

out or delete any thing that he knows would violate the rules of this House if spoken from the floor.

MR. GINGRICH: Under the Rules of the House . . . if one were to only utter the words on the floor that were appropriate, but were to then insert the item in the Record, is the Record then edited by the House? That is, if it was put in as an extension of remarks or put in under general leave?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: As the gentleman knows, there are precedents where a question of privilege can be raised about certain things inserted in the Record, and those could be raised if the gentleman attempts to insert them into the Record, or not. . . .

As the gentleman knows, words spoken on the floor of the House can be objected to.

The following exchange took place on Feb. 27, 1985:⁽²⁾

MR. [THOMAS S.] FOLEY [of Washington]: . . . I came to the floor [to] suggest that it is important that we have a balanced opportunity to discuss these issues. . . . I simply think it is important that we observe the rules of the House in the course of debate, and I think the two gentlemen, Mr. Walker and Mr. Gingrich, know that it is not permissible under long-standing rules of the House and interpretations of the Parliamentarians . . . to read into the Record statements that would be inappropriate if made by a Member directly. . . .

I just wanted to make the point that these gentlemen in the well and the

gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Walker) know the rules very well. They are very skilled at them and they know that it is inappropriate to use a newspaper article, however widely published, to violate the rules of the House.

§ 83.7 In response to a parliamentary inquiry, the Chair indicated that a question of the privileges of the House could be raised against the insertion in the Record of a press account using language personally offensive against a sitting Member, whether uttered by a former Member or anyone else.

The proceedings of Feb. 25, 1985, relating to newspaper articles sought to be inserted in the Record by Mr. Newton L. Gingrich, of Georgia, are discussed in § 83.6, *supra*.

§ 84. Use of Exhibits

Rule XXX, as amended in the 103d Congress,⁽³⁾ states:

When the use of any exhibit in debate is objected to by any Member, it shall be determined without debate by a vote of the House.

The use of exhibits in debate requires the consent of the House if

2. 131 CONG. REC. 3902, 99th Cong. 1st Sess.

3. *House Rules and Manual* §915 (1995).

objection is made.⁽⁴⁾ However, where Members supporting certain legislation use relevant exhibits in debate for the information of other Members, objection is rarely made to the display.⁽⁵⁾ But a Member may not have distributed on the floor copies of a bill marked with his own interpretations of its effect and support.⁽⁶⁾ The Chair controls the positioning of an exhibit in the well or along the side aisles, in order that his view of the floor or the Members' view of the rostrum is not obstructed.

In one instance, the Speaker ordered removed from the lobby a placard posted by a Member which impugned the motives of Members.⁽⁷⁾

Permission To Display Exhibit

§ 84.1 Where objection is raised against the use of ex-

4. See §§84.1, 84.2, *infra*; 8 Cannon's Precedents §§2452, 2453.

See also 118 CONG. REC. 36133-38, 92d Cong. 2d Sess., Oct. 13, 1972 (Member exhibited several types of military bombs during a "special-order speech" on the legality of the Vietnam War).

5. See §§84.4, 84.5, *infra*.

6. See §84.7, *infra*.

7. See §84.6, *infra*. Since the placard contained language subject to a point of order if stated in debate, the placard could not have been read in debate by consent of the House.

hibits in debate, the question is put to a vote in the House or the Committee of the Whole.

On June 21, 1937,⁽⁸⁾ Mr. Maury Maverick, of Texas, made a point of order against the display on the floor of the House of an object by Mr. Robert F. Rich, of Pennsylvania. Speaker William B. Bankhead, of Alabama, put the question on the display to the House:

MR. MAVERICK: Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman has no right to display a liquor bottle in the House of Representatives.

MR. RICH: Mr. Speaker, this is Government rum, presented to me by Secretary Ickes.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has no right to exhibit the bottle without permission of the House. The point of order is well taken. . . .

