

Chapter 14 – Solons? The 81st Congress

Most of the 65 returning members of the Class of '46 had proved that they could achieve at least some level of legislative accomplishment, and they all scored definite electoral triumphs. There were now 106 representatives with less seniority than the least senior of the Class, who was John Whitaker of Kentucky.¹ Olin Teague of Texas, the most senior was now 259th on the seniority list. Being a sophomore was a long way from being a senior.

Nevertheless, there were perks. Class members had an opportunity to improve their office assignments. Seven already did so before the end of the 80th Congress. Thirty-two now changed offices, including Omar Burleson of Texas, Joe Evins of Tennessee, and Edward Miller of Maryland, who also moved during the previous House. Eighteen moved from the Old House Office Building to the New one. Seven were already in the New Building. No one moved from the New Building to the Old Building.

While having an improved office environment might enhance the member's presentation to constituents, lobbyists, donors, other members, and oneself, more directly relevant to the member's legislative activities were changes in committee assignments.

Some changes occurred before the end of the 80th Congress. Republican Caleb Boggs of Delaware moved from both House Administration and Expenditures in the Executive Departments to Judiciary in March 1948. Democrats Toby Morris of Oklahoma and John Bell Williams of Mississippi replaced House Administration with, respectively, Public Lands and Post Office and Civil Service in May. Democrat Robert Jones of Alabama added Public Works to District of Columbia in June. Democrat Carl Albert of Oklahoma moved from Post Office and Civil Service to Agriculture in August.

The partisan shift from the 80th to the 81st Congress resulted in a reallocation of committee seats. Democratic seats grew in number while Republican seats diminished. The Appropriations Committee, for example, changed from 25 Republican and 18 Democratic seats to 27 Democratic and 18 Republican. Such could result in Republican members losing their committee assignments. But then Ralph Harvey of Indiana and Walter Riehlman of New York left House Administration but not for lack of Republican seats. Perhaps because minority members did not want to sit on the Committee, three of the seven Republican seats, including Harvey's and Riehlman's, remained unassigned.

Frederic Coudert of New York, with the choicest committee assignment of any member of the Class of '46, retained his seat on Appropriations. He was now not even the lowest ranking Republican on the Committee, having advanced from 25th of 25 to 17th of 18. But now he was a minority member. Coudert was joined by Republican Norris Cotton of New Hampshire and two Democrats on the Appropriations Committee, Prince Preston of Georgia and Otto Passman of Louisiana, 20th and 21st respectively in seniority. Preston and Passman gave up their other committee assignments to make the change.

Political Scientist Richard Fenno would interview both Preston and Passman as to how they were given the seats. Preston reported, "I lobbied the members of the Ways and Means Committee for a whole year. The Speaker has a lot to do with it. If he hadn't supported me, I doubt that I would have made it. He will indicate to the Ways and Means Committee who he thinks ought to go on the committee, and I don't say they will always take his advice, but 95 per cent of the time they do." Passman told Fenno he made his wishes known to the Louisiana member on Ways and Means but did not talk to the Speaker. Passman also

¹ Nine of the members of the 81st Congress who did not serve in the 80th Congress had prior service.

got the endorsement of the other members of the Louisiana delegation, with a push by Sen. John Overton of the State.²

Two Democrats on Appropriations in the 80th Congress retired, leaving vacancies from Indiana and Florida, and one from Illinois moved to Ways and Means. The membership had been roughly representative of the geographic distribution of House Democrats after the 1946 election; the South was a little underrepresented (50% of the Committee versus 55% of the House), the North a little overrepresented (28% vs. 24%).³

More senior members from Florida, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and West Virginia were given seats on Appropriations in the 81st Congress, with precedence before Preston and Passman. Members from Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, Massachusetts, and Indiana were given seats with less seniority on the Committee than the two members of the Class. These last five arguably had fewer terms in the House than Preston and Passman; “arguably” because Louis Rabaut of Michigan was in his sixth term, but his tenure was interrupted in 1946 by Class member Harold Youngblood. The geographic effect of the new eleven members and the departure of three members was to bring the Committee membership closer to that of the distribution of Democrats in the House as a whole.⁴

That which can be said about Appropriations was generally true of all committees. Members left and members were added. Seniority on the committees was altered by increasing and decreasing partisan allocation of seats and who left and who joined. Members lobbied for assignments they wanted. The geographic distribution of assignments was a consideration.

The only other member of the Class of '46 to advance to one of the three exclusive committees (Rules, Appropriations, Ways and Means) was Democrat John Carroll of Colorado, who gave up Public Lands for a seat on Ways and Means. Political columnist Tris Coffin attributed the placement to returning Speaker Sam Rayburn and called Carroll “the great white hope of the liberal-labor folks.”⁵

Among major committees below the top three, Democrat Frank Wilson of Texas moved to Judiciary from Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Democrat Laurie Battle of Alabama traded Post Office and Civil Service for Foreign Affairs, Democrat Charles Deane of North Carolina gave up District of Columbia for Banking and Currency, Republican Thruston Morton of Kentucky surrendered Post Office for Education and Labor, and much later in the 81st Congress, on March 1, 1950, Republican Herbert Meyer of Kansas would take Armed Services in addition to Veterans' Affairs.

Republican Edward Jenison of Illinois moved to Post Office from Public Lands, seemingly a step in the opposite direction, probably resulting from a reduction in the number of Republican seats on Public Lands. There were ten places in the new configuration (plus one for the Hawaii delegate) and ten carry-overs from the old membership had Jenison stayed. As it was, his change freed a place for John Saylor, a freshman from Pennsylvania. Then on June 20, 1950, Jenison reversed the change, moving back to Public Lands from Post Office thanks to a slot made available by the death of William Lemke of North Dakota.

² Preston interview. Passman interview (1959). *The Monroe News-Star*, May 11, 1948. *The Shreveport Times*, March 7, 1948.

³ More geographic detail reveals that East South Central states were overrepresented and East North Central states were doubly represented (17% vs. 8% of the House), while Middle Atlantic, South Atlantic, and West South Central states were underrepresented.

⁴ The mean difference between Committee and House membership for a four-part regional division (North, South, Border, West) dropped from 2.7 points to 1.0 point. The mean difference for a nine-part regional division dropped from 5.0 points to 2.8 points.

⁵ *Cumberland Sunday Times*, December 19, 1948.

Trading committees generally meant a loss of seniority. Battle would have been fourth among Democrats on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee had he stayed, while becoming eighth on Foreign Affairs. Morton would have been fifth on Post Office, but became seventh on Education and Labor. Wilson would have been sixth on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, traded for tenth on Judiciary. The major committee was possibly worth the loss of seniority.

Members of the Class also had the opportunity to add second committees to their portfolios. Albert and Don Wheeler of Georgia added House Administration. John Blatnik of Minnesota and Harold Donohue of Massachusetts added Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Democrat Edward Garmatz of Maryland took on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Porter Hardy of Virginia joined Armed Services. Henderson Lanham of Georgia acquired Public Works. Monroe Redden of North Carolina took a seat on the District of Columbia Committee. Ken Regan of Texas moved onto Public Lands. George Smathers of Florida added Foreign Affairs, it was reported as part of a Sam Rayburn effort to raise the competence of a committee that was insignificant before the War. Thomas Stanley of Virginia went onto Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Burleson eventually added Foreign Affairs on March 16, 1949, after Sol Bloom of New York died, creating a vacancy. All these were Democrats, but Republican Carroll Kearns of Pennsylvania took on District of Columbia on April 4, 1950, when George Bates of Massachusetts died.⁶ While the acquisitions of Garmatz, Hardy, Lanham, and Regan had clear relevance to their districts, and those of Smathers, Stanley, and Burleson were prestigious, one guesses the extra workloads of Albert, Wheeler, Blatnik, Donohue, Redden, and Kearns were assumed to please the leadership.

Five other committee changes are worthy of note. Seats on the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business were taken by Democrats Evins and Hardy, the latter earlier, on August 14, 1948. This committee was the only assignment of specially-elected Republican Franklin Lichtenwalter of Pennsylvania in the 80th Congress. Now he added Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Democrat Burr Harrison of Virginia took a seat on Un-American Activities. Republican Donald Jackson of California would, too, but not until December 14, 1950. The small and contentious HUAC had become a permanent committee in 1945. Small and placid Small Business would not do so until 1975.

While the seniority standing of the Class in the overall House was low, that in various committees, generally speaking the least valued, could be promising for those who stayed with their initial assignments. Three Class members placed 3rd: Harrison on House Administration out of 17 Democrats, Lanham on Expenditures in Executive Departments out of 17 Democrats, and Riehlman on Expenditures in Executive Departments out of 7 Republicans, as well as on Small Business out of 4 Republicans.⁷ Richard Nixon of California scored even better on HUAC, second of four Republicans. HUAC, while hardly considered a major committee, had made Nixon a household name.

Ten Class members were fourth on their committees: Democrats Burleson on House Administration, James Davis of Georgia on Post Office, Hardy on Expenditures in Executive Departments, and Teague on

⁶ MacNeil, 160. Bates died on November 1, 1949, in a midair collision at National Airport, now Ronald Reagan National.

⁷ The new chair of Expenditures in Executive Departments was William Dawson of Chicago, the first African American to chair a House committee. It was a testament to the seniority system that Dawson became chair without visible contention. His biographer attributed the lack of disputation to John McCormack, who surrendered the first chair to Dawson when McCormack recaptured the majority leadership. Carl Albert attributed it to the system. Lanham and Hardy served on the Committee along with another Southerner. Lanham, reportedly, visited Dawson's office to let him know he was positive about the arrangement. Nelson, 414-6. Albert with Goble, 219-20. Drew Pearson, January 21, 1949.

Veterans' Affairs; Republicans Harvey on Expenditures in Executive Departments, Lichtenwalter on Small Business, Meyer on Veterans Affairs, Katharine St. George of New York on Post Office, Wint Smith of Kansas on Education and Labor, and Thor Tollefson on Merchant Marine.

