should Stand

§ 29.8 A Member recognized in support of an amendment may yield to another for a question or statement, but he must remain standing in order to protect his rights to the floor.

On Mar. 12, 1964,⁽⁷⁾ Chairman Chet Holifield, of California, stated a Member recognized on an amendment who yields to another should remain standing:

MR. [THOMAS J.] MURRAY [of Tennessee]: Mr. Chairman, I will explain the amendment, I hope to the satisfaction of all.

MR. [THOMAS B.] CURTIS [of Missouri]: I wish to say, if the gentleman will yield further, that this is about 30 pages. Without copies available I believe possibly a recess will be in order.

MR. [WAYNE L.] HAYS [of Ohio]: Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

6. See also 113 CONG. REC. 19033, 90th Cong. 1st Sess., July 17, 1967; 113 CONG. REC. 4997, 90th Cong. 1st Sess., Mar. 1, 1967; 111 CONG. REC. 16836, 89th Cong. 1st Sess., July 25, 1965; and 81 CONG. REC. 3283-90, 75th Cong. 1st Sess., Apr. 8, 1937.

7. 110 CONG. REC. 5100, 88th Cong. 2d Sess.

The gentleman from Tennessee had the floor, and I have not heard him yield to any Member lately. He is not standing.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Murray] has been recognized by the Chair. We hope the gentleman from Tennessee will maintain his position standing, if he wishes to obtain the attention of the Chamber.

MR. MURRAY: I thank the Chairman. I shall do so.

Effect of Yielding Back Balance of Time on Motion Without Moving Previous Question

§ 29.9 If a Member recognized to control one hour on a motion yields back the balance thereof without moving the previous question, another Member may be recognized for one hour.

On Oct. 10, 1940,⁽⁸⁾ Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, laid before the House a veto message from the President. Mr. Samuel Dickstein, of New York, moved that the message and the bill be referred to a House committee. He was recognized for one hour by the Speaker, delivered some remarks, and then stated "I yield back the balance of my time." Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, asked for recognition in opposition to the motion, and the Speaker in-

8. 86 CONG. REC. 13522-24, 76th Cong. 3d Sess.

quired of Mr. Dickstein whether he yielded. When Mr. Dickstein stated that he had yielded the floor, Mr. Rankin was recognized for one hour. Mr. Dickstein then objected that he had not meant to surrender the floor, but the Speaker stated that he had affirmatively done so.

§ 29.10 A Member having yielded the floor without moving the previous question after making a motion, another Member seeking recognition is recognized for one hour.

On July 5, 1945,⁽⁹⁾ Mr. Malcolm C. Tarver, of Georgia, offered a motion to correct the permanent Record, in order to accurately reflect a colloquy between himself and Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi. Mr. Tarver discussed his motion and then yielded the floor without moving the previous question. Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, recognized Mr. Rankin for one hour.

Effect on Time Already Yielded Where Member in Control Loses Floor

§ 29.11 A Member in control of the time under the hour rule may yield a portion of his

9. 91 CONG. REC. 7221-25, 79th Cong. 1st Sess.

time to another Member, but if he loses the floor (by yielding for an amendment), the time yielded to the other Member is also lost.

On Nov. 29, 1967,⁽¹⁰⁾ Mr. William R. Anderson, of Tennessee, called up by direction of the Committee on Rules House Resolution 960, a privileged resolution authorizing travel by members of the Committee on Education and Labor, for investigatory purposes; as is customary on a Rules Committee resolution, he yielded 30 minutes to the minority (Mr. H. Allen Smith, of California). Mr. Anderson then yielded to Mr. Durward G. Hall, of Missouri, to offer an amendment, thereby surrendering control of the resolution to Mr. Hall. When Speaker Pro Tempore Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, stated that the question was on the resolution, a parliamentary inquiry was raised:

MR. [H. ALLEN] SMITH of California: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

MR. SMITH of California: I was yielded 30 minutes a while ago by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Anderson]. Do I not have that time?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: When the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr.

