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."

material, or additions of new subject matter.

The official reporters of debate frequently submit to Members for their inspection and editing remarks they have made on the floor of the House that day. In order to ensure publication in the Record for the following morning, manuscripts must be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m.[2] A Member may withhold his remarks from the Record for a period not to exceed 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized.[3]

There are a number of significant limitations upon the right of a Member to edit and revise his remarks. For example, a Member may not delete from the Record the proceedings by which his words were taken down,[4] remarks interjected by another Member to whom he has yielded[5] or to whom he has responded.[6] A Member may not revise remarks which alter the context of colloquys with other Members, without their consent.[7] A Member may, however, withhold his remarks from the Record for revision up to 30 days notwithstanding the fact that such remarks contain a colloquy with another Member.[8]

Member's Own Remarks

§ 19.1 A Member may revise his own remarks without obtaining permission from the House, but he must have permission to extend his remarks.

On Jan. 25, 1939,[9] the following exchange occurred on the floor of the House:

> MR. [HUGH] PETERSON of Georgia: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my own remarks. I am asking not to extend my remarks in the Record but to revise them.
>
> MR. [JOSEPH W.] MARTIN [Jr.] of Massachusetts: Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I may say that under the rules of the House the gentleman has the right to revise his remarks, but he does not have the right to extend them.
>
> THE SPEAKER:[10], In the opinion of the Chair, the gentleman has the right to revise his remarks.

2. Rule 3 of the Joint Committee on Printing.

3. Rule 7 of the Joint Committee on Printing.

4. See § 19.2, infra.

5. See § 19.7, infra.

6. See § 19.6, infra.

7. See §§ 19.3, 19.4, infra.

8. See § 19.10, infra.

9. 84 CONG. REC. 791, 76th Cong. 1st Sess.

10. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).

Remarks Affecting Official House Proceedings

§ 19.2 A Member's revision of his remarks, so as to delete from the Record the proceedings by which his words were taken down, gives rise to the question of the privilege of the House.

On Apr. 26, 1940,[11] Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, was recognized on a question of the privilege of the House, and submitted a resolution requesting that the Record of the previous day be corrected so as to include the proceedings by which words spoken by Mr. Edward E. Cox, of Georgia, had been taken down and ruled out of order. Mr. Cox, after his words were ruled out of order, had requested and received the unanimous consent of the House to withdraw them from the Record. In revising his remarks, however, Mr. Cox deleted the entire proceedings by which his remarks had been taken down, and ruled out of order.

Mr. Hoffman's resolution was rejected by the House. Mr. Cox, after explaining that the proceedings had been deleted inadvertently, requested the unanimous consent of the House that the permanent edition of the Record be corrected so as to include them. The House agreed to the request.[12]

Remarks Affecting Colloquys

§ 19.3 A Member may edit the reporters' transcript of remarks he has made on the floor of the House, provided he does not alter the remarks of other Members.

On Aug. 5, 1941,[13] the Chair was asked to clarify the conditions under which a Member may re-

11. 86 CONG. REC. 5111–14, 76th Cong. 3d Sess.

12. For a ruling by Speaker William B. Bankhead (Ala.) that a question of the privilege of the House is raised by the action of a Member in withholding from the Record for up to 30 days the proceedings by which his words were taken down and ruled upon by the Speaker, see § 19.11, infra.

13. 87 CONG. REC. 6801, 77th Cong. 1st Sess.

The principle that permits a Member to revise his remarks without permission as long as the change does not affect the remarks of another Member is a long-standing one. See 8 Cannon's Precedents §§ 3461, 3463, 3497; 5 Hinds' Precedents § 6972. For a ruling by Speaker William B. Bankhead (Ala.) to the effect that a Member, under the rules of the House, need not secure the permission of the House to revise his remarks, but that such permission was required to extend his remarks, see § 19.1, supra.

vise his remarks without the consent of the House. The proceedings were as follows:

MR. [DAVID L.] POWERS [of New Jersey]: Mr. Speaker, can a Member without unanimous consent, revise and extend his remarks in the Record?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:[14] He may not extend his remarks without permission.

MR. POWERS: Another parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman will state it.

MR. POWERS: The Speaker said he may not extend his remarks. May a Member revise his remarks without unanimous consent?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: He may make corrections, as I understand it. The Chair will read the rule:

> The practice is to allow Members to edit the reporters' transcription of their remarks before it is sent to the printer, but such revision shall not alter language affecting the context of colloquies with other Members without their approval. Where the remarks of another are not affected, a Member in revising his speech for the Record may strike out any portion or may edit the speech in its entirety, but alterations which place a different aspect on the remarks of a colleague require authorization by the House.

