

ticular instance comes too late. Intervening debate has proceeded.

MR. CAMPBELL: The gentleman who previously spoke, Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet asking to be recognized on a point of order, who had made those accusations.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE: The Chair will state the Chair expects all Members to maintain the dignity of the Chamber, and that includes the proper use of language in reference to their colleagues of either political party.

The Chair will state that the point of order made by the gentleman at this time is not timely made. But the Chair will instruct all Members with the expectation that parliamentary language will be observed.

§ 63.—Falsehood

A Member may assert in debate that the statement of another Member is untrue,⁽¹¹⁾ provided that no accusation of intentional misrepresentation is made.⁽¹²⁾ Any

11. See § 63.3, *infra*. See also 5 Hinds' Precedents § 5159.
12. See the statement of Speaker Joseph W. Byrns (Tenn.) at § 63.3, *infra*. For past rulings, see 5 Hinds' Precedents §§ 5158 ("That is not true, and he knows it" held in order), 5160 ("Bold and direct attack upon truth" held out of order by vote of Senate); 8 Cannon's Precedents § 2545 ("The devotion of the gentleman . . . to the truth is so notorious that I shall not reply" held out of order).

term or language implying a deliberate misstatement of the truth, for whatever motive, is unparliamentary,⁽¹³⁾ including allegations of insincerity,⁽¹⁴⁾ and hypocrisy.⁽¹⁵⁾

Allegations of Express or Implied Falsehood

§ 63.1 The Speaker ruled that the word "canard" meant falsehood and was out of order in debate when referring to another Member.

On May 11, 1949,⁽¹⁶⁾ Mr. Emanuel Celler, of New York, stated in debate in reference to Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, "Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the occasion go by without commenting on the canard that the gentleman from Mississippi was guilty of when he

Charges of deliberate falsehood against persons who are not Members are in order; see 8 Cannon's Precedents § 2532.

13. See §§ 63.4 ("false and slanderous"), 63.5 ("lies and half-truths"), *infra*; § 61.2, *supra* ("cover up wrongdoing"). See also 8 Cannon's Precedents § 2530 ("liar").
14. See § 63.7, *infra*; 5 Hinds' Precedents § 5148.
15. See § 63.6, *infra* ("hypocrisy" linked to "falsehood"); compare 8 Cannon's Precedents § 2542.
16. 95 CONG. REC. 6042, 6043, 81st Cong. 1st Sess.

called the Antidefamation League subversive.” Mr. Rankin demanded that the words be taken down and Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, ruled as follows:

The Chair desires to make a statement. There are too many “left-handed” compliments being passed around this House all the time on both sides.

The word “canard” to me conveys the idea that a man has told a falsehood. Therefore, if anybody desires to move to strike it from the Record—without objection, the word “canard” will be stricken from the Record.

There was no objection.

§ 63.2 A statement in debate referring to another Member “when he comes here to defend some slime-monger who goes on the radio and lies about me, then I am ready to meet him anywhere” was held in order.

On Feb. 12, 1946,⁽¹⁷⁾ Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, stated in debate in reference to Mr. Adolph J. Sabath, of Illinois, “when he comes here to defend some slime-monger who goes on the radio and lies about me, then I am ready to meet him anywhere.” Mr. Sabath demanded that the words be taken down. However, Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, ruled that the language objected

to was not a breach of order since it was directed not towards Mr. Sabath but towards a news commentator.

§ 63.3 Where a Member stated in debate he did “not believe a word that another Member has said,” the language was held in order as no intentional misrepresentation was implied.

On July 2, 1935,⁽¹⁸⁾ Mr. Maury Maverick, of Texas, stated in debate “I do not believe a word the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Ralph O. Brewster] said” while the House was considering House Resolution 285, to appoint a committee to investigate charges of intimidation of Mr. Brewster by an official of the executive branch.

Mr. Brewster demanded that the words be taken down as a challenge to his words on the floor of the House. Speaker Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, ruled as follows:

The gentleman from Texas made the statement, but that does not necessarily imply that the gentleman from Maine intentionally made a misstatement on his own part. He simply said he did not believe it, but this did not necessarily imply that the gentleman from Maine intentionally made a misstatement. What the gentleman from

17. 92 CONG. REC. 1240, 1241, 79th Cong. 2d Sess.

