

Chapter 32 - Dealt Out: The 90th Congress

The seventeen remaining members of the Class of '46, fifteen Democrats and two Republicans, joined a 90th House of Representatives still much in the control of Democrats but, as usually the case, with a Democratic Party divided by geography or, more accurately, slavery and the Civil War.

John McCormack of Massachusetts remained Speaker thanks to the votes of 246 Democrats, opposing Gerald Ford of Michigan, supported by 186 Republicans.¹ Notably voting for McCormack was Class member John Bell Williams of Mississippi, who was stripped of his seniority by the Democratic Caucus in the previous Congress over his active support of 1964 Republican presidential nominee Barry Goldwater. Like Williams, 83 of the Democrats were from the South and another 28 were from the Border. That left 135 other Democrats versus the Republicans, so holding 68 of the Southern and Border Democrats with the other unified Democrats against unified Republicans was a necessity.

The Democratic members of the Class varied in their Party loyalty. Congressional Quarterly's "party unity" scores are based on the percentage of the time a member votes with their party on roll calls in which a majority of their party opposes a majority of the other party. Scores are by session, so each member received two scores in for the 89th Congress. Northern Democrats Harold Donahue of Massachusetts, John Blatnik of Minnesota, and Abraham Multer of New York voted with their Party at least 98% of the time on these "party unity rollcalls." Border Democrats Edward Garmatz of Maryland, Frank Karsten of Missouri, and Carl Albert of Oklahoma supported their Party at least 94% of the time. Albert was the Majority Leader, and Garmatz and Karsten were big-city representatives. They were typical of only 15 of the 28 Border Democrats. Karsten was the area whip for Missouri and Iowa, yet he made "no major effort" to organize the votes of his State's Democratic delegation, simply because he was considerably more liberal than they.²

The Southern Democrats in the Class were a mixed lot. Robert Jones of Alabama and Joe Evins of Tennessee posted party unity scores of 78% to 91%. Porter Hardy of Virginia scored 52% and 58%. Olin Teague and Omar Burleson of Texas and Bryan Dorn of South Carolina were in the 28% to 50% range. Otto Passman of Louisiana and Watkins Abbitt of Virginia scored 14% to 25%. Apostate Williams came in at an unsurprising 7% and 9%. In other words, five of the nine Southerners voted more with the Republicans than with their own Party. Two were pretty reliable Democratic votes. One was iffy.

Burleson remained the leader of a group of Southern and Border members, who had been labeled the Boll Weevils Club. This made him central to whatever explicit coordination existed between Southern rightists and the Republican leadership and more so in the 90th House than before, because one of the victims of the primaries of 1966 was Howard Smith of Virginia, who had been central to that role. Burleson would note in 1968 that he would usually deliver 52 to 60 Democratic votes to the Republicans. Such a collection would leave 51 to 59 votes for the Democratic leadership, short of the necessary 68 and thus doom many of their initiatives.³

Perhaps more troubling to the Democratic leadership was that the scores of each of the Southerners except for Dorn dropped from the 88th Congress. Hardy had showed 80% and 73% then; his change was

¹ McCormack and Ford abstained. There was one vacancy in the House membership, a seat that had just elected a Democrat.

² *CQ Almanac 1966*, on-line. *The Maryville Daily Forum*, February 27, 1967.

³ *Abilene Reporter-News*, June 8, 1968.

the biggest. This reflected the Great Society legislation that President Lyndon Johnson pushed through the largely compliant 89th Congress.

Problems for the dominant Democrats began before Congress convened on January 10, 1967. It is a partisan distinction that Republican Conferences had fought over their leaders since 1947, ejecting first Joseph Martin then Charles Halleck, while Democrats fought over geography. While there was a policy distinction between Northeastern and Midwestern Republicans, it paled next to that between Southern Democrats and the rest of the Party. Political scientist V.O. Key observed, "In its grand outlines the politics of the South revolves around the position of the Negro."⁴ In 1967 this was no less true than it was when that statement was published in 1949, but a dividing point was introduced in 1964 with the Republican Party's embrace of racial segregation in the nomination of presidential candidate Barry Goldwater and the Democratic Party's rejection of racial exclusion in the policies of presidential inheritor Lyndon Johnson.