As many as are in favor of granting the gentleman from Pennsylvania the right to exhibit the bottle which he now holds in his hand will say "aye" and those opposed will say "no."

The vote was taken and the Speaker announced that the ayes have it, and the permission is granted.

On Aug. 5, 1949,⁽⁹⁾ the Chairman of the Committee of the

8. 81 CONG. REC. 6104, 6105, 75th Cong. 1st Sess.

9. 95 CONG. REC. 10859, 81st Cong. 1st Sess.

Whole, Howard W. Smith, of Virginia, put the question as to the display of a chart to the Committee for a decision:

MR. [OREN] HARRIS [of Arkansas]: Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. . . .

MR. [EUGENE D.] O'SULLIVAN [of Nebraska]: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state it.

MR. O'SULLIVAN: Mr. Chairman, is it in order for an exhibit to be presented to the Committee of the Whole or to the House of Representatives? As I read the rules it is not in order to do so, unless the permission of the Committee of the Whole or of the House is first obtained.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the gentleman from Nebraska objects to the use of the exhibit, the Chair will put the question to the Committee of the Whole. Does the gentleman object?

MR. O'SULLIVAN: I object, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is: Shall the use of the exhibit be permitted?

The question was agreed to.⁽¹⁰⁾

§ 84.2 A Member used an exhibit while engaged in debate in the Committee of the Whole without objection.

On June 8, 1966,⁽¹¹⁾ while the Committee of the Whole was con-

10. See also 8 Cannon's Precedents §§ 2452, 2453.

11. 112 CONG. REC. 12574, 89th Cong. 2d Sess.

sidering H.R. 15202, to temporarily increase the public debt limit, Mr. Wright Patman, of Texas, was characterizing the actions of the banking industry in raising interest rates as "a loaded dice game." During his remarks, he displayed, without objection, a pair of oversized dice. The following exchange occurred between Mr. Patman and Mr. H. R. Gross, of Iowa:

MR. GROSS: Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. PATMAN: Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

MR. GROSS: Mr. Chairman, I just walked in. Is the gentleman trying to convert the House Chamber into a gambling establishment with those dice here?

MR. PATMAN: No, I am trying to convert them against a gambling establishment, that is, the Federal Reserve establishment. These are Federal Reserve dice. If you roll them, they will roll 7 or 11 every time. Try them.

Use of Exhibits To Explain Legislation

§ 84.3 After objection was made, the Committee of the Whole voted to permit a Member to display a chart in explanation of a legislative proposition.

On Aug. 5, 1949,⁽¹²⁾ when objection was made to a request by a

12. 95 CONG. REC. 10859, 81st Cong. 1st Sess.

Member to display a chart explaining the provisions of H.R. 1758, amending the Natural Gas Act, the Committee of the Whole voted to permit the exhibit.

§ 84.4 The House by unanimous consent permitted the Committee on Science and Astronautics to use models and exhibits in the Committee of the Whole during debate on a bill.

On Aug. 1, 1963,⁽¹³⁾ a unanimous-consent request was granted for the Committee on Science and Astronautics to use exhibits and models on the floor:

MR. [OLIN E.] TEAGUE of Texas: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may be permitted to use certain models and exhibits on the floor this afternoon to better present the information that we will try to present to the House.

There was no objection to the request.

During debate on the pending bill, H.R. 7500, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, members of the committee referred to the models and exhibits.⁽¹⁴⁾

§ 84.5 In debating a bill or a special rule providing for its

13. 109 CONG. REC. 13853, 88th Cong. 1st Sess.

14. See for example *id.* at p. 13876.

consideration, Members may display charts without requesting permission, where no objection is made to the display.