§ 19.4 Members who desire to revise for the permanent Record remarks that affect each other, but who cannot agree upon the appropriate revision, should submit the matter to the Speaker for decision.

On May 9, 1934,[15] the following parliamentary inquiry was raised:

MR. [MALCOLM C.] TARVER [of Georgia]: Mr. Speaker, in the course of debate on yesterday . . . I entered into a colloquy with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Lewis], who had made a statement in regard to certain occurrences in my State with which I felt obliged to take issue.

The gentleman from Colorado later in the correction of the stenographic copy of his remarks, I am sure in good faith, because I know the gentleman would not willingly do an injustice to anyone, having ascertained that his statements were not in accord with the facts, undertook to correct, and did correct, the stenographic record so as to eliminate the statements of which I complained. The difficulty lies in the fact that my own remarks made in the Record immediately after his statement have remained unchanged, and the effect is to place me in a false light and in the attitude of questioning statements of the gentleman appearing in the Record which were not made on the floor at all.

May I inquire whether or not I am entitled to have the Record corrected to show the statements made by the gentleman from Colorado in the course of this colloquy?

The Speaker[16] responded as follows:

---

14. Wright Patman (Tex.).

15. See 78 CONG. REC. 3562 et seq., 73d Cong. 2d Sess.

16. Henry T. Rainey (Ill.).

No Member has the right in revising his own remarks to change them in such a way as to affect another Member without the consent of the other Member concerned. The Members involved should try to adjust the matter among themselves, but if they cannot agree, the matter should be submitted to the Speaker for decision.

Remarks Interjected by Another Member

§ 19.5 Remarks made by a Member without recognition from the Chair or the permission of the Member occupying the floor at that time may be deleted from the Record by the latter in revising his remarks.

On Apr. 14, 1936,[17] Mr. Marion A. Zioncheck, of Washington, made a point of order to the effect that Mr. John J. Boylan, of New York, had deleted from the text of his remarks certain remarks interjected by Mr. Zioncheck without the authority to do so. Mr. Boylan had been addressing the House the previous day when Mr. Zioncheck requested that he be yielded time to speak. Mr. Boylan refused, immediately prior to the expiration of his speaking time. After the gavel fell, and without recognition by the Chair, Mr. Zioncheck made the remarks which were later deleted from the Record by Mr. Boylan. The Speaker[18] made the following ruling:

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

§ 19.6 A Member may not delete from the Record of the proceedings remarks improperly interjected by a Member to whom he has declined to yield, if he has offered any response to those remarks.

On Apr. 20, 1937,[19] Mr. Edward W. Curley, of New York, made a parliamentary inquiry[20] concerning the right of a Member in revising his remarks to delete from the Record those remarks improperly interjected by a Member to whom he has declined to yield. Mr. Curley stated that on Apr. 15, during an address by Mr.

17. 80 CONG. REC. 5478, 74th Cong. 2d Sess.

18. Joseph W. Byrns (Tenn.).

19. 81 CONG. REC. 3669, 75th Cong. 1st Sess.

20. Mr. Curley's parliamentary inquiry was first made on Apr. 19, 1937, and was withdrawn at the suggestion of several Members, in order to permit Mr. Wadsworth, a significant participant in the proceedings, to be present for the Speaker's ruling. 81 CONG. REC. 3589, 75th Cong. 1st Sess.

James W. Wadsworth, Jr., of New York, in the Committee of the Whole, he was twice recognized by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole[1] for the purpose of requesting Mr. Wadsworth to yield the floor. On both occasions Mr. Wadsworth refused to yield. Immediately subsequent to the second refusal Mr. Curley stated the following: "The gentleman is making a wrong statement." Mr. Wadsworth continued his remarks without responding to that statement. The daily edition of the Record for Apr. 15 contained the remarks of Mr. Wadsworth without any reference to either the requests to yield or the subsequent statement made by Mr. Curley. Mr. Curley stated that he had been informed by the reporter that the omitted remarks had been included in the reporter's original notes, and that the omission from the daily edition of the Record was in error.[2] Mr. Curley contended that the Record should be corrected so as to include the omitted exchanges. The Speaker,[3] after discussing the applicable precedents on the subject, which indicate that a Member may delete from his remarks those remarks made by another Member to whom he has declined to yield, ruled against the request of Mr. Curley.

