the following announcement on the floor of the House, which illustrates a procedure by which the consent of Members, whose remarks are to be reprinted, is obtained:

> Mr. Speaker, with respect to the 50th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, a private order is being submitted for reprint publication of all statements and other insertions made by Members of the House of Representatives prior, during, and after the January 22, 1968, event, which was observed in the House on January 23, 1968.
>
> If there is no objection from any such Member, his or her statement or insertion will be incorporated in the reprint brochure, which has been requested by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

§ 16. Matters Printed in the Record; Civil Liability

Statutory law, House rules, and the practices of the House regulate the content of the House portion of the Record. In addition, the House frequently agrees by unanimous consent to permit specific items to be inserted in the Record which would not ordinarily be included.

The oath of office subscribed to by Members and Delegates is required by statute[17] to be printed in the Record. A list of Members filing the oath with the Clerk of the House is then recorded following the text of the oath.[18]

Occasionally an act of Congress requires a governmental activity to report to Congress and specifies that "the Clerk of the House . . . shall cause to be published in the *Congressional Record* all reports submitted pursuant to this law."[19] Where publication of such reports in the Record is required by statute, the Parliamentarian furnishes a copy of the report to the Clerk at the time the communication is referred to committee, and the Clerk submits the report for printing in the Record.[20]

The insertion of certain types of materials in the Record is prohibited. For example, maps, diagrams, or illustrations may not be

17. 2 USC § 25 (1970).

18. An example of the form of entry in the Record of the oath and the listing of Members subscribing to it may be found at 94 CONG. REC. 5750, 80th Cong. 2d Sess., May 12, 1948.

19. § 4(b) of Pub. L. No. 85–804, an act to authorize the making, amendment, and modification of contracts to facilitate the national defense, is an example of such a statutory provision. This act is codified at 50 USC 1434 (1970).

20. For an example of the form of entry in the Record of such reports, see 107 CONG. REC. 4816–18, 87th Cong. 1st Sess., Mar. 24, 1961.

inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing.[1]

Certain significant matters are printed in the Record under the House rules. The list includes the following: petitions or memorials or bills of a private nature;[2] bills, resolutions and documents referred to committee under the rules;[3] amendments to be protected for debate time under the five-minute rule;[4] the filing of committee reports;[5] committee expenditures;[6] conference reports and accompanying statements;[7] messages received from the Senate and President of the United States, giving notice of bills passed or approved;[8] voting pairs;[9] and motions (with signatures) to discharge a committee from further consideration of a bill.[10]

Certain matters are traditionally printed in the Record pursuant to the practices of the House. For example, notations of the following occurrences are usually printed: bills signed by the Speaker subsequent to adjournment *sine die*, by title;[11] bills "pocket vetoed" by the President during adjournment to a day certain, and supporting memoranda;[12] delivery of bills and joint resolutions to the President by the Committee on Enrolled Bills;[13] the delivery of bills to the White House endorsed "held for presentation to the President upon his return to the United States,"[14] or "delivered to the White House for forwarding to the President" by the Committee on House Administration;[15] reference by the Speaker

1. 44 USC § 904 (1970).

2. Rule XXII clause 1, *House Rules and Manual* § 849 (1973).

3. Rule XXII clause 4, *House Rules and Manual* § 854 (1973).

When a bill or resolution is introduced by request, that fact is noted in the Record. Rule XXII clause 6, *House Rules and Manual* § 860 (1973).

4. Rule XXIII clause 6, *House Rules and Manual* § 874 (1973).

5. Rule XIII clause 2, *House Rules and Manual* § 743 (1973).

6. *House Rules and Manual* § 738 (1973).

7. Rule XXVIII clause 2(a), *House Rules and Manual* § 912 (1973).

8 Rule XXXIX *House Rules and Manual* § 935 (1973).

9. Rule VIII clause 2, *House Rules and Manual* § 660 (1973).

10. Rule XXVII clause 4, *House Rules and Manual* § 908 (1973).

11. 88 CONG. REC. 9620, 77th Cong. 2d Sess., Dec. 26, 1942.

12. 89 CONG. REC. 755, 78th Cong. 1st Sess., July 19, 1943.

13. 89 CONG. REC. 10539, 78th Cong. 1st Sess., Dec. 9, 1943.