10. 113 CONG. REC. 34136-38, 90th Cong. 1st Sess.

Anderson] yielded to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall] for the purpose of offering an amendment, he surrendered all his time, and the Chair so informed the gentleman from Tennessee.

MR. SMITH of California: If the gentleman has agreed to yield 30 minutes to me, I lose it?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: When the gentleman yielded for the purpose of amendment.

Yielding Is Discretionary

§ 29.12 Where debate on a bill is under control of the chairman and ranking minority member of a committee, they may yield as many times as they desire to whomever they desire.

On July 11, 1946,⁽¹¹⁾ Chairman William M. Whittington, of Mississippi, answered a parliamentary inquiry:

MISS [JESSIE] SUMNER of Illinois: Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry?

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentlewoman will state it.

MISS SUMNER of Illinois: The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Hays] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] have spoken two or three times on this bill during general debate. Is that permissible under the rules of the House?

THE CHAIRMAN: The time is within the control of the chairman and the

ranking minority member of the committee.

MISS SUMNER of Illinois: May the same person speak two or three times in general debate on the same bill?

THE CHAIRMAN: General debate on this bill has been fixed at 16 hours, the time equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee. They may yield, once, twice, or as many times as they desire to whom they desire.

§ 29.13 Where the House by unanimous consent fixed the time for and control of debate, it was held that the Members in control were not required to use or to yield all their available time.

On Mar. 11, 1941,⁽¹²⁾ the House was considering House Resolution 131 under the terms of a unanimous-consent request providing two hours of debate in the House, dividing control of debate between Mr. Sol Bloom, of New York, and Mr. Hamilton Fish, Jr., of New York, and providing that at the conclusion of such debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the adoption of the resolution. After debate, Mr. Bloom asked for a vote on the resolution prior to the expiration of the two hours' time, and Mr. Martin J. Kennedy, of New York, objected on the ground that

11. 92 CONG. REC. 8694, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.

12. 87 CONG. REC. 2177, 2178, 77th Cong. 1st Sess.

the unanimous-consent agreement was not being complied with in that two hours of debate had not been consumed and Mr. Bloom had refused to yield further time. Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, ruled as follows:

THE SPEAKER: The unanimous-consent request agreed to yesterday left control of the time in the hands of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish]. At any time those gentlemen do not desire to yield further time, compliance with the request has been had.

§ 29.14 A Member calling up a resolution providing for the order of business under the "21-day rule," in effect in the 89th Congress, was recognized for one hour and could yield time as he saw fit, and was not bound by the custom of the Committee on Rules to yield one-half the time to the opposition.

On Sept. 13, 1965,⁽¹³⁾ Mr. Adam C. Powell, of New York, called up, pursuant to the provisions of Rule XI clause 23, House Resolution 478, providing for the consideration of H.R. 9460, which had been pending before the Committee on Rules for more than 21 calendar days without having

13. 111 CONG. REC. 23618, 23619, 89th Cong. 1st Sess.

been reported by the committee. Mr. Howard W. Smith, of Virginia, made a point of order against the manner in which debate was being conducted on the resolution, claiming that under the usual procedure one hour of debate in the House was in order, to be equally divided between the majority and minority.

Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, ruled as follows:

The Chair will state that the control of time in the present parliamentary situation rests with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell].

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith] has referred to the action taken on the last resolution. That was a matter within the judgment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman]. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] has control of the 1 hour and he can dispose of that time as his judgment dictates.⁽¹⁴⁾

Motion To Instruct Conferees: Former Practice

§ 29.15 A Member offering a motion to instruct conferees, and in control of the one hour for debate, yielded control of one-half his time to the opposition.

14. See also 111 CONG. REC. 18076, 89th Cong. 1st Sess., July 26, 1965.

The 21-day rule was deleted from the rules by H. Res. 7, 90th Cong. 1st Sess. (1967).