On Mar. 12, 1974,⁽¹⁵⁾ the House was considering House Resolution 963, providing for the consideration of H.R. 69, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1974. Mr. Peter A. Peyser, of New York, referred to a chart which was being displayed before the House and which continued to be displayed and referred to after the resolution had been adopted and the Committee of the Whole was conducting general debate on the bill. (The bill contained complex funding formulas suited to graphic description.)⁽¹⁶⁾

Displays Impugning Members

§ 84.6 Under authority granted him by House rule, the Speaker ordered removed from the Speaker's lobby a placard posted by a Member containing language which might have been ruled disorderly had it been uttered on the House floor.

15. 120 CONG. REC. 6269, 93d Cong. 2d Sess.

16. *Id.* at p. 6279 (see the remarks of Mr. Carl D. Perkins [Ky.]).

On June 5, 1930, the House discussed the action of the Speaker in ordering removed from the Speaker's lobby placards posted by a Member criticizing the action of House conferees on a particular bill (H.R. 2667, a tariff bill).⁽¹⁷⁾

Speaker Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio, stated that he ordered removed the placard under his authority granted by Rule I clause 3, empowering him to exercise control over the corridors and passages and unappropriated rooms in the House side of the Capitol. The Speaker also stated that "the Chair was of the opinion that at least two of the sentences in that document were sentences which, if pronounced on the floor of the House, would have been subject to being taken down, and were not in order, and, by analogy, the Chair thinks it is even more improper to have such publications posted where no one can criticize them."

The Speaker read the following objectionable language of the placard:

3. The House conferees, in violation of the gentleman's agreement and in disregard of the positive mandate of the House, voted lumber used by the farmers on the dutiable list and polls and ties used by the public utilities on the free list.

17. 72 CONG. REC. 10122, 10123, 71st Cong. 2d Sess.

4. The conferees are the servants of the House, not its masters. Will the Members by their votes condone the violation of the gentleman's agreement and the disregard of the positive mandate of the House on the part of its conferees.

The Speaker stated that the truth or falsity of the document was not material; he added that whether the document cast doubt upon the worthiness of the motives of the conferees was relevant to his decision.⁽¹⁸⁾

Distribution of Bills Edited With Interpretation

§ 84.7 It is not in order for a Member to have distributed on the floor of the House copies of a bill marked with his own interpretations of its provisions.

On Aug. 16, 1935,⁽¹⁹⁾ Speaker Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, ruled that a Member could not distribute in the Chamber copies

18. Rule I clause 3, *House Rules and Manual* §623 (1995) provides: "He [the Speaker] shall have general control, except as provided by rule or law, of the Hall of the House, and of the corridors and passages and the disposal of the unappropriated rooms in that part of the Capitol assigned to the use of the House, until further order."

19. 79 CONG. REC. 13433, 74th Cong. 1st Sess.

of a bill marked with his own interpretation thereof, and instructed the House pages not to distribute any such documents:

MR. [CLAUDE A.] FULLER [of Arkansas]: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I just sent a page for the bill under consideration, H.R. 9100, and received the copy which I have in my hand. At the top of the bill, pasted onto it is a pink slip, and on that pink slip in typewriting are the words:

Bituminous-coal bill as amended and reprinted—controversial phases largely eliminated. Two-thirds of tonnage output operators favor bill and more than 95 percent of labor.

My inquiry is to know whether it is proper for anybody to paste such a thing as that on a document of the House and whether it is proper for it to be circulated in the House. This is the first time in my experience that I have ever seen any advertisement on an official document or bill pending in the House. I rise for the purpose of ascertaining how it came there and whether or not it is proper to be on this bill.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair has no information on the subject. Where did the gentleman get his copy of the bill?

MR. FULLER: From a page. I send this copy to the desk so that the Speaker may examine it.

MR. [J. BUELL] SNYDER [of Pennsylvania]: I can tell the gentleman how that came there.

THE SPEAKER: The gentleman may state.

MR. SNYDER: Mr. Speaker, I had so many of these bills sent to my office,

and with my secretarial help we wrote those words on that pink slip and pasted the slip on the bill. That is how that happens to be there. I sent copies of these bills with the slip on them to those interested and sent some of them to the desk back here, to be handed out upon request. It is altogether fitting and proper that I should do so. . . .

