AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

pugned the motives of Mr. Dingell.

The Committee rose and Speaker Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, ruled as follows:

> On May 4, 1943 . . . Speaker [Sam] Rayburn [of Texas] held:
>
> Statement by Newsome of Minnesota that, "I do not yield to any more demagogues," held not in order.
>
> It is the opinion of the Chair that the statements reported to the House are within the framework of this ruling, and without objection the words are therefore stricken from the Record.

Exciting To Prejudice

§ 65.7 A statement in debate accusing a Member of remarks on the floor calculated to stir up race prejudice was ruled in order as a statement of opinion and not reflecting upon the character or integrity of the Member mentioned.

On Feb. 25, 1948,[20] Mr. Frank B. Keefe, of Wisconsin, used the following words in debate in relation to Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi:

> [T]hat statement of the gentleman from Mississippi is just as wrong as many of the other inflammatory statements which he makes on the floor of this House in an attempt to stir up race prejudice that ought to be subdued rather than stirred up.

Mr. Rankin demanded that the words be taken down and Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, ruled that Mr. Keefe had merely stated his opinion and did not reflect upon the character or integrity of Mr. Rankin. The Speaker ruled that the statement was not unparliamentary since it only expressed a difference of opinion.

§ 66. — Disloyalty

Remarks in debate impugning the loyalty of a Member are not in order.[1] However, if such language is directed at the House or at its membership in general, the remarks may not be improper.[2] Allegations of disloyalty or lack of patriotism may assume various forms, including such labels as

20. 94 CONG. REC. 1707, 80th Cong. 2d Sess.

1. Accusations of active disloyalty are in order when the subject is relevant to disciplinary proceedings brought by the House against a Member, or to the consideration of resolutions of censure, expulsion, or exclusion. See Ch. 7, supra (disloyalty as disqualification for membership) and Ch. 12, supra (conduct; punishment, censure, or expulsion).

2. See, for example, § 53.1, supra. Compare 5 Hinds' Precedents § 5139 ("rebel elements" in House held unparliamentary).

"communist"[3] and "subversive,"[4] as well as the assertion that a Member has given aid or comfort to the enemy.[5]

Particular Accusations—Communism

§ 66.1 A statement in debate referring to another Member's language as "communistic" was held unparliamentary.

On Feb. 12, 1946,[6] Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, stated in response to comments accusing him of using disgraceful language, "I am not going to sit here and listen to these communistic attacks made on me."

Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, ruled that Mr. Rankin's language was unparliamentary.

§ 66.2 A statement in debate accusing all opponents of the Committee on Un-American Activities as communist enemies was held in order on the assurance of the Member having the floor that he was not referring to any Member of the House.

On Feb. 27, 1946,[7] Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, stated of the words "The House Un-American Committee" that had appeared in a *Congressional Record* insert by another Member:

> That is the Communist line, Mr. Speaker, that is being followed by these enemies of our country, in their attacks on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Adolph J. Sabath, of Illinois, asked that those words be taken down, and Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, questioned Mr. Rankin as to whether he intended to refer to Mr. Sabath in stating those remarks. Mr. Rankin stated that he was not referring to any individual in the House but only to communists and enemies throughout the Nation. No further action was taken in the matter.

Giving Aid and Comfort to Enemies

§ 66.3 A statement in debate referring to Members who give aid and comfort to enemies and traitors was ruled not a breach of order since it did not reflect on individual Members.

On Nov. 24, 1947,[8] Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, delivered the following words in debate:

3. See §§ 66.1–66.5, infra.
4. See § 66.8, infra.
5. See §§ 66.3, 66.4, infra.
6. 92 CONG. REC. 1241, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.
7. 92 CONG. REC. 1724, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.
8. 93 CONG. REC. 10791, 80th Cong. 1st Sess.

> . . . It has been amazing to hear these Members rise on the floor of the House and give aid and comfort to those enemies, those traitors within our gates, for every Communist in America is a traitor to the Government of the United States and is dedicated to its overthrow.

The words were demanded to be taken down by Mr. Vito Marcantonio, of New York, and Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, ruled that although a close question was presented, the remarks used did not reflect upon individual Members personally and were therefore not out of order.

§ 66.4 A reference in debate to Members whose utterances would give "great aid and comfort to the Soviet Politburo" was held to violate the rules and was stricken from the Record.

On Aug. 17, 1951,[9] Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, ruled that certain words used in reference to Members violated the rules of the House.

Parliamentarian's Note: The words objected to and stricken from the Record referred to certain Members as "apostles of doom" whose utterances would give "great aid and comfort" to the Politburo of the Soviet Union.

9. 97 CONG. REC. 10250, 82d Cong. 1st Sess.

§ 66.5 A statement in debate referring to Members of the House who would rip down the American flag and replace it with the Soviet flag was held in order as not reflecting on any particular individual Member of the House.

On Mar. 25, 1948,[10] Mr. Edward E. Cox, of Georgia, stated in debate as follows:

> Mr. Chairman, how long, I wonder, must Members of this body sit here and hear assaulted from day to day the Government we love, and by people who would rip from the wall that symbol of liberty that hangs above the Speaker's rostrum, and who would run down the flag of the stars and stripes that proudly floats above this Capitol and run up in its stead the flag of the hammer and sickle?

Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, ruled that nothing in the words used reflected upon any particular individual Member of the House and that in the debate at that time much latitude would be allowed.

