§ 28. Recapitulation of Roll Call Vote

The term, "recapitulation," refers to a procedure[16] whereby the count on a roll call vote is verified by the Chair. Undertaken at the Chair's discretion,[17] a recapitulation is had either before or after the announcement of the result. The sole purpose is to ascertain how Members are recorded. Occasionally requested on close votes,[18] the procedure enables incorrectly recorded Members to obtain corrections. Members may not change their votes during a recapitulation[19] [a correction, of course, does not constitute a "change" of vote]. However, if the Chair directs the recapitulation before announcing the result of the vote, Members may change their votes following the recapitulation and preceding the announcement of the result.[20]

Beginning in the 92d Congress, the House began using the electronic voting system (§ 31, infra). Most yea and nay votes have been taken with the electronic system since Jan. 23, 1973. Recapitulation has not been permitted since that time but would still be available on a vote taken by roll call.

16. See § 28.8, infra.
17. See §§ 28.1–28.5, infra.
18. See §§ 8.4, 28.5, infra.
19. See § 28.6, infra.
20. See § 28.6, infra.

Speaker's Discretion

§ 28.1 Either before or after the announcement of the result of a roll call vote, the Speaker may, in his discretion, order a recapitulation of the vote.

On Sept. 2, 1959,[1] the House voted on overriding a Presidential veto of a bill (H.R. 7509) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960.

After the votes were tallied, but before the Speaker announced the result, Mr. Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, prompted the following discussion:

> MR. CANNON: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recapitulation of the vote.
>
> MR. [CHARLES A.] HALLECK [of Indiana]: Mr. Speaker, may we not have the vote announced first?
>
> THE SPEAKER:[2] The Chair holds that there can be a recapitulation be-

1. 105 CONG. REC. 17752, 17753, 86th Cong. 1st Sess.
2. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

fore or after the vote. Therefore, we will have a recapitulation.

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

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. HALLECK: Upon request, will not the Speaker announce the vote?

THE SPEAKER: The Chair has discretion in this matter.

MR. [FRANCIS E.] WALTER [of Pennsylvania]: Mr. Speaker, regular order.

THE SPEAKER: The regular order is the Clerk will call the names of those voting in the affirmative. . . .

MR. HALLECK: Mr. Speaker. I renew my request for an announcement of the vote.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair has already ordered a recapitulation. The Clerk will call the names of those voting in the affirmative.[3]

§ 28.2 In the course of exercising his discretionary authority, the Chair once stated that it was not possible to request a recapitulation where a roll call vote was still in progress.

On Oct. 12, 1962,[4] the House agreed to a conference report on a bill (H.R. 12900) making certain public works appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973. The Members then proceeded to consider the first amendment remaining in disagreement between the two bodies, and Mr. Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, moved that the House recede from its disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

After the Speaker put the question on the motion, it was taken; and he announced that the noes appeared to have it. Mr. Cannon then objected to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present whereupon the Chair counted and subsequently directed the Clerk to call the roll. The roll having been called, the Speaker directed the Clerk to call the names of those Members who failed to answer the first call.

In the course of this resumption of the call, the following proceedings occurred:

MR. [H. R.] GROSS [of Iowa] (interrupting the rollcall): Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER:[5] The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

MR. GROSS: Mr. Speaker, how many times must a Member check how he has voted?

THE SPEAKER: That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

MR. [EDMOND] EDMONDSON [of Oklahoma] (interrupting the rollcall): Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

3. For similar instances, in which the Chair makes evident its authority to order a recapitulation before the announcement of the vote, see § 28.3, infra; and 81 CONG. REC. 7772, 75th Cong. 1st Sess., July 28, 1937. But see § 28.2, infra.

4. 108 CONG. REC. 23432, 23433, 23434, 87th Cong. 2d Sess.

5. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

MR. EDMONDSON: Mr. Speaker, is it possible to have a recapitulation of the votes that have been cast in advance of the announced vote?

THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state that there has been no vote announced as yet. Therefore, at this point it is not possible to request a recapitulation.

(The Clerk resumed calling the roll.)

Parliamentarian's Note: It should be noted that any determination as to whether to conduct a recapitulation is within the discretionary power of the Chair. Thus, it is altogether possible to interpret the Speaker's language in this instance as meaning that such a request was not permissible because in the exercise of the Speaker's discretionary authority, he did not choose to entertain such a request before the announcement of the vote.

