circumstances, the Chair rules that the objection was in order, so the question comes to a vote without debate. . . .

MR. [LESTER L.] WOLFF [of New York]: Mr. Speaker, does the motion mean that the entire proceedings must be read, or is it confined to selected portions the gentleman wants to read?

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Butler) has a prepared document, and he has been allotted 8 minutes by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Wright). He could read as much of the document as he has within those 8 minutes.

Use of Video in Floor Debate

§ 80.8 A Member having been denied permission to utilize a Betamax video telecasting machine on the floor of the House during a special order to communicate statements made by non-Members of the House, informed the House of the Speaker's denial of his request (which was based upon precedents prohibiting non-Members from participating in debate).

On Feb. 11, 1980,[17] Guy Vander Jagt, of Michigan, was recognized in the House and made a statement as indicated below:

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Vander Jagt) is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

MR. VANDER JAGT: . . . The National Republican Congressional Committee, of which I am chairman, and the National Republican Committee have prepared a nationwide television advertising campaign which addresses these three issues and presents Republican solutions to these problems which the people feel so acutely.

Madam Speaker, I have taken this special order and requested of the Speaker permission to bring a Betamax onto the floor so that our colleagues would be able to see exactly what these commercials are saying. The Speaker did not see fit to grant that request but scripts of the commercials are at the desk. . . .

§ 81. Voting on Permission To Read Papers

Rule XXX, which formerly required unanimous consent for the reading of papers if objection was made, has been rewritten to apply to the use of exhibits rather than the reading of papers.[18] Procedures under the former rule were as follows: where objection was made to the reading of a paper in debate, the question was put on the reading by the Speaker or Chairman.[19] The question was

17. 126 CONG. REC. 2596, 96th Cong. 2d Sess.

18. See the discussion in § 80, supra.

19. See § 81.1, infra.

put without debate,[20] and could be determined in the same manner as any other proposition before the House or Committee of the Whole.[1]

Time consumed on the objection and on the vote to permit reading was not taken out of the time of the Member attempting to read,[2] but permission to read did not entitle the Member to more time than originally allotted.[3]

Procedures Under Former Rule XXX

—Putting the Question

§ 81.1 Where objection was made to the reading of a paper other than one on which the House or the Committee of the Whole was to vote, the Chair put the question to the House or Committee for determination.[4]

—Voting; Debate

§ 81.2 Where objection was made to the reading of a paper, the House decided the question by majority vote and not by unanimous consent.

On Oct. 24, 1945,[5] Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, made a point of order against the reading of papers in debate by Mr. Hugh De Lacy, of Washington, and asserted that "A Member who has the floor has to get unanimous consent to read."

Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, ruled that a vote of the House was required on an objection to such reading, and put the question to the House for a majority vote.[6]

§ 81.3 Under the former practice, when objection was made to the reading of a paper, it would be deter-

20. See § 81.3, infra.
1. See § 81.4, infra (voice vote and division).
2. See § 81.5, infra.
3. See § 81.6, infra.
4. See, for example, 94 CONG. REC. 3436, 80th Cong. 2d Sess., Mar. 24, 1948; 91 CONG. REC. 10031, 79th Cong. 1st Sess., Oct. 24, 1945; 83 CONG. REC. 4874, 75th Cong. 3d Sess., Apr. 6, 1938; 80 CONG. REC. 3143, 74th Cong. 2d Sess., Mar. 3, 1936; 79 CONG. REC. 10418, 10419, 74th Cong. 1st Sess., June 29, 1935; and 75 CONG. REC. 3281, 72d Cong. 1st Sess., Feb. 2, 1932.

   Objections to the reading of papers not to be voted upon were determined by the House pursuant to Rule XXX, *House Rules and Manual* § 915 (1991).
5. 91 CONG. REC. 10031, 79th Cong. 1st Sess.
6. See also 94 CONG. REC. 2479, 80th Cong. 2d Sess., Mar. 10, 1948.

mined without debate by a vote of the House.[7]

§ 81.4 The House could by voice or division vote permit a Member to continue reading a paper after objection had been made.

On Feb. 27, 1946, objection was made to the reading by Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, of a document expressing the political doctrine of William Z. Foster.[8] Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, ruled that whether the paper could be read was for the House to decide, and put the question to the House, as follows:

> The question is: Shall the gentleman be permitted to proceed to read the paper from which he is now reading?
>
> The question was taken; and the House decided that Mr. Rankin be permitted to proceed with the reading.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Mississippi will proceed in order.

On Jan. 25, 1939,[9] Speaker Pro Tempore Stephen Pace, of Georgia, ruled that where objection was made to a Member's reading his own address from a manuscript, the question must be put to the House:

> MR. [JOHN C.] SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Regular order, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman is out of order. Under the rules of the House, the gentleman is not supposed to read from a manuscript. . . .
>
> Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order under the rules of the House and is not supposed to read his remarks in the well of the House. I ask for a ruling.
>
> THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair has been provided with a copy of the rules of the House and refers to rule XXX, which reads:
>
> > When the reading of a paper other than one upon which the House is called to give a final vote is demanded, and the same is objected to by any Member, it shall be determined without debate by a vote of the House. . . .
>
> The Chair is of the opinion that under this rule the question of whether or not the gentleman from Washington shall be permitted to proceed to read his own remarks must be submitted to the House.
>
> The question is on permitting the gentleman from Washington to proceed to read his own remarks.
>
> The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Schafer of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 15, noes 3.