THE SPEAKER: The Chair knows of no rule or authority for inserting a statement like that to which the gentleman has called attention on a bill, and the Chair instructs the pages of the House not to distribute any more bills carrying this sort of inscription to Members on the floor of the House.

Proper Time To Use Displays

§ 84.8 The Member having the floor in Committee of the Whole may display charts or exhibits by permission of the Committee, but if objection is made, the question is put, without debate, as to whether such Member should be permitted to use displays; but exhibits are only to be displayed during the debate, and the Chair can direct their removal when they are not being utilized.

On Sept. 20, 1977,⁽²⁰⁾ the following proceedings occurred in the Committee of the Whole during consideration of H.R. 6796 (the

²⁰ 123 CONG. REC. 29927, 95th Cong. 1st Sess.

Energy Research and Development appropriations):

MR. [OLIN E.] TEAGUE [of Texas]: Madam Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽¹⁾ The gentleman will state it.

MR. TEAGUE: Madam Chairman, I am not going to have a lot to say, but I do not care to have what I do have to say distracted by a bunch of charts here. I think the gentleman from California should not bring those in. I ask the Chair if that is not proper.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair would advise the gentleman from Texas that if he does object to the demonstrations or displays before the committee, he may do so. If he does object, the Chair would then put the question as to whether the Member having the floor should be permitted to use displays.

MR. TEAGUE: Madam Chairman, I object to them until the gentleman is ready to speak. Then, I will ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to bring them in.

MR. [GEORGE E.] BROWN [Jr.] of California: Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

MR. TEAGUE: I yield.

MR. BROWN of California: Madam Chairman, I want to do whatever the chairman thinks is fair. I want to point out that these charts were prepared for the purpose of assisting a number of speakers. We would be happy to put them all together and have them brought out one by one as the speakers prefer. I will not be able to use them, but others will.

MR. TEAGUE: I think it is proper, as they come to the charts, to use them.

1. Barbara Jordan (Tex.).

I will not object to that, but I do think that if other people are making speeches, the charts should not be there.

MR. BROWN of California: I will be happy to accede to the gentleman's objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: That, the Chair thinks, resolves the question.

§ 84.9 While Members are permitted to use exhibits such as charts during debate (subject to the permission of the House under Rule XXX), the Speaker may under Rule I direct the removal of a chart from the well if not being utilized during debate.

The following proceedings occurred in the House on Apr. 1, 1982:⁽²⁾

(Mr. Gregg asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. [JUDD] GREGG [of New Hampshire]: Mr. Speaker, with the Congress having allegedly been in session now for approximately 4 months and about to go on recess for the month of April, I felt that we should review the "report card" of the liberal leadership of this Congress. So it has been prepared here on this chart. . . .

THE SPEAKER:⁽³⁾ If there are no other Members who will use the chart in the well at this time during 1-minute speeches, it will be removed until such time as it is needed.

The Chair recognized the Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Michel).

2. 128 CONG. REC. 6303, 6304, 97th Cong. 2d Sess.

3. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (Mass.).

§ 84.10 The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may direct the removal from the well of charts and other displays if not currently being utilized in debate.

During consideration of the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1983 (H. Con. Res. 345) in Committee of the Whole on May 25, 1982,⁽⁴⁾ the following proceedings occurred:

MR. [LEON E.] PANETTA [of California]: Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

THE CHAIRMAN:⁽⁵⁾ The gentleman from California (Mr. Panetta) is recognized, but first the charts will be removed.

MR. PANETTA: Please, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps from the laughter, it might be worth having the Chair remind the Members that charts are always brought forward for a particular speaker. They are present entirely at the sufferance of the Committee.⁽⁶⁾

4. 128 CONG. REC. 11752, 97th Cong. 2d Sess.
5. Richard Bolling (Mo.).
6. See §84.9, supra, where the Speaker pursuant to his general authority under Rule I, directed the removal from the well of a chart that was not being utilized at the time. Under Rule XXX, the House or Committee of the Whole controls the use of displays during debate, upon the objection of any Member.