Moreover, the majority of recapitulation instances indicate that the Chair has felt few constraints on the timing of his decision to order a recapitulation. Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, for example, declined a Member's request for announcement of the vote prior to undertaking a recapitulation in 1941.[6] Speaker William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, responding to a Member's point of order in 1937, stated:[7]

In answer to the point of order the Chair refers to section 3123, volume 8, Cannon's Precedents. The syllabus recites that "under the more recent practice recapitulation of a vote may be had either before or after the announcement of the result of the vote."

—*Members' Responsibility*

§ 28.3 When a recapitulation of a roll call vote on overriding a Presidential veto is ordered by unanimous consent, Members who come on the floor for the first time while the recapitulation is being taken are not permitted to vote. Members leaving the Chamber after voting on the original roll call who may have been incorrectly recorded do so on their own responsibility, and any Member who desires to change his vote before the vote is announced following the recapitulation may do so.

On Aug. 7, 1941,[8] the House proceeded by roll call vote to consider the question of overriding the President's veto on S. 1580 (a road bill). When the roll call was completed the Speaker[9] announced:

The Chair thinks this vote is close enough so that, if there is no objection, there will be a recapitulation. . . .

6. 87 CONG. REC. 6869, 77th Cong. 1st Sess., Aug. 7, 1941.

7. 81 CONG. REC. 7772, 75th Cong. 1st Sess., July 28, 1937.

8. 87 CONG. REC. 6895–97, 77th Cong. 1st Sess.

9. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

MR. [JOSEPH E.] CASEY of Massachusetts: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. CASEY of Massachusetts: May we hear the present vote?

THE SPEAKER: We are starting a recapitulation to determine whether or not the vote is correct. The Clerk will call the names of those recorded as voting "yea."

MR. [JACK] NICHOLS [of Oklahoma]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. NICHOLS: Mr. Speaker, will Members who come on the floor while this recapitulation is being taken be permitted to vote?

THE SPEAKER: Members cannot qualify unless they were here before the roll call was completed.

MR. [LEO E.] ALLEN of Illinois: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. ALLEN of Illinois: How could you have a correct analysis of the vote if a Member were out of the Chamber now who had voted "nay" and he is recorded as voting "yea" and he is not here to correct it?

THE SPEAKER: That is not the business of anybody in the House except the particular Member involved. . . .

MR. [EARL C.] MICHENER [of Michigan]: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

MR. MICHENER: As I understand the rules, at the conclusion of the calling of the roll, the rules require the Speaker to announce the result.

No business can intervene between the calling of the roll and the announcing of the result of the roll call. After the result has been announced and it is known whether or not the vote is close, the Speaker may, of his own volition, order a recapitulation of the roll call. . . . It has been held that a recapitulation will only be ordered where the vote is close. Consequently, it seems imperative that the House should be advised as to what the vote is before a recapitulation is ordered. . . .

It is fundamental that a Member cannot change his vote after the result of the roll call has been announced. A recapitulation is for the purpose of correcting any errors in the vote as recorded, and not for the purpose of giving an additional opportunity to members to change their votes. . . . A recapitulation is for the purpose of correcting clerical errors.

To hold otherwise would be to lend encouragement to effective filibuster in order that one side in a closely contested vote might bring influence to bear and cause Members to change their original votes. To hold otherwise would do violence to the democratic processes of the House. . . .

THE SPEAKER: The Chair certainly is not in a filibuster. It has been held time and time again that any Member may change his vote before the vote is announced, and I read from page 419 of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives, and this is exactly what the Speaker operated under:

> The motion that a vote be recapitulated is not privileged, but either before or after the announcement of the vote, the Speaker may, in his discretion, order recapitulation. (If

more than four votes different, in the absence of other considerations, recapitulation will not be ordered.)

The Speaker did not order a recapitulation until he asked if there was objection by any Member of the House.

MR. MICHENER: There was no announcement to see whether there was a difference of but a few votes. The effect of this procedure is to interrupt an incompleted roll call and proceed with a recount. No votes should be changed in a recount and no new votes should be added during a recount or a recapitulation.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair is following this book. The Chair is going to hold that up until the time the result of this vote is announced by the Chair any Member may change his vote, because that is merely following the precedents of the House. Any Member who desires to change his vote before the vote is announced, may do so.

After the names of Members who had voted aye were called, and the last of those voting no, several Members then changed their votes before the result was announced.

The vote was—yeas 251, nays 128, not voting 54. So the President's veto was not overridden.

Closeness of Vote as Determining Factor

§ 28.4 The Speaker has declined to order a recapitulation where the difference in the vote was as great as 10.

On June 21, 1962,[10] Mr. Paul Findley, of Illinois, offered a motion to recommit a bill (H.R. 11222) to the Committee on Agriculture pertaining to farm products, prices, income, and other agricultural matters. When the Speaker put the question, the yeas and nays were demanded and subsequently ordered. The question was taken; and there were—yeas 215, nays 205, not voting 17. The Chair then announced the result of the vote on the motion.

