

Record, since it is well established that the Committee of the Whole itself has no control over the *Congressional Record*.⁽¹⁶⁾

On Apr. 20, 1937,⁽¹⁷⁾ the Speaker⁽¹⁸⁾ stated that only the Speaker, and not the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, has the authority to direct the reporters to delete certain improper remarks from the Record. The Speaker cited this principle as partial support for a ruling by which the reporters were instructed to take down and include as part of the Record of the proceedings remarks made by a Member to whom the Member having the floor had declined to yield.⁽¹⁹⁾

Deletion by Government Printing Office

§ 17.23 The Government Printing Office edits materials inserted in the “Extension of Remarks” section of the Record so as to delete profane words, and indicates such deletions with dashes.

On Feb. 24, 1970,⁽²⁰⁾ Mr. Ken Hechler, of West Virginia, directed

16. 5 Hinds' Precedents §6986.

17. 81 CONG. REC. 3670, 75th Cong. 1st Sess.

18. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).

19. This ruling is discussed in §19.8, *infra*.

20. 116 CONG. REC. 4543, 91st Cong. 2d Sess.

the attention of the House to the fact that he had inserted in the “Extension of Remarks” section of the Record for the previous day a printed newspaper interview with George Titler, who was then the vice president of the United Mine Workers of America, in which Mr. Titler was quoted as making a number of critical remarks against the character of the late Joseph Yablonski. Mr. Hechler noted that the Government Printing Office had properly deleted several profane remarks made by Mr. Titler in the text of the interview, because such profanity in the Record would not be in conformity with the rules of the House.⁽¹⁾

Parliamentarian's Note: The Government Printing Office has been authorized by the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing to delete profane extraneous material inserted in the Record, and to indicate such deletions with dashes.

§ 18. Correction of Errors

The House may correct errors in the printing of the *Congressional Record* in order to ensure that the

1. The text of the interview appears at 116 CONG. REC. 4457, 91st Cong. 2d Sess., Feb. 24, 1970.

proceedings of the House are accurately recorded.⁽²⁾ This prerogative of the House, however, does not permit it to revise remarks that are correct and in order, because the House may not change the Record merely to show what a Member should have said on the floor.⁽³⁾

Although a Member may edit and revise his own remarks without the consent of the House,⁽⁴⁾ and the Speaker may order unparliamentary remarks or remarks made out of order deleted from the Record,⁽⁵⁾ only the House, and not the Speaker,⁽⁶⁾ may order the correction of printing errors in the Record.

The correction of printing errors in the Record is frequently raised as a question of privilege of the House.⁽⁷⁾ While the correction of the Record is usually proposed informally, by the submission of minor corrections to the official reporters,⁽⁸⁾ or by unanimous-con-

sent requests for more significant changes,⁽⁹⁾ a motion or resolution must be submitted if a question of order⁽¹⁰⁾ is raised.

A question of privilege concerning an error in the Record may not be raised until the daily edition has appeared.⁽¹¹⁾ Under the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing,⁽¹²⁾ once the daily edition is published, the House has 30 days to submit corrections for the permanent edition, before it is made up for printing and binding. No corrections may be submitted after the permanent edition of the particular volume is published.⁽¹³⁾

Question of Privilege of the House

§ 18.1 An error in the printing of the Congressional Record, by which the remarks of one Member are attributed to an-

2. 5 Hinds' Precedents § 6972.

3. 8 Cannon's Precedents §§ 3469, 3498; 6 Cannon's Precedents § 583; 5 Hinds' Precedents § 6974. The right of the House to delete from the Record unparliamentary remarks or remarks made out of order is discussed in § 17, *supra*.

4. See § 19, *infra*.

5. See § 17.21, *supra*.

6. 5 Hinds' Precedents § 7019.

7. See §§ 18.1, 18.2, *infra*.

8. See § 18.3, *infra*.

9. See §§ 18.4, 18.5, *infra*.

10. 8 Cannon's Precedents § 3464.

11. 5 Hinds Precedents § 7020.

12. Rule 8 of the Joint Committee on Printing, effective May 23, 1972. These rules are frequently reprinted in the daily edition of the *Congressional Record* in the section entitled "Laws and Rules for Publication of the Congressional Record," which precedes the section entitled "Daily Digest."