Displays Should Not Detract From Good Order and Decorum

§ 84.11 Recognition is within the discretion of the Chair, who may deny a Member recognition to speak under the “one-minute rule” in order to uphold order and decorum in the House as required under clause 2 of Rule I; thus, the Speaker inquired of a Member in the well seeking recognition, as to his purpose in utilizing an object for demonstration in debate, and then denied that Member recognition pursuant to his authority under clause 2 of Rule XIV, when he determined that the object might subject the House to ridicule.

On Aug. 27, 1980,⁽⁷⁾ the following proceedings occurred in the House:

THE SPEAKER:⁽⁸⁾ The Chair would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Shuster) what he intends to do with the doll. The Chair is not going to allow the Congress to be held up to ridicule and will object to any such exhibit being used in debate.

MR. [E. G.] SHUSTER [of Pennsylvania]: Mr. Speaker, if I may respond, I simply want to introduce this duck as

7. 126 CONG. REC. 23456, 96th Cong. 2d Sess.
8. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (Mass.).

a symbol of the lameduck session that I want to speak to.

THE SPEAKER: The Chair is of the opinion the Member would be holding the House up to ridicule and would ask the gentleman to make the speech without utilizing the apparatus or the doll or anything of that nature.

MR. SHUSTER: Mr. Speaker, this is certainly not the intention.

THE SPEAKER: That is the way the Chair feels about it and the Chair so rules.

(Mr. Shuster asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Parliamentarian's Note: The original transcript shows that the Speaker first inquired as to Mr. Shuster's purpose and then denied him recognition, and that Mr. Shuster was then recognized for one minute. Thus, the Speaker was exercising his power of recognition, and was not unilaterally preventing the use of a demonstration during debate, which would be a matter to be determined by a vote of the House, under Rule XXX.

§ 84.12 Where the Speaker, pursuant to his authority and responsibility to preserve decorum in debate under clause 2 of Rule I, had informally requested a Member not to wear a mask in debate, that Member utilized the mask as a display while

mentioning the Speaker's admonition.

On Oct. 6, 1983,⁽⁹⁾ during consideration of H.R. 3958 (water resources development appropriations for fiscal 1984) in the House, the following occurred:

MR. [SILVIO O.] CONTE [of Massachusetts]: Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. Conte asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. CONTE: Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I was going to start out this debate today by wearing this pig mask because I think it is the only way we can properly describe this bill.

But I was asked by my dear friend the Speaker not to wear it, and I am not going to put it on. But I wish I could wear it.

Because all this amendment would do is trim a little of the fat. If this amendment is adopted it will not keep anyone from bringing the bacon back home.

Parliamentarian's Note: The Speaker may deny recognition or continued recognition when an improper display is utilized. A different question would be raised by a Member's use of a politically provocative display which is not inherently disruptive or demeaning. In such a case the House, on objection of a Member, would decide the issue.

9. 129 CONG. REC. 27629, 98th Cong. 1st Sess.

§ 84.13 The Speaker's responsibility under clause 2 of Rule I to preserve decorum during debate in the House requires that he not permit exhibits to be utilized in debate which would be demeaning to the House, and the Chair may inquire as to the Member's intentions before conferring recognition.

The following proceedings occurred in the House on Mar. 21, 1984:⁽¹⁰⁾

MR. [ROBERT S.] WALKER [of Pennsylvania]: I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:⁽¹¹⁾ What has the gentleman got in his hand?

MR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, this is a demonstration of what I have. I am not certain I am going to be able to use it under the rules.

THE SPEAKER: If the gentleman does not think so, why is he trying?