Immediately thereafter, the following exchange occurred:

MR. [HAROLD D.] COOLEY [of North Carolina]: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recapitulation of the vote.

THE SPEAKER:[11] Does the gentleman insist on his request for a recapitulation?

MR. COOLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I insist upon it.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair feels that the vote is not sufficiently close to order a recapitulation.

MR. COOLEY: All right, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.[12]

---

10. 108 CONG. REC. 11383, 11384, 87th Cong. 2d Sess.

11. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

12. The Chair has also declined to order a recapitulation after being so urged in earlier Congress; see, for example, 101 CONG. REC. 11930, 84th Cong. 1st Sess., July 28, 1955, where a seven-vote difference was involved, and 83 CONG. REC. 5124, 75th Cong.

§ 28.5 The Speaker has declined to order a recapitulation of a vote where there was a four-vote difference.

On Oct. 9, 1969,[13] Mr. Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts, offered a motion instructing House conferees to insist on a particular provision with respect to a bill (H.R. 11612) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

Shortly thereafter, a preferential motion was offered to lay the Conte motion on the table. On a vote by division, there were—ayes 64, noes 44. Mr. Conte objected to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present whereupon the Speaker, concurring, directed the Clerk to call the roll. The question was taken and there were—yeas 181, nays 177. Accordingly, the preferential motion was agreed to.

Immediately thereafter, the following proceedings occurred:

> MR. [PAUL] FINDLEY [of Illinois]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.
>
> THE SPEAKER:[14] The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.
>
> MR. FINDLEY: Mr. Speaker, was the vote 181 affirmative and 177 negative?
>
> THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state that that is correct.
>
> MR. FINDLEY: Mr. Speaker, on that I request a recapitulation.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The Chair will state that the Chair feels that if there was a difference of one or two votes, the Chair would order a recapitulation, but where there are four votes the Chair does not feel a recapitulation should be ordered.

Parliamentarian's Note: Referring to the difference between the yea and nay columns in a similar situation, Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, stated,[15] "If the number were less than 4, the Chair would consider a recapitulation but not on a vote where there is this much [seven votes] difference." A number of years earlier, Speaker William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, noted,[16] "The Chair has the discretion upon a very close vote to request a recapitulation; that is, where there is a difference of only one or two or three or possibly four votes."

Vote Changes; Effect of Announcement of Result

§ 28.6 Members desiring to change their votes on a re-

3d Sess., Apr. 8, 1938, where there was an eight-vote spread. See also § .28.5, infra.

13. 115 CONG. REC. 29314, 29315, 91st Cong. 1st Sess.

14. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

15. 101 CONG. REC. 11930, 84th Cong. 1st Sess., July 28, 1955.

16. 83 CONG. REC. 5124, 75th Cong. 3d Sess., Apr. 8, 1938.

capitulation of a vote may do so after the recapitulation providing the result has not been announced by the Chair.

On July 28, 1954,[17] the House took a roll call vote on a resolution (H. Res. 626) providing that upon its adoption the Committee of the Whole would sit to consider a bill (H.R. 236) authorizing a flood control project in Colorado. Immediately after the vote and prior to making any announcement as to the result, the Chair asked for a recapitulation, and the following proceedings then occurred:

MR. [HAROLD A.] PATTEN [of Arizona]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER:[18] The gentleman will state it.

MR. PATTEN: What are we doing now?

THE SPEAKER: We are recapitulating the vote to find out if the Members are correctly recorded.

MR. PATTEN: Is it true that a Member who voted "yea" can now vote "nay"?

THE SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. PATTEN: Then you are not recapitulating, you are asking for a new vote.

THE SPEAKER: The House is in the process of recapitulating the vote.

MR. PATTEN: A person who voted "yea" before may now vote "nay." You cannot do that, Mr. Speaker. I raise a point of parliamentary procedure. You cannot do that.

THE SPEAKER: Will the gentleman take his seat, and we will do it in due order?

MR. PATTEN: No; I shall not take my seat.

THE SPEAKER: Will the gentleman cease for a moment?

MR. PATTEN: The Parliamentarian will tell you that is wrong.

THE SPEAKER: The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that Members can change their votes at any time before the Chair announces the result of the vote.

MR. PATTEN: Then I may change my vote at this point?

THE SPEAKER: Not until after the recapitulation.

The Clerk will call the names of those voting "yea."

The Clerk proceeded to call the names of those voting "yea."