Mr. Curley then made a further parliamentary inquiry concerning the fact that a similar interruption of the same speech by another Member had occurred, and that exchange had appeared in the Record. That exchange was as follows:

> MR. [JOSEPH A.] GAVAGAN [of New York]: Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
>
> MR. WADSWORTH: I cannot yield

Mr. Gavagan, despite the rule that prohibits a Member from speaking under these circumstances, then stated:

> I am sure if the gentleman had read the bill he would not have made that statement.

Thereupon Mr. Wadsworth recognized Mr. Gavagan's statement and responded to it by saying:

> I have read the language.[4]

Mr. Curley requested the opinion of the Chair as to why Mr. Gavagan's exchange with Mr.

1. John J. O'Connor (N.Y.).
2. It should be noted that at the conclusion of the discussion Mr. Wadsworth indicated that he had not deleted from the text of his remarks any words interjected by another Member. 81 CONG. REC. 3670, 75th Cong. 1st Sess., Apr. 20, 1937.
3. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).
4. The entire exchange between Mr. Wadsworth and Mr. Gavagan is reprinted at 81 CONG. REC. 3521, 75th Cong. 1st Sess., Apr. 15, 1937.

Wadsworth had appeared in the Record, and his similar exchange with Mr. Wadsworth had been deleted. The Speaker responded as follows:

> So it seems from the particular circumstances of these two incidents that although neither the gentleman from New York [Mr. Curley] nor the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gavagan], under the rules, had any right to make any statement whatever, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wadsworth], occupying the floor, agreed to recognize the interpolation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gavagan] and voluntarily replied to it.

This ruling of the Speaker was further clarified by the following parliamentary inquiry and response of the Speaker:

> MR. [GERALD J.] BOILEAU [of Wisconsin]: In the event a Member interrupts some other Member who is occupying the floor, without the Member having the floor specifically giving the other Member the right to interpose a question, and the Member having the floor answers the question, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wadsworth] did with respect to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gavagan], could the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wadsworth] as a matter of right then delete that portion of his remarks?
>
> THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state in answer to the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin that if a Member occupying the floor voluntarily decides to respond to a question asked by another Member, he thereby waives any right to interpose the objection that it is a violation of the rule and under those circumstances the transcript of the Record should show actually what did occur.

§ 19.7 A Member, in revising his remarks, may not delete or alter the meaning of remarks actually spoken by another Member to whom he has yielded, without such Member's consent

On Mar. 27, 1935,[5] a discussion occurred on the floor of the House with respect to the right of a Member, who had yielded the floor to another Member for the purpose of asking a question, to delete that Member's words from the Record, whether spoken from the floor or inserted with the unanimous consent of the House. The Speaker[6] had held that a Member to whom the floor was yielded must, in correcting his remarks, obtain the consent of the Member who yielded, especially if the correction changes the meaning of the question asked. The following parliamentary inquiry was then made concerning the right of a Member who has yielded the floor to strike from the Record words spoken by the Member to whom he has yielded:

> MR. [ALBERT E.] CARTER [of California]: As I understand, the gen-

5. 79 CONG. REC. 4540, 74th Cong. 1st Sess.

6. Joseph W. Byrns (Tenn.).

tleman from California [Mr. Kramer] attempts to justify his striking out what I wrote in on the ground that he had authority to do that. My inquiry is, has any Member the right to strike out any portion of any other Member's remarks, whether it is in there by his permission or not?

THE SPEAKER: No. If those remarks were made in the course of the debate and with the consent of the Member.

§ 19.8 The reporters are instructed to take down and include as part of the Record of the proceedings remarks interjected by a Member to whom the Member occupying the floor has refused to yield, even though such remarks are out of order and may be stricken from the permanent Record by the House, the Speaker, or the Member in revising his remarks.

On Apr. 20, 1937,[7] the Speaker[8] made a ruling by which the reporters were instructed to take down and include as part of the Record of the proceedings the remarks of a Member, even though the Member occupying the floor had declined to yield and those remarks were not in order. That ruling was a revision of a ruling made the previous day[9] in which the Speaker had instructed the reporters not to record remarks made under such circumstances. The Speaker's revised ruling was made in response to a renewed parliamentary inquiry that had been made and withdrawn the previous day.[10]

The Speaker gave the following reasons in support of the revised ruling:

The Chair has been induced to change his position upon that question, for two reasons: In the first place, upon more mature consideration, the Chair is of the opinion that it places upon the reporters of the House what might be termed a species of censorship of editing of the remarks the Members make, however improvidently made or improperly stated. The Chair does not think that this type of burden should be imposed upon the reporters of the House. In the second place, as was the instance here referred to, the remarks were made while we were in Committee of the Whole, presided over by a Chairman and not by the Speaker of the House; and under the rule only the Speaker-and not a Chairman of the Committee—has the authority to direct the reporters to delete certain improper remarks from the Record.