14. 105 CONG. REC. 17637, 86th Cong. 1st Sess., Sept. 1, 1959.

15. 109 CONG. REC. 11792, 88th Cong. 1st Sess., June 26, 1963.

of House bills with Senate amendments to committee;[16] reference to more than one committee of executive communications;[17] appointment by the Speaker of Members to a commission subsequent to adjournment;[18] and submission of the report of the Board of Visitors, U.S. Coast Guard Academy.[19]

The House frequently agrees by unanimous consent to permit the insertion in the Record of materials at the request of Members. The occasions are so numerous and the types of materials so varied, that the following insertions serve only as examples: a communication from the Chamber of Deputies, Peru, expressing condolences on the Alaskan earthquake;[20] rules and regulations governing the use of the House office buildings,' the House garages, and the Capitol power plant, adopted by the House Office Building Commission;[1] and the Speaker's analysis of a session of Congress and the accomplishments of the House.[2]

The protection afforded matters printed in the Record by the Speech or Debate Clause of the Constitution[3] has been the subject of several court decisions. In *Hentoff* v *Ichord*,[4] the United States District Court for the District of Columbia enjoined the publication or distribution of a congressional committee report by the Public Printer because it was held to be without any proper legislative purpose and an infringement upon first amendment rights. The court, however, stated that publication in the *Congressional Record* of the report could not be enjoined, because of the protection afforded by the Speech or Debate Clause. A more extensive discussion of this subject is found elsewhere in this work.[5]

The Speech or Debate Clause does not immunize a Member from a civil libel action for the reprinting and distribution of allegedly libelous statements which have appeared in the Record. In *Long* v *Ansell*,[6] the Supreme

16. 97 CONG. REC. 8987, 82d Cong. 1st Sess., July 30, 1951.

17. 106 CONG. REC. 10625, 86th Cong. 2d Sess., May 18, 1960.

18. 97 CONG. REC. 13783, 82d Cong. 1st Sess., Oct. 31, 1951.

19. 109 CONG. REC. 13639, 88th Cong. 1st Sess., July 30, 1963.

20. 110 CONG. REC. 7962, 88th Cong. 2d Sess., Apr. 15, 1964.

1. 111 CONG. REC. 23926, 89th Cong. 1st Sess., Sept. 15, 1965.

2. 109 CONG. REC. 25556, 88th Cong. 1st Sess., Dec. 24, 1963.

3. U.S. Const. art. I, § 6.

4. 318 F Supp 1175 (D.D.C. 1970).

5. See Ch. 7, infra.

6. 293 U.S. 76 (1934).

Court stated this proposition in dictum. In *McGovern* v *Martz*,[7] the United States District Court for the District of Columbia held that remarks made on the floor and published in the Record were absolutely privileged, and approved the dictum in *Long* v *Ansell* to the effect that such privilege would not extend to the republication and distribution by a Member of remarks he had made on the floor of the House.

Bills

§ 16.1 The House, in the interest of economy, occasionally agrees by unanimous consent to dispense with the printing in the Record of the text of an especially lengthy bill.

On June 17, 1963,[8] the House was considering a bill to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure."[9] In view of the high cost of printing such a lengthy bill, the House agreed by unanimous consent to dispense with the printing of the text of the bill in the Record.[10]

On Apr. 2, 1962,[11] the House, while considering a bill to revise and codify the general and permanent laws relating to the Canal Zone,[12] agreed by unanimous consent to permit the insertion of a statement in the Record explaining the bill in lieu of printing the entire bill.[13]

§ 16.2 Upon the rejection by the House of an amendment in the nature of a substitute that the Committee of the Whole had reported to the House in place of the bill as reported by a committee, the text of the original bill was printed in the Record.

On Dec. 16, 1970,[14] a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964,[15] as reported with standing committee amendments, was being considered in the Committee of the Whole. The Committee of the Whole agreed to and

7. 182 F Supp 343 (D.D.C. 1960).

8. 109 CONG. REC. 10910, 88th Cong. 1st Sess.

9. H.R. 4157, 88th Cong. 1st Sess. (1963).

10. 109 CONG. REC. 10911, 88th Cong. 1st Sess., June 17, 1963.

11. 108 CONG. REC. 5531, 87th Cong. 2d Sess.