The greatest leap in committee seniority was that of Riehlman on Expenditures in Executive Departments. At initial assignment he was 14th of 15. His advancement to 3rd of 7 was aided by Caleb Boggs' departure in 1948 for Judiciary and that of James Wadsworth of New York for District of Columbia and the defeats for reelection of five, including Classmate Melvin Snyder of West Virginia. Three others resigned from the Committee, having other assignments. And Ross Rizley of Oklahoma did not run for reelection, making an unsuccessful try for the Senate.

Harvey on the same committee moved from fourteenth to fourth, aided by the same individual movements as Riehlman. When Harvey joined the Committee after his special election, Riehlman had already moved from fourteenth to thirteenth, thanks to Boggs' move to Judiciary.

All of the bigger jumps in seniority were Republicans, thanks to electoral defeat and members giving up second committee assignments among the fewer Republican seats available.

Seniority did not necessarily translate to clout. Republicans as the minority party were undoubtedly left at a disadvantage on committees. Some were arguably worse off than others, last among the lot being those with one minor committee assignment. That would be Glenn Davis of Wisconsin and Dayton Phillips of Tennessee on Veterans' Affairs, Antoni Sadlak of Connecticut and St. George on Post Office, and, worst of all, Harvey on Expenses in the Executive Departments, presumably with the Democratic majority much less inclined on this investigatory body to look into the Democratic administration.

Among Democrats the short straws were pulled by Hamilton Jones of North Carolina on Veterans' Affairs, Whitaker on Post Office, and, sharing Harvey's inactivity from the other side of the aisle, Frank Karsten of Missouri on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Karsten may have been an even bigger loser than his continuation on this committee alone would indicate. Reportedly, Labor lobbied Rayburn to put him on Ways and Means, but the nod went to six other Democrats, none on Labor's short list.⁸

One assumes that anyone who would have gone to the time, effort, and expense to run for a Congressional seat would have likely been an optimist. Winning reelection should have confirmed that optimism and encouraged the member to consider longer term options of a personal nature.

One of these options would have been an improved District residence. Putting up with a "black hole of Calcutta" residence might have been acceptable as a temporary expedient, but not as a longer term consideration, particularly if a family accompanied.⁹ At least 21 of the 65 returning members of the Class changed District domiciles either late in the 80th Congress or in the 81st Congress. Thirteen of these had reported changes for the special session in 1948, likely indicating that their earlier residence was unavailable on the short notice for that session. Of those who reported a District home in 1949, none kept this special session residence.

The relocations had two countervailing trends. Five members moved from within to outside the District, while four members moved closer to work, specifically to the private Congressional Hotel, which opened in 1948 across the street from the Old House Office Building.¹⁰

⁸ *Cumberland Sunday Times*, December 19, 1948.

⁹ This member kept the black hole for two more terms.

¹⁰ "Welcome to the Hotel Congressional."

Another change was in family. All but four of the married 65 had indicated that their spouses accompanied them in Washington when they were first elected. Kenneth Keating's wife of New York, now challenged with multiple sclerosis, joined these stay-at-home spouses by 1948, those of Cotton, Morton, and Sadlak in 1949, and those of Watkins Abbitt of Virginia, Jackson, and Edward Jenison of Illinois in 1950.¹¹ Presumably there was some dimming of the glow of the seat of national power as well as competing demands from family and home, and the realization that the semiannual major relocations accompanying seven month sessions, the trips back-and-forth to the district during the session, and the workload of the member while in session were detriments to marital conviviality. Twenty of the sixty-five had no spouse. Still, that left most (barely) members accompanied, at least on paper.

The legislative work remained constant, with the major change that now the Democrats replaced the Republicans in control of the process. One might have assumed that the 81st House would be quicker off the mark than the 80th, given that the earlier contended with a new arrangement of committees due to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the new committees were served by Republican chairs and staff that were new to their roles. Democratic chairs and staff in large part returned to their accustomed jobs in 1949. Such speed, however, was not the case overall with respect to proposed legislation.

By the end of the first regular session in 1947 14% of bills introduced by members of the Class of '46 had made it to at least a committee report. In 1949 the figure for the Class was 12%. But then a committee report is a positive act, and the Democratic-led committees may have simply been more critical of the Class's proposed legislation. They were, however, faster in reporting private bills, public bills being the cause of the relative delay.

One would assume that the sophomores of the Class of '46 in 1949 might be more adept than the freshmen of 1947 at preparing bills that would get a positive consideration by committee. Such evidence is lacking. Perhaps the responsiveness of the Republican led committees in 1947 to 65 Republican members of the class shamed that of the Democratic led committees in 1949 to 32 Democratic members.

Volume may explain the fall-off in reporting. And the greater increase in bills was in public bills, which leaped from 370 to 870. Private bills increased in number from 285 to 489. These are numbers in both congresses only for the 65 sophomores. Thirteen of this group were chosen in special elections and served abbreviated terms in the 80th Congress, but, even assuming that the late-comers introduced legislation at the same rate over an extended period, the Class increased its bill production by 96% and that of resolutions by a huge 369%.

The increase in bills and resolutions may be attributable to greater familiarity with the job of representative and greater confidence. Those new representatives who said they would watch and learn had sometimes did so. Also, bills often do not spring from the desires and observations of individual representatives or from their staff, but rather from interested groups and individuals who seek a sponsor for their legislative goals. A second-term representative would be a more attractive sponsor than a first-term. This may be especially true of private bills for the benefit of specific individuals or corporations. Nevertheless, public bills saw the greater increase.

The desire of interested parties for a more effective sponsor of proposed legislation could explain why there was a shift from Republicans to Democrats, from the old majority party to the new majority party, in the numbers of introduced bills. The number of bills introduced by Republicans increased from 369 to

¹¹ *The Daily Herald*, November 11, 1957. *Brownsville Herald*, September 24, 1947. *Abilene Reporter-News*, October 1, 1947. USGenWeb.org. *Time*, October 30, 1964.

653, a 69% increase, allowing for the short terms of some representatives. The number from Democrats grew from 286 to 706, a 130% increase. The Republicans introduced 56% of the bills from the Class sophomores in the 80th House, but only 48% of those in the 81st. The change from the 80th to the 81st was greater for public bills than for private bills. Public bills increased by 154% for Democrats and 85% for Republicans. Private bills increased by 88% for Democrats and 52% for Republicans. Parties interested in private legislation had fewer alternative representatives than did those concerned about public issues. Representatives would be less attentive to sponsoring aid for individuals who were not their own constituents.

Two members of the Class did not increase their production of bills. Albert introduced one less bill in the 81st House, and there was a reduction in his private bills from 8 to 5. Public bills increased from 8 to 10. Phillips introduced two fewer bills in the 81st, dropping from 11 to 9, public bills declining from 10 to 7, while private bills doubled from 1 to 2.

Six representatives who sponsored no bills in the 80th Congress, made introductions in the 81st: Donald Nicholson of Massachusetts (11), Whitaker (10), Abbitt (9), Cotton (5), Paul Dague of Pennsylvania (5), and Lichtenwalter (4). Abbitt, Lichtenwalter, Nicholson, and Whitaker were short-termers in the 80th.

In general, the members who were most active in introducing legislation in the 80th House were also the most active in the 81st. The major exceptions in public bills were Teague, who introduced 8 in the 80th and 51 in the 81st, John Kennedy of Massachusetts – 9 and 46, and Abraham Multer of New York, who served only half of the 80th term – 12 and 47. These were Democrats.

Those with large increases in private bills were Multer – 3 and 20, Nixon – 6 and 24, and Jacob Javits of New York – 12 and 30. The last two were Republicans.

There remained a wide range of activity in the introduction of legislation, wider even than in the 80th Congress, since no one could introduce negative numbers of bills and resolutions and two Republican representatives continued to initiate nothing. Jenison remained totally inactive in this regard. So did William McCulloch of Ohio, who at least had the excuse in the 80th Congress of serving only half the legislative days.

The Class saw 10% of their public bills enacted in the 81st Congress and a rather impressive 26% of private bills. The corresponding figures for the larger Class in the 80th Congress were 6% and 10%. Was this substantial jump due to institutional differences between the congresses, increased experience by the members of the Class, the natural abilities of those of the Class who survived the 1948 elections, an improvement in staffing, or something else?

The sophomore members of the Class witnessed 7% of their public bills and 10% of their private bills enacted in the 80th Congress. If they had greater innate skills as freshmen members than their soon-to-be fallen compatriots, it does not show in those figures.

Members of the majority party were more successful in getting bills enacted in each congress. Republican members of the Class had 8% of their public bills and 11% of their private bills become law in the 80th Congress. The figures for Democrats were 3% and 9%. In the 81st Congress, 8% of public and 22% of private bills sponsored by Democrats were enacted. The figures for Republicans were 5% and 18%. The partisan advantage between the two congresses was virtually identical in the case of private bills, with about twice as many in percentage terms enacted in the latter congress for both parties. With respect to public bills, Republicans had a better chance of success in the Democratic controlled congress than

Democrats did in the Republican controlled congress. The overall improvement in public bill enactment in the 81st Congress was due to gains by the minority party.

Enactment required a journey through the Senate and the Executive as well as the House. Restricting the analysis to the rate by which bills passed the House, one sees little change from the above conclusions with respect to private bills, but a greater advantage to majority party members for public bills. That is, the House was somewhat more partisan than the Senate and the Executive in its handling of public bills. Given that the President was a Democrat during both congresses, this might be expected, although the 81st House appears to have been more partisan relative to the Senate and the Executive than was the 80th House.

If one pushes the legislative process even farther back, to whether a bill was even reported by committee, the only noteworthy difference that emerges is that Democratic public bills were somewhat more successful in getting reported and then passed by the House in the 80th Congress relative to Republican public bills in the 81st House. This could have been due to somewhat greater hostility by the Rules Committee, the majority leadership, or by the membership as a whole in the 81st.

In summary, the partisan handling of bills resulted in (1) greater success by members of the majority party, (2) the minority party was better served with respect to public bills in the 81st Congress, (3) the House as a whole was more hostile to minority public bills than was the committee structure in the 80th Congress, and (4) private bills were less susceptible to partisan considerations. The lesser partisanship with respect to public bills contributed a little to the increased enactments of the 81st Congress.