So in order that full justice may be done to all Members, although they

7. 81 CONG. REC. 3670, 76th Cong. 1st Sess.

8. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).

9. 81 CONG. REC. 3588, 75th Cong. 1st Sess., Apr. 19, 1937.

10. A Member requested the opinion of the Chair as to whether the Record might be corrected so as to include remarks he had made after the Member occupying the floor at the time had refused to yield to him.

may be in small measure violating the rules of the House, and in order that the Record may definitely show what actually transpired in haec verba, the Chair withdraws that part of his ruling directing the reporters hereafter not to take down such improvident remarks, and will conform to the old practice which the Chair thinks probably the best, leaving to the Members themselves, after the speeches are transcribed, the right and privilege to strike from the transcript any remarks made by a Member where the Member speaking and sought to be interrupted has declined to yield.

Previous rulings of the Chair indicate that where a Member is occupying the floor at the time of an unauthorized interruption of his speech,[11] the Speaker,[12] the House or the Member himself,[13] may strike the remarks of the interrupting Member.

§ 19.9 A question of privilege arises when a Member, in revising his remarks for the permanent Record, strikes out remarks made by another Member after he had reserved the right to object to a unanimous-consent request.

On Aug. 3, 1939,[14] the following exchange occurred concerning a question of privilege:

MR. [CLARE E.] HOFFMAN [of Michigan]: Mr. Speaker, this involves the integrity of the Record. Under date of July 27, when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Keller] had the floor, certain remarks were made by me under a reservation of the right to object. I send to the Speaker's desk a printed copy of the Record and a transcript from the Official Reporters, which shows that all of those remarks made by me were stricken from the Record by the gentleman from Illinois. That is the question of personal privilege and of the privilege of the House I now present. . . .

THE SPEAKER:[15] The Chair is of the opinion that the gentleman presents a question affecting the privileges of the House and he is recognized for 1 hour.

Following a discussion of the deleted material, the House agreed to a motion reinserting that material in the permanent Record.[16]

Withholding of Remarks

§ 19.10 A Member who controlled the floor has the right to withhold remarks he made at that time from the Record for revision up to 30 days notwithstanding the fact that such remarks contain a colloquy with another Member.

On Mar. 26, 1940,[17] Mr. Compton I. White, of Idaho, raised a

11. 8 Cannon's Precedents § 3465.
12. 8 Cannon's Precedents § 3466.
13. 8 Cannon's Precedents § 3467.
14. 84 CONG. REC. 10966, 76th Cong. 1st Sess.
15. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).
16. 84 CONG. REC. 10968, 76th Cong. 1st Sess.
17. 86 CONG. REC. 3451, 76th Cong. 3d Sess.

question of privilege. The proceedings were as follows:

> MR. WHITE of Idaho: Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, when an appropriation bill was being considered by the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hoffman] and I had quite a colloquy on the National Labor Relations Board. I find on inspection of the Record this morning that nothing appears of that debate. I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman in yielding to me, and I would like to have the statements made on the floor appear in the Record. I find the matter has been withheld. . . .
>
> THE SPEAKER:[18] The Chair may say to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. White] that when a Member who has the floor in his own right engages in colloquy with another Member, under the rules he has the right to withhold the remarks from the Record temporarily. The Chair may add that he has 30 days, under the rules of the House, in which to revise his remarks and place them in the Record.

§ 19.11 Although under the general practice of the House, a Member who controlled the floor has the right to withhold his remarks from the Record for revision [up to 30 days], he may not withhold that part of the proceedings whereby his remarks were taken down.

On June 1, 1939,[19] Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, introduced a resolution[20] raising a question of the privilege of the House. Mr. Hoffman stated in his resolution that on the previous day, during debate in the Committee of the Whole, Mr. Sam C. Massingale, of Oklahoma, had intimated that in the future the action of the House Committee on Ways and Means on the bill which was under consideration would be regarded as "pusillanimous." A Member demanded that the words be taken down and the Committee rose. When the House convened, the Speaker[1] ruled upon the point of order, and Mr. Massingale was permitted to proceed. Thereafter the House again resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole, and Mr. Massingale continued his remarks.[2] Subse-

18. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).

