

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⁾ con-

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).

cerning 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⁾

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

19. 44 USC § 901 (1970).

20. See §§ 17.7-17.10, infra.

A Member occasionally makes a remark in the heat of debate which reflects unfavorably upon the House, its membership, or its committees, and which he immediately regrets. In such instances the Member who has spoken the words may request the unanimous consent of the House that they be deleted from the Record or such request may be made by another Member. The House frequently agrees to these requests made in the spirit of apology.⁽¹⁾

During floor debate a Member will sometimes demand that words spoken by another Member be taken down. The Speaker⁽²⁾ then determines whether the words spoken in debate reflect unfavorably upon the House, its membership or institutions. If the Speaker rules the words unparliamentary, a Member frequently makes a motion or introduces a resolution to delete the unparliamentary remarks from the Record.⁽³⁾ Occasionally the Speaker will immediately order the unparliamentary remarks deleted

Disorder in debate generally, see Ch. 29, *infra*.

1. See §§ 17.11, 17.12, *infra*.
2. If the words are taken down in the Committee of the Whole they must be reported to the House for a decision by the Speaker. See § 17.17, *infra*.
3. See § 17.13, *infra*.

from the Record, without awaiting action by the House.⁽⁴⁾

A Member may also challenge unparliamentary remarks that were not deleted from the reporter's notes prior to publication of the daily edition of the Record. The usual procedure is similar to the procedure employed in challenging remarks that were inserted in the Record under leave to extend. In such instances a Member is recognized on a question of privilege.⁽⁵⁾

***Procedure; Deletion or
Expungement Generally***

§ 17.1 The insertion in the Record of unparliamentary remarks is sufficient to raise a question of the privilege of the House.

On Sept. 5, 1940,⁽⁶⁾ Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, was recognized on a question of the privilege of the House, and offered a resolution⁽⁷⁾ to expunge from the daily edition of the Record for the

4. See §§ 17.21, 17.22, *infra*.

5. See § 17.19, *infra*.

For a general discussion of questions of privilege, see Ch. 11, *infra*.

6. 86 CONG. REC. 11552, 76th Cong. 3d Sess.

7. H. Res. 591, 76th Cong. 3d Sess. (1940).

previous day words spoken on the floor of the House by Mr. Beverly M. Vincent, of Kentucky, which impugned the patriotism of Mr. Martin L. Sweeney, of Ohio. The House agreed to the resolution.

§ 17.2 The Speaker held that the question of whether an allegedly unparliamentary remark inserted in the Record under leave to extend violated the privileges granted the Member who made the insertion was not subject to a point of order, but was a question for the House.

On Feb. 27, 1946,⁽⁸⁾ Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, made a point of order alleging that Mr. Adolph J. Sabath, of Illinois, had inserted in the Record an attack on the Committee on Un-American Activities.⁽⁹⁾ The Speaker⁽¹⁰⁾ responded as follows:

The Chair thinks the remedy of the gentleman from Mississippi is not a point of order. This is an extension of remarks and whether or not it violated the privileges granted the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Sabath] would be a question for the House to pass on, not the Chair.

- 8. 92 CONG. REC. 1725, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.
- 9. Mr. Sabath had referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities as "the House Un-American Committee."
- 10. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

Mr. Rankin then made a motion to delete the remarks of Mr. Sabath from the permanent Record. The House rejected the motion for the previous question on Mr. Rankin's motion, but the House agreed to a unanimous-consent request by Mr. Sabath that the remarks referring to the Committee on Un-American Activities be deleted from the Record. Mr. Rankin then withdrew his motion.

§ 17.3 The action of the House in ordering the entire speech of a Member and the proceedings under a call to order expunged from a permanent Record does not give rise to a question of personal privilege or privilege of the House; the proper method of reopening the matter is by a motion to reconsider the vote whereby such action was taken.

On Feb. 13, 1941,⁽¹¹⁾ Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, rose to state a question of personal privilege and privilege of the House. He offered a resolution stating that on Feb. 11, Mr. Samuel Dickstein, of New York, had, during the course of his remarks on the House floor, impugned the integrity of a committee of the

- 11. 87 CONG. REC. 979. 77th Cong. 1st Sess.