13. See § 18.2, *infra*.

other, gives rise to a question of privilege.

Parliamentarian's Note: An error in the printing of the *Congressional Record* by which the remarks of one Member are attributed to another, raises a question of the privilege of the House. (Generally, see Ch. 11, *infra*.)

§ 18.2 An error in the printing of the Congressional Record, by which a Member's remarks were quoted in the text of an insertion made by another Member and were not printed in smaller type as required by a rule of the Joint Committee on Printing, gives rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

On May 11, 1936,⁽¹⁴⁾ Mr. John Taber, of New York, was recognized on a question of the privilege of the House. He stated that certain remarks attributed to him had been inserted in the Record of May 7, 1936,⁽¹⁵⁾ but did not appear in small type as required by the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing in the case of quotations.

Mr. Taber introduced a resolution to correct the Record, but it

14. 80 CONG. REC. 7019-21, 74th Cong. 2d Sess.

15. CONG. REC. (daily ed.), 74th Cong. 2d Sess.

was defeated on a roll call vote. Mr. John A. Martin, of Colorado, sought unanimous consent to correct the Record so as to reduce the quotation to small type; this request was objected to.

Submitting Corrections to Reporters

§ 18.3 A Member may submit minor corrections of the Record to the official reporters, but controversial questions or matters that might involve another Member must be submitted to the House.

On Feb. 9, 1937,⁽¹⁶⁾ the following exchange occurred concerning a parliamentary inquiry:

MR. [JOHN J.] O'CONNOR of New York: In the matter of correcting the Record, as I understand it, unless it is a matter that involves the Journal or would adversely affect another Member, these minor corrections can be made by the Member going to the desk in front of the Speaker and taking it up with the reporters.

THE SPEAKER:⁽¹⁷⁾ Answering the gentleman from New York, the rule is that upon insignificant or minor matters such corrections may be made at the request of the Member by submitting it to the reporter at the desk; but if it involves any substantial matter

16. 81 CONG. REC. 1013, 75th Cong. 1st Sess.

17. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).

that might bring into controversy some other Member or some other controversial question, the Member must rise and ask for such correction from the floor.

Correction by Unanimous Consent

§ 18.4 The House agreed, by unanimous consent, to correct the Record so as to reflect the actual content of a Presidential message which had been transmitted to the House.

On Mar. 12, 1963,⁽¹⁸⁾ the House agreed to the unanimous-consent request of Mr. Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, that the Record of the previous day be corrected so as to reprint accurately the text of a Presidential message, as transmitted to the House by the President of the United States.⁽¹⁾

Parliamentarian's Note: The original copy of the message relat-

18. CONG. REC. (daily ed.). 88th Cong. 1st Sess.

1. The House must approve the correction of most errors in the printing of the *Congressional Record*, since only minor corrections may be submitted to the official reporters by a Member. See §18.3, supra. The House frequently manifests its consent to changes in the Record by agreeing to unanimous-consent requests made by an individual Member. For example, see §§18.13–18.16, infra (correction of errors in recording of vote).

ing to the International Rules of Judicial Procedure, which was transmitted to the House by the President, was correct in all respects. One of the attached copies, however, contained a message on an unrelated subject which had been attached before the message had left the White House. It was the submission of this erroneous copy to the official reporters at the desk that caused the error in the Record.

§ 18.5 Although a Member's words have been taken down and read to the House, the Speaker may recognize him for a unanimous-consent request to withdraw or modify the words objected to.

On June 5, 1962,⁽²⁾ Mr. John D. Dingell, of Michigan, during the course of his remarks on the House floor, referred to Mr. Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, as a "mouthpiece" for the American Medical Association. Mr. Curtis requested that the words be taken down, and the Speaker⁽³⁾ ordered the Clerk to report the words objected to. Following the reading by the Clerk, Mr. Dingell requested unanimous consent of the House to change the word "mouthpiece"

2. 108 CONG. REC. 9739, 87th Cong. 2d Sess.

3. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

to “self-appointed spokesman.” The request was agreed to without objection, and Mr. Curtis withdrew his point of order.⁽⁴⁾

Correction by Motion

§ 18.6 A motion to correct the Record is privileged after the approval of the Journal.