MR. WALKER: I will explain that in my speech, but I certainly would not want to violate the rules.

THE SPEAKER: Without objection, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman and will be watching carefully.

MR. WALKER: I thank the Speaker, and I know that the Speaker always watches very carefully everything that I do. . . .

Mr. Speaker, we have to be amused by an article in this morning's Wash-

ington Post, but I am pleased to see that two of my distinguished colleagues have gone on record supporting one of the major industries in my congressional district.

If we take everything they had to say, fold it between two pieces of bread, slap on a little mustard, we have the biggest bologna sandwich in history. The Lebanon bologna industry in my district is going to be forever grateful.

Mr. Speaker, what I have here is a real live Lebanon bologna, and I noticed in the rules, in reading the rules, that I probably would not be able to show that. What we are allowed to show on this floor is "verbal bologna" but not real bologna.

. . . Mr. Speaker, I did not violate the rules. I kept it in the bag.

Parliamentarian's Note: Reference to certain debate in the House as "baloney" has never been ruled unparliamentary, but to characterize all House debate as such might be ruled out as demeaning to the House.

§ 84.14 Prior to a special-order speech in which several Members intended to use photographic exhibits of missing children, the Chair reminded all Members to address the Chair and to avoid direct references to the television audience.

On Apr. 2, 1985,⁽¹²⁾ the Speaker Pro Tempore made an announcement, as follows:

10. 130 CONG. REC. 6187, 6188, 98th Cong. 2d Sess.

11. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (Mass.).

12. 131 CONG. REC. 7221, 99th Cong. 1st Sess.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽¹³⁾ The Chair will ask that all Members who wish to exhibit pictures to address the Chair and avoid direct references to the television audience.

Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Edwards) is recognized for 60 minutes.

MR. [MICKEY] EDWARDS of Oklahoma: Mr. Speaker, last summer I began a project to use the televised proceedings of the House of Representatives to help find some of the 160,000 children who each year are reported kidnaped either by strangers or by a parent who does not have custody.

§ 84.15 During a special-order speech, a Member on one occasion utilized cartoon caricatures as an exhibit to ridicule the Administration, particularly statements made by the Secretary of the Interior.

The following proceedings occurred in the House on June 2, 1987,⁽¹⁴⁾ during the period designated for special-order speeches:

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽¹⁵⁾ Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Scheuer] is recognized for 60 minutes.

MRS. [PATRICIA] SCHROEDER [of Colorado]: Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. [JAMES H.] SCHEUER [of New York]: Of course, I would be happy to

yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

MRS. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman to explain some of the [exhibits] that the gentleman has down there. I can tell the gentleman from New York has worked very hard on this.

I take it that right beside the gentleman he has these [figures of] cats wearing hats and glasses and then the fish. The gentleman does not have a hat on the fish, but my understanding is that it is just as dangerous to the fish.

MR. SCHEUER: There is a hat on the fish, but it is a plastic hat and it sticks very close to its scales.

MRS. SCHROEDER: Oh, I see. So the gentleman is pointing out that the first thing we would have to do is start catching all these animals. . . .

Parliamentarian's Note: The display of exhibits in debate is always subject to the will of the House and any Member may object by requesting the Chair to put the question of propriety to the House. In particular instances, a question may arise as to whether the Chair should take the initiative and deny recognition for breaches of decorum.⁽¹⁶⁾ The exhibit here consisted of large photographs of animals dressed up in sunglasses, straw hats, and the like, and was intended to ridicule a statement by the Secretary of the Interior that depletion of the

16. See 8 Cannon's Precedents § 2452.

13. Kenneth J. Gray (Ill.).

14. 133 CONG. REC. 14255, 100th Cong. 1st Sess.

15. James A. Hayes (La.).

ozone layer could be countered by such protective devices. Especially since it was probably aimed at the television audience during special orders, it was arguably such breach of decorum as the Chair has the authority under Rule I, clause 2, to prevent.