House. Mr. Hoffman had interrupted Mr. Dickstein's remarks with a point of order that such remarks were out of order and in violation of the Constitution. The Speaker⁽¹²⁾ refused to rule the words out of order and permitted Mr. Dickstein to continue speaking. A few moments later Mr. Dickstein's remarks were again interrupted, this time by Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, who demanded that the words be taken down. The words were taken down, and Mr. Rankin moved "to expunge the entire speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dickstein] from the Record." The House agreed to the motion, and the Record of the House proceedings for Feb. 11 did not contain either the remarks of Mr. Dickstein or the proceedings by which the words were taken down. Mr. Hoffman stated in his resolution that the deletion of the entire proceedings from the Record raised a question of personal privilege and privilege of the House, and requested that the permanent edition for Feb. 11 be corrected so as to include a portion of Mr. Dickstein's remarks and the entire proceedings by which his words were taken down.

In response to Mr. Hoffman's argument in support of the resolu-

tion that the omission of the proceedings referred to violates the First Amendment freedom of speech and of the press, the Speaker stated that the Constitution also gives the House the authority to establish rules for its own procedure. After Mr. Hoffman further argued in support of the question of the privilege of the House which he had raised, the Speaker responded as follows:

The House would have to decide that, and, in the opinion of the Chair, the House did decide the matter when it expunged the remarks from the Record. The Chair thinks, under the circumstances, that the proper way to reopen the question would be by a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Rankin] was adopted. The Chair is of the opinion that inasmuch as the question raised by the gentleman from Michigan was decided by a vote of the House on a proper motion, that he does not now present a question of privilege of the House or of personal privilege.

§ 17.4 The Speaker declined to rule on a question of personal privilege arising from the insertion in the Record of allegedly unparliamentary remarks because the transcript of the insertion had not been submitted for the inspection of the Chair.

On Apr. 7, 1943,⁽¹³⁾ Mr. Emanuel Celler, of New York, was rec-

12. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

13. 89 CONG. REC. 3065, 78th Cong. 1st Sess.

ognized on a question of personal privilege. He stated that several days earlier a Member had inserted in the Record remarks which reflected upon his integrity, and requested an opportunity to respond to that charge. The Speaker⁽¹⁴⁾ requested that the original transcript of the remarks be submitted for his inspection. Mr. Celler replied that he did not have a copy of the transcript in his possession at that time, and asked the permission of the Chair to proceed nevertheless. With respect to the question of personal privilege, the Speaker stated as follows:

The Chair is not going to rule on this question without seeing the original transcript and it is not here. If there is no objection, the gentleman may proceed for 10 minutes.

§ 17.5 The Speaker ruled that a delay of several months did not preclude a Member from being recognized on a question of personal privilege concerning remarks appearing in the Record.

On June 30, 1939,⁽¹⁵⁾ Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, requested recognition on a question of personal privilege. He cited in

14. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

15. 84 CONG. REC. 8468, 76th Cong. 1st Sess.

support of his question of privilege remarks made on the floor of the Senate by a Member of that body on Jan. 17, 1939, which were highly critical of a statement he had previously made in the House. Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, then made the following point of order:

Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the statement that the gentleman from Michigan is making does not in any way constitute a question of high constitutional privilege. . . . [T]he statement made in the Senate was months and months ago. It has been in the Congressional Record all this time, and the gentleman from Michigan knew it. Now he is guilty of what is called laches in our courts. He is not entitled to rise to the question of high constitutional privilege at this time in order to use it to filibuster against the bill before the House. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not entitled to rise to a question of high constitutional privilege.

The Speaker, William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, ruled against Mr. Rankin's point of order, and recognized Mr. Hoffman on the question of personal privilege.

Remarks Made Out of Order

§ 17.6 The Chair may direct the exclusion or deletion, from the Record, of words held to be out of order. (See §17.21, infra.)

§ 17.7 Remarks made by a Member on the floor of the House after he has been called to order by the Chair are excluded from the Record.

On June 17, 1936,⁽¹⁶⁾ Mr. Robert F. Rich, of Pennsylvania, was propounding a question to the Member occupying the floor, under a reservation of the right to object, when the regular order was demanded by Mr. Claude A. Fuller, of Arkansas. Mr. Rich, however, ignoring the announcement by the Speaker that the regular order had been demanded, made an additional statement. The Speaker⁽¹⁷⁾ stated that Mr. Rich had been out of order in extending his statement after the Chair announced that the regular order was demanded. The following parliamentary inquiry and response by the Speaker then occurred:

MR. FULLER: Mr. Speaker, under the ruling of the Chair I suppose it is to be taken for granted that the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania should be stricken from the Record. If they are not I want to object, because he was speaking out of order, speaking after the Chair had cautioned him, as is his custom all the time.

THE SPEAKER: The remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, or any

16. 80 CONG. REC. 9694, 74th Cong. 2d Sess.