On Jan. 24, 1936,⁽⁵⁾ Mr. Joseph P. Monaghan, of Montana, requested unanimous consent that an error in the Record of the previous day, by which only part of an amendment he had submitted was printed in the Record, be corrected so as to include the entire text of the amendment. Mr. Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas, then obtained recognition, on a reservation of objection to the unanimous-consent request, in order to praise the clerks for the conscientious and efficient manner in which they usually performed their duties. Mr. Clifton A. Woodrum, of Virginia, made a point of order to the effect that a

4. See 93 CONG. REC. 6895, 80th Cong. 1st Sess., June 12, 1947, for an occasion on which Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr. (Mass.) ruled that a Member who has had his words taken down may be recognized to propound a unanimous-consent request.

5. See 80 CONG. REC. 977, 74th Cong. 2d Sess.

motion to correct the Record would be in order, and that the unanimous consent of the House was not required. The Speaker⁽⁶⁾ agreed. Thereupon Mr. Monaghan moved that the Record be corrected. Mr. Blanton again rose to state that he had obtained recognition on a reservation of objection to the unanimous-consent request, and the regular order was demanded. The Speaker presented the unanimous-consent request, and an objection was raised against it. Mr. Monaghan immediately moved that the Record be corrected in the manner in which he had previously described. The previous question was ordered, and the House agreed to the motion.

§ 18.7 Debate on a motion to correct the Record is under the hour rule.

On July 5, 1945,⁽⁷⁾ Mr. Malcolm C. Tarver, of Georgia, made a motion to correct the Record so as to include the exact colloquy which had occurred between himself and Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, which had been modified by Mr. Rankin in the process of revising his remarks. After Mr. Tarver had concluded his remarks

6. Joseph W. Byrns (Tenn.).

7. 91 CONG. REC. 7221-25, 79th Cong. 1st Sess.

in support of this motion, Mr. Rankin requested to be heard on the motion. Upon being recognized by the Speaker,⁽⁸⁾ Mr. Rankin inquired as to how long he would be permitted to speak. The Speaker advised him that he would be permitted to speak under the hour rule.⁽⁹⁾

§ 18.8 The House agreed to a motion to refer a motion to correct the Record to the Committee on Rules.

On July 5, 1945,⁽¹⁰⁾ Mr. Malcolm C. Tarver, of Georgia, made a motion to correct the Record so as to include the language actually spoken in debate by himself and Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, on July 2, 1945. Mr. Tarver stated in support of his motion that the colloquy which had occurred on the floor, as taken down by the reporters, had been changed substantially by Mr. Rankin in revising the text of his remarks. Subsequently, a motion was made to refer Mr. Tarver's motion to the Committee on Rules. The House, by a division vote, agreed to the motion to refer.

Correction by Resolution

§ 18.9 Upon objection being raised to a unanimous-con-

8. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

9. 91 CONG. REC. 7222, 79th Cong. 1st Sess.

10. *Id.* at pp. 7221-25.

sent request that the Record be corrected to show remarks as reported by the official reporters, the House agreed to a resolution so correcting the Record.

On Mar. 23, 1949,⁽¹¹⁾ Mr. William J. Green, Jr., of Pennsylvania, requested unanimous consent that the Record be corrected to indicate the exact language that had occurred in the colloquy between himself and Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, the previous day. In support of his request Mr. Green alleged that Mr. Rankin had altered the language of their exchange in revising the text of his remarks. Mr. Rankin raised an objection to the unanimous-consent request, and Mr. Green thereupon offered the following resolution:⁽¹²⁾

Resolved, That the Record of Tuesday, March 22 be amended by printing the colloquy between Mr. Rankin and Mr. Green as reported by official reporters.

The House agreed to the resolution.

§ 18.10 Debate on a resolution to correct the Record is under the hour rule.

11. 95 CONG. REC. 3041, 81st Cong. 1st Sess.

12. H. Res. 164, 81st Cong. 1st Sess. (1949).

On Feb. 13, 1946,⁽¹³⁾ Mr. Howard W. Smith, of Virginia, introduced a resolution to delete from the Record of the previous day remarks spoken on the floor and inserted in the Record by Mr. Charles R. Savage, of Washington, which reflected unfavorably upon Virginia state officials. Mr. Smith was recognized to speak on the resolution, and the following parliamentary inquiry and response by the Speaker⁽¹⁴⁾ then occurred:

MR. [JOHN E.] RANKIN [of Mississippi]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry; for how long is the gentleman from Virginia recognized?