—Charging of Time on Vote

§ 81.5 Where objection was made to the reading of a

---

7. See, for example, 98 CONG. REC. 8175, 8176, 82d Cong. 2d Sess., June 26, 1952 (in Committee of the Whole); 92 CONG. REC. 1729, 79th Cong. 2d Sess., Feb. 27, 1946; and 88 CONG. REC. 8237, 77th Cong. 2d Sess., Oct. 15, 1942.

Rule XXX, *House Rules and Manual* § 915 (1991) provided that the vote on permission to read would be taken without debate.

8. 92 CONG. REC. 1729, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.

9. 84 CONG. REC. 796, 76th Cong. 1st Sess.

paper, the time consumed in voting on the question was not taken out of the time of the Member attempting to read.

On Jan. 25, 1939,[10] objection was made by Mr. John C. Schafer, of Wisconsin, to the reading in debate of a manuscript by Mr. Knute Hill, of Washington. Speaker Pro Tempore Stephen Pace, of Georgia, ruled that the question must be put to the House. Mr. Hill inquired whether time consumed on the objection and on the vote was to be taken out of his time and the Speaker Pro Tempore responded that it would not.

On Mar. 25, 1937,[11] Speaker William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, ruled that unanimous consent granted to Mr. Ralph E. Church, of Illinois, to revise and extend his remarks did not include permission to read such extraneous matter in debate. During debate on the point of order, Mr. Church stated, "Mr. Speaker, I do not want this taken out of my time." The Speaker responded, "This will not be taken out of the gentleman's time."

10. 84 CONG. REC. 796, 76th Cong. 1st Sess.

11. 82 CONG. REC. 2784–88, 75th Cong. 1st Sess.

—Permission To Read Did Not Affect Allotted Time

§ 81.6 Where a Member was permitted by vote of the Committee of the Whole to read a letter, he could read it only within the five minutes allotted him and did not necessarily have the right to read the entire letter.

On June 26, 1952,[12] while the Committee of the Whole was considering amendments, under the five-minute rule, to the pending bill, Mr. Clinton D. McKinnon, of California, moved to strike out the last word. He then began reading a statement by Governor Arnall, of Georgia, on the subject of price control ceilings, a subject covered by the pending bill, H.R. 8210, the Defense Production Act Amendments.

Mr. Jesse P. Wolcott, of Michigan, objected to the reading of the statement, and the House by teller vote permitted Mr. McKinnon to proceed with the reading of the letter in question. Mr. McKinnon commenced reading the letter, and Chairman Wilbur D. Mills, of Arkansas, ruled that he could read only for five minutes.

MR. [HERMAN P.] EBERHARTER [of Pennsylvania]: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

12. 98 CONG. REC. 8175, 8176, 82d Cong. 2d Sess.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state it.

MR. EBERHARTER: Mr. Chairman, the House decided by a teller vote to permit the reading of this letter. I submit that the letter should be read in its entirety; that is the point of order I make.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not the decision made by the Committee. The Committee made the decision that the gentleman could read the letter within the time allotted to the gentleman of 5 minutes.

MR. EBERHARTER: I did not hear it so stated when the motion was put, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question put to the Committee had nothing whatsoever to do with the time to be consumed by the gentleman from California. The Chair recognized the gentleman from California for 5 minutes; the question arose as to whether or not he could within that 5 minutes time read extraneous papers.

The point of order is overruled.

§ 81.7 Formerly under Rule XXX, a Member could read a paper upon which the House would not vote only by permission of the House, if any Member objected to that reading; and where a Member objected to another Member's reading of her own written speech, the Chair put the question to the House for a determination without debate.

On Dec. 19, 1974,[13] the principle stated above was demonstrated in the House, as follows:

MR. [DAVID T.] MARTIN of Nebraska: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I object to the gentlewoman in the well reading her remarks because she did not ask unanimous consent before she started to read her remarks, and that is according to Jefferson's Manual.

THE SPEAKER:[14] The question is: May the gentlewoman from New York read her remarks?

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

THE SPEAKER: The gentlewoman from New York may proceed.

§ 82. Motions; Unanimous-consent Procedures

Rule XXX, which formerly required unanimous consent for the reading of papers if objection was made, has been rewritten to apply to the use of exhibits rather than the reading of papers.[15] Procedures under the former rule were as follows: where objection was made to a reading, the Speaker on his own initiative ordinarily put the vote on the question of whether the reading should be permitted (see § 81, supra). Alter-

13. 120 CONG. REC. 41425, 93d Cong. 2d Sess.

14. Carl Albert (Okla.).

15. See the discussion in § 80, supra.