17. William B. Bankhead (Ala.).

other gentleman who interjects remarks into the Record after he has been called to order by the Chair upon a demand for the regular order, are not entitled to be incorporated in the Record.

§ 17.8 Remarks made by a Member subsequent to his point of order that a quorum is not present are ordinarily excluded from the Record, because the point of order is not debatable and only remarks that are made in order are included in the Record.

On Apr. 15, 1940,⁽¹⁸⁾ Mr. John Taber, of New York, was recognized on a question of the privilege of the House. He stated that earlier in the debate Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, had made a point of order that a quorum was not present, and thereafter had made additional statements. Mr. Taber made the point of order that Mr. Rankin had not been recognized for the purpose of making those statements and that they should not be in the Record. The Speaker pro tempore⁽¹⁹⁾ made the following ruling:

Under the rules of the House, remarks should only be included in the Record that are made in order. After a

18. 86 CONG. REC. 4517, 76th Cong. 3d Sess.

19. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

point of order is made, which is not debatable, any further remarks should not be included in the Record. Therefore the Chair rules that any remarks that may have been made after the point of order that a quorum was not present was made should not be included in the Record.

§ 17.9 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.

The reporters are instructed to take down such interjections even though they are out of order and may be stricken from the permanent Record by the House, the Speaker, or the Member in revising his remarks.⁽²⁰⁾

§ 17.10 A parliamentary inquiry may not be used to place statements in the Record.

On Jan. 6, 1933,⁽¹⁾ the following parliamentary inquiry was made:

MR. [THOMAS L.] BLANTON [of Texas]: Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Would it be in order to state that the Republican organization voted silently against the previous question?

The Speaker⁽²⁾ responded as follows:

- 20.** This ruling is discussed in §19.8, *infra*.
- 1.** 76 CONG. REC. 1362, 72d Cong. 2d Sess.
 - 2.** John N. Garner (Tex.).

That is not a parliamentary inquiry, and the gentleman ought not to take advantage of a parliamentary inquiry to make a statement.

Deletion by Unanimous Consent

§ 17.11 The House occasionally agrees to a unanimous-consent request by a Member to have certain unparliamentary remarks spoken in debate by another Member deleted from the Record.

On Aug. 4, 1970,⁽³⁾ Mr. Page H. Belcher, of Oklahoma, referred to Mr. Silvio O. Conte, of Massachusetts, as “the other guy” who was horning in. Mr. Leslie C. Arends, of Illinois, requested unanimous consent that “the other guy” as spoken by Mr. Belcher in debate be deleted from the Record and that there be inserted in lieu thereof “the gentleman from Massachusetts.” The House agreed to the request.⁽⁴⁾

§ 17.12 A Member may, with the unanimous consent of the House, have his own remarks, which had been inserted under leave to extend, deleted from the permanent Record.

- 3.** 116 CONG. REC. 27130, 91st Cong. 2d Sess.
- 4.** CONG. REC. (daily ed.), 89th Cong. 2d Sess.

On Sept. 20, 1966,⁽⁵⁾ a speech delivered by Mr. Arnold Olsen, of Montana, which was made in Montana and was highly critical of another Member, appeared in the Record. The following day, Mr. Olsen, in requesting the unanimous consent of the House that the speech be deleted from the permanent Record, stated that it had been inserted by his staff, without his permission or knowledge. The House agreed to the unanimous-consent request.⁽⁶⁾

Deletion Pursuant to Motion

§ 17.13 After the Speaker ruled certain words spoken by a Member in debate to be out of order, the House agreed to a motion deleting his entire speech from the Record.

5. CONG. REC. (daily ed.), 89th Cong. 2d Sess., Sept. 21, 1966.
6. On several other occasions the House has agreed by unanimous consent to permit a Member to delete his remarks from the Record. See, *e.g.*, CONG. REC. (daily ed.), Aug. 12, 1970 (remarks critical of a United States Senator); CONG. REC. (daily ed.), Sept. 14, 1967 (remarks critical of another Member); 86 CONG. REC. 1124, 76th Cong. 3d Sess., Feb. 6, 1940 (letters that were later found to have been forged); CONG. REC. (daily ed.), Mar. 18, 1965 (an extension of remarks by a Member that had been lost by the Public Printer, rediscovered nine years later, and inserted as if it were current).

On Feb. 11, 1941,⁽⁷⁾ the Speaker⁽⁸⁾ ruled that certain words spoken by a Member in debate on a resolution⁽⁹⁾ to continue an investigation by a Special Committee on Un-American Activities impugned the motives and actions of a committee and its individual members, and were therefore out of order. Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, moved to expunge the entire speech from the Record. The House agreed to the motion.