On Aug. 8, 1961,⁽¹⁵⁾ the House agreed to a resolution taking from the Speaker's table a House bill with a Senate amendment, disagreeing to the amendment and requesting a conference with the Senate.

Mr. James E. Van Zandt, of Pennsylvania, offered a motion to instruct conferees, and Speaker Pro Tempore Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, advised him that he was entitled to one hour of debate on his motion. Mr. Van Zandt then stated:

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. Hollifield] 30 minutes and yield myself 13 minutes.⁽¹⁶⁾

Parliamentarian's Note: Debate time on any motion to instruct conferees is now divided between the majority and minority parties. If both are supporters of the motion, one-third of the hour can be demanded by a Member opposed to the motion. See H. Res. 5, 101st

15. 107 CONG. REC. 14947-49, 87th Cong. 1st Sess.

16. See also 108 CONG. REC. 18029, 18035, 18036, 87th Cong. 2d Sess., Aug. 29, 1962.

The Member in control under the hour rule may yield in his discretion for debate. See 97 CONG. REC. 5435-45, 82d Cong. 1st Sess., May 17, 1951; and 95 CONG. REC. 11139-45, 81st Cong. 1st Sess., Aug. 9, 1949.

Congress, Jan. 3, 1989. See §26, *supra*, for further discussion.

Reversion of Unused Yielded Time

§ 29.16 Where a Member in control of a specific amount of time for debate in the House yields part or all of his remaining time to another Member, and the latter does not consume such time, the unused time reverts to the Member who yielded.

On Sept. 19, 1966,⁽¹⁷⁾ Mr. Adam C. Powell, of New York, moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill. He used part of the 20 minutes available to him under the rules and then yielded the "balance" of his time to Mr. James G. O'Hara, of Michigan. Mr. O'Hara delivered a short address and Mr. Powell then yielded time to Mr. John H. Dent, of Pennsylvania. Mr. H. R. Gross, of Iowa, made a point of order that Mr. Powell had lost control of the floor and Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, overruled the point of order:

MR. GROSS: Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] yielded his remaining time to the gentleman from

17. 112 CONG. REC. 22933, 22934, 89th Cong. 2d Sess.

Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] and that he therefore cannot yield time.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Michigan consumed 3 minutes.

MR. GROSS: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York yielded the remainder of his time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara].

MR. POWELL: Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state, when that is done on either side, when a Member does not consume the remainder of the time, control of the remaining time reverts to the Member who has charge of the time.

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

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

MR. GROSS: When the Member in charge of time yields the remainder of his time to another Member, Mr. Speaker, I would not know how he would then be able to yield time to any other Member.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will rule that when the gentleman in control of time yields the remainder of his time to another Member, and the other Member does not use up all the time, then the remainder of the time comes back under the control of the Member who originally had control of the time.

On Feb. 8, 1972,⁽¹⁸⁾ the House was considering House Resolution 164, creating a select committee. Mr. Ray J. Madden, of Indiana, was in control of the time under the hour rule. He yielded 10 min-

utes to Mr. Cornelius E. Gallagher, of New Jersey; Speaker Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, ruled that Mr. Gallagher could not reserve any part of that time, and that any part of the 10 minutes not used by him reverted to Mr. Madden:

MR. MADDEN: Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Gallagher).

MR. GALLAGHER: Mr. Speaker, may I take 5 minutes now and reserve 5 minutes to the end of the debate since it is my bill?

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman may do that. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. [DURWARD G.] HALL [of Missouri]: Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I hate to object, but is it in order to have a unanimous-consent request at a time like this when the time is controlled by the members of the Committee on Rules to bring the bill on the floor?

MR. GALLAGHER: I asked for the time to close the debate since there will be objections, and I would like to respond to those objections. It was my understanding that I would have the time at the conclusion of debate.

MR. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I submit this is between the gentleman and the man handling the rule, and therefore I must object.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will notify the gentleman when 5 minutes are up. . . .

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from New Jersey has consumed 5 minutes.