The full realization of the impact of these changes would be in the on-rushing future, but they played a role in both the Democratic Caucus and the Republican Conference which convened prior to the opening of the Congress.

The matter dealt with by the Conference was less critical, in part because it did not involve a change of leadership, but also because it was as yet hypothetical. Arthur Younger of California introduced a resolution which sought to punish Republicans who would vote too often with Democrats. Class member Glenn Davis of Wisconsin offered an amendment to set the metric at 50% defection. Using Congressional Quarterly's party unity scores for the 89th Congress, this would have provided some level of discipline for seventeen Republicans, fourteen from the Northeast, in the 90th Congress. Minority Leader Jerry Ford of Michigan opposed the action as did Albert Watson of South Carolina, who pointed out that it was his lack of party unity voting as a Democrat as well as his support for Goldwater that caused his punishment by his former Party and his conversion to Republicanism. The Conference voted down the proposal 89-23.⁵

Watson would turn out to be not the harbinger of Democratic representatives changing their spots but rather the result of the Southern electorate slowly changing their votes. In 1966 only 23 of 106 Southern representatives elected were Republicans, though in 1946 that was 2 of 96 and in 1960 7 of 106. It would be 1994 before Republicans elected a majority of Southern representatives.

The Democratic Caucus came up against the race issue hard on January 9, but not with respect to its Southern segregationists. Rather, Rep. Adam Powell of New York was charged with misusing his position as Chair of the Education and Labor Committee to fund personal travel and to employ staff with personal connections who did no work. These behaviors were not unique to Powell among representatives, though perhaps his transgressions differed in scale, and certainly they differed in publicity, both because the Chair was grandiose in his public and private life and because he was a black man. Powell could pass as white, which he did briefly before being outed in college, but since then, if not before, he embraced his blackness

⁴ Key (1949), 5.

⁵ Drew Pearson, January 16, 1967. Younger's party unity score in the 89th Congress was 82%, Glenn Davis' was 88%, and Watson's was 80%. Ford's was 70%.

in a way that often poked at the racial insecurities of predominantly white societies, including that of the House.⁶

His Committee had already moved to clip Chair Powell's wings, and in September 1966 Glenn Andrews (R AL) introduced HRes 1021 calling for an investigation of Powell. The investigation, in which Powell refused to participate, reported on January 3, 1967, that his use of Committee funds was "deceptive." The Caucus six days later voted to relieve him of his chairship. The motion was introduced by Morris Udall of Arizona and was phrased so as to select Carl Perkins of Kentucky, in the second seat, as chair of Education and Labor. Udall's action represented a push by members of the Democratic Study Group to weaken the seniority system by denying two most senior members their chairships. The other target was William Colmer of Mississippi, the presumptive new Chair of the Rules Committee.⁷ Colmer supported Strom Thurmond's third party run for the presidency in 1948 and pointedly did not back Democrat John Kennedy for President in 1960. Powell, indeed, had supported Republican Dwight Eisenhower for President over Democrat Adlai Stevenson in 1956.

Speaker John McCormack opposed the removal of Powell as Chair, and Multer, representing the Speaker, moved a substitute to Udall's motion to suspend Powell as Chair pending the results of a new investigation. Multer's motion was rejected 88-122, and then the Caucus accepted Udall's by voice vote. A motion to appoint Ray Madden of Indiana chair of Rules, also opposed by McCormack, was rejected. The Democratic Caucus chose to preserve the powers of the segregationist Colmer and weaken those of the African American Powell. It is also noteworthy that the liberal DSG was willing to sacrifice half of the two black chairs of committees (and one of only six black members of the House) but only one of ten Southern chairs, evidence if one was required that tone-deafness knew no ideological bounds.⁸