The greater likelihood that a bill introduced by a member of the referred committee also added a little to the number of Class bills that became law in the 81st Congress. The proportion of public bills introduced that met this scenario increased from 28% in the 80th to 30% in the 81st House. The curiosity is that the increase was so small. More experienced members, some on more attractive committees, might be expected to have played the game more effectively. Thirty-eight of the Class sophomores did increase their introduction of bills intended for their committees. Twelve introduced fewer bills of this type. Such bills by the Sophomores increased from 85 in the 80th to 261 in the 81st Congress, changing from 23% of all public bills to 30%. Thus, there is evidence for legislative education on the part of sophomores, who, it turns out, were a less legislatively active group than the entire original complement of the Class, in part because thirteen of them served only part of the 80th Congress.

Membership in a group of 435 people argues for a targeted approach to legislative accomplishment. Representatives find it advantageous in that regard to specialize on public policy topics. This improves their chances of getting bills and resolutions approved, amendments adopted, and of swaying action on measures in committee and on the floor. Being a recognized expert in an area also enables influence with executive actors and, not incidentally, interest groups, the media, and constituents, all of whom can aid a long political career.

A member may arrive in the House with interest or even expertise in a particular area, but the representative may also have greatness thrust upon him or her. Democrat Teague, like so many of his classmates, was assigned to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs rather than his preferred Armed Services Committee. In the 80th Congress he introduced two veterans bills, neither being reported. When Lyndon Johnson gave up a Texas seat on Armed Services to take a Senate seat, Teague wanted to replace him.¹²

¹² *Abilene Reporter-News*, May 19, 1948.

Such was not to be, and finding himself already fourth in seniority among Democrats on Veterans' Affairs, he threw himself in. In the 81st Congress he introduced 26 veterans bills. Alas, none became law, but three did make it out of committee. Teague also served on the District of Columbia Committee; he was sixth in seniority. He introduced no DC bills.

Other similar evidence of using the hand one has been dealt includes James Davis of Georgia, who wanted the Commerce Committee, but was given Post Office and District of Columbia. He introduced a total of four bills for those committees in the 80th and fifteen in the 81st. Evins wanted the Judiciary Committee and got Veterans' Affairs, where he was one seniority position behind Teague. His veterans introductions went from three to eleven. John Kennedy of Massachusetts was on Education and Labor and District of Columbia. His committee bills went from 0 to 14, with the larger number, 9, in DC, perhaps because the high-handedness of the chair of Education and Labor, John Lesinski of Michigan, closed off some possibilities in that more prestigious venue.¹³

Other members changed committees in the 81st Congress, resulting in a jump in output of bills. Williams introduced no bills destined for the House Administration Committee on which he found himself in the 80th Congress. He moved to Post Office and introduced ten bills for that committee in the 81st. Morris also changed from House Administration, in his case to Public Lands. He introduced no bills for the former committee and a phenomenal twenty-five for the latter.

Some focused on what they had. Multer, placed on Banking and Currency in his shorter tenure in the 80th Congress, expanded his committee bills from two to ten in the 81st. Keating was active with eight Judiciary bills in the 80th Congress and expanded that to fourteen in the 81st.

Kennedy's activism in introducing legislation went far beyond his committees. In the 81st Congress he introduced 74 bills, more than any other member of the Class. Of these, 46 were public, and 28 were private. Six of the private bills became law, and another was vetoed by the President. Three other private bills passed the House. Two of his public bills were enacted. Successful bills require work, not only in the drafting but in the lobbying to bring them to the attention of overworked committees and to gather the necessary support of members. Representatives relied on their staff or on lobbyists for much of the work of drafting, but the volume of production and review required an active office. Kennedy offered no floor amendments in this Congress, but as discussions of particular issues that follow in this chapter will indicate, he was quite active in committee.

This level of involvement conflicts with the later post-mortem evaluations of Kennedy as an indifferent member of the House. Richard Bolling (D MO), who replaced Class member Albert Reeves in the House in 1949 and served until 1983, including two terms as chair of the Committee on Rules, would describe Kennedy thusly in a 1965 interview:

It seemed to me by the time I got here, in 1949, that he was already running for something else. He was pleasant and attractive, but he just wasn't much of a House member. That has often happened with House members who have their eye on the Senate or a governorship. ... he was just another vote, you might say, and sometimes that was a very independent vote. I think that would be the one characteristic I remember about him then—that he voted the way he damn well pleased.¹⁴

At one point, Bolling would characterize Kennedy as "a third-rater. I don't mean second rater, either." Charles Bartlett, a reporter and friend, would say of Kennedy in 1965 that "in the House he didn't feel

¹³ *The Atlanta Constitution*, January 5, 1947. *Kingsport Times*, July 6, 1947. Drew Pearson, January 20, 1949.

¹⁴ Bolling Interview.

busy. You never felt that he was really enjoying himself. He went off every weekend, usually to Florida or Hyannis Port. You didn't feel that he was really seized by the House." Republican Classmate Harvey would write dismissively in 1975, "Kennedy did not spend much time on the Floor while in the House...." Eugene McCarthy (D MN), who replaced Class member Edward Devitt in 1949, would say in 1980 of Kennedy in the House, "Well, I guess if you don't want to work for a living, this is as good a job as any." Thomas O'Neill (D MA), later the Speaker, but who did not serve in the House with Kennedy, would write in 1987, "In all my years in public life, I've never seen a congressman get so much press while doing so little work. He didn't pay much attention to the public-service part of the job, either."¹⁵

A somewhat more contemporary opinion was that attributed to Speaker Sam Rayburn in the context of Kennedy's run for the presidential nomination in 1960: "Jack is one of the laziest men I ever talked to." Even Ted Sorensen, a close adviser to Kennedy, would write in 1965, "Some might say that he fiddled around as a Congressman and really didn't become interested until his sophomore year in the Senate." Author Lance Morrow would sum these assessments up in 2005: "Kennedy attended to his always fragile health, and to a variety of attractive women. He went to New York as often as he could to see the Broadway shows. The day-to-day business of his congressional office was tedious; he left it to his staff." Robert Caro would write in 2012 that, due in part to health issues, Kennedy's "rate of absenteeism was one of the highest in the House."¹⁶

Rayburn's biographers would excuse their subject's negative evaluation of Kennedy by writing, "He had observed the handsome war hero when he first came to Congress as a House member and pegged him as a wealthy dilettante." Rep. Edward Hébert (D LA) would write that he heard Rayburn say in the 1950s, "'Jack Kennedy will always be a little boy to me."¹⁷ Hale Boggs (D LA), who rejoined the House in 1949 and professed a greater appreciation of Kennedy, described his appearance:

I remember very well when I first met Jack Kennedy, and the reason I remember it is that *Life* magazine had written a piece about his campaign for Congress.... The family name was well known. I had known the [Kennedy père] Ambassador when I was a very young Congressman. ... So I was interested in meeting Jack Kennedy, and when I met him he was, as so many people would say, not too impressive. He was a kind of a tall fellow. He didn't comb his hair very much. He didn't care much about the way he looked. In those days he was really a very careless dresser. ... In any event, at that particular time he paid practically no attention to it and oftentimes he would walk around with khaki trousers on and some nondescript looking coat!¹⁸

The emaciated, frail, ostentatiously rich, handsome, playa, who looked and dressed younger than his actual 30s, did not impress. People underrated Kennedy and continued to do so through his presidency and beyond.

Still, there is a truth in the assessments. Failing to impress by appearance is useful largely in the ability to catch others unaware, but this is not a skill valued in the House. Short-term victories lead to long-term defeats in a body in which the members interact with each other on many matters over an extended period. Did Kennedy expect a number of terms in the House? Bolling would say later that Kennedy was "already running for something else" in 1949. Political scientist James McGregor Burns, who was also a would-be Democratic Massachusetts politician, would write in 1960 that Kennedy was never attracted to a House career. This was not only true of Kennedy as well as Bryan Dorn of South Carolina and Glen

¹⁵ Nelson, 457. Charles Bartlett interview, 3. Harvey, 83. Collier and Horowitz, 172, 495. O'Neill with Novak, 87.

¹⁶ Hardeman and Bacon, 434. Sorensen, 27. Sorensen joined Kennedy's staff only in 1953. Lance Morrow, 3. Caro (2012), 29.

¹⁷ Hardeman and Bacon, 404. Hébert and McMillan, 227.

¹⁸ Hale Boggs interview.

Johnson of Oklahoma, who left the House after one term for tries at the Senate, but of others. Nixon wrote to a friend and political adviser in August 1949, "I do not see any great gain in remaining a member of the House...."¹⁹

Kennedy's activism, or that of his office, in producing bills was, however, broad. While nine of his public bills went to his District of Columbia Committee, this was a small part of his total production of 46. On the other hand, Abbitt and Albert focused on agriculture and their Agriculture Committee. The former was successful with a major bill on crop insurance (HR 3825) and the latter successfully pushed an amendment to increase peanut acreage allotments, important for his District and a point of pride to the sophomore. Albert's description of the activism required for his peanut amendment serves as an illustration of what a member needed to do to achieve a legislative goal.

I got a membership list from the Oklahoma Peanut Growers Association, and I got on the phone to every member. I called every peanut processor and sheller in the state. I called every banker in every peanut-producing county in Oklahoma. I told each of them the same thing. I told them that Senator Thomas needed to be educated about just how important that peanut amendment was to Oklahoma. ... The next thing I knew, Elmer Thomas invited me, a very junior congressman, to meet with his Senate conferees. I told them the plain truth in a politician's language, 'I can't get a peanut bill to pass alone, but Senator [Clinton] Anderson has a horse that will ride, and I want this peanut amendment to ride on it.' Senator Thomas threw several hundred telegrams on the table and spoke even plainer: 'There won't be any [Anderson] cotton bill until Carl Albert is satisfied on peanuts.'²⁰

This effort in the Senate was only after the amendment made it through the House subcommittee, Agriculture Committee, Rules Committee, and floor.