MR. [CLIFF] CLEVENGER [of Ohio] (interrupting the recapitulation): Mr. Speaker, the Clerk passed my name. I voted in the affirmative about four times as loud as I could yell.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman may make that correction at the end of the call of those who voted in the affirmative.

Immediately after the recapitulation, but prior to the Chair's announcement of the result, the Record reveals that 10 Members changed their votes.[19]

17. 100 CONG. REC. 12453, 12454, 83d Cong. 2d Sess.

18. Joseph W. Martin, Jr. (Mass.).

19. Members desiring to change incorrectly recorded votes may do so, of

§ 28.7 The result of a roll call vote having been announced, a Member may not change his vote on a subsequent recapitulation although he is entitled to correct his vote if it was incorrectly recorded.

On Feb. 17, 1955,[20] the House had under consideration a resolution (H. Res. 142) which provided that upon its adoption the House would resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole in order to consider a bill (H.R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The resolution additionally provided that no amendment other than those offered by the Committee on Ways and Means would be in order, and that such amendments would not be subject to amendment.

After the previous question on the resolution was voted down, Mr. Clarence J. Brown, of Ohio, offered an amendment to provide for an open rule which would have allowed "any amendment . . . germane to H.R. 1 when . . . considered under the 5 minute rule." Following debate on the Brown amendment, the Speaker put the question, it was taken; and, the yeas and nays having been ordered, there were—yeas 191, nays 193, not voting 50. The Chair announced the result of the vote, and the following proceedings then occurred:

> MR. BROWN of Ohio: Mr. Speaker, may I call for a recapitulation.
>
> THE SPEAKER:[1] The Chair thinks the vote is close enough so that there should be a recapitulation.
>
> The Clerk will call the names of those voting in the affirmative.
>
> MR. [JOHN W.] MCCORMACK [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.
>
> MR. MCCORMACK: I would like to inquire of the Speaker if my understanding is correct that on recapitulation no Member can change his vote. The question is only how they are recorded.
>
> THE SPEAKER: That is true because the vote has been announced.
>
> MR. BROWN of Ohio: Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.
>
> THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.
>
> MR. BROWN of Ohio: Upon recapitulation, if a Member finds that his vote has been recorded incorrectly, he certainly has a right to correct it.
>
> THE SPEAKER: That is the purpose of a recapitulation.[2]

Procedure

§ 28.8 When a recapitulation is ordered, the Clerk calls first

---

course, at the proper time during the recapitulation; see §§.28.7, 28.8, infra.

20. 101 CONG. REC. 1661, 1678, 1682, 1683, 84th Cong. 1st Sess.

1. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

2. See also §.28.6, supra.

those voting in the affirmative, second, those voting in the negative, and, third, those answering "present"; any necessary corrections are made after all the names in each respective category are called.

On July 28, 1954,[3] the House took a roll call vote on a resolution (H. Res. 626) providing that upon its adoption the Committee of the Whole would sit to consider a bill (H.R. 236) authorizing a flood control project in Colorado. Immediately after the vote and prior to making any announcement as to the result, the Speaker asked for a recapitulation, and directed the Clerk to call the names of those voting in the affirmative. The proceedings were as follows:

THE SPEAKER:[4] The Clerk will call the names of those voting "yea."

The Clerk proceeded to call the names of those voting "yea."

MR. [CLIFF] CLEVENGER [of Ohio] (interrupting the recapitulation): Mr. Speaker, the Clerk passed my name. I voted in the affirmative about four times as loud as I could yell.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman may make that correction at the end of the call of those who voted in the affirmative.

MR. CLEVENGER: I voted in the affirmative.

THE SPEAKER: Will the gentleman be seated and wait until the end of the call?

The Clerk concluded the call of the names of those voting "yea."

THE SPEAKER: Are there any corrections to be made where any Member was listening and heard his name called as voting "yea" who did not vote "yea"? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Did any Member vote "yea" whose name was not called?

MR. CLEVENGER: Mr. Speaker, I said I voted four times in the affirmative.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will be recorded as voting "yea."

The Clerk will call the names of those recorded as voting "nay."

The Clerk called the names of those voting "nay."

THE SPEAKER: Is there any Member voting "nay" who is incorrectly recorded?[5] [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Where Different Result Obtained

§ 28.9 The Chair having directed a recapitulation on a close vote, a different result than that previously announced was obtained.

3. 100 CONG. REC. 12453, 12454, 83d Cong. 2d Sess.