MR. GALLAGHER: Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

18. 118 CONG. REC. 3181-3200, 92d Cong. 2d Sess.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair must advise the gentleman that the time is under the control of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Madden) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Latta).

MR. GALLAGHER: Mr. Speaker, I was granted 10 minutes and I reserve the balance of my time.

MR. GROSS: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman cannot reserve the balance of 5 minutes.

MR. GALLAGHER: I am not speaking under the 5-minute rule.

MR. GROSS: It does not make any difference. . . .

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Indiana has control of the time and the Chair has so advised the gentleman from New Jersey of that fact.

If the gentleman from Indiana desires to yield further time at this time he can do so.

Yielding for Reading of Paper

§ 29.17 A Member having the floor may yield to another to read a paper without losing the right to the floor.

On Apr. 25, 1947,⁽¹⁹⁾ Mr. John J. Rooney, of New York, had the floor under the five-minute rule in the Committee of the Whole. Mr. Rooney yielded to Mrs. Helen Gahagan Douglas, of California, to read a statement made by the Secretary of the Interior. Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, made the point of order that Mr.

19. 93 CONG. REC. 4086, 80th Cong. 1st Sess.

Rooney had yielded and lost the floor. Chairman Earl C. Michener, of Michigan, overruled the point of order and stated that Mr. Rooney still had the floor.

Member Having Special Order Yielded to Member Having Next Special Order

§ 29.18 A Member having a special order was permitted, by unanimous consent, to relinquish part of his time to the Member having the next special order.

On July 11, 1966,⁽¹⁾ Mr. Wright Patman, of Texas, had scheduled a special order to address the House, with a special order to follow by Mr. Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri. By unanimous consent, Mr. Patman relinquished the floor for five minutes to Mr. Curtis.

Use of Time Yielded for Debate Only

§ 29.19 A Member may not be recognized to offer an amendment in time yielded for debate only.

On Feb. 2, 1955,⁽²⁾ Mr. Ray J. Madden, of Indiana, called up at the direction of the Committee on

1. 112 CONG. REC. 14988, 89th Cong. 2d Sess.

2. 101 CONG. REC. 1076-79, 84th Cong. 1st Sess.

Rules House Resolution 63, authorizing the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to inspect the Veterans' Administration. Mr. Madden yielded three minutes' time for debate to Mrs. Edith Nourse Rogers, of Massachusetts. Mrs. Rogers indicated she wished to offer an amendment to prohibit the Committee on Veterans' Affairs from investigating any matter under investigation by another committee of the House. Mr. Madden stated that he did not yield for the purpose of having such an amendment offered. Speaker Pro Tempore Robert C. Byrd, of West Virginia, ruled that Mrs. Rogers did not have the right to offer an amendment in time yielded her for debate only.

§ 29.20 When a motion to recede from and concur in a Senate amendment is pending, an amendment to the motion may not be offered in time yielded for debate.

On July 11, 1968,⁽³⁾ Mrs. Julia Butler Hansen, of Washington, offered a motion to recede and concur in a Senate amendment following adoption of a conference report on H.R. 17354, the Department of the Interior appropriations for fiscal 1969. At his re-

3. 114 CONG. REC. 20683, 90th Cong. 2d Sess.

quest, Mrs. Hansen yielded for debate to Mr. Charles R. Jonas, of North Carolina, who then attempted to offer an amendment to the motion. However, Mrs. Hansen refused to yield for that motion saying she had yielded only for the purpose of debate.

§ 29.21 A Member may not in time yielded him for general debate move that the Committee of the Whole rise, nor may he yield to another for such motion.