§ 17.14 The Speaker ruled that a motion to strike from the Record would have to be put in writing where the material to be stricken gave rise to a question of privilege of the House.

On Apr. 25, 1944,⁽¹⁰⁾ Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, introduced a resolution to strike from the Record a statement inserted by another Member that impugned the integrity and patriotism of Mr. Hoffman and which mentioned various Senators and Representatives. During debate on the resolution the Speaker⁽¹¹⁾ in-

7. 87 CONG. REC. 894-899, 77th Cong. 1st Sess.
8. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).
9. H. Res. 90, 77th Cong. 1st Sess. (1941).
10. 90 CONG. REC. 3696-98, 78th Cong. 2d Sess.
11. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

dicated that there was an inconsistency in the resolution,⁽¹²⁾ and Mr. Hoffman requested permission to withdraw the resolution on the condition that he be permitted to reword it and offer it again later in the day. At that point Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, requested the opinion of the Chair as to whether a motion to strike the matter under discussion from the Record must be in writing, or whether it could be done orally. The Speaker responded as follows:

The Chair is going to demand that any motion to strike from the Record be put in writing. The gentleman withdraws the resolution.

Later in the same day Mr. Hoffman introduced a modified resolution.⁽¹³⁾

§ 17.15 Debate on a motion to expunge from the Record words taken down and ruled out of order is under the hour rule.

On June 12, 1947,⁽¹⁴⁾ after Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi,

12. The resolution directed both that the words be stricken from the Record and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules for such action as it may deem proper.
13. The resolution provided for its referral to the Committee on Rules and directed the committee to consider the offensive statement and to take such action as it deemed proper.
14. 93 CONG. REC. 6895, 80th Cong. 1st Sess.

was recognized on his motion to strike words from the Record that had been held out of order by the Speaker,⁽¹⁵⁾ he made the following parliamentary inquiry:

Mr. Speaker, I am recognized now for 1 hour and I have a right to yield to any other Member I desire in this discussion?

The Speaker responded affirmatively.

§ 17.16 A Member who has been called to order for words spoken in debate is not entitled to be recognized by the Speaker during debate on a motion to expunge his words from the Record.

On Feb. 11, 1941,⁽¹⁶⁾ during debate on a resolution⁽¹⁷⁾ to continue an investigation by a special Committee on Un-American Activities, the Speaker⁽¹⁸⁾ ruled that words spoken by Mr. Samuel Dickstein, of New York, impugned the motives and actions of a committee and the members thereof and were therefore not in order. Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, moved to expunge the entire speech of Mr. Dickstein from

15. Joseph W. Martin, Jr. (Mass.).
16. 87 CONG. REC. 894-899, 77th Cong. 1st Sess.
17. H. Res. 90, 77th Cong. 1st Sess. (1941).
18. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

the Record. During the debate on the resolution Mr. Dickstein sought recognition for the purpose of making a parliamentary inquiry. The Speaker replied that he could not be recognized.

§ 17.17 A motion to expunge words from the Record is not in order in the Committee of the Whole; words taken down in debate in the Committee must be reported to the House by the Chairman.

On Feb. 18, 1941,⁽¹⁹⁾ during debate in the Committee of the Whole, Mr. Robert F. Rich, of Pennsylvania, demanded that certain words spoken by Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, be taken down. The Clerk, upon the order of the Chairman,⁽²⁰⁾ read the words objected to. Mr. Rich then requested that the words be expunged from the Record. The Chairman stated that it was a

19. 87 CONG. REC. 1126, 77th Cong. 1st Sess.

On May 31, 1934, in a similar situation, a Member moved to expunge from the Record words taken down during a debate in the Committee of the Whole. A point of order was made that the words would have to be first reported to the House. The Chairman, John H. Kerr (N.C.), agreed and directed the Committee to rise. 78 CONG. REC. 10167-70, 73d Cong. 2d Sess.

20. Warren G. Magnuson (Wash.).

matter for the House to decide, and he directed the Committee to rise. The Committee then rose and Mr. Magnuson reported to the House that certain words in debate had been objected to, taken down upon request, and read at the Clerk's desk. After listening to the Clerk's reading of the words objected to, the Speaker⁽¹⁾ ruled that they did not reflect in an unparliamentary manner upon any Member, and that they did not violate the rules of the House.

§ 17.18 A motion to delete from the Record certain words reported to the House by the Committee of the Whole is in order subsequent to a ruling by the Speaker holding them unparliamentary.

