

diately. Formerly they might be taken down at any time the same day. *2 Hats., 196; Mem. in Hakew., 71; 3 Grey, 48; 9 Grey, 514.*

The House has, by clause 4 of rule XVII, provided a method of procedure in cases of disorderly words. The House permits and requires them to be noticed as soon as uttered, and has not insisted that the offending Member withdraw while the House is deciding as to its course of action.

Disorderly words spoken in a committee must be written down as in the House; but the committee can only report them to the House for animadversion. *6 Grey, 46.*

§ 369. Disorderly words taken down and reported from Committee of the Whole.

This provision of the parliamentary law has been applied to the Committee of the Whole, rather than to select or standing committees, which are separately empowered to enforce rules of decorum (clause 1(a) of rule XI, which incorporates the provisions of rule XVII where applicable). The House has censured a Member for disorderly words spoken in the Committee of the Whole and reported therefrom (II, 1259).

In Parliament, to speak irreverently or seditiously against the King is against order. *Smyth's Comw., L. 2, c. 3; 2 Hats., 170.*

§ 370. References in debate to the Executive.

This provision of the parliamentary law is manifestly inapplicable to the House (V, 5086); and it has been held in order in debate to refer to the President of the United States or his opinions, either with approval or criticism, provided that such reference be relevant to the subject under discussion and otherwise conformable to the Rules of the House (V, 5087–5091; VIII, 2500). Under this standard the following references are in order: (1) a reference to the probable action of the President (V, 5092); (2) an adjuration to the President to keep his word (although an improper form of address) (Dec. 19, 1995, p. 37601); (3) an accusation that the President “frivolously vetoed” a bill (Nov. 8, 1995, p. 31785).

Personal abuse, innuendo, or ridicule of the President is not permitted (VIII, 2497; Aug. 12, 1986, p. 21078; Oct. 21, 1987, pp. 28857, 28858; Sept. 21, 1994, p. 25147; Sept. 7, 2006, pp. 17381, 17382; Oct. 24, 2017, p. __). The standards applicable to references regarding the President apply also to the President-elect (*e.g.*, Nov. 14, 2016, p. 14092). In the 102d Congress, the Speaker enunciated a minimal standard of propriety for all debate concerning nominated candidates for the Presidency, based on the tradi-

tional proscription against personally offensive references to the President even in the capacity as a candidate (Speaker Foley, Sept. 24, 1992, p. 27344). This policy has been extended to a presumptive major-party nominee for President (*e.g.*, Apr. 22, 2004, pp. 7401, 7402) (although references to the past statements or views of such nominee are not necessarily unparliamentary (May 6, 2004, p. 8554)). The House has adopted a special order of business permitting Members to engage in personalities toward the President during debate on certain specified measures (sec. 2, H. Res. 38, Jan. 12, 2021, p. __).