On Feb. 22, 1950,⁽⁴⁾ Mr. Howard W. Smith, of Virginia, moved, in time yielded him in the Committee of the Whole by Mr. Adam C. Powell, of New York, for general debate, that the Committee rise. Chairman Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, ruled that that motion was not in order, since Mr. Powell had control of the time and since he had not yielded time to Mr. Smith for the making of the motion. Subsequently, Mr. Hugo S. Sims, Jr., of South Carolina, in time yielded for debate by Mr. Powell, yielded to Mr. Smith who again moved that the Committee rise, stating he had "some time of my own." The Chairman ruled that the motion was not in order, since Mr. Sims was yielded time

4. 96 CONG. REC. 2178, 81st Cong. 2d Sess.

for general debate and could not yield to Mr. Smith for the making of the motion.

On appeal, the Chairman's ruling was sustained.⁽⁵⁾

Parliamentarian's Note: When the House has vested control of general debate in the Committee of the Whole in the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee reporting a bill, their control of general debate may not be abrogated by another Member moving that the Committee rise—unless they yield for that purpose.

—Parliamentary Inquiries in Time Yielded for Debate

§ 29.22 Where a Member controlling the time for debate yields to another for debate, the latter may, during the time so yielded, propound a parliamentary inquiry.

On July 17, 1967,⁽⁶⁾ Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, ruled that a Member yielded time for debate could within that time propound a parliamentary inquiry:

MR. [SAMUEL N.] FRIEDEL [of Maryland]: Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Adams].

5. See also 113 CONG. REC. 14121, 90th Cong. 1st Sess., May 25, 1967.

6. 113 CONG. REC. 19033, 90th Cong. 1st Sess.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

MR. [BROCK] ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

MR. FRIEDEL: Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman for the purpose of debate.

MR. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman controlling the time whether I may also make a parliamentary inquiry?

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state that if the gentleman wants to make a parliamentary inquiry, it is within his time. A parliamentary inquiry will take up the time of the gentleman.

Yielding for Parliamentary Inquiry

§ 29.23 A Member may not be taken from the floor by a parliamentary inquiry, but he may yield for that purpose.

On Oct. 8, 1968,⁽⁷⁾ Mr. Ray J. Madden, of Indiana, called up by direction of the Committee on Rules a resolution providing an order of business. Mr. Madden was recognized for one hour, and Mr. Gerald R. Ford, of Michigan, attempted to raise a parliamentary inquiry. Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, indicated that Mr. Madden could not be taken off the floor by an inquiry made without his consent,

7. 114 CONG. REC. 30217, 90th Cong. 2d Sess.

but that he could yield for that purpose:

MR. GERALD R. FORD: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: Does the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

MR. GERALD R. FORD: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

MR. MADDEN: I do not yield.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair is asking the gentleman from Indiana if he yields to the gentleman from Michigan for the purpose of making a parliamentary inquiry.

MR. MADDEN: No.

MR. GERALD R. FORD: Mr. Speaker, I demand the right to make a parliamentary inquiry.

MR. MADDEN: I yield.

MR. GERALD R. FORD: Mr. Speaker, I make a demand of personal privilege.

THE SPEAKER: Just a minute. The gentleman from Indiana has yielded to the gentleman from Michigan for the purpose of making a parliamentary inquiry.

MR. GERALD R. FORD: I appreciate the delayed recognition by the gentleman from Indiana.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.⁽⁸⁾

§ 29.24 A Member may not be interrupted by another Mem-

8. See also 111 CONG. REC. 17931, 89th Cong. 1st Sess., July 22, 1965; and 106 CONG. REC. 11267, 11268, 86th Cong. 2d Sess., May 26, 1960.

Where a Member yields to another for a parliamentary inquiry, the time consumed by the inquiry is charged against the yielding Member (see §§ 29.5, 29.7, supra).

ber for a parliamentary inquiry without his consent and if the Member who has the floor refuses to yield and demands regular order the Chair will not recognize another Member to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

On July 8, 1975,⁽⁹⁾ the proceedings described above occurred in the Committee of the Whole, as follows:

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. Hébert: . . .

MR. DINGELL: Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment about which my colleagues have received communications in the last few days from the Sierra Club and from other nationwide conservation organizations. . . .

MR. [DON] YOUNG of Alaska: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order to the germaneness of this amendment.