12. H.R. 10931, 87th Cong. 2d Sess. (1962).

13. For additional illustrations of this precedent, see 111 CONG. REC. 8375, 89th Cong. 1st Sess., Apr. 26, 1965; 109 CONG. REC. 18044, 88th Cong. 1st Sess., Sept. 25, 1963.

14. 116 CONG. REC. 41981, 91st Cong. 2d Sess.

15. H.R. 18582, 91st Cong. 2d Sess. (1970).

reported to the House an amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.[16] The House, by a roll call vote, then rejected the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.[17] After the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, the text of the original bill was printed in the Record.[18]

§ 16.3 After a bill was reported back to the House by a standing committee with an amendment, in accordance with a motion to recommit with instructions, the entire text of the bill, as amended, was printed in the Record, instead of the usual notation of the third reading of the bill by title.

On Apr. 16, 1970,[19] the House, while considering the Family Assistance Act of 1970,[20] adopted a motion to recommit with instructions to report the bill back with specific amendments forthwith. The committee reported back the bill as instructed, the House agreed to the amendment, and the Speaker[1] then put the question of the engrossment and third reading of the bill to the House. At this point the full text of the bill, as amended, was printed in the Record.[2]

Parliamentarian's Note: The adoption of a motion to recommit with instructions does not ordinarily require the printing of the complete text of the bill, as amended, in the Record. The third reading of the bill is by title, and usually this is so indicated in the Record. In this instance, due to the widespread public interest in the bill, the Speaker requested that the bill be printed in full, as amended, in the Record.

§ 16.4 The text of a House amendment to a Senate bill was, by unanimous consent, ordered printed in the Record on the following legislative day rather than at the point in the proceedings at which it was adopted.

Parliamentarian's Note: On Mar. 19, 1970, the House discharged the Committee on the District of Columbia from further consideration of the Senate bill for District of Columbia court reorganization and criminal law re-

16. 116 Cong. Rec. 42032, 91st Cong. 2d Sess., Dec. 16, 1970.
17. *Id.* at p. 42033.
18. *Id.*
19. 116 Cong. Rec. 12092, 91st Cong. 2d Sess.
20. H.R. 16311, 91st Cong. 2d Sess. (1970).

1. John W. McCormack (Mass.).
2. 116 Cong. Rec. 12093, 91st Cong. 2d Sess., Apr. 16, 1970.

form,[3] and substituted an amendment containing the text of a bill which had already passed the House.[4] Because of the length of the bill and the lateness of the hour on Mar. 19, the House expressed unanimous consent that the text and the amendment be printed in the Record for the next legislative day, Monday, Mar. 23, in order not to delay the printing of the Record for Mar. 19.[5] The Government Printing Office, however, misinterpreted this request and deferred the printing of the entire proceedings surrounding the adoption of the amendment to Mar. 23, as well as the text of the amendment itself.[6]

Petitions

§ 16.5 Neither the Speaker nor the Committee on Printing has jurisdiction over the manner of printing of petitions of Members in the Record under clause 1 of Rule XXII; appeal must be made to the individual Member concerned.

On Apr. 30, 1935,[7] the following discussion occurred concerning the propriety of repeated insertions in the Record by a Member of petitions covering subject matter that had been dealt with legislatively by the House in the current session:

> MR. [THOMAS L.] BLANTON [of Texas]: Mr. Speaker, the inquiry I wish to direct to the Chair is whether the Committee on Printing cannot control the matter of inserting such petitions in the Record, after a measure passes, when it is clearly apparent the petitions can accomplish no useful purpose?
>
> THE SPEAKER:[8] The gentleman understands that the Chair has no right to judge . . . the sufficiency or propriety of petitions Members may insert in the Record; nor, in the opinion of the Chair, does the Committee on Printing have any jurisdiction in the matter. Appeal must be made to the individual Member concerned.
>
> MR. BLANTON: And control is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Printing.
>
> THE SPEAKER: No; the Chair just stated that the Committee on Printing does not have jurisdiction.
>
> Paragraph 1, rule XXII, provides as follows:
>
> > Members having petitions or memorials or bills of a private nature to present may deliver them to the Clerk, endorsing their names and the reference or disposition to be

3. S. 2601, 91st Cong. 2d Sess. (1970).

4. H.R. 16196, 91st Cong. 2d Sess. (1970).

5. 116 CONG. REC. 8221, 91st Cong. 2d Sess., Mar. 19, 1970.