Under this standard, the following remarks regarding personal conduct, demeanor, or attributes have been held out of order as unparliamentary references: (1) discussing personal conduct even as a point of reference or comparison (July 16, 1998, p. 15784; Sept. 9, 1998, p. 19735); (2) “cowardly,” “cowardice” (*e.g.*, Oct. 25, 1989, p. 25817), lacking personal courage (Mar. 26, 2014, p. 4875), “dastardly” (July 25, 2017, p. __), or lacking a backbone (July 16, 2018, p. __); (3) “a little bugger” (Nov. 18, 1995, p. 33974); (4) “disgusting” and “despicable” (Mar. 11, 2004, p. 4033; Jan. 15, 2019, p. __), “disgraceful” (*e.g.*, June 20, 2012, pp. 9462, 9463) or a disgrace (*e.g.*, Sept. 25, 2017, p. __), “disgusting and indecent rhetoric” (Mar. 27, 2017, p. 4898), “vile” (June 15, 2018, p. __), incapable of “basic human decency” (Sept. 13, 2018, p. __) or a “loathsome human” (Dec. 14, 2017, p. __); (5) a personal “dark side” (Mar. 1, 2017, p. 3243), ruthless (May 8, 2019, p. __) or “sinister” (Dec. 20, 2018, p. __); (6) that such person is deserving of shame (May 24, 2016, p. 6998) or is “shameful” (*e.g.*, Dec. 8, 2016, p. 16331) (although an accusation of “shameful opposition” to a legislative proposal is not necessarily out of order (Deschler, ch. 29, § 58.7)); (7) not “a large enough person” to apologize (Mar. 11, 2004, p. 4086); (8) “arrogant” (*e.g.*, Jan. 11, 2007, p. 998); (9) “mean-spirited” (*e.g.*, July 15, 2008, p. 15061), “mean” (July 28, 2017, p. __), or vicious (Sept. 25, 2017, p. __); vengeful (June 3, 2013, p. 7783), “cruel” (*e.g.*, Nov. 15, 2013, p. 17166), heartless (*e.g.*, July 25, 2017, p. __), callous (*e.g.*, Sept. 27, 2017, p. __), a “jerk” (Nov. 15, 2018, p. __), or accusations of demeaning and denigrating others (Oct. 26, 2017, p. __); (10) ill-tempered or lacking temperament (*e.g.*, Sept. 7, 2016, p. 11924), “infantile” (June 15, 2016, p. 8771) or “petulant” (*e.g.*, Jan. 18, 2018, p. __); (11) a “hissy fit” (*e.g.*, Oct. 27, 2011, pp. 16239, 16245) or “temper tantrum” (*e.g.*, Mar. 19, 2018, p. __); (12) was “rooting against,” or was turning one’s back on, the American people (*e.g.*, Mar. 16, 2016, p. 3317), intentionally hurting the public (Oct. 3, 2013, p. 15069), or “bilking” the taxpayer (Apr. 22, 2015, p. 5374); (13) that such person had engaged in insults (*e.g.*, May 13, 2015, p. 6583), “attacks women” (July 16, 2018, p. __) or protected classes (Oct. 26, 2017, p. __), or “says ugly things about women” (Nov. 21, 2019, p. __); (14) accusing such person of being “delusional” (*e.g.*, Dec. 9, 2015, pp. 19794, 19795), “paranoid” (Dec. 14, 2017, p. __), “mentally unwell” (Sept. 29, 2021, p. __), or “erratic and impetuous” (Jan. 24, 2019, p. __); (15) commenting derogatorily on physical attributes (May 24, 2016, p. 6997); (16) accusing

such person of engaging in “character assassination” or a “smear campaign” against others (Jan. 10, 2018, p. __); (17) alleging that such person mocked disabled individuals (Feb. 14, 2018, p. __); (18) referring to such person as a “moron” (Mar. 22, 2018, p. __), an “idiot” (Dec. 20, 2017), a “withering, blundering, failure” (Feb. 3, 2022, p. __), or of doing or saying stupid things (Oct. 26, 2017, p. __); (19) referring to such person as “greedy” (Apr. 17, 2018, p. __); (20) accusing such person of threats against public officials (Apr. 25, 2018, p. __); (21) questioning such person’s “reckless” and “negligent” personal conduct (May 24, 2018, p. __), doubting such person’s faithfulness to a spouse (*e.g.*, June 13, 2018, p. __), accusing such person of “using women” (June 28, 2018, p. __), or alleging that such person has a “sex tape” (July 18, 2018, p. __); (22) “soulless” (June 21, 2018, p. __) or “immoral” (*e.g.*, Sept. 25, 2017, p. __); (23) a “drama queen” (Dec. 20, 2018, p. __); (24) insinuating that such person acts according to his ego (Oct. 10, 2017, p. __), has a fragile ego (Nov. 29, 2017, p. __), or is “making the American people suffer for the sake of his ego” (Jan. 9, 2019, p. __); (25) accusing such person of “spreading evil” (Dec. 1, 2017, p. __); (26) accusing such person of vanity (July 11, 2019, p. __); (27) suggesting that such person was “struggling to stay awake” (June 24, 2021, p. __).