MR. DINGELL: Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for the point of order. The point of order is too late.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹⁰⁾ The Chair rules that the point of order is too late.

MR. YOUNG of Alaska: Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

9. 121 CONG. REC. 21628, 94th Cong. 1st Sess.
10. Neal Smith (Iowa).

MR. DINGELL: Mr. Chairman, may we have the regular order. . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) refuses to yield.

MR. YOUNG of Alaska: Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: That could only be made before the gentleman from Michigan was recognized with respect to his amendment. . . .

MR. DINGELL: Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) refuses to yield.

Under regular order, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dingell) is recognized.

Time Yielded for Unanimous-consent Request; Debate Under Reservation of Objection

§ 29.25 Where the Committee of the Whole is considering an amendment under a "modified closed" rule permitting only one amendment and no amendments thereto, and equally dividing the debate time on the amendment, time consumed under a reservation of objection to a unanimous-consent request to offer an amendment to the pending amendment comes out of the time controlled by the Member yielding for that request.

During consideration of House Joint Resolution 413 (further continuing appropriations for fiscal

1984) in the Committee of the Whole on Nov. 10, 1983,⁽¹¹⁾ the following proceedings occurred:

MR. [SILVIO O.] CONTE [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Solomon).

MR. [GERALD B.] SOLOMON [of New York]: . . . Mr. Chairman, in just a moment I will be asking unanimous consent to offer an amendment which will reduce the amount of economic aid that we give to Zimbabwe by \$30 million. . . .

MR. [THOMAS J.] HUCKABY [of Louisiana]: Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is it my understanding that there is \$75 million that is earmarked for Zimbabwe in the Wright amendment, and that Zimbabwe is also the country that has consistently supported the Cuban troops in Angola?

THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE:⁽¹²⁾ The Chair would inform the Members that the debate on the reservation will have to come out of allotted time which is controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Interruption for Point of Order

§ 29.26 A Member having the floor may not be interrupted by another Member raising a parliamentary inquiry unless he yields for that purpose, but the Chair must permit an interruption to rule on any

11. 129 CONG. REC. 32120, 98th Cong. 1st Sess.

12. Wyche Fowler, Jr. (Ga.).

point of order raised during debate.

On Dec. 18, 1987,⁽¹³⁾ during consideration of a privileged resolution (H. Res. 335, disciplining a Member) in the House, the following proceedings occurred:

MR. [JULIAN C.] DIXON [of California]: Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 335) in the matter of Representative Austin J. Murphy, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 335

Resolved, That the House of Representatives adopt the report by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct dated December 16, 1987, in the matter of Representative Austin J. Murphy of Pennsylvania. . . .

MR. [NEWT] GINGRICH [of Georgia]: Mr. Speaker, I commend the committee for its report and its recommendation. . . .

This committee's earlier report on the gentleman from Rhode Island should be reexamined with this new yardstick. The committee's letter on the gentlewoman from Ohio should be scrutinized with this new yardstick. The admission of \$24,000 in election law violations by the gentleman from California should be held up to this new yardstick.

Finally, the numerous allegations about the Speaker must be——

MR. [TOMMY F.] ROBINSON [of Arkansas]: Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽¹⁴⁾ The gentleman will state it.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Speaker, I thought we were here today to hear a very serious charge against one of our colleagues from Pennsylvania, not from California or other States.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Will the gentleman suspend? Does the gentleman from Georgia yield?

MR. GINGRICH: No, I do not yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman will state his point of order.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that we are here to consider the committee's report against our colleague Austin Murphy and not against other Members today that the charges have not been substantiated or presented to the committee.

MR. GINGRICH: Would the Chair——

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Will the gentleman suspend?

The [gentleman] will yield on the point of order.

On the debate currently ongoing, there can be references made to other cases reported by the committee, not by individual or by name. The gentleman from Georgia, as the Chair understands, has not mentioned other individuals and the gentleman from Arkansas——

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Speaker, he has, too.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman may compare disciplinary actions reported by the committee and should confine his remarks to the matters before the House.