4. Joseph W. Martin, Jr. (Mass.).

5. For comparable instances, see 105 CONG. REC. 17752, 86th Cong. 1st Sess., Sept. 2, 1959; 101 CONG. REC. 5807, 84th Cong. 1st Sess., May 5, 1955; 97 CONG. REC. 8876, 82d Cong. 1st Sess., July 25, 1951; and 87 CONG. REC. 6897, 77th Cong. 1st Sess., Aug. 7, 1941.

On Mar. 24, 1949,[6] Mr. Olin E. Teague, of Texas, moved that the bill (H.R. 2681) to provide pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II based on nonservice-connected disability and attained age, be recommitted to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for further study. Shortly thereafter, the Speaker Pro Tempore put the question on Mr. Teague's motion, it was taken; and the Chair announced that the "ayes" had it. Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, then demanded the yeas and nays which were ordered.

The roll was called, and prior to the announcement of the result, two Members changed their votes from "no" to "aye." Thereafter, the following exchange took place:

> THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:[7] On this vote the ayes are 208; the noes are 209.
>
> The Chair thinks the vote is so close that there should be a recapitulation.
>
> MR. RANKIN: Oh, no; it is clear.
>
> THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair will take its own initiative; either way the Chair would have taken the initiative on this vote.
>
> MR. [LOUIS C.] RABAUT [of Michigan]: Mr. Speaker, I make such a request.
>
> MR. [VITO] MARCANTONIO [of New York]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.
>
> THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman will state it.
>
> MR. MARCANTONIO: Mr. Speaker, a Member cannot change his vote during the recapitulation; is that correct?
>
> THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The gentleman is correct.
>
> The Clerk will call the names of those voting in the affirmative.

At this point the recapitulation process took place after which the Chair stated:

> Upon the tallying of the vote on the recapitulation it appears the vote is as follows: Those in favor of recommittal, 208; those opposed, 207.

Accordingly, the motion to recommit was agreed to—a different result having been obtained after recapitulation of the vote.

Parliamentarian's Note: The cause of this different result lay in the change of votes by the aforementioned two Members from "no" to "aye." It seems the tally clerk properly added two more affirmative votes to the "yea" column but inadvertently neglected to subtract those votes from the "nay" column. Hence, the original error.

In the Senate

§ 28.10 The Chair has held that a Senator may vote after a yea and nay vote has been recapitulated providing the result of the vote has not been announced.

---

6. 95 CONG. REC. 3114, 3115, 81st Cong. 1st Sess.

7. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

On Feb. 28, 1947,[8] the Senate resumed consideration of a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) establishing a ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 to be expended in that fiscal year. In the course of the resolution's consideration, the President Pro Tempore put the question on an amendment to an amendment. The yeas and nays having been ordered on this particular proposal, the vote was taken and a recapitulation was had.

Immediately thereafter, the following proceedings occurred:

> THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE:[9] On this vote the yeas are 38, the nays——
>
> MR. [MILLARD E.] TYDINGS [of Maryland]: Mr. President, I ask for a recapitulation.
>
> THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE: The Clerk will recapitulate the vote.
>
> The vote was again recapitulated.
>
> THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE: On this vote the yeas are 38——
>
> MR. [GLEN H.] TAYLOR [of Idaho]: Mr. President——
>
> MR. [ROBERT A.] TAFT [of Ohio]: It is too late, Mr. President.
>
> MR. TYDINGS: Oh, no; it is not. The result has not been announced.
>
> THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE: The Senator from Idaho is recognized.
>
> MR. TAYLOR: I vote "yea."

Senator Taylor's vote having been permitted, the final tally was—yeas 39, nays 38, not voting 18. Thus, the result of the vote was altered by the Chair's recognition of the Senator from Idaho prior to the announcement.

§ 29. Voting by the Speaker

Rule I clause 6 provides:

> He [the Speaker] shall not be required to vote in ordinary legislative proceedings, except where his vote would be decisive, or where the House is engaged in voting by ballot; and in cases of a tie vote the question shall be lost.

The Speaker's name is not on the roll from which the yeas and nays are called[10] and is not called unless on his request.[11] It is then called at the end of the roll,[12] the Clerk calling him by name. On an electronic vote, the Chair directs the Clerk to record him and verifies that instruction by submitting a vote card.[13] The Chair may vote to make a tie and so decide a question in the negative, as he may vote to break a tie and so decide a question in the af-

8. 93 CONG. REC. 1547, 1552, 80th Cong. 1st Sess.

9. Arthur H. Vandenberg (Mich.).

10. 5 Hinds' Precedents § 5970.

11. 5 Hinds' Precedents § 5965.

12. 5 Hinds' Precedents § 5965; 8 Cannon's Precedents § 3075.

13. See § 29.2, infra.