It is not in order to call the President a “liar” or accuse such person of “lying” (*e.g.*, June 26, 1985, p. 17394). Indeed, any suggestion of mendacity is out of order, such as: (1) suggesting that such person misrepresented the truth, attempted to obstruct justice, and encouraged others to perjure themselves (Feb. 25, 1998, p. 2621); (2) dishonesty (*e.g.*, July 13, 2004, p. 15275), failing to be honest (Apr. 14, 2011, p. 6198), making a “dishonest argument” (Sept. 12, 2006, p. 17851), or intent to be intellectually dishonest (May 9, 1990, p. 9828) or issue a false statement (Dec. 20, 2017, p. __), or stating that many were convinced such person had “not been honest” (Mar. 5, 1998, p. 2620), or stating that such person had “fallen quite short when it comes to fairness or honesty” (June 12, 2017, p. __); (3) “raping” the truth (Apr. 24, 1996, p. 8807), “contempt for the truth” (June 24, 2019, p. __), not telling the truth (*e.g.*, Oct. 29, 2003, p. 26363), distorting the truth (Sept. 9, 2003, pp. 21570–73), having only a “nodding acquaintance” with the truth (Mar. 1, 2017, p. 3291), or asserting that such person’s “relationship with the truth is complicated at best” (June 22, 2017, p. __); (4) not being “straight with us” (*e.g.*, Nov. 19, 2003, p. 29811) or “spoke out of the other side of his mouth” (Jan. 31, 2012, p. 525); (5) attributing “hypocrisy” (*e.g.*, Sept. 25, 1992, p. 27674); (6) “deceit” (Nov. 17, 2014, p. 15809), “deception” (*e.g.*, Sept. 28, 2016, p. 13894), being deceptive (*e.g.*, Mar. 29, 2004, pp. 5523, 5524), using “deceptive rhetoric” (Oct. 17, 2007, pp. 27534, 27538), or engaging in a “massive campaign of deception” (July 11, 2018, p. __); (7) making promises while having “no intention of living up to his promises” (Mar. 27, 2017, p. 4898) or stating that such person went back on (Dec. 20, 2018, p. __) or “personally reneged on” (Jan. 18, 2018, p. __) his word; (8) acting in a “duplicitous” manner (June 11, 2015, p. 9358); (9) acting in a “disingenuous” manner (Mar. 1,

2017, p. 3307); (10) fabricating an issue (*e.g.*, July 6, 2004, pp. 14313, 14314), “gaslighting” (Dec. 14, 2022, p. __), engaging in “scams” (May 22, 2019, p. __), “playing the American people for fools” (Oct. 19, 2021, p. __), or intending to mislead (*e.g.*, Oct. 6, 2004, p. 21053), such as pushing falsehoods (Aug. 24, 2021, p. __) or stating “blatant falsehoods” (Jan. 30, 2017, p. 1339); (11) engaging in “elaborate attempts to conceal information” (Dec. 14, 2017, p. __); (12) engaging in “defamation” (Dec. 14, 2017, p. __); (13) intentional mischaracterization, although mischaracterization without intent to deceive is not necessarily out of order (July 19, 2005, p. 16525); (14) cheating in an election (Aug. 22, 2020, p. __); (15) a “lying, dog-faced pony soldier” (May 10, 2022, p. __).