13. 133 CONG. REC. 36266, 36271, 100th Cong. 1st Sess.

14. Dave McCurdy (Okla.).

One Recognized for Parliamentary Inquiry May Not Yield

§ 29.27 Recognition for a parliamentary inquiry is within the discretion of the Chair, and a Member so recognized may not yield to other Members.

On Mar. 16, 1988,⁽¹⁵⁾ the following proceedings occurred in the House:

MR. [JUDD] GREGG [of New Hampshire]: Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry. . . .

Mr. Speaker, I was just in my office viewing the proceedings here, and during one of the proceedings, when the gentleman from California [Mr. Dornan] was addressing the House, it was drawn to my attention that the Speaker requested that Mr. Dornan's microphone be turned off, upon which Mr. Dornan's microphone was turned off.

Mr. Speaker, my inquiry of the Chair is: Under what rule does the Speaker decide to gag opposite Members of the House? . . .

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽¹⁶⁾ The Chair is referring to Mr. Dornan. He requested permission of the Chair to proceed for 1 minute, and that permission was granted by the House. Mr. Dornan grossly exceeded the limits and abused the privilege far in excess of 1 minute, and the Chair proceeded to restore order and decorum to the House. . . .

MR. GREGG: . . . I have not heard the Chair respond to my inquiry which

15. 134 CONG. REC. 4084, 4085, 100th Cong. 2d Sess.

16. Gary L. Ackerman (N.Y.).

is what ruling is the Chair referring to which allows him to turn off the microphone of a Member who has the floor?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Clause 2 of rule I.

MR. GREGG: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that that rule be read. I would ask that that rule be read, Mr. Speaker. . . .

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: It reads, 2. He shall preserve order and decorum, and, in case of disturbance or disorderly conduct in the galleries, or in the lobby, may cause the same to be cleared. . . .

MR. GREGG: My parliamentary inquiry is that I want to know how the Chair can specifically turn off the microphone and what rule the Chair does it under, because the Chair has not answered that question.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair has responded to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from New Hampshire.

MR. GREGG: Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time, and yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. Martin]. . . .

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair advises that a Member may not yield time to another Member under a parliamentary inquiry.

Yielding Blocks of Time—Further Yielding by Member to Whom Time Yielded

§ 29.28 A Member yielded time by the manager of a proposition in the House may yield a block of time to another Member by unanimous consent only.

During consideration of the conference report on the Energy Security Act (S. 932) in the House on June 26, 1980,⁽¹⁷⁾ the following proceedings occurred:

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽¹⁸⁾ Pursuant to House Resolution 728 and the rules of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Moorhead) will be recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. McKinney) will be recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Moorhead). . . .

MR. [THOMAS S.] FOLEY [of Washington]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Perkins).

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

MR. [WILLIAM S.] MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania: Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, at this time I intended to yield a block of 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Foley) for the purpose of yielding, debating, reserving his time, and yielding back his time.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Foley)?

There was no objection.

Parliamentarian's Note: An exception to this principle is during

17. 126 CONG. REC. 16889, 16897, 96th Cong. 2d Sess.

18. Bruce F. Vento (Minn.).

debate on special orders from the Committee on Rules, where the manager normally yields 30 minutes to the minority member, who in turn is permitted to yield blocks of time to other Members without remaining on his feet. And where time is divided by the House rules, each Member can yield blocks of time.

§ 29.29 A Member recognized in opposition to a motion to discharge a committee may not yield his time for debate to another to be yielded by the other Member.

On June 11, 1945,⁽¹⁹⁾ Mr. Vito Marcantonio, of New York, called up the motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from the further consideration of House Resolution 139, providing for the consideration of H.R. 7, the antipoll tax bill. Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, stated that Mr. Marcantonio would be recognized for 10 minutes in favor of the motion and that Mr. Edward E. Cox, of Georgia, would be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition.