After the reelection of McCormack as speaker on the next day, members were asked to stand for their oaths of office. Lionel Van Deerlin (D CA) asked for recognition and objected to the oath being given to Powell. An objection was then made to Benjamin Blackburn (R GA) being sworn, and he and Powell had to step aside. Udall then rose and moved HRes 1 to administer the oath to Powell but to appoint a committee to report within 60 days on his "final right" to his seat. Udall brought up his transgression as Chair as well as a case in New York in which he was cited for criminal contempt for noncompliance with court orders in a defamation lawsuit. Udall's motion was an attempt to head off a Republican motion which would also demand the investigation but deny Powell his seat in the interim.⁹

During debate on Udall's motion, Albert obtained unanimous consent that Powell be allowed to speak on his own behalf. Albert also argued as did Multer that there was no question of the legitimacy of Powell's election and that he thus was entitled to his seat until disabling charges were proven. Powell's response included an accusation that none of the members sitting in judgment were without sin – not a way to win his audience. At the end of debate, Udall's motion of the previous question, i.e. to vote on his resolution and avoid the Republican amendment, was defeated 126-305. This paved the way for Minority Leader Ford to offer the substitute. Multer spoke again, arguing that the punishment was preceding the trial. The

⁶ See Charles Hamilton for a good biography of Powell, that covers his legal and congressional problems as well as his personality. On his passing for white, Charles Hamilton, 49-50.

⁷ *CQWR*, January 13, 1967, 48-9. Nelson, 711-5.

⁸ Drew Pearson, January 16, 1967. Bolling (1968), 242-4.

⁹ *Congressional Record*, January 10, 1967, 14-15. Charles Hamilton, 23. *CQ Almanac 1967*, on-line. Blackburn's case was that of a contested election brought by the incumbent Democrat. The Georgia Supreme Court ruled for Blackburn as did then the House.

substitute was adopted 363-65 and Powell was denied his seat pending the report of the investigating Special Committee.

No Republicans voted for Udall's motion. Nine Southern Democrats voted for Udall's, though none of the Class of '46. Albert, Blatnik, Donahue, Karsten, and Multer were ayes for Udall's, though Albert and Donahue also voted for Ford's. Garmatz, the one other non-Southerner in the Class, opposed Udall's and voted for Ford's. Thus, only Blatnik, Karsten, and Multer supported Powell's right to his seat.

The Special Committee was faced with the lack of clear precedents on how to decide that question. The House had no established rules on the matter and had no regular body to police its members. Burleson's Committee on House Administration was as close to such as there was, and the Chair, as had those before him, ran the Committee as a housekeeper rather than a court. Burleson had been asked to check on Powell's expenditures earlier and did not do so until pressed to appoint a Subcommittee chaired by Wayne Hays of Ohio. The new Special Committee decided to examine the New York case as well as the financial irregularities cited by the Hays Subcommittee.¹⁰

The Special Committee delivered a unanimous finding that (1) Powell met the constitutional requirements for membership in the House, (2) he was in criminal contempt of a New York court, (3) he had misappropriated \$46,228.48 in public funds, and (4) he had made false reports on expenditures of counterpart funds. The report unanimously recommended that (1) he should be seated, (2) he be censured and condemned, (3) he should reimburse \$40,000, (4) he be stripped of his seniority, and (5) the House study its procedures in dealing with similar cases. The Special Committee, although reporting that Powell met the three constitutional requirements for his office as representative, did not state a conclusion that those were the only requirements. All the members of the Special Committee agreed this was the case, but the Republican members on direction of their leadership refused to include such a statement in the report.¹¹

On March 1 the House rejected the Special Committee report 222-202 but adopted a Republican substitution 248-176 to exclude Powell from membership. Only 25 Northern Democrats voted for the exclusion, though Southern Democrats supported the amendment 77-5 and Border Democrats did 21-6. Republican opponents numbered 59. The votes of Class members were consistent on both votes with Udall's motion to seat Powell and investigate, with the exception of Glenn Davis, who voted for the committee report and against exclusion.