6. See 116 CONG. REC. 8495–8550, 91st Cong. 2d Sess., Mar. 23, 1970, for the entire proceedings.

7. 79 CONG. REC. 6631, 74th Cong. 1st Sess.

8. Joseph W. Byrns (Tenn.).

made thereof; and said petitions and memorials and bills of a private nature, except such as, in the judgment of the Speaker, are of an obscene or insulting character, shall be entered on the Journal, with the names of the Members presenting them, and the Clerk shall furnish a transcript of such entry to the official reporters of debates for publication in the Record.

After further debate, the Speaker stated:

The Chair may say to the gentleman from Texas that as a matter of practice there is not the slightest objection to a Member lumping all of the petitions together. Then they would be in the Record. But this is up to the Member.

MR. [JOHN J.] O'CONNOR [of New York]: Mr. Speaker, the situation, as I understand it, is this, and I have talked to the members of the Printing Committee: A member files petitions at the desk. On the same day he may file 100 or 200 of them, reading, "The petitioner, John Jones, and others." Each one of those petitions is referred to in the Appendix. I think the desk itself at the close of the day might lump together the petitions of each Member as to the same subject. There would then be only one reference in the Appendix or in the Record, instead of sometimes 10 pages. I do not see why it cannot be done mechanically by the Clerk.

THE SPEAKER: Under the rules no one at the desk has authority to lump the petitions together. It is a matter either for the House, under the rule which has just been read, or else an appeal must be made to the individual Member. No one at the desk has authority to combine them without the consent of the Member who introduces them. The House, of course, could control the matter.

Committee Reports

§ 16.6 The Public Printer refused to print in the Record the text of a congressional committee report that had already been printed in pamphlet form, citing a ruling by the Joint Committee on Printing that prohibits such duplication of printing.

On Mar. 29, 1949,[9] Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, stated that on the preceding day he had asked and received the unanimous consent of the House to extend his remarks in the Record and to include a report on spies issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities. Mr. Rankin further stated that he had been informed by the Government Printing Office that the report would not be printed in the Record, because to do so would violate a ruling by the Joint Committee on Printing that prohibits the printing of committee reports in the Record that have previously been printed in pamphlet form.[10]

---

9. 95 CONG. REC. 3396, 81st Cong. 1st Sess.

10. This rule, which applies to committee and subcommittee reports but not to conference reports, is rule 9 of the rules adopted by the Joint Com-

§ 16.7 The House agreed by unanimous consent to permit the printing of a committee activity report in both pamphlet form and in the Congressional Record notwithstanding the rule of the Joint Committee on Printing that prohibits the printing of committee reports in both forms.

On Sept. 1, 1960,[11] the House agreed by unanimous consent to permit the printing of an activity report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the Record. Immediately thereafter Mr. Oren Harris, of Arkansas, requested unanimous consent that the same report be printed in pamphlet form for distribution notwithstanding the rule of the Joint Committee on Printing that prohibits committee reports to be printed in both pamphlet form and in the Record.[12] The House agreed to the request without objection.

Conference Reports

§ 16.8 The consideration of conference reports is privileged business, and the calling up of such a report does not require unanimous consent after the report has been printed in the Record.

On Sept. 2, 1959,[13] the House was considering a conference report on a bill relating to the power of the states to impose net income taxes on income derived from interstate commerce and establishing a Commission on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce and Interstate and Inter-governmental Taxation Problems.[14] After Mr. Wright Patman, of Texas, reserved the right to object to a request that the statement of the managers of the bill be read in lieu of the report, the following discussion occurred:

> MR. PATMAN: If I do not object to the reading, that does not foreclose me from objecting to the consideration of the conference report?

---

mittee on Printing, effective May 23, 1972.

11. 106 CONG. REC. 19139, 86th Cong. 2d Sess.

12. This rule is often reprinted in the daily edition of the *Congressional Record* in the section entitled "Laws and Rules for Publication of the Congressional Record", which immediately precedes the section entitled "Daily Digest". See for example rule 9 of the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing, effective May 23, 1972, that are reprinted in the daily edition of the *Congressional Record* for Thursday, Apr. 19, 1973.

13. 105 CONG. REC. 17769, 86th Cong. 1st Sess.