It is not in order to cast aspersions on the ethical behavior of the President, including: (1) alluding to unethical behavior or corruption (*e.g.*, June 20, 1996, p. 14829), such as implying a cause-and-effect relationship between political contributions and his actions as President (*e.g.*, May 22, 2001, p. 9028), including an accusation that the President had “lined the pockets” of his “political cronies” and filled “campaign coffers” (Sept. 14, 2005, pp. 20238, 20239); (2) using the Presidency for personal benefit (*e.g.*, Jan. 11, 2017, p. 583) or “self-enrichment” (*e.g.*, Apr. 17, 2018, p. __), or accusing the President of the “appearance of wrongdoing” and of “profiting illegally” from the office (Mar. 15, 2018, p. __); (3) questioning whether the President can “live up to the ethical requirements” of the office (Jan. 24, 2017, p. 1183); (4) calling such person “amoral” or lacking in morality (June 3, 2013, p. 7783; Nov. 16, 2016, p. 14390), or accusing such person of having “no conscience” (May 21, 2018, p. __); (5) referring to such person as having financial conflicts of interest (Dec. 11, 2018, p. __).

Accusations that the President has committed a crime, or even that the President has done something illegal, are unparliamentary. The following allegations are not in order: (1) “draft-dodger” (*e.g.*, Apr. 24, 1996, pp. 8807, 8808), unexcused absences from military service (May 5, 2004, pp. 8417, 8418), such as being “A.W.O.L.” (Sept. 22, 2004, p. 18953), dereliction of duty as Commander-in-Chief (*e.g.*, Oct. 22, 2015, pp. 16385, 16389), or of “abdication of duty” (Oct. 12, 2017, p. __); (2) discussing “charges” leveled at the President or under investigation (*e.g.*, Mar. 19, 1998, p. 4094), including alluding to “fund-raising abuses” (Mar. 14, 2000, p. 2716), speculating that the Vice President might someday pardon the President for certain charges (Apr. 12, 2000, p. 5419), or invoking a finding of personal liability by a court (May 24, 2016, p. 6998); (3) “crook” (*e.g.*, Mar. 1, 2017, p. 3241), “come clean” (Sept. 21, 2016, p. 13243), “fess up” (Feb. 6, 2017, p. 1849), or an allegation that the President has engaged in a “coverup” (May 22, 2019, p. __); (4) suggesting censure or impeachment (*e.g.*, Feb. 2, 2017, p. 1698); (5) discussing alleged criminal conduct (*e.g.*, Sept. 10, 1998, p. 19976), including an assertion that the President led a vast criminal enterprise for decades (Sept. 5, 2018, p. __); (6) obstruction of justice (*e.g.*, May 17, 2017, p. __) or speculation that a hypothetical action by the President would constitute obstruction of justice (Jan. 29, 2018, p. __); (7) accusations

of “illegal” activity or actions taken with the knowledge that they were not in accordance with the law (*e.g.*, June 20, 2006, p. 11935); (8) “above the law” (*e.g.*, June 18, 2012, p. 9191), “lawless” (*e.g.*, Aug. 1, 2014, p. 14017), violating the law (*e.g.*, July 29, 2014, p. 13385), breaking the law (Sept. 9, 2014, p. 14290), abusing the law (Feb. 27, 2015, p. 2907), assaulting the rule of law (May 16, 2017, p. __), disrespecting the rule of law (Sept. 27, 2018, p. __), or “beyond justice” (Apr. 11, 2018, p. __); (9) suggesting collusion with a foreign country to violate the integrity of a U.S. election (Mar. 29, 2017, p. 5048); (10) “shredding” (Apr. 19, 2016, p. 4563), having contempt for (*e.g.*, July 17, 2013, pp. 11608, 11609), having disrespect for (Feb. 3, 2014, p. 2389), decimating (Apr. 11, 2018, p. __), trampling upon (*e.g.*, Apr. 26, 2018, p. __), or raping (Feb. 26, 2019, p. __) the Constitution; (11) “con man” or “con artist” (*e.g.*, June 9, 2016, p. 8375); (12) alluding to alleged sexual misconduct (*e.g.*, May 10, 1994, p. 9697), labeling such person a sexual predator (Nov. 16, 2016, p. 14390), or accusing such person of bragging about sexual assault (May 16, 2018, p. __); (13) referring to such person as a “grifter” (Apr. 11, 2018, p. __); (14) alleging that such person is holding “innocent babies” hostage and referencing their placement in cages (June 19, 2018, p. __) or generally referring to such person’s “disregard for the well-being of children” (May 9, 2019, p. __); (15) accusing such person of child abuse (July 18, 2018, p. __) or encouraging others to commit assault (June 27, 2018, p. __); (16) accusing such person of treason (Dec. 14, 2017, p. __) or of potentially “treasonous” behavior (*e.g.*, July 16, 2018, p. __); (17) referring to such person as a “mobster, con man, gangster” (June 11, 2019, p. __) or a “mob boss” (June 11, 2019, p. __); (18) accusing such person of blackmailing a foreign leader (Sept. 24, 2019, p. __); (19) suggesting that such person is “helping” drug cartels with “their human trafficking business” (Apr. 16, 2021, p. __) or aiding and abetting drug cartels (Oct. 22, 2021, p. __), or calling such person the “trafficker-in-chief” (*e.g.*, Feb. 2, 2022, p. __).