On Mar. 24, 1961,⁽²⁾ the Committee of the Whole reported to the House that certain words used in debate had been objected to and, on request, taken down and read at the Clerk's desk. When the House resumed sitting, the Clerk reported the words objected to, and the Speaker⁽³⁾ ruled them out of order. The following parliamentary inquiry and response by the Speaker then occurred:

MR. [THOMAS B.] CURTIS [of Missouri]: The ruling means that these

1. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).
2. 107 CONG. REC. 4780, 87th Cong. 1st Sess.
3. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

words will be stricken from the Record?

THE SPEAKER: If a motion is made to strike them from the Record.

Mr. Curtis then made a motion to strike the words from the Record, and the House agreed to the motion.

Deletion Pursuant to Resolution

§ 17.19 The insertion in the Record of unparliamentary remarks is sufficient to give rise to a question of privilege, which is frequently presented in the form of a resolution to expunge such remarks from the permanent Record.

On May 13, 1946,⁽⁴⁾ Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, rose to a question of the privilege of the House and offered a resolution⁽⁵⁾ stating that on May 10, Mr. Frank E. Hook, of Michigan, had caused to be inserted in the *Congressional Record* an address delivered by the President of the Michigan CIO Council, which impugned the integrity of Congress and the individual Members thereof. The resolution requested that the entire speech be ex-

4. 92 CONG. REC. 4922-24, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.

5. H. Res. 616, 79th Cong. 2d Sess. (1946).

punged from the permanent Record. On a roll call vote, the House agreed to the resolution and the speech was expunged from the permanent Record.⁽⁶⁾

§ 17.20 A resolution, which proposes to strike from the Record language inserted under leave to extend, and which provides that such resolution is to be referred to the Committee on Rules for such action as it may deem proper, is privileged.

On Apr. 25, 1944,⁽⁷⁾ Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, rose to a question of privilege and introduced a resolution⁽⁸⁾ instructing the Committee on Rules to consider a statement impugning the integrity and patriotism of Mr. Hoffman, that had been inserted in the Record by another Member. Subsequent to the Speaker's⁽⁹⁾ statement that without objection

6. See 93 CONG. REC. 2461-63, 80th Cong. 1st Sess., Mar. 24, 1947, for another occasion on which the House agreed to a resolution expunging from the permanent Record unparliamentary remarks which had been inserted under leave to extend.

7. 90 CONG. REC. 3698, 78th Cong. 2d Sess.

8. H. Res. 516, 78th Cong. 2d Sess. (1944)

9. Sam Rayburn (Tex.).

the resolution was agreed to, the following exchange occurred:

MR. [JOHN E.] RANKIN [of Mississippi]: Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

THE SPEAKER: It is a privileged resolution.

MR. RANKIN: I understand, but anything that goes to the Committee on Rules is not a privileged resolution.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair recognized the gentleman from Michigan on the theory that it is a privileged resolution, and holds that it is a privileged resolution. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman to offer it.

Deletion by the Chair

§ 17.21 The Speaker, after ruling certain words taken down in debate out of order, immediately ordered them deleted from the Record, without awaiting action by the House.

On Feb. 22, 1945,⁽¹⁰⁾ Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, requested that certain words spoken in debate by Mr. Frank E. Hook, of Michigan, be taken down. The Speaker pro tempore,⁽¹¹⁾ after hearing the words read by the Clerk, made the following ruling:

The Chair rules the words out of order and they will be stricken from the Record.

10. 91 CONG. REC. 1371, 79th Cong. 1st Sess.

11. John W. McCormack (Mass.).

Mr. Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan, then asked the Chair, in the form of a parliamentary inquiry, what had become of the request that the words be taken down. The Speaker pro tempore responded as follows:

The Chair has already ruled on that. The words were stricken from the Record.

§ 17.22 Although the Speaker may strike from the Record of the proceedings remarks made by a Member to whom the Member occupying the floor has refused to yield, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may not.

Although it has been said that the Speaker has no control over the official record of debates,⁽¹²⁾ it is well established that he may exclude from the Record flagrantly disorderly words,⁽¹³⁾ words spoken by a Member after he has been called to order,⁽¹⁴⁾ and remarks made by a Member who has not been recognized and to whom the Member having the floor has declined to yield.⁽¹⁵⁾ The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, however, does not share even the Speaker's limited control over the

12. 5 Hinds' Precedents § 7017.

13. 8 Cannon's Precedents § 3471.

14. 5 Hinds' Precedents §§ 6975–6978.

15. 8 Cannon's Precedents § 3466.

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.