14. H.R. 2524, 86th Cong. 1st Sess. (1959).

THE SPEAKER:[15] This is a privileged matter. No objection lies.

MR. PATMAN: No objection lies on this? The Speaker is talking about the reading?

THE SPEAKER: The Chair is talking about the conference report, which is a privileged matter.

MR. PATMAN: And one objection would not lie to it?

THE SPEAKER: No objection would.

§ 16.9 A conference report was called up as a privileged matter even though it had not been printed in the Record because the House had not been in session the previous day when the report was filed.

On Tuesday, May 12, 1959,[16] the House agreed by unanimous consent to give the conferees on a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959,[17] until midnight Wednesday, May 13, to file a conference report on the disagreeing of votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendments to the bill. The House adjourned from Tuesday, May 12 until Thursday, May 14. Since there were no House proceedings to be printed in the Record for Wednesday, May 13, the conference report was not printed at the time it was filed. On Thursday, May 14,[18] the conference report was called up as a privileged matter, and no objection was made to the fact that it had not been printed in the Record as required by House Rule XXVIII clause 2.[19]

§ 16.10 The House has agreed by unanimous consent to order the printing of a conference report in the Record for a day in which the House was not in session.

On Aug. 3, 1961,[20] the House agreed, by unanimous consent, to permit the managers on the part of the House to have until mid-

15. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

16. 105 CONG. REC. 8006. 86th Cong. 1st Sess.

17. H.R. 5916, 86th Cong. 1st Sess. (1959).

18. 105 CONG. REC. 8167, 86th Cong. 1st Sess.

19. *House Rules and Manual* § 912 (1973). At the time of the consideration of this conference report the controlling House rule required only that a conference report be printed in the Record prior to its consideration by the House. 5 Hinds' Precedents § 6516. The provision in Rule XXVIII clause 2(a), which requires the conference report to be printed in the Record three days before being considered by the House, was added by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, section 125(p), and made part of the rules in 1971. H. Res. 5, 92d Cong. 1st Sess. (1971).

20. 107 CONG. REC. 14544, 87th Cong. 1st Sess.

night the following day, Friday, Aug. 4, to file a conference report on a bill,[1] and to order the report to be printed in the Record for Aug. 4, notwithstanding the fact that the House would not be in session. On Friday, Aug. 4, the conference report was printed in the daily edition of the Record under the heading "House of Representatives," which immediately followed the Senate proceedings. In the bound edition of the Record for Friday, Aug. 4,[2] however, there appears under the heading "House of Representatives" only a notation indicating that the conference report had been submitted on that date. The full text of the report does not appear until it was Considered by the House on Aug. 7, 1961.[3]

§ 16.11 The House, by unanimous consent, has provided for the consideration of a conference report notwithstanding the fact that it had not been printed in the Record as required by the House rules.

On July 14, 1970,[4] the House agreed to the following unanimous-consent request:

> MR. [CARL] ALBERT [of Oklahoma]: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order on tomorrow, Wednesday, July 15, to consider the conference report on the bill S. 2601, the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970, notwithstanding rule 28, clause 2.
>
> Mr. Speaker, I make this request because of the high cost of printing the voluminous conference report in the Congressional Record. I am informed that it might cover as many as 160 pages of the Record. I can assure the Members that printed copies of the report, in pamphlet form, will be available for their consideration before this report is called up.

On several occasions the House has agreed, by unanimous consent, that it shall be in order during the week to consider any conference report at any time.[5] The House has also agreed, by unanimous consent, to permit a conference report to be considered on

1. H.R. 7445, 87th Cong. 1st Sess. (1961).
2. 107 CONG. REC. 14727, 87th Cong. 1st Sess.
3. 107 CONG. REC. 14757–59, 87th Cong. 1st Sess. For other occasions on which the House has ordered a conference report to be printed in the Record for a day that the House was not in session, see, *e.g.*, 108 CONG. REC. 14841, 87th Cong. 2d Sess., July 26, 1962; 107 CONG. REC. 18642, 87th Cong. 1st Sess., Sept. 7, 1961.
4. 116 CONG. REC. 24030, 91st Cong. 2d Sess.
5. 100 CONG. REC. 14670, 83d Cong. 2d Sess., Aug. 16, 1954; 94 CONG. REC. 10258, 80th Cong. 1st Sess., July 25, 1947.

the same day it was filed, even though it had not been printed in the Record.[6]

§ 16.12 The House agreed by unanimous consent to permit 40 minutes of debate on a conference report subsequent to its adoption, and to have the text of the debate inserted in the Record preceding the adoption of the report.