References to racial or other discrimination on the part of the President are not in order. As such, remarks may not refer to the President as: (1) a racist (*e.g.*, June 9, 2016, p. 8375); (2) having made “racial slurs” or “racial epithets” (*e.g.*, Jan. 9, 2017, p. 392); (3) telling a “racist lie” (*e.g.*, Jan. 9, 2017, p. 392); (4) a bigot (*e.g.*, June 9, 2016, p. 8375), including by referring to bigotry emanating from the Presidency (*e.g.*, Jan. 16, 2019, p. __); (5) having made a bigoted or racist statement (*e.g.*, June 7, 2016, p. 7898); (6) having taken a bigoted action (Jan. 30, 2017, p. 1339) or “putting his bigotry into policy” (June 27, 2018, p. __); (7) not caring about black people (Sept. 8, 2005, p. 19797); (8) a misogynist (June 9, 2016, p. 8363) or a homophobe (Sept. 5, 2018, p. __); (9) having run a prejudiced campaign (Jan. 12, 2017, p. 854); (10) having engaged in “racist rhetoric” (Jan. 17, 2018, p. __), racist stereotyping (Oct. 23, 2017, p. __), or a “racist rant” (Feb. 6, 2018, p. __); (11) having “racist intentions” (Jan. 17, 2018, p. __) or “inciting racism” (Nov. 8, 2017, p. __); (12) normalizing bigotry (Jan. 30, 2018, p. __); (13) exhibiting “hatred for immigrants” (Feb. 27,

2018, p. __), demonizing immigrants (*e.g.*, Feb. 8, 2018, p. __), “hate peddling” (June 21, 2018, p. __) or having engaged in “hateful rhetoric” (Sept. 6, 2018, p. __), “hateful policies” (Feb. 26, 2019, p. __), condoning hate groups (June 11, 2019, p. __), “stoking the flames” of hate (July 24, 2019, p. __), “inhuman” behavior (Mar. 7, 2019, p. __) or fearmongering (Jan. 9, 2019, p. __; Jan. 10, 2019, p. __) with respect to immigrants; (14) holding the view that “crime and the skin color of a person are synonymous” (May 16, 2018, p. __); (15) “uniting hatred” (Sept. 25, 2017, p. __); (16) engaging in “xenophobic threats” (June 4, 2019, p. __); (17) having a “white nationalist agenda” (July 22, 2020, p. __).