References to Fascist Elements

§ 66.6 A statement in debate that insertions in the Record by another Member were taken from "Nazi elements" was held to be out of order.

10. 94 CONG. REC. 3533, 80th Cong. 2d Sess.

On June 14, 1940,[11] Mr. Adolph J. Sabath, of Illinois, demanded that the following words used in reference to him in debate be taken down:

> I feel these inserts are unjustifiable and unwarranted. They are not founded on facts. You cannot substantiate any of them—I think you should desist—taken from Nazi elements who are feeding you with that stuff.

Speaker Pro Tempore Emmet O'Neal, of Kentucky, ruled that the words referring to Nazi elements were out of order.

§ 66.7 A statement by a Member that internal fascist organizations exercised extensive influence on a special House committee was held to impugn the motives and actions of the committee and its members and was ruled a breach of order.

On Feb. 11, 1941, during consideration of House Resolution 90 to continue investigation by a special committee [the Dies Committee] on unAmerican activities, Mr. Samuel Dickstein, of New York, had the floor in debate.[12] Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, interrupted Mr. Dickstein's remarks and demanded that the following words be taken down as a violation of the rules of the House:

> I also charge, Mr. Speaker, that 110 Fascist organizations in this country had the back key, and have now the back key to the back door of the Dies committee.

Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, ruled that the language noted "certainly impugns the motives and actions of a committee and the individual members thereof." The House then expunged Mr. Dickstein's entire speech from the *Congressional Record*.

Characterizing Debate as Subversive

§ 66.8 When a Member in debate accuses another of making remarks that are subversive, it is a violation of the rules of the House.

On Apr. 2, 1946,[13] Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, demanded that words used by Mr. Vito Marcantonio, of New York, in debate accusing him of subversive remarks be taken down. Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, ruled that "when a Member accuses another of making remarks that are subversive, it is a violation of the rules of the House."

Parliamentarian's Note: The objectionable words, which were

11. 86 CONG. REC. 8269, 76th Cong. 3d Sess.

12. 87 CONG. REC. 894, 895, 77th Cong. 1st Sess.

13. 92 CONG. REC. 2957, 2958, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.

stricken from the Record, were as follows: "There is nothing more subversive than the kind of red baiting tactics that are being carried on in this House by the gentleman from Mississippi."

§ 66.9 A statement in debate referring to another Member as attempting to undermine the government was held out of order and stricken from the Record.

On May 14, 1946,[14] Mr. Charles E. McKenzie, of Louisiana, delivered remarks in debate accusing another Member who had spoken before him of "trying to undermine" the government. The words were taken down and Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, ruled that they were not parliamentary since they reflected upon a Member of the House. The words were then stricken from the Record.

§ 66.10 A statement in debate referring to the association of a Member with a newspaper allegedly dedicated to the destruction of the government was held in order.

On Mar. 28, 1946,[15] the following remarks in debate by Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, in relation to Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, of Wisconsin, were taken down:

> I have just seen in the Communist Daily Worker of this morning that Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller had written these words, "There is no place in our democracy for a committee functioning like the present one," referring to the Committee on Un-American Activities. He does not know any more about what goes on in the Committee on Un-American Activities than he does about what goes on in the moon. He has never come before that committee, he has never asked it a question, he has never appeared before it, yet he goes into the Communist Daily Worker, that everybody knows is dedicated to the destruction of this Government——

Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, ruled that Mr. Rankin was expressing his opinion of the newspaper and not reflecting upon the character or integrity of Mr. Biemiller.

Characterization of House Committees

§ 66.11 A statement in debate characterizing the Committee of the Whole as an agency of the Soviet Union was held in order as it did not reflect upon any Member's integrity but indicated criticism of the House.

On June 4, 1948,[16] Mr. Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, stated

14. 92 CONG. REC. 5028, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.

15. 92 CONG. REC. 2751, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.

16. 94 CONG. REC. 7171, 80th Cong. 2d Sess.

in debate: "You will think, when you review the Soviet press, that the committee of this House [the Committee of the Whole] was an agency of the U.S.S.R." Mr. Frank B. Keefe, of Wisconsin, demanded that the words be taken down, and Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, ruled that the words used indicated criticism of the House but did not reflect upon the integrity of any individual Member and were therefore in order.

§ 66.12 A reference in debate to the Committee on Un-American Activities as "the Un-American Committee" was held out of order.

On June 12, 1947,[17] Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, demanded the taking down of the reference by Mr. Chet Holifield, of California, in debate to the Committee on Un-American Activities as the "Un-American Committee."

Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, ruled that the reference impugned the motives of the committee in question and were used in debate in violation of the rules of the House.

H. DURATION OF DEBATE IN THE HOUSE

§ 67. In General

The duration of debate on a proposition in the House is governed by the type of procedure invoked for its consideration. Most proposals are considered pursuant to one of the four procedures below:

(1) consideration under the hour rule where a standing rule of the House or a special rule from the Committee on Rules does not otherwise provide;[18]

(2) consideration for a fixed period of time provided for by a standing rule governing a particular House procedure, such as suspensions or Calendar Wednesday;[19]

(3) consideration under the five-minute rule in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, by unanimous consent, special order,

17. 93 CONG. REC. 6895, 80th Cong. 1st Sess.

18. See § 68, infra.

19. See § 69, infra.

20. See § 70, infra. On rare occasions, a special rule has provided that bills