§ 84.16 In response to a parliamentary inquiry, the Chair rendered an anticipatory ruling that he would utilize his authority under Rule I, clause 2, to prevent the display of exhibits in the Chamber during debate which might disrupt order or impair decorum in the Chamber, without ruling that the exhibits were necessarily obscene or offensive.

On Sept. 13, 1989,⁽¹⁷⁾ it was demonstrated that the Chair may in his discretion make an anticipatory ruling that the exhibition of certain materials during debate should be precluded as disruptive of decorum. The proceedings were as follows:

MR. [ROBERT S.] WALKER [of Pennsylvania]: Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE:⁽¹⁸⁾ The gentleman will state it.

17. 135 CONG. REC. 20362, 101st Cong. 1st Sess.

18. George E. Brown, Jr. (Calif.).

MR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, we are in the process of discussing certain artworks which have been paid for by taxpayers' money. What would be the ruling of the Chair should those particular artworks be brought on the floor for display as a part of the debate? Can the Chair tell me that?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair would respond that it would be the intention of the Chair under rule I to prevent any activity which would disrupt the decorum of the Chamber and he would rule such action to be a disruption of the proper decorum of the Chamber.

MR. WALKER: I have a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

So, in other words, the material that we are talking about is so bad that it would disrupt the decorum of the House if this were displayed and so, therefore, the Chair would have to rule against that display, is that correct?

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair would rule as the Chair has already stated.

Various Types of Displays

§ 84.17 On one occasion, a Member utilized dismantled weapons as an exhibit during debate.

The following proceedings occurred in the Committee of the Whole on Apr. 23, 1985,⁽¹⁹⁾ during consideration of House Joint Resolution 239 (appropriations for aid to Nicaragua):

MR. [NEWT] GINGRICH [of Georgia]: . . . I want to specifically pick up on

19. 131 CONG. REC. 9024, 99th Cong. 1st Sess.

the arguments of an earlier speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas, who in a sense was asking what are these votes in Nicaragua really all about.

There are a number of ostrich Democrats who would have us believe that there is no danger from Nicaragua. . . .

Let me offer the physical proof of the Soviet-Cuban-Nicaraguan Communist offensive in El Salvador and Honduras. Let me say in advance to my colleagues, these exhibits are all harmless but they have been harmful. These exhibits are authenticated captured weapons from El Salvador. They are on loan from the El Salvadoran Government to the U.S. Defense Department. They have been dismantled. They meet every kind of rule of safety.

Parliamentarian's Note: Under Rule XXX, the Committee of the Whole or the House may, on demand of any Member, vote to permit a Member to utilize an exhibit during debate. In this instance, the Speaker had denied use of the Speaker's Lobby for the exhibition of the dismantled weapons, in accordance with his consistent policy; the Speaker could have precluded their display during debate in order to preserve decorum if he believed the display to pose a problem.

—Badges as Exhibits

§ 84.18 Clause 1 of Rule XIV, requiring Members desiring

20. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (Mass.).

to “speak or deliver any matter to the House” to rise and address the Speaker to be recognized, proscribes, in effect, the wearing of badges by Members to communicate messages; thus, the Speaker, exercising his authority to preserve order and decorum, has advised Members that the wearing of badges is inappropriate under the rules of the House.

The following statement was made by the Speaker⁽²⁰⁾ during proceedings on Apr. 15, 1986:⁽¹⁾

All Members wearing yellow badges should be advised that they are inappropriate under the rules of the House.

The badges in question urged support of military assistance to the Nicaraguan Contras. In recent years, some Members and staff have worn various badges on the floor to convey political messages to their colleagues and to the TV audience. Under the definition of decorum and debate in clause 1 of Rule XIV, a Member must first seek recognition and then speak his message, or use exhibits as provided in Rule XXX subject to approval of the House if objection is made.

1. 132 CONG. REC. 7525, 99th Cong. 2d Sess.