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman from Virginia is under the 1-hour rule.

The House agreed to the resolution.

Government Printing Office Omissions

§ 18.11 Where a committee report is ordered printed in the Record and certain illustrations are omitted from the Record version due to mechanical limitations at the Government Printing Office, such omissions are noted in the Record.

13. 92 CONG. REC. 1274, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.

14. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

On Feb. 2, 1966,⁽¹⁵⁾ H. Rept. No. 1241⁽¹⁶⁾ was reprinted in the Record. The following notation of omissions was printed immediately following the House report:

Illustrations identified as Robert Shelton, Exhibits Nos. 1, 3, and 7 are omitted because of mechanical limitations in printing the Congressional Record. All of the referenced exhibits, however, are fully illustrated in House Report No. 1241 which was filed and printed this date.⁽¹⁷⁾

Time for Correction

§ 18.12 The Record is not subject to correction after the permanent edition has been printed.

On Jan. 23, 1969,⁽¹⁸⁾ Mr. William F. Ryan, of New York, made a unanimous-consent request that a correction be made in the Record for Oct. 15, 1968. The Speaker⁽¹⁹⁾ refused to recognize Mr. Ryan for this purpose because an error in the Record of a previous Congress cannot be corrected when the permanent edition has already been printed.⁽²⁰⁾

15. 112 CONG. REC. 1742, 89th Cong. 2d Sess.

16. 89th Cong. 2d Sess. (1966).

17. 112 CONG. REC. 1754, 89th Cong. 2d Sess.

18. CONG. REC. (daily ed.), 91st Cong. 1st Sess.

19. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

20. The principle that the Record is not subject to correction after the perma-

The Speaker did indicate, however, that Mr. Ryan's statement of the error would appear in the Record of the proceedings for the current day.

Roll Call Vote Corrections

§ 18.13 The correction of a Member's erroneously recorded roll call vote can be made only with the unanimous consent of the House; the insertion in the Record, with the unanimous consent of the House, of remarks in which such an error is recited, does not constitute the consent of the House to effect a change in the Record.

On June 28, 1966,⁽¹⁾ Mr. Lawrence H. Fountain, of North Carolina, with the unanimous consent of the House, had inserted in the Record the following remarks:

Mr. Speaker, the Record of yesterday's rollcall No. 153 has me recorded as being absent. I was present and so answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the journal be so corrected.

I ask unanimous consent that the Congressional Record of June 27, 1966, be corrected, in that, on rollcall No.

ment edition has been printed is a long-standing one. See 8 Cannon's Precedents § 3093.

1. CONG. REC. (daily ed.), 89th Cong. 2d Sess.

153 I am recorded as absent, I was present and so answered to my name.

§ 18.14 The House may agree to a unanimous-consent request by a Member to correct the permanent edition of the Record so as to correctly record his vote, but a request by a Member to change his vote is not in order after the announcement of the result.

On May 28, 1959,⁽²⁾ the House agreed to a unanimous-consent request of Mr. James G. Fulton, of Pennsylvania, who had been incorrectly recorded as not voting on roll call No. 59, to correct the Record so as to indicate that he had been present and had voted "aye". The following subsequent parliamentary inquiry and reply by the Speaker pro tempore⁽³⁾ illustrates the distinction between correcting an erroneously recorded vote in the Record and changing a vote after the announcement of the result:⁽⁴⁾

MR. [CLARE E.] HOFFMAN [of Michigan]: I did not hear how the gentleman

2. 105 CONG. REC. 9335, 86th Cong. 1st Sess.

3. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

4. A Member may not change his vote after the announcement of the result. 8 Cannon's Precedents §§ 3070, 3123, 3124, 3160; 5 Hinds' Precedents §§ 5931-5933, 6093, 6094.

Generally, see Ch. 30, *infra*.

stated he had voted. Is it permissible to change a vote, on a roll call, a ye-and-nay vote? May a Member change from one to the other the next day?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: Of course it is not permissible to change a vote, but it is permissible for a Member to correct the Record.⁽⁵⁾

§ 18.15 A request by a Member to correct his incorrectly recorded vote on a roll call is noted in the Record, provided the request is made before the announcement of the result.