Language impugning the patriotism or loyalty of the President is not in order, such as: (1) directly questioning patriotism (Sept. 9, 2016, p. 12156); (2) labeling the President as un-American or having an “un-American ideology” (*e.g.*, June 7, 2016, p. 7898) or “subverting democracy” (Apr. 17, 2018, p. __); (3) accusing the President of giving “aid and comfort to the enemy” (*e.g.*, Jan. 25, 1995, p. 2352), “aiding and abetting the enemy” (Apr. 22, 2004, pp. 7401, 7402), “aiding and abetting a terroristic regime” (Sept. 10, 2015, p. 13976), choosing terrorists over Americans (Mar. 9, 2022, p. __), or “sucking up to dictators” (June 7, 2018, p. __); (4) accusing the President of “spying” on Congress (*e.g.*, Jan. 7, 2016, p. 128); (5) equating the President’s decisions with regard to armed conflict to his having “slaughtered” thousands (Mar. 8, 2007, p. 5815) or that a soldier’s death was for his “amusement” (Oct. 18, 2007, pp. 27569, 27570); (6) accusing the President of having “hurt” Americans “out of spite” (July 28, 2017, p. __), of torturing the American people (Jan. 23, 2019, p. __), or of inflicting harm upon Americans (July 9, 2019, p. __); (7) alleging that the President “puts himself above his country” (July 17, 2018, p. __); (8) referring to the President’s “voter fraud playbook” (Dec. 11, 2018, p. __); (9) calling the President a “threat to national security” (Jan. 26, 2023, p. __).

Personally disparaging the manner in which the President carries out the duties of the office can constitute a personality, such as when the remarks suggest that the President is an undemocratic leader akin to a dictator. Remarks that have been held to be unparliamentary include: (1) an accusation of “abuse of power” or “abuse of the office” (*e.g.*, Sept. 9, 2014, p. 14314) or “abuse of executive privilege” (Apr. 27, 2016, p. 5239); (2) an accusation that the President “disrespected the office” (Mar. 27, 2017, p. 4898) or took an action “beneath the dignity of the office” (May 3, 2017, p. __); (3) an accusation of violating the oath of office (*e.g.*, Dec. 3, 2013, p. 18074); (4) likening the President to a “ruler” (*e.g.*, July 8, 2013, p. 10964), “king” (*e.g.*, July 17, 2013, p. 11622), “monarch” (Jan. 15, 2013, p. 218), “emperor” (Dec. 2, 2014, p. 16380), “modern-day pharaoh” (Jan. 23, 2019, p. __), a dictator (*e.g.*, Feb. 6, 2018, p. __), or accusing the President of “quasi-monarchical” behavior or of “royal pageantry” (July 11, 2019, p. __); (5) an accusation of “tyranny” (Mar. 16, 2016, p. 3317), of having “tyrannical impulses” (Oct. 20, 2021, p. __), or of admiring tyrants (Feb. 26, 2019, p. __); (6) an accusation of “demagoguery” or of being a

demagogue (*e.g.*, Jan. 23, 1996, p. 1144); (7) referring to the President as a “Manchurian President” (July 24, 2017, p. __); (8) an accusation that the President has brought shame upon the office (Dec. 1, 2017, p. __) or the nation (Dec. 12, 2017, p. __), “diminished” the office by turning it into a “Theatre of the Absurd” (Jan. 19, 2018, p. __), or is a “reality-show President” (Jan. 17, 2019, p. __); (9) an accusation of “authoritarian” behavior (Feb. 14, 2018, p. __); (10) accusing the President of “boot-licking” foreign leaders (July 18, 2018, p. __); referring to the President as a bully (Jan. 15, 2019, p. __) or a “billionaire bully” (Jan. 9, 2019, p. __).

The Chair may admonish Members transgressing this stricture even after other debate has intervened (Jan. 23, 1996, p. 1144; Apr. 27, 2016, p. 5239).

A Member may not read in debate extraneous material personally abusive of the President that would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words (Mar. 3, 1993, p. 3958; Nov. 15, 1995, p. 32587; May 2, 1996, p. 10010; Mar. 17, 1998, p. 3799; July 15, 2003, p. 18170; Sept. 16, 2003, pp. 22151, 22152; Oct. 17, 2007, p. 27538; Oct. 5, 2013, p. 15297; Sept. 28, 2015, p. 14945; Apr. 19, 2016, p. 4563; June 29, 2017, p. __; Jan. 17, 2018, p. __; July 12, 2018, p. __), such as material labeling the President's statement a lie (Sept. 10, 2014, p. 14416). This prohibition includes the recitation of another Member's criticism of the President made off the floor (even if recited as a rebuttal to such criticism) (Dec. 17, 1998, p. 27775; Apr. 18, 2016, p. 4499; Oct. 24, 2017, p. __).