19. 84 CONG. REC. 6531, 76th Cong. 1st Sess.

20. H. Res. 208, 76th Cong. 1st Sess. (1939).

1. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).

2. When Mr. Massingale continued his remarks in the Committee of the Whole, he went on to make certain charges involving the integrity of another Member of the House. The words were taken down, the Committee again arose, the House convened, and the Speaker this time sustained the point of order. Mr. Massingale, however, obtained the unanimous consent of the House to have those remarks deleted from the Record. In addition, the House agreed to a unanimous-consent request by Mr. Sam Rayburn (Tex.)

quently, Mr. Massingale withheld from the Record of May 31 not only the remarks by which he had impugned the integrity of the Committee on Ways and Means, but also the entire proceedings by which the words were taken down and ruled upon by the Speaker. The resolution requested that the following action be taken:

> *Resolved*, That a committee of three be appointed by the Speaker of the House, or in the discretion of the Speaker, make reference to a standing committee of the House, to ascertain from the reporters of the House and from such other sources as they may deem trustworthy a true and correct record of what did occur, deleting from such record all such matters which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Massingale] was given permission to delete, and retaining in the Record all such other transactions and proceedings which occurred on the floor of the House and for the withdrawal of which permission was not given; and thereupon to report its conclusions to the House, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

Mr. Hoffman, in support of his resolution, emphasized that in his opinion the record of the proceedings of May 31 was not a true and accurate text of what had occurred on the floor, because Mr. Massingale had not obtained permission to withhold the entire proceedings by which his remarks reflecting upon the integrity of another Member had been taken down and ruled upon by the Speaker. The Speaker stated:

> The Record shows that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Massingale] did obtain unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Under the general practice of the House that gave to the gentleman from Oklahoma the right to withhold revision of his remarks from the Record. The Chair is of the opinion that the other subject matter stated in the resolution of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hoffman] probably does raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules.

§ 19.12 The Committee on Rules has jurisdiction of a resolution that proposes the creation of an investigating committee to determine whether a Member has wrongfully withheld remarks from the Record.

On June 1, 1939,[3] Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, introduced a resolution[4] that proposed that

---

that the entire proceedings by which the remarks of Mr. Massingale with reference to another Member, be deleted from the Record, and that Mr. Massingale be permitted to revise and extend his remarks.

3. 84 CONG. REC. 6531, 76th Cong. 1st Sess.

4. H. Res. 208, 76th Cong. 1st Sess. (1939).

a committee ascertain from the reporters of the House whether Mr. Sam C. Massingale, of Oklahoma, had wrongfully withheld from the Record in revising his remarks the entire proceedings by which his remarks were taken down and ruled upon by the Speaker. The Speaker[5] asked Mr. Hoffman whether he desired to have the resolution referred to a committee. Mr. Hoffman responded that, in the discretion of the Speaker, he would like it referred to either a special committee or to any standing committee. The Speaker stated that the Committee on Rules would have jurisdiction over the resolution. The resolution was so referred.

§ 20. Extension of Remarks

The practice in the House of permitting Members to extend their remarks so as to insert in the Record speeches that were not delivered on the floor of the House and extraneous materials related to the subject under discussion is a long-standing one.[6] A Member must obtain the consent of the House to extend his remarks,[7] and authorizations to extend remarks in the Record are strictly construed.[8] The Speaker will only entertain requests for permission to extend remarks at certain times during the conduct of House business,[9] and such requests will be granted only to the individual whose remarks are to be inserted.[10] The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize a Member to extend his own remarks,[11] but the Committee of the Whole lacks the power to permit the inclusion of extraneous materials[12] or to permit insertions at a later date.[13] The insertion of unparliamentary remarks is prohibited, and violations of this rule give rise to a question of privilege of the House.[14]

5. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).

6. For a discussion of the reasons underlying the development of the practice, see 5 Hinds' Precedents §§ 6990–6996, 6998–7000.

7. See § 20.1, infra.

8. 8 Cannon's Precedents § 3479.

9. See § § 20.4 et seq., infra.

10. House Supplement to "Laws and Rules for Publication of the Congressional Record", effective Dec. 29, 1970. 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".

11. See § 20.12, infra.

12. See 20.13, infra.

13. See § 20.18, infra.

14. See § 20.19, infra; 8 Cannon's Precedents § 3495; 5 Hinds' Precedents