Harrison, whose output of bills was minimal – four – and none for his committees of House Administration and Un-American Activities, nevertheless spent inordinate time and energy on a bill to revise the Hatch Act. HR 1243 was not Harrison's bill, but rather that of Hugh Mitchell (D WA) and it sought to enable Federal employees to participate in partisan politics on the local level. Harrison's Virginia District did not impinge on the suburbs of Washington City, with its large Federal employee base, but his effort might have been appreciated by his powerful colleague Howard Smith whose District did. Harrison was appointed to the conference committee that worked for over three months to reconcile the different versions, and he "led the fight for approval of the conference report." Truman vetoed that bill, but a similar one, HR 9023, was eventually enacted.²¹

The notable effort by Jackson in the 81st House was the transfer of funding for the International Children's Emergency Fund to the World Health Organization, arguing that many of the needs were caused by long-term problems of "bad governments" and not the short-term effects of the War. He also argued that the international effort was a rare area of cooperation between the West and the Soviet countries, the latter providing one-third of the funding. Jackson presented the Foreign Affairs minority report on HR 2785 and achieved the amendment of the bill on the floor. The bill was enacted as amended.²²

¹⁹ Burns (1960), 99-101. Nixon, *Memoirs*, 72.

²⁰ Albert with Goble, 179-81.

²¹ *CQ Almanac 1950*, on line.

²² *CQ Almanac 1950*, on line.

Morris introduced 22 bills dealing with Indians and not just those of Oklahoma. Seven of the bills were specific to Indians in Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah. Eleven of his bills passed the House, three of these were enacted, and two others vetoed.

Keating specialized in budget cutting amendments. He failed to cut 25% from authorized reclamation projects, 20% from Federal aid for highways, disaster relief, and new judgeships in Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. Turning his attention to increasing spending, he nevertheless failed on an amendment to increase the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Another kind of specialization was that of Hardy. Appointed as chair of the Government Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Hardy led an investigation of ship subsidies by the Maritime Commission. While avoiding charges of dishonesty, the Subcommittee recommended recovering some of the benefits to shipping lines and a revision of statutes to prevent future issues. The approach won over the initially hostile Chair of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Chair of the Commission. It may not have hurt that Hardy took seven other representatives to visit Truman to discuss the Commission. This experience determined a House career of investigations by Hardy. In 1950 alone Hardy's subcommittee investigated the National Service Life Insurance program, electric co-ops, and the TVA.²³

The Truman Administration, now with a Democratic Congress, proposed a collection of "Fair Deal" legislation: Repeal Taft-Hartley, increase and expand the minimum wage, provide Federal aid to education, create a Department of Defense, enact universal military training, create a Department of Welfare, increase taxes, expand manufacturing through government construction - all of which failed wholly or partially. A public housing proposal succeeded in the first session, as did continuation of the Marshall Plan, an extension of the Trade Agreements Act, and ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty. The second session enacted an expansion of Social Security, though not to the extent requested by Pres. Truman, particularly rejecting what 20 years later would become Medicare. The President's Civil Rights initiatives went nowhere, though his desegregation of the armed forces under his executive authority held fast. The invasion of South Korea by the North on June 25, 1950, resulted in an expansion of the war powers of the president, extension of selective service, and an increase in military spending and manpower, and did not hurt the potential enactment of a communist control bill.²⁴

Legislative review of the North Atlantic Treaty that established NATO was outside the purview of the House but was important in the consideration of a military aid proposal by the Administration that eventually became the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 (HR 5895). Whereas earlier such aid, as to Greece or China, was to meet particular emergencies, this act began a long series of repetitive appropriations to a variety of nations to attempt to halt the expansion and effect the containment of communism. As enacted, the Act provided one billion dollars for NATO, \$200 million for Greece and Turkey, \$75 million for China, and \$28 million for Iran, Korea, and the Philippines.²⁵

The Administration requested none for China, Secretary of State Dean Acheson writing on March 15, 1949, that additional funds were not likely to change anything; in other words, the Nationalist forces were

²³ *CQ Almanac 1949*, on line. Drew Pearson, October 20, December 19, 1949. Truman calendar, May 2, 1950, Truman Library. Poissant, 365. *Breckenridge American*, August 13, 1950. *The News*, August 23, 1950. *Lincoln Evening Journal*, January 5, 1950.

²⁴ Boeckel, "81st Congress (second session)."

²⁵ Boeckel, "81st Congress (first session)."

going to be driven from the mainland by the Communist forces in any event. In August the Administration published 1054 pages of documentation on America's relations with China, contending that two billion dollars had already been spent on the Nationalists to no good effect. Jackson was one of three Republicans issuing a minority report from the Foreign Affairs Committee opposing HR 5895 as creating "an unrealistic sense of security" in western Europe that "would impede essential economic recovery."²⁶ The report contended that only air power would save western Europe. John Davis Lodge of Connecticut was part of another three-man Republican minority report that objected to the lack of money for the Nationalist Chinese. Lodge offered an unsuccessful amendment to send not only money to China but American soldiers.

Korea, a former Japanese colony adjacent to China, with military occupation duties divided between the USSR and the USA, elicited similar concerns. The Soviets enabled the declaration of a government in the North in September 1948, which was followed by an American endorsed South in January 1949. Occupation forces largely withdrew from both states. Economic aid for the South was enacted in the third deficiency appropriation bill and the second supplemental appropriation bill in 1949, totaling \$60 million.²⁷

An Administration request for another \$150 million for economic aid for South Korea, reduced by committee to \$60 million in a stand-alone bill (HR 5330), was defeated by one vote in the House on January 19, 1950. Congressional Quarterly attributed the defeat to dissatisfaction with Administration policy resulting from the Nationalist defeat in China. The bill elicited concerns from Republicans on the Foreign Affairs Committee, fearing that money to Korea would end up in the same "basic rat hole" as money sent to China, but House Republicans and Administration Democrats had two different Chinese rat holes in mind. For the former it was the potential that the funds would end up under communist control, while for the latter it was that the funds would be peculated by the government in the South. Lodge offered an amendment in June 1949 to require South Korean aid to be stopped if the country formed a coalition government including communists or if the government collaborated with the North Koreans. This resolved Republican concerns and enabled the Committee to report the amended bill. Jackson spoke on the floor in opposition to HR 5330, contending that South Korea had "no strategic position with respect to our national defense," was indefensible for the United States and as good as lost to the communists. Lodge introduced HR 5916 to provide \$200 million in military aid to the Chinese Nationalists. The Administration's HR 5330 for South Korea was non-military. Lodge's bill did not make it out of committee.²⁸

The vote on HR 5330 was heavily partisan, with Democrats outside the South supporting the bill 126-15, Republicans opposing it 21-130, and Southern Democrats split 43-46. Among the Class, the only non-Southern Democrat opposed was Morris of Oklahoma. Republicans who supported the bill were Lodge and Javits and Riehlman. Southern Democrats voting for the bill were Robert Jones, Battle, Lanham, Deane, Hamilton Jones, Redden, Evins, Burleson, and Hardy. Nays were Preston, James Davis, Wheeler, Passman, Williams, Wilson, Teague, Lucas, Regan, and Harrison.²⁹

²⁶ McCullough, 743.

²⁷ Boeckel, "81st Congress (first session)."

²⁸ "Record of the 81st Congress (Second session)." *CQ Almanac 1949*, on-line.

²⁹ Democrats not voting were John Whitaker of Kentucky and John Blatnik of Minnesota. Republican not voting was Dayton Phillips of Tennessee. Republicans John Allen of California paired for the bill, while Kingsland Macy and Coudert of New York paired against. Southern Democrats not voting were George Smathers of Florida and Abbitt and Stanley.

The vote on Korea was then reversed 21 days later (S 2319). Jackson, who had answered present in the 17-1 committee vote to report the new bill, issued a minority report on behalf of himself, Lodge, and three other Republicans, observing that the bill would aid a former enemy, as Korea was part of the Japanese Empire, while no aid was to be forthcoming to the Chinese Nationalists, an ally during the Second World War.³⁰ Ten of the Class switched their votes (including pairs) to support the new bill: Republicans Nixon, Caleb Boggs, John Sanborn, Morton, Miller, Cotton, Coudert, and Tollefson and Democrats Preston and Teague. Democrats Whitaker, Blatnik, and Abbitt voted for the new bill after sitting out the first bill. Republican Phillips and Democrat Stanley voted nay after not voting the first time. Republicans James Patterson and St. George, after opposing the first bill, failed to vote. More economic aid for Korea was also included in HR 7797 that, among other things, continued the Marshall Plan. This last was enacted on June 5, 20 days before the North Korean invasion.

The invasion resulted in the Korea-specific roll calls playing an outsize role in the upcoming elections. Those who voted against either of the bills or failed to vote on them were pilloried by their opponents for inviting the attack on South Korea. The response, particularly from Republicans, but also from some Democrats was that the economic aid was irrelevant to stopping the invasion and that the Administration telegraphed its lack of support for South Korea when Acheson failed to mention the country within a perimeter of American interests in a speech at the National Press Club in January. These accusations glossed over the appropriation of military aid for Korea in HR 5895 in August 1949.³¹

The campaign of Republican Glenn Davis of Wisconsin in 1950 would be somewhat typical. After he voted against HR 5330, he was quoted in his hometown newspaper as saying, "To me there just didn't seem any logic in the claim that we could save Korea but couldn't do anything to save Formosa." Military funding for China of \$75 million was signed by the President over three months earlier, but it was funding the Administration did not request. Davis's Democratic opponent, Horace Wilkie, five days after the North Korean invasion, accused Davis of voting three times against aid to Korea. Davis voted against the passage of HR 5895 and thus its military funds for China and Korea as well as the two Korea-specific economic aid bills. Davis said he voted against aid to Korea in 1949 because United States policy was to "let Formosa go along with China," and that he wanted "full scale help to the Chinese Nationalists."³²

American policy from the time that the Nationalists began establishing themselves on Formosa in October 1948 was not to use force to protect the island. This changed with the North Korean invasion, when Truman ordered the Seventh Fleet to "seal off" the island. Davis also said at the same time that he approved of Truman's intervention in Korea. Wilkie broadened his attack on Davis by citing seven roll call votes by the Representative against aid to Korea and noted he voted the same on each as Vito Marcantonio (AL-NY), "who openly and consistently follows the Communist party line." These votes included acceptance of the conference report on HR 5985 as well as the initial passage and three votes to recommit the three bills.³³

Attacking Davis as a communist supporter was similar to such an attack on Nixon, which his opponent in 1950 would also try. Murray Chotiner, Nixon's campaign manager, would point out that such a strategy was "the fatal mistake of attacking our strength instead of sticking to attacking our weaknesses." By

³⁰ *San Mateo Times and Daily News-Leader*, February 1, 1950.