On May 22, 1968,[7] the House agreed, without debate, to the conference report[8] on the Consumer Credit Protection Act.[9] Subsequent to the adoption of the report, Mr. Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, made the following unanimous-consent request:

> Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 40 minutes of debate may be had on this matter, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Patman) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Cahill), and that it appear in the Record prior to the adoption of the conference report.

The House agreed to the request.[10]

Presidential Messages

§ 16.13 A designated Speaker pro tempore may refer a Presidential message and order it printed in the Record only with the unanimous consent of the House.

On Oct. 9, 1969,[11] the Speaker pro tempore[12] laid before the House the Second Annual Report of the National Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education, a message from the President of the United States.[13] The message was, without objection, referred by the Speaker pro tempore to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the Record.

Change of Vote

§ 16.14. The change of a vote by a Member after the con-

6. 108 CONG. REC. 19258, 87th Cong. 2d Sess., Sept. 12, 1962. Although the conference report had not previously been printed in the daily edition of the Record, it does appear in the permanent edition immediately preceding the consideration of the report by the House. *Id.* at p. 19278.

   Conference reports generally, see Ch. 33, infra.

7. 114 CONG. REC. 14396, 90th Cong. 2d Sess.

8. H. REPT. No. 1397, 90th Cong. 2d Sess. (1968).

9. S. 5, 90th Cong. 2d Sess. (1968).

10. 114 CONG. REC. 14405, 90th Cong. 2d Sess., May 22, 1968.

11. 115 CONG. REC. 29347, 91st Cong. 1st Sess.

12. Richard Bolling (Mo.).

13. H. Doc. No. 176, 91st Cong. 1st Sess. (1969).

clusion of a roll call and before the announcement of the result is noted in the Record.

On Mar. 16, 1934,[14] the following exchange occurred relating to a parliamentary inquiry

> MR. [JOHN J.] O'CONNOR [of New York]: As I understand it, the practice has been for some time that when a Member changes his vote from "no" to "aye" or from "aye" to "no" there is nothing in the Record to show it. The reporters do not take it down.
>
> I make the point of order at this time that every word that is uttered in this House should appear in the Congressional Record, and I make the point of order that when a Member changes his vote, as was done 2 days ago, when 40 or 50 Members on the majority and minority sides changed their votes, that change should appear in the Congressional Record.
>
> THE SPEAKER:[15] The gentleman from New York is correct as to the practice that has prevailed heretofore. The Chair thinks that if a Member changes his vote it ought to appear in the Record, and hereafter the reporters will see that all Members who change their votes are reported in the Congressional Record.

On Dec. 20, 1969,[16] several Members changed their vote on the conference report[17] concerning a foreign assistance appropriation bill.[18] The changes were noted in the Record, immediately following the announcement of pairs, as follows:

> Mr. Davis of Georgia, Mr. Bow, Mrs. Reid of Illinois, Mr. Minshall, and Mr. Kuykendall changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."
>
> Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Culver, and Mr. Tiernan changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."
>
> Mr. Scheuer changes his vote from "nay" to "yea."

§ 17. Deletion of Unparliamentary Remarks

Although the *Congressional Record* is "substantially a verbatim report of proceedings,"[19] the House frequently excludes from the Record remarks made out of order or unparliamentary remarks which reflect unfavorably upon the House, its committees, or individual Members. Remarks made on the floor by a Member after he has been called to order, without recognition by the Chair, or without the consent of the Member occupying the floor, are frequently deleted from the Record by the House, the Speaker, or the Member in revising his remarks.[20]

---

14. 78 CONG. REC. 4691, 73d Cong. 2d Sess.

15. Henry T. Rainey (Ill.).

16. 115 CONG. REC. 40456, 91st Cong. 1st Sess.

17. H. REPT. No. 779, 91st Cong. 1st Sess. (1969).

18. H.R. 15149, 91st Cong. 1st Sess. (1969)

19. 44 USC § 901 (1970).

20. See §§ 17.7–17.10, infra.