On Sept. 6, 1961,⁽⁶⁾ Mr. Peter F. Mack, Jr., of Illinois, following a roll call vote⁽⁷⁾ and prior to the announcement of the result, announced that his vote had been incorrectly recorded, and requested that he be recorded as having voted "aye." Following the announcement of the result of the vote, Mr. Mack made the following parliamentary inquiry:

Mr. Speaker, I was incorrectly recorded on the last roll call. I am won-

5. For a similar occasion on which the House agreed by unanimous consent to correct an error in the recording of a Member's vote in the Record, see CONG. REC. (daily ed.), Jan. 8, 1964.
6. 107 CONG. REC. 18256, 87th Cong. 1st Sess.
7. The vote was on the question of whether to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 9000, 87th Cong. 1st Sess. (1961).

dering if the Record will show that I was incorrectly recorded or whether it will show that I changed my vote.

The Speaker pro tempore⁽⁸⁾ responded as follows:

All the Chair can state is that the Record will show what actually transpired.

Pairs

§ 18.16 Although as a general rule the House does not take cognizance of pairs, a Member may request the unanimous consent of the House that the Record be corrected where pairs are erroneously recorded or omitted.

On Aug. 3, 1965,⁽⁹⁾ the House agreed to a unanimous-consent request by Mr. Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, to correct the Record so as to indicate that the live pairs recorded at the conclusion of roll call No. 215 the previous day⁽¹⁰⁾ should have been recorded as general pairs. On other occasions the House has similarly agreed by unanimous consent to delete from the Record pairs erroneously recorded⁽¹¹⁾ and to include pairs erroneously omitted.⁽¹²⁾

8. John W. McCormack (Mass.).
9. CONG. REC. (daily ed.), 89th Cong. 1st Sess.
10. 111 CONG. REC. 18976, 89th Cong. 1st Sess., Aug. 2, 1965.
11. CONG. REC. (daily ed.), Aug. 14, 1967.
12. CONG. REC. (daily ed.), Dec. 10, 1963.

Cosponsors of Bill or Resolution

§ 18.17 An error in the listing of the cosponsors on a bill or resolution that has been introduced in the House cannot be subsequently corrected, but a Member's statement that an error has occurred will appear in the Record.

On Oct. 9, 1969,⁽¹³⁾ Mr. Jeffery Cohelan, of California, announced to the House that the name of Mr. Michael J. Kirwan, of Ohio, was incorrectly included as a cosponsor of a House joint resolution for the funding of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under a continuing resolution.⁽¹⁴⁾ In response to Mr. Cohelan's unanimous-consent request that the Record stand corrected, the Speaker pro tempore⁽¹⁵⁾ stated as follows:

The gentleman's statement will appear in the Record. There is no way of correcting the resolution.

13. 115 CONG. REC. 29347, 91st Cong. 1st Sess.

For an example of another occasion on which the statement of a Member that the listing of the cosponsors of a particular bill was in error, see 114 CONG. REC. 1873, 90th Cong. 2d Sess., Feb. 1, 1968.

14. H.J. Res. 927, 91st Cong. 1st Sess. (1969).

15. Richard Bolling (Mo.).

§ 19. Revision of Remarks

Although the Record is "substantially a verbatim report of proceedings",⁽¹⁶⁾ it has been the practice of the House to permit a Member, with the approval of the Speaker, but without permission from the House, to edit and revise his remarks before publication in the Record.⁽¹⁷⁾ The consent of the House, however, is required for the correction of major errors,⁽¹⁸⁾ and the deletion of unparliamentary remarks or remarks made out of order.⁽¹⁹⁾ In addition a Member may not extend his remarks without permission from the House.⁽²⁰⁾

Under the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing⁽¹⁾ a revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct

16. 44 USC § 901 (1970).

17. 5 Hinds' Precedents § 6971.

18. See § 18, supra.

19. See § 17, supra.

20. See § 20, infra.

1. Rule 8 of the Joint Committee on Printing, effective May 23, 1972. These rules are frequently reprinted in the daily edition of the *Congressional Record* in the section entitled "Laws and Rules for Publication of the Congressional Record," which precedes the section entitled "Daily Digest."