³¹ For the criticality of that omission, see Halberstam (2007), 48.

³² *Waukesha Daily Freeman*, January 28, 1950. *The Capital Times*, July 1, 1950. *The Janesville Daily Gazette*, July 6, 1950.

³³ *The Capital Times*, August 24, 1950. Acheson, 349. The Fleet also prevented the Nationalists from reopening the war on the mainland under the presumed distraction of the Korean conflict.

August, Davis was less inclined to show support for the Administration on Korea, saying, “When haberdasher Harry stole the shirt off China’s back, he tossed in the necktie for Korea’s throat for good measure” and “while Acheson flustered and [Secretary of Defense Louis] Johnson blustered, ill-equipped and badly outnumbered American men were sent into combat in Korea.”³⁴

At this time, South Korean and United Nations forces had been pushed into the Pusan Perimeter, holding on until the defended port enabled an infusion of material and men to power their eventual breakout. Journalist David Halberstam would write,

Militarily, America was a country trying to get by on the cheap, and in Korea it showed immediately. The blame for the poor condition of the Army belonged to everyone – the president, who wanted to keep taxes down, pay off the debt from the last war, and keep the defense budget down to a bare-bones level; the Congress, which if anything wanted to cut the budget even more; and the theater commander, [Douglas] MacArthur, under whose aegis the troops had been so poorly trained, and who had only five years earlier said that he did not really need all the troops Washington had assigned to him.³⁵

Glenn Davis’s own roll call votes on military matters were limited. By House passage, the dollars were changed in committee, and opposition to defense spending was negligible. In 1948 and 1949 Davis supported Air Force appropriations, votes being recorded because of battles over how much to expand the service, with the Administration advocating less. In 1949 he voted to insist to the Senate on the House’s greater expenditures for strategic stockpiles. On the other hand, Davis opposed reinstitution of Selective Service in 1948 and its extension in 1949, the latter vote coming two days after the North Korean invasion. On August 28 Davis complained the Administration had not provided South Korea with the material to defend itself and that the economic aid bill, which he labeled a \$10 million bill rather than the actual \$60 million, only provided “a power plant, insecticides and fertilizer.” On September 7, 1950, Davis told Kiwanis that the United States must prepare for world war, including the draft, which he had opposed. In that speech he again referred to \$10 million, but specified it was for military aid and said it resulted only in South Korea receiving \$200 worth of wire. On September 12, Davis accused the Administration of misleading Congress and the nation on America’s military strength. It is fair to say the Administration misled itself over the necessity of its military preparedness, if it anticipated going to war in Korea, but it is clear it did not expect that to happen. CIA assessments and Army intelligence were ignored, both by MacArthur and Washington. On October 4, Davis told Lions that the United States had to reunite Korea under a United Nations trusteeship. This would have eliminated the anti-communist South Korean government as well the communist North. Given the Administration’s fear that South Korean President Syngman Rhee might have started the War on his own, this might have had some allure.³⁶

³⁴ Ambrose (1987), 215. *The Rhinelander Daily News and the New North*, August 28, 1950.

³⁵ Halberstam (2007), 138.

³⁶ HR 6226, April 15, 1948. HR 1437, March 16, 1949, two votes. HR 4145, October 10, 1949, two votes. HR 6401, June 15, 1948 and June 18, 1948 (two votes). HR 6876, June 27, 1950. *Waukesha Daily Freeman*, August 29, September 8, October 5, 1950. The same \$10 million figure showed up in campaigning by Katherine St. George of New York and Bramblett of California and may have originated in a Republican briefing book. Bramblett and later Glenn Davis expressed it as military aid, which raises the possibility the reference was to the \$75 million appropriation for Iran, the Philippines, and Korea. The Act left it to the president to apportion that amount among the three countries. It is unclear whether St. George was referring to economic or military assistance. *The Reporter Dispatch*, October 6, 1950. *Santa Maria Times*, October 17, 1950. *The Capital Times*, September 13, 1950. Hastings, 43, 52. Hastings also notes that “only historians can focus with such clarity on the intelligence warnings of war.”

A major legislative result of the Korean War was the Defense Production Act of 1950 (HR 9176), which gave the President broad powers to requisition materials and facilities, fund expansion of production, stabilize prices and wages, settle labor disputes, and control credit. Regularly reauthorized and amended, it is still in force. Members of the Class of '46 attempted a number of amendments to HR 9176, most unsuccessfully (Deane, Keating, St. George, Morton, Javits, Stanley, Nicholson, Kearns), though another Javits amendment and a Multer motion succeeded. The bill passed the House 383-12 on August 10, with Jenison, Nicholson, and Sanborn among the twelve.³⁷

Another result of the War was a tax increase. Given that the Republican 80th Congress made tax cutting a high priority, this was a major reversal, but one accompanied by a certain amount of Republican support, particularly for an excess profits tax. In theory, the demands for war production would be a windfall for some companies, and portions of this windfall should be returned to the war effort. On September 13, 1950, 31 House Republicans issued a statement that they would oppose congressional adjournment without an excess profits tax. Class members Ernest Bramblett of California, Glenn Davis, Javits, Kearns, Keating, Lodge, Sadlak, St. George, and Tollefson signed the statement. Truman asked in 1949 for a \$4 billion tax increase to balance the budget and in January 1950 for \$1 billion in new taxes. These requests did not bear fruit before the North Korean invasion in June 1950, which then prompted the President to ask for an additional \$5 billion. At this point Truman rejected inclusion of an excess profits tax as slowing down consideration of the other taxes he wanted, but Congressional advocates committed to consider one after the nine-week recess for elections. In November after Chinese intervention in the War, Truman added a \$4 billion excess profits tax to his requests. The House passed the tax on December 5 after rejecting a Republican substitute that would have raised the rate while also raising a tax credit. Kennedy was the only Class Democrat to vote for the Republican substitute. As enacted, the take was projected to be \$3.3 billion. The Revenue Act of 1950 also raised personal income taxes by reversing the tax cuts of 1945 and 1948, increasing corporate tax rates, and levying an excise tax on newfangled television sets.³⁸

Before a new war added new veterans, the House was still contending with benefits for veterans of wars past. John Rankin (D MS), chair of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, introduced HR 2681 to raise benefits from \$60 to \$90 a month for veterans over 65 and pay \$120 a month for disabled veterans under 65. The 50-year cost of the bill was estimated to be \$125 billion and, as a result, drew lukewarm support from veterans organizations. Rankin's conduct of his committee led on February 15, 1949, to a walkout by one Republican, Glenn Davis, and six Democrats, including Donohue. The Committee reported the bill with the \$90 and \$120 provisions but shorn of other changes and it sat in the Rules Committee until March 22, when Rankin freed it under the privileged reports rule. Carroll moved to strike the enacting clause, which carried on a non-record vote but then lost on roll call. He then moved to recommit, which failed on roll call. Two days later Teague succeeded in recommitting the bill on a 208-207 roll call. Both Carroll and Teague wanted to move veterans' pensions under the Social Security system.³⁹

Rankin tried again with HR 3821, then HR 4617, which would pay \$72 a month to those over 65 and \$100 per month to the disabled. Teague in committee got the bill amended to apply only to veterans over

³⁷ Dague, Kennedy, Regan, Smith, and Williams did not vote.

³⁸ "Record of the 81st Congress (second session)." *CQ Almanac 1950*, 669-77.

³⁹ The Committee on Veterans' Affairs was privileged to report at any time on general pension bills. Deschler, Chapter 17, Sec. 63. *CQ Almanac 1950*, on line.

65 who were unemployable. Estimates of cost were \$57 billion over 50 years without Teague's provision and \$9 billion with it. The House rejected the unemployable provision and voted against Glenn Davis's motion to recommit, passing the bill 365-27 on June 1, 1949. The Senate took no action on the bill.

Carroll, Teague, and Glenn Davis were veterans themselves. Their opposition was not atypical. One analysis reported that Teague's motion to recommit the first bill was opposed 82-49 by World War I veterans in the House and supported 54-34 by the younger World War II vets. Teague had a spot in the press sun during committee hearings, quoting American Legion legislative liaison John Thomas Taylor saying during a 1930 hearing that a pension passed then would be a quitclaim against future pensions for veterans of the First World War. Taylor was now advocating for more benefits for those veterans.⁴⁰

Teague also shepherded S 2596 through to enactment by substituting his own HR 8465 for it in the nature of an amendment. Teague's bill gave veterans more freedom in picking their own courses under the GI Bill but also defined standards for accrediting the schools that provided instruction under that Bill.⁴¹

Federal aid to education, an active though unachieved topic for the Congress as well as the Class of '46 in the 80th House, was again on the agenda. A bill from Sen. Robert Taft (R OH) passed the Senate in the 80th Congress, and enactment of a similar bill was expected in the 81st. S 246 passed the Senate in 1949 but failed to make it out of committee in the House because of dissent over aid to private schools and concerns over Federal control of local schools. Graham Barden (D NC), chair of a subcommittee of Education and Labor, removed the Senate provision for funding of private schools. Francis Cardinal Spellman, Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York, in an address at Fordham University attacked Barden as a "new apostle of bigotry." Former First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt supported Barden in her column, bringing an accusation of anti-Catholicism from Spellman. Kearns in committee raised a different issue, achieving a modification that would ban aid, unless the president promised the Federal Security Agency would not provide sex education in the schools. Dwight Eisenhower, now president of Columbia University, wrote opposing aid because it might propagate "paternalism, if not outright socialism," which would seem to tar a hundred years of public education. The Committee voted 12-13 against reporting the bill, with Morton voting yea and Kennedy, Wint Smith, Lucas, Nixon, and Kearns all nay – because it was anti-Catholic and anti-capitalist? Morton, Kearns, and Thomas Werdel (R CA), introduced HR 5789 to provide funds just for 13 southern states, with funding available to private schools if the recipient states chose. Nixon tried to bring the bill up in committee but lost on an 8-16 vote, and aid to education, other than to areas impacted by Federal installations, failed to make it out of the 81st Congress.⁴²

The Congress did, however, pass the Housing Act of 1949 (S 1070, in lieu of HR 4009), which provided for public housing and slum clearance through one million dollars in loans and \$500 million in grants to local governments. The House Banking and Currency Committee considered two bills, HR 4009, the Administration bill introduced by Chair Brent Spence (D KY), and HR 1883 from Frances Bolton (R OH), of which there were copies introduced by Javits, Keating, Lodge, Patterson, Riehlman, Tollefson, and four other Republicans. The latter bill called for \$1.5 billion for slum clearance, \$268 million for public housing, and \$255 million for rural housing. The Committee on a party-line vote reported HR 4009. Teague got the bill amended to extend a veterans preference provision, which failed to make it through conference.

⁴⁰ *CQ Almanac 1950*, on line. Drew Pearson, April 21, 1949.

⁴¹ *CQ Almanac 1950*, on line.

⁴² "Record of the 80th Congress (second session)." *CQ Almanac 1950*, 178-80.

Robert Jones' amendment from the floor structured the final outcome and included \$12.5 million in grants to farmers for repairs to structures.⁴³

Rent control was again a legislative concern. The first session found itself at the end of a one year extension from 1948 that carried forward the "voluntary" increase of 15% and added a mechanism to override decontrol, which the local boards could institute. This session punted to the second session, extending rent controls for 15 months to June 1950. Williams amended the bill, HR 1731, to allow state and local governments to end rent control, a provision which survived conference and enactment but with safeguards added by the Senate. The 15% provision enacted by the 80th Congress was eliminated but with a provision that landlords could expect a "fair net operating income." In the second session, James Davis successfully amended HR 8276 (which became S 3181) to extend rent control for one year and another six months if states and localities wanted to continue. States and localities could end control at any time.⁴⁴

The Korean War brought a return to the possibility of other price, as well as wage, controls. The president was given stand-by authority to impose them with a provision that Congress could override them without presidential approval.⁴⁵

Repeal of Taft-Hartley was a plank in the national Democratic platform. Truman had campaigned on it. The Administration bills (S 249 and HR 2032) would repeal it and restore the Wagner Act with a prohibition of jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts. In the House the bill was sent to the floor (with Lucas the only Democrat in Education and Labor opposing the report) but on a 217-203 vote was replaced by a bill (HR 4290) from John Wood (D GA) which repealed Taft-Hartley but reenacted most of its provisions. Morton successfully amended the Wood substitute to weaken its prohibition of secondary boycotts and to allow union hiring halls. Lodge amended the substitute to compel an employer to fire a worker who disclosed confidential union information or engaged in conduct subjecting the union to legal action. Lucas amended the substitute to give independent unions representation on the National Labor Management Panel. The Wood substitute was then recommitted on a 212-209 vote.⁴⁶

All Northern Democratic votes were against the Wood substitute and to recommit it. The Border Democrats were nearly unanimous, voting 36-3 against the substitute and 39-1 to recommit it. Members of the Class from the Border States voted with the majority of their region. Republicans were also nearly unanimous, 146-22 for the substitute and 147-18 against recommitting it. Javits, Phillips, and Tollefson voted against the substitute and for recommitment. Patterson voted against the substitute and against recommitment. Russell Mack of Washington voted against the substitute and paired for recommitment.

Southern Democrats were unsurprisingly split, 68-30 for the substitute and 61-39 against recommitment. Of the members of the Class of '46, fourteen voted with the majority of their regional brethren on both votes. Robert Jones, Smathers, Lanham, Deane, Hamilton Jones, and Burleson voted the opposite way. Evins and Hardy voted for the substitute and then voted to recommit it.

Recommitment was with the hope that in the second session a more Labor friendly bill might have a chance. Eleven members who voted for the substitute also vote to recommit it. S 249 passed the Senate nearly two months after the recommitment vote in the House with one major change to Taft-Hartley, that

⁴³ "Housing Act of 1949 S 1070 – P.L. 171," *CQ Almanac 1949*, on-line

⁴⁴ "Economic Policy," *CQ Almanac 1949*, on-line. "Rent Control Extension," *CQ Almanac 1950*, on-line

⁴⁵ "Defense Production Act of 1950," *CQ Almanac 1950*, on-line.

⁴⁶ "Taft-Hartley Repeal Attempts," *CQ Almanac 1949*, on-line.

of how to handle national emergency strikes. The House Education and Labor Committee never reported the Senate bill or any other bill substantially altering Taft-Hartley.

Truman requested an increase in the minimum wage from the present 40¢ to 75¢ per hour and expansion of coverage from the current 23 million jobs to 28 million. Lucas offered a substitute for the Administration bill (HR 5856) that would reduce the coverage to 22 million and tie the minimum wage to the cost of living. The House adopted the substitute, which Redden quickly moved to amend to reestablish the 75¢ rate. That passed the House. Further Senate exemptions from coverage and the resulting conference affected the number of jobs covered but kept the rate. As is usually the case, the minimum wage trailed increases in wages actually paid. The 1949 revision as enacted reduced the coverage to 21 million, and only 1.3 million of those got a benefit from the law.⁴⁷

The basing point pricing system for bulky commodities, long practiced by industries that produced them, was outlawed by the Supreme Court as collusive pricing in *Federal Trade Commission v. The Cement Institute, et al.*, in 1948. The practice increased costs for such commodities which were distant from a producer's basing point, which was set by the producer at the point of manufacture or distribution. By providing a return on shipping costs, it also inhibited the dispersal of the location of such points. The practice was accused, as well, of price collusion on base prices among manufacturers of a given commodity. S 1008 was passed by both houses in 1949, and the conference report by the House that year and by the Senate in 1950. The bill would have restored the basing point pricing system if the producer were "acting independently." Carroll successfully offered two amendments to prevent S 1008 from altering anti-trust statutes. The conference report rejected the Carroll amendments. Carroll and Evins were two of six Democratic representatives and six Democratic senators who visited the White House to urge Truman to veto the bill. He did so and there was no attempt to override.⁴⁸

On March 4, 1949, the Library of Congress announced the award of the first Bollingen Prize in Poetry to Ezra Pound, arrested for treason for broadcasts from Italy during the War and now a resident of St. Elizabeth's Hospital in DC for treatment of insanity. The Fellows in American Letters of the Library voted 11-2 with one abstention for Pound over William Carlos Williams. After press coverage, particularly in the *Saturday Review of Literature*, Javits on June 24 wrote the Librarian of Congress of his concerns about the award, and on July 19 Patterson spoke to the House, criticizing the award. On July 21 Javits asked for an investigation, and the Joint Committee on the Library resolved that the Library should not give prizes or make awards. The Bollingen Prize was transferred to the Yale University library and continues to this day. Pound's radio broadcasts had been in support of Italy's government, at war with the United States, and were conspicuously anti-Semitic.⁴⁹

The prize, of course, was not given for politics or bigotry but for poetry. Parsing the whole person has bedeviled us since at least the funeral of Julius Caesar, per William Shakespeare. It even reflexively bedevils; "All men are created equal" wrote the slave owner. Javits' concern does not reflect badly on him, but his request of the Librarian for the names of the Fellows does. It recalls the demands of witnesses for names by the members and investigators of the Un-American Activities Committee.

⁴⁷ "Economic Policy," *CQ Almanac 1949*, on-line. Kantor, 1101.

⁴⁸ *CQ Almanac 1950*, 564-8.

⁴⁹ McGuire.

The anti-subversion and communist registration bill, the so-called Mundt-Nixon, which cleared the 80th House but not the 80th Senate, returned in the 81st Congress. Karl Mundt, now in the Senate, introduced S 1194, and Nixon introduced HR 7595. Mundt's and other bills were rolled into S 4037 in committee and Nixon's and others into HR 9490 in HUAC, which would eventually supplant the Senate bill. Sen. Pat McCarran (D NV), chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee, was the sponsor of S 4037, and though the final medium was HR 9490, sponsored by Chair John Wood (D GA) of HUAC, the statute became the McCarran Act, shorthand for the Internal Security Act of 1950.

The House passed the bill on August 29, 1950, by a 354-20 vote and the conference report on September 30 by 313-20. Truman vetoed the bill, and both houses overrode, the House by 286-48. Truman complained in his veto message, "It would put the Government of the United States in the thought control business." After 12 years of existence HUAC had its first statute. The most contentious component of the Act was its requirement that "Communist-action" and "Communist-front" organizations must register with the attorney general and their officers must register if the organization did not. No one ever did register under the Act, but it made several trips to the Supreme Court before the registration requirement was repealed in 1968.⁵⁰

Carroll, Blatnik, and Multer voted nay on each of the three roll calls. Javits voted against the bill on passage and override and paired against on the conference report. He was not the only Republican to oppose the bill; Usher Burdick of North Dakota voted nay all three times. There were no other nay votes from members of the Class of '46 on passage or the conference report. Morris supported Truman on the override vote, more consistent with his position on Mundt-Nixon than his votes for passage and the conference report. Karsten also shifted to opposing the bill on the override, joining nine other Missouri Democrats who changed their positions on the bill. Two other Border State Democrats made the same shift, as did 14 northern Democrats. One southern Democrat, Thurmond Chatham of North Carolina, upheld the veto after supporting the bill.⁵¹ Blatnik and Javits were also two of twelve who voted against HRes 482, authorizing \$150,000 for HUAC.

Nixon's central role in the exposure of Alger Hiss continued to play out during the 81st Congress. The first trial of Hiss for perjury ended in deadlock on July 7, 1949. Nixon accused the judge of prejudice and threatened to subpoena the four jurors who voted for acquittal. Hiss was convicted of perjury in a second trial on January 21, 1950, encouraging Nixon to go on the radio to accuse the Administration of a "deliberate" effort to conceal the "conspiracy." Acheson, asked at a press conference for comment, said he did not "intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss." Nixon called Acheson's comments "disgusting." "Traitors in the high councils of our own government have made sure that the deck is stacked on the Soviet side of the diplomatic tables." Nixon was not alone among the Class; Democrat Wheeler urged the ouster of Acheson for "defending traitors."⁵²

⁵⁰ "Veto of the Internal Security Bill," Truman Library. Goodman, 291-4.

⁵¹ Williams and McCulloch paired for the bill on passage. Nixon did so on the conference report. Smith and Regan did not vote on passage. Meyer, Nicholson, Potter, Coudert, Redden, Lichtenwalter, and Mack did not vote on the conference report. Phillips did not vote either time. Sadlak paired in support of the override. Lodge, Nicholson, Redden, Lichtenwalter, Mack, and Tollefson did not vote on the override.

⁵² Goulden, 337. McCullough, 759-60. *The Atlanta Constitution*, May 10, 1954.

Since the late 1930s the Rules Committee was effectively controlled by a coalition of Republicans and conservative, mostly Southern, Democrats, a largely but not completely informal grouping known as the “conservative coalition.”⁵³ In 1949 the chair was Adolph Sabath of Chicago, age 82. There also were four Southern and three other Democrats and four Republicans. On the first day of the 81st Congress, Chair Sabath, as was tradition, rose to propose the adoption of rules for the House. He offered HRes 5, the rules of the 80th House with an amendment - a 21-day rule, which would allow the chair of a committee to discharge a bill from Rules if Rules did not report it in 21 calendar days. Sabath then moved the question, which precluded debate. On the vote on calling the previous question, Democrats supported the motion 225-31 and Republicans opposed it 49-111. The rule itself was adopted by voice. Twenty-nine of the Democratic nays were Southerners, including Battle, James Davis, Wheeler, Williams, Lucas, and Regan. Lodge, Patterson, Sadlak, Morton, Charles Potter of Michigan, Cotton, Javits, Riehlman, and McCulloch were among the Republicans who voted yea.⁵⁴

The new rule was on Speaker Rayburn’s initiative. It gave him more control over the business of the House. The Rules Committee would be restricted in its ability to constrain that business, while Rayburn could limit the ability of chairs to utilize the new rule by simply failing to recognize them on the floor. It also was a reaction to the disloyalty of some representatives who backed the presidential campaign of Strom Thurmond. Rather than evicting them from the Democratic Party as Truman demanded, the ability of the Rules Committee to bottle up Truman’s program would be reduced. Rayburn insisted in the Democratic Caucus that the vote on the 21-day rule would be binding on Democrats. While not all Democrats voted for Sabath’s motion, 72 Southerners did.⁵⁵

The 21-day rule was critical in the ability to bring one equal rights bill to the floor. On July 25, 1949, a bill abolishing the poll tax in Federal elections was brought to the floor under the Rule. Eleven nearly identical abolition bills had been introduced. The bill in question, HR 3199, was that of Chair Mary Norton (D NJ) of the House Administration Committee, which handled the bill. Though Rayburn thought the tax was a matter of state concern, he understood the national hostility to it and was personally opposed to the tax. Taxpaying requirements for voting were once common; at one time or another 26 states had them. By 1949 there were only seven states, all Southern, with such a prerequisite. Political scientist V.O. Key observed, “In northern discussion of southern politics, the poll tax often plays the role of the chief villain.” But after an extended analysis of its effects, he concluded, “The poll tax has had little or no bearing on Negro disfranchisement.... On the contrary, those kept from voting by the tax have been the whites. Negro disfranchisement has been accomplished by extralegal restraints and by the white primary.”⁵⁶

Rayburn recognized Norton, ignoring a demand for recognition from Clare Hoffman (R MI).⁵⁷ The vote on ordering the previous question to discuss HRes 276, the rule for HR 3199, passed 262-100. There was an immediate motion to adjourn from Robert Sikes (D FL), which brought an admonition from Rayburn against dilatory tactics. Adjournment was rejected 110-252. Thomas Pickett (D TX) then observed the absence of a quorum, which the Speaker rejected. There was then a vote on the resolution which was accepted, 265-100. The motion to convene in the Committee of the Whole to consider the bill resulted in a request for a roll call by James Davis, which was refused. Howard Smith (D VA) demanded a division, which resulted in acceptance of the motion for the Committee of the Whole, 134-46. Smith then observed

⁵³ Donovan (1982), 118.

⁵⁴ James Robinson, 64. Jenison, Phillips, and Tollefson did not vote.

⁵⁵ Hardeman and Bacon, 343-4. Steinberg, 250-1.

⁵⁶ Keyssar, Table A.10. Key (1949), 578, 579, 618.

⁵⁷ Hardeman and Bacon, 333.

the absence of a quorum on the vote. The Speaker observed, “Just a moment ago the vote disclosed that 365 Members were present.” Smith said that was then and not now. The Speaker counted and came up with 230, a quorum.

Norton began her presentation by noting that poll tax repeal was adopted in the four previous Houses and was a part of both national party platforms in 1948. After some debate, John Rankin (D MS) observed the absence of a quorum and the roll was called. Norton threatened to keep the House in session until 10:00 pm if a quorum could not be maintained. After more discussion, the Committee rose and the House transacted other business until adjournment at 6:47.

Debate resumed the next day without objection. Apart from a number of pro forma amendments allowing members of both sides of the issue to put their words into the record, there was little delay. Robert Hale (R ME) moved a pro forma amendment to observe that the previous bills passed by the House had never passed the Senate and this one would not either; so, this was a waste of time. Two amendments were offered by Southerners and voted down. A motion to recommit was defeated on roll call 123-267. The bill passed on another roll call 273-116. The bill would not be reported by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

On the five roll call votes, among the Class of '46 all Southern Democrats were consistently opposed with the exception of the three from North Carolina. Hamilton Jones failed to vote on any of the roll calls. Redden and Deane did not vote on the first three, but on recommitment Redden paired opposed and Deane voted nay. On passage Redden paired for, and Deane voted yea. North Carolina was the first Southern state to eliminate the poll tax, in 1920.⁵⁸ Two border Democrats, Albert and Morris, voted for recommitment and against passage, while voting to enable the debate on all three of the first roll calls. Kentuckian Whitaker did not vote on the first two but paired against the rule, for recommitment, and against passage. All other Democrats in the Class supported the bill. All Republicans in the Class supported the bill but for Wint Smith and Nicholson, who consistently opposed it, and Cotton who voted as did Albert and Morris.

The 21-day rule was used eight times in the 81st Congress. Chair John Lesinski (D MI) of the Committee on Education and Labor announced he would call up HR 4453, the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act, using the procedure on January 23, 1950. The Bill was reported on August 2, 1949, by Education and Labor, and the Rules Committee had not released it. Rayburn responded that he would not recognize Lesinski but someone with a less controversial bill. He recognized the chair of the Committee on Public Lands, who called up bills on Alaska and Hawaii statehood using the 21-day rule. It is unclear what Rayburn expected, because both those bills resulted in dilatory tactics, including efforts by James Davis and John Bell Williams, and a resolution was not reached on either of them.⁵⁹

Adam Powell (D NY), who introduced HR 4453, filed a discharge petition for the bill on January 25. To be successful, a majority of the House must sign the petition. That same day, Lesinski could have attempted to call up the bill under the Calendar Wednesday procedure, but chairs are called in

⁵⁸ Key (1949), 578. Two other North Carolinians failed to vote, but the rest opposed passage. In the seven states still levying the Tax, all members voted against the bill, except for two in Texas and, notably, five in Tennessee (including the two Republicans). In the other Southern states that had abolished the Tax, every single member opposed the bill. Southern solidarity was an acid test.

⁵⁹ “Record of the 81st Congress (second session).”

alphabetical order by committee name and Armed Services took advantage of the procedure and then the House adjourned.⁶⁰

On the next Wednesday, February 1, Banking and Currency went, James Davis and Williams working to slow the process until adjournment. Lesinski did not attempt to take advantage of Calendar Wednesday on February 8. Williams was absent on February 8 due to family illness, and Lesinski's reticence may have been in the sense of good sportsmanship. On February 15 the Committee on the District of Columbia took advantage of Calendar Wednesday, and Williams and James Davis forced delays until adjournment.

Finally on February 22 after the traditional reading of Washington's Farewell Address and dilatory tactics by Williams, James Davis, and Nicholson, Lesinski gained the floor to call up HR 4453. It was after 5:00 p.m. The Bill would make it unlawful for an employer to hire or fire on the basis of race, religion or national origin, or for a labor union to discriminate against or segregate any part of its membership on those grounds. A Fair Employment Practices Commission would have the powers to enforce the Act.

Attempts to delay kept coming. A point of order that Lesinski was not authorized by his committee to call up the bill was overruled. A motion to vote on whether to consider the bill was approved 287-121. Lesinski's request for unanimous consent to dispense with reading the 22-page bill was objected to, and the bill was read. A motion that the Committee of the Whole rise was ruled out of order. The ruling was appealed and the presiding chair was upheld on division and then on teller. A motion to adjourn was ruled out of order as the House was sitting as Committee of the Whole. Another motion that the Committee rise was lost on division and then by teller. Another such motion ditto. Ditto again. Samuel McConnell (R PA) and Tom Steed (D OK) moved substitutes, both providing for voluntary compliance. Ten amendments to the McConnell substitute were accepted, including one from Keating to provide that not more than three commissioners would be members of the same political party. Five amendments to the Steed substitute were accepted, including one from Harrison to provide that a religious organization not be required to hire atheists, and one by Redden that employment of a person of a particular race etc. would create a presumption that such a race etc. was not discriminated against. Eventually a motion by Majority Leader John McCormack (D MA) to end debate on the McConnell substitute at 2:30 a.m. carried 192-64. The McConnell substitute was approved 236-63 by division. Andrew Biemiller (D WI) then demanded an engrossed copy; so, McCormack asked unanimous consent to adjourn until Friday February 24, but Kennedy objected. The House adjourned at 3:19 a.m. until noon the same day.

The net result was a voluntary Federal Fair Employment bill, the McConnell substitute, without any enforcement. Republicans, with Morton a prime mover, had enabled the House to stay in session so that the mandatory bill could be defeated and the voluntary substitute enacted through a combination of Southern Democratic and Republican votes. Republican opposition may have had less to do with active racism than active opposition to government regulation of the private sector. Republicans supported the abolition of the poll tax, which regulated state governments but not the private sector. Thus passive racism in employment would be allowed to continue.

The Senate filibustered the bill to death.

It is worth noting another equal rights initiative in the 81st House. Republican St. George introduced HJRes 68 in 1949, a proposed constitutional amendment "relative to equal rights for men and women." Twelve other similar measures were introduced, but HJRes 68 became the test measure. The Judiciary

⁶⁰ On Wednesdays but for the last two in a session, names of committees are called alphabetically, and a committee may call up bills for discharge from the Rules Committee. George Norris (R NE) called Calendar Wednesday "a homeopathic dose of nothingness." Bolling (1968), 74.

subcommittee to which it was referred took no action; so, in March 1950 St. George filed a discharge petition. She got 79 signatures from men and the opposition of organized labor and thus of Democrats. The petition was unsuccessful and the bill was not reported. The Senate equivalent, SJRes 25 did come to debate in the Senate, during which a neutering rider was attached and passed. This version was not brought to the House.⁶¹ The wording of St. George's Resolution was, "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." St. George voted for the McConnell amendment making Fair Employment enforcement voluntary.

Lobbyists were a target of Truman's attacks during his election campaign. On October 6, 1949, Rayburn created a Select Committee on Lobbying Activities and named, among others, Lanham and Albert to it. The Committee cast a broad net and one that it hauled in was the Civil Rights Congress in the person of its leader, African American William Patterson. Lanham was chairing the subcommittee that was questioning Patterson about the failure of his organization to submit subpoenaed documents. Patterson said he had been too busy trying to save Negroes from "legal lynching" in Georgia. This led to an argument with Lanham, resulting in, according to *Time*, Lanham leaping to his feet, yelling "Damn son of a bitch!" and "Black son of a bitch!" and rushing at Patterson in the witness seat. Capitol police restrained Lanham. The House voted to cite Patterson for contempt. Lanham was not cited.⁶²

Press coverage during the session revealed that a number of members of Congress had family members on the office payroll. While not illegal, it had the aura of feather-bedding. Among those featured were the wives of Jackson, Nicholson, and Tollefson, and the brother and sister-in-law of Sadlak. During the 1950 primary, an opponent of Deane would accuse him of "'excessive expenditure' of the taxpayer's money, including the fact Mrs. Deane was on the Congressman's pay roll...." This would be a recurring story for members.⁶³

Finally, in terms of press interest, in this case that of intent by members, was the organization of a self-described "liberal group" of Republican representatives, which came to be called the Chowder and Marching Society. The origins are debatable, but the initiative seems to have been John Rankin's overly generous veterans benefits bill. Glenn Davis had walked out of Rankin's committee session along with a number of Democrats in disgust at Rankin's chairship. With Jackson, he called a meeting in Jackson's office that was attended by Nixon, Potter, Cotton, Keating, Caleb Boggs, Morton, and Lodge, all Class members, as well as by Gerald Ford, a freshman from Michigan. Davis later said, "We were being treated by Joe Martin and Clarence Brown as just a bunch of warm bodies who gave the old bulls a majority. We were told how to vote and to keep our mouths shut." "But we stood up and helped to lick the bill – by just one vote." Joseph Martin, the former Speaker, was now the Minority Leader, and Brown was a sixth term Republican from Ohio, a member of the Rules Committee.⁶⁴

⁶¹ The first Equal Rights Amendment was introduced in 1923, in the House by a nephew of Susan B. Anthony. No such amendment reached the floor until 1946, in the Senate. Neale, 2. Gertzog, 152-3. "Equal Rights Amendment," *CQ Almanac 1950*, on-line. Harrison, 31.

⁶² "Lobby Investigation," *CQ Almanac 1950*, 752-66. *Time*, August 14, 1950.

⁶³ *San Bernardino Daily Sun*, December 31, 1949. *Tampa Bay Times*, December 31, 1949. *Capital Journal*, December 31, 1949. *The Hartford Courant*, January 7, 1949. *The Gastonia Gazette*, April 29, 1950.

⁶⁴ DeLong, 149-50. Kevin Smith, 104-7. On the still generous HR 4617 that passed, of the Society members listed here, only Glenn Davis voted nay.

The Chowder and Marching Society would endure as a semi-secret group of Republican representatives, current membership held loosely to the vest, but former members would brag incessantly about their previous membership as a symbol of ultra-belonging and possible influence with the congressional party. It would not remain a junior group, as new membership was limited usually to two members each Congress. The Society eschewed staff involvement and formal positioning and thus was essentially a social group.⁶⁵ But social interaction was a fundamental medium of exchange and of power in the House. Time would tell whether this group of minority members could alter the course of the House and of the country.

Most defeated members returned to their pre-House occupations during the 81st Congress, if they had even left them during congressional service, but a number cashed in their political bona fides with government appointments. Republican David Potts looked to have secured an appointment to the New York City Municipal Civil Service Commission, until protests by the Liberal Party and the NAACP caused the Mayor to change his mind. State appointments were secured by George Sarbacher as the Pennsylvania Director of Public Safety, by Homer Jones as Superintendent of the Washington Veterans' Home, and by William Dawson as Welfare Commissioner of Utah. Federal appointments came to Glen Johnson to head the National Production Authority for Oklahoma and Georgia Lusk of New Mexico to the War Claims Commission. Charles Russell of Nevada and Preston Peden of Oklahoma were hired as congressional staffers.⁶⁶

Charles Kersten of Wisconsin also became a staffer, in his case for Sen. Joseph McCarthy in his investigations of alleged communists. Francis Love of West Virginia greeted the Senator on February 9, 1950, at his arrival in Wheeling, where he launched his series of varying numerical allegations of communists in the Administration. When the FBI sent an agent to interview the reporter for *The Wheeling Intelligencer*, who had reported on the speech, Love sat in on the meeting as an "adviser" to the reporter, who declined to sign an affidavit on the accuracy of his reporting.⁶⁷

Abe Goff of Idaho returned to active duty with the Army for 6½ months. Willis Bradley went to work as the chief engineering officer for the Pacific Coast Steamship Company. Less positively, his home in Long Beach was burgled. Howard Coffin of Detroit organized a lobbying firm in DC, the Industrial Service Bureau, one of the first to tap a potentially lucrative payoff for congressional service for members of the Class.⁶⁸

Others sought election to offices other than the House from which they were ousted. Leo Isacson was defeated as the ALP candidate for president of the Bronx Borough in 1949. In 1950 he turned down the ALP nomination for Governor over the Party's opposition to the Korean War. Charles Russell was elected Governor of Nevada in 1950, taking 58% of the vote and would serve two four-year terms. Dawson of Utah and Goff tried for the US Senate in 1950. Dawson came in fourth in the convention balloting for the Republican nomination, while Goff was defeated in the Republican primary by the incumbent.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ Kevin Smith, 106. Gertzog, 92-3.

⁶⁶ *The New York Age*, May 20, 1950. 1950 Census schedule, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

⁶⁷ Drew Pearson, April 13, 1950. *Ames Daily Tribune*, April 18, 1950. *The Capital Times*, June 9, 1950. *The Decatur Daily Review*, September 30, 1951. Desmond. *Journal-Every Evening*, March 24, 1950.

⁶⁸ *Corvallis Gazette-Times*, June 18, 1949. *Long Beach Independent*, January 12, 1949. *The Los Angeles Times*, April 6, 1949.

⁶⁹ Wolfe, 52. *The Salt Lake Tribune*, June 11, 1950. *Corvallis Gazette-Times*, June 18, 1949. *The Ogden Standard-Examiner*, August 25, 1950.

Two members of the incumbent Class were reported in 1950 as believing in flying saucers, a term coined in 1947: Jenison and Karsten.⁷⁰

Musical performer Kearns kept his hand in his previous occupation while still in the House. For the Lincoln Day celebration in 1950 he directed the stage and radio show at Uline Arena in Washington for a packed house of 12,000, with Fred Waring's Pennsylvanians as the headliner.⁷¹

A number of members welcomed new offspring. Evins' third child was born in DC in 1949. Lucas's fifth child was born in Texas, also in 1949. Dorn's first child was born in Denver, Colorado in 1949. He was on extended travel with his wife in the West. Many more came in 1950: Williams' first in Mississippi, Javit's second in New York, Glenn Davis's second in Washington, Wheeler's second, also in Washington.⁷²

Coffin, whose wife Abbie died in 1945 after forty years of marriage, remarried in 1949 to widow Marie Thraikill Brown, fourteen years his junior.⁷³

The Second World War remained an open wound for many, even as the country staggered into another conflict. The body of Caleb Boggs' brother Edgar was returned to the US in 1949 and buried in Arlington National Cemetery. Edgar, nine years younger than Caleb, died in action in the Philippines in 1945 at the age of 26. He left a widow and a son whom he never met.⁷⁴

Mortality was even closer for members of the Class. Whitaker spent much time in the Naval hospital at Bethesda, Maryland, plagued with heart ills since 1948. Franklin Maloney of Philadelphia, defeated in 1948, was hospitalized in early January 1949 with a heart attack. Hugh Meade of Baltimore, defeated for renomination in 1948, died on July 8, 1949, in the Willard Hotel in DC from heart disease. He was 42 and left wife Isabel Muth Meade and six children, ranging in ages from sixteen to nine.⁷⁵ He was the second member of the Class of '46 to die. He had been hired in January as general counsel for the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

⁷⁰ Drew Pearson, April 3, 1950. *Amarillo Daily News*, September 26, 1950.

⁷¹ *The Record-Argus*, January 13, February 10, 1950.

⁷² Mary Adelaide Evans Certificate of Marriage, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1980. USGenWeb.org. *The Index-Journal*, October 4, 1949. *McComb Enterprise-Journal*, August 30, 1950. Kevin Smith, 128. 1950 Census schedule, Bacon County, Georgia.

⁷³ Abbie G. Coffin stone, Woodlawn Cemetery, Detroit, Michigan. Marie Thraikill Brown Coffin stone, Green Lawn Cemetery, Columbus, Ohio.

⁷⁴ *Journal-Every Evening*, February 16, 1949.

⁷⁵ *The Owensboro Messenger*, March 13, 1949. *The Courier-Journal*, December 16, 1951. *The Philadelphia Inquirer Public Ledger*, January 18, 1949. 1940 Census schedule, Baltimore City, Maryland. *The Baltimore Sun*, August 8, 1939.