A special election to fill Powell's vacated seat on April 11 returned Powell with 86% of the vote. He was again not seated. In November 1968 he would be returned and then seated in the 91st Congress. On June 16, 1969 the Supreme Court would rule 7-1 that the House had unconstitutionally deprived him of membership as he met the three constitutional qualifications.¹²

The division between the voting of Northern and Southern Democrats raises the obvious question as to whether the Powell case was a matter of racist retribution for an uppity black man. Perhaps a good authority for that would be Fishbait Miller, Doorkeeper of the House, a Mississippian and the protégé of William Colmer.

[Powell] started traveling not only with a black secretary but a white one as well. In 1962, he took along Corrine Huff, his white receptionist, and Mrs. Tamara Wall, a black lawyer on his Labor Committee, to study employment of women overseas, and he authorized his own trip since he was chairman of the House Labor

¹⁰ Andrew Jacobs, 37-44. Smith and Burka, 121-2. Drew Pearson, February 18, 1967.

¹¹ Andrew Jacobs, 162, 174, 249-55. The black member of the committee added a statement of additional views but signed the committee report. Andrew Jacobs, 256.

¹² Nelson, 715. *Powell v. McCormack*.

Committee. This, in my opinion, was the straw that broke the camel's back and made Congress determined to get Powell. When he had relatives on the payroll and got kickbacks, that was something some congressmen shared, but when he mixed the races, they were livid with rage.¹³

One other personnel matter came to the fore in the Democratic Caucus on January 9 – the matter of the Clerk of the House. Ralph Roberts had been the Clerk since 1949, with the exception of the 83rd Republican House, was now 69, employed a couple of relatives, and used his official limousine for trips to the horse track. There were accusations of a lack of responsiveness to members and a reluctance to modernize the operations of his office. Pat Jennings, who was defeated in 1966 after six terms in the House, wanted the job and counted the support of his fellow Virginians and some of the more liberal members to take the position away from Roberts. Hardy led the charge in caucus and Roberts was voted out 138-105.¹⁴

Williams, who was punished through his loss of seniority in the 89th Congress for the same reason as Albert Watson of South Carolina, unlike Watson did not switch parties, voted for McCormack for Speaker, and asked for the restoration of his seniority. If done, he would presumptively become the Chair of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.¹⁵

Meeting in Caucus on February 1, the Democrats rejected Williams's appeal 134-100. Blatnik spoke against it, saying the Mississippian was entitled to his seat in the House but not to an important position where he could assist Republican policies. The representatives from Mississippi argued that Republicans were "snapping at our heels" and Party unity was needed. That would be "Party unity" in name but not policy. Williams himself said, "I don't regret a thing that I have done. I'd do it all over again. Let me assure you. I'll continue to be a loyal member of the Mississippi Democratic Party." Williams asked not to be assigned to any committee unless his seniority was restored.¹⁶

Eleven days after the Caucus, Williams announced for governor of Mississippi, which was holding its regular election in 1967. He was one of seven candidates in the Democratic primary on August 8 and not the most vociferous segregationist, though only one of the five major candidates outdid him. Although the black population of the State was close to 40%, lags in registration and turnout assured a white electorate for the contest. Journalist Curtis Wilkie would write, "It was ... the state's last openly racist campaign – blacks had not yet taken full advantage of the Voting Rights Act.... 'Insult, insinuation and invective. These are the hallmarks of Mississippi's 1967 governor's race,' I wrote in the *Press Register*." The most moderate of the major five, State Treasurer William Winter, presumably took what black vote there was and led the primary with 32%. Williams was runner-up with 29%.¹⁷

¹³ Miller as told to Leighton, 212. Miller confused the women. Mrs. Wall was the "attractive, blond, 31-year-old divorcee and an assistant counsel" to Education and Labor. Corrine Huff was the 21-year-old black receptionist and former Miss Ohio. Andrew Jacobs, 51-2. One cannot help but note that attractive female staff were common to House members. Cokie Roberts noted that the House office of her father, Hale Boggs, included a room full of people including the "very attractive New Orleansians" who worked there. Roberts interview. Andrew Jacobs himself referred to "Muffet – my pretty secretary, Mrs. Phyllis Coelho." Andrew Jacobs