Mr. Cox yielded to Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, who inquired whether he could be yielded the balance of Mr. Cox's time, with the privilege of yielding to

19. 91 CONG. REC. 5892-96, 79th Cong. 1st Sess.

others. Mr. Cox yielded Mr. Rankin the balance of his time, but Speaker Rayburn stated that Mr. Cox and not Mr. Rankin would control the distribution of the time.

§ 29.30 The Member in charge of time for debate yielded one-half the time to a minority Member who was permitted, by unanimous consent, to further yield that time.

On Mar. 12, 1963,⁽²⁰⁾ Mr. Emanuel Celler, of New York, asked unanimous consent for the consideration of H.R. 4374, to bestow citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill. Speaker John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, stated, in response to a parliamentary inquiry by Mr. H. R. Gross, of Iowa, that Mr. Celler was entitled to one hour of debate, to be yielded as he desired. The House then agreed to the following unanimous-consent request stated by Mr. Celler:

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff], and that he may yield such time as he desires.

Parliamentarian's Note: Richard H. Poff was a minority Member of the House.

²⁰ 109 CONG. REC. 3993, 88th Cong. 1st Sess.

Five-minute Debate—Yielding Time Allocated Under Limitation on Debate

§ 29.31 A limitation on time for debate on a pending amendment and all amendments thereto in effect abrogates the five-minute rule and the Chair, at his discretion, may allocate time to all Members desiring to speak, whether or not they have previously spoken on the amendment; Members to whom time has been allocated may by unanimous consent yield their time to another Member.

On Oct. 1, 1975,⁽¹⁾ during consideration of the Department of Defense appropriation bill (H.R. 9861) in the Committee of the Whole, the proceedings described above occurred as follows:

MR. [GEORGE H.] MAHON [of Texas]: Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had misjudged before the desire of the House at an earlier time to try to limit debate to 30 minutes. I want to be sure that no one is denied the opportunity to speak. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 15 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽²⁾ Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

1. 121 CONG. REC. 31074, 31075, 94th Cong. 1st Sess.
2. Dan Rostenkowski (Ill.).

There was no objection. . . .

MR. [BURT L.] TALCOTT [of California]: Mr. Chairman, may I inquire whether or not the Members who have already spoken on this amendment may speak again during limited time?

THE CHAIRMAN: When time is limited, Members are permitted to speak again under the allocation of time.

MR. TALCOTT: And they can yield their time to other Members?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a unanimous-consent request. . . .

MR. [BARRY] GOLDWATER [Jr., of California]: . . . I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended another 15 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

MR. [ANDREW J.] HINSHAW [of California]: Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if we were to accede to the unanimous-consent request, would that open the door for additional Members to stand up to seek additional time?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair has already announced his allocation of time.

§ 30. — For Motions or Amendments

Cross References

Amendments generally, see Ch. 27, *supra*.

Member must be recognized by Chair to offer amendment, see § 19, *supra*.

Member must be recognized by Chair to offer motion, see § 23, *supra*.

Motions generally, see Ch. 23, *supra*.

No motions or amendments in time yielded for debate, see §§ 29.20–29.22, *supra*.

In House: Yielding for Amendment

§ 30.1 A pending motion being considered in the House is not subject to amendment unless the Member in control specifically yields for that purpose or unless the previous question is rejected.

On Oct. 31, 1983,⁽³⁾ during consideration of a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3222 (Departments of Commerce, State, and Justice appropriations for fiscal 1984) in the House, the following proceedings occurred:

MR. [GEORGE M.] O'BRIEN [of Illinois]: Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'Brien moves that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 3222, be instructed to insist on the House position on the amendment of the Senate numbered 93.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽⁴⁾ The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. O'Brien) is recognized for 1 hour.

MR. O'BRIEN: Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

3. 129 CONG. REC. 29963, 29964, 98th Cong. 1st Sess.

4. Robert A. Roe (N.J.).