Although wide latitude is permitted in debate on a proposition to impeach the President (V, 5093), Members must abstain from language personally offensive (V, 5094; Dec. 18, 1998, p. 27829); and Members must abstain from comparisons to the personal conduct of sitting Members of the House or Senate (Dec. 18, 1998, p. 27829). Furthermore, when impeachment is not the pending business on the floor, Members may not refer to evidence of alleged impeachable offenses by the President contained in a communication from an independent counsel pending before a House committee (Sept. 14, 1998, p. 20171; Sept. 17, 1998, p. 20758), although they may refer to the communication, itself, within the confines of proper decorum in debate (Oct. 6, 1998, p. 23841), and may not otherwise suggest that the President has done something worthy of censure or impeachment (*e.g.*, Feb. 2, 2017, p. 1698), including by reciting the vote totals on an impeachment resolution that had been previously laid on the table by the House (Dec. 7, 2017, p. __) or by urging the Senate to convict the President during a trial following his impeachment by the House (Jan. 29, 2020, p. __).

References in debate to former Presidents are not governed by these standards (Nov. 15, 1945, p. 10735; June 27, 2002, pp. 11844, 11845), nor are references to members of the President's Cabinet (Mar. 14, 2019, p. __).

The Chair has advised that the protections afforded by Jefferson's Manual and the precedents against unparliamentary references to the Presi-

dent, personally, do not necessarily extend to members of his family (Speaker Foley, July 12, 1990, p. 17206).

For discussion of the stricture against addressing remarks in debate to the President, as in the second person, see § 945, *infra*.

On January 27, 1909 (VIII, 2497), the House adopted a report of a committee appointed to investigate the question, which report in part stated:

“The freedom of speech in debate in the House should never be denied or abridged, but freedom of speech in debate does not mean license to indulge in personal abuses or ridicule. The right of Members of the two Houses of Congress to criticize the official acts of the President and other executive officers is beyond question, but this right is subject to proper rules requiring decorum in debate. Such right of criticism is inherent upon legislative authority. The right to legislate involves the right to consider conditions as they are and to contrast present conditions with those of the past or those desired in the future. The right to correct abuses by legislation carries the right to consider and discuss abuses which exist or which are feared.

“It is, however, the duty of the House to require its Members in speech or debate to preserve that proper restraint which will permit the House to conduct its business in an orderly manner and without unnecessarily and unduly exciting animosity among its Members or antagonism from those other branches of the Government with which the House is correlated.”

It is a breach of order in debate to notice what has been said on the same subject in the other House, or the particular votes or majorities on it there; because the opinion of each House should be left to its own independency, not to be influenced by the proceedings of the other; and the quoting them might beget reflections leading to a misunderstanding between the two Houses. 8 *Grey*, 22.

§ 371. References in debate to the other House and its Members.

Until former clause 1 of rule XIV (currently clause 1 of rule XVII) was amended in the 100th and 101st Congresses (H. Res. 5, Jan. 6, 1987, p. 6; H. Res. 5, Jan. 3, 1989, p. 72), this principle of comity and parliamentary law as described by Jefferson governed debate in the House to the full extent of its provisions (see generally, V, 5095–5130; VIII, 2501–21; July 31, 1984, p. 21670; Deschler-Brown, ch. 29, § 44). From the 101st Congress through the 108th Congress, clause 1 of rule XVII permitted some factual references that were a matter of public record, references to the pendency or sponsorship in the Senate of certain measures, factual descriptions con-