18. 79 CONG. REC. 10670, 10671, 74th Cong. 1st Sess.

Texas said may be construed as meaning that the gentleman from Maine was merely mistaken in his conclusions, and that the gentleman did not deliberately make a false statement.

§ 63.4 A statement in debate that the remarks of a Member were “false and slanderous” was held out of order.

On Dec. 20, 1943,⁽¹⁹⁾ Mr. Adolph J. Sabath, of Illinois, had the floor and was speaking of a bill related to the right of servicemen to vote. During the course of his remarks, he referred to a certain bill as depriving them of the vote. Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, rose to demand that that language be taken down; he stated “I make the point of order that his statement is false and slanderous.”

Mr. Sabath demanded that Mr. Rankin’s accusation be taken down and Speaker Pro Tempore John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, ruled on both points of order. He ruled that Mr. Rankin’s statement clearly transgressed the rules of the House and declined to sustain Mr. Rankin’s argument that “When any Member rises on the floor and makes a false statement, any other Member has the right to say that that statement is false; and when that statement

19. 89 CONG. REC. 10922, 78th Cong. 1st Sess.

is slanderous, any gentleman is within the rules of the House when he says so.”

§ 63.5 Language in a telegram read in debate in the House which repudiated “lies and half-truths” of a House committee report was held out of order as reflecting on the integrity of committee members.

On June 16, 1947,⁽²⁰⁾ Mr. Chet Holifield, of California, read in the House a telegram from the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. Mr. John E. Rankin, of Mississippi, made a point of order against certain words in the telegram and demanded that they be taken down: “We completely repudiate the lies and half-truths of the report that was issued and consider it un-American.”

Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, ruled that the words objected to, referring to the Committee on Un-American Activities, were unparliamentary, since they “reflect upon the character and integrity of the membership of a committee. . . .” The words were stricken on motion from the *Congressional Record*.

Hypocrisy

§ 63.6 A statement in referring to another Member that “I

20. 93 CONG. REC. 7065, 80th Cong. 1st Sess.

was reminded that pretexts are never wanting when hypocrisy wishes to add malice to falsehood or cowardice to stab a foe who cannot defend himself” was held unparliamentary.

On Oct. 25, 1945,⁽¹⁾ Mr. Edward E. Cox, of Georgia, stated in debate in reference to Mr. Emanuel Celler, of New York: “I was reminded that pretexts are never wanting when hypocrisy wishes to add malice to falsehood or cowardice to stab a foe who cannot defend himself.” Mr. Celler demanded that the words be taken down, and Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, ruled the language unparliamentary as specifically directed to Mr. Celler.

Allegations of Insincerity

§ 63.7 A statement by a Member “I cannot believe that the gentleman from Mississippi is sincere in what he has just said” was held out of order as a personal attack on a Member’s sincerity.

On Nov. 2, 1942,⁽²⁾ Mr. Harold Knutson, of Minnesota, stated in debate: “Mr. Speaker, I cannot

1. 91 CONG. REC. 10044, 79th Cong. 1st Sess.

2. 88 CONG. REC. 8702, 77th Cong. 2d Sess.

believe that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. John E. Rankin] is sincere in what he has just said.” Mr. Rankin demanded that the words be taken down and Speaker Pro Tempore Jere Cooper, of Tennessee, ruled as follows:

The Chair is of the opinion that the words complained of, in effect, accuse the gentleman from Mississippi of insincerity and constitute a personal attack on the sincerity of the gentleman from Mississippi and are in violation of the rules of the House.

§ 64. — Lack of Intelligence

Wide latitude is permitted in debate to criticize the understanding of other Members or groups of Members in relation to pending legislation. But such remarks may not extend to personal attacks on the intelligence of another Member.⁽³⁾

Implication in Debate

§ 64.1 An implication in debate that another Member did not understand English was held in order.

During debate on Mar. 9, 1936,⁽⁴⁾ Mr. Thomas L. Blanton, of

3. See § 64.4, *infra*.

4. 80 CONG. REC. 3465, 74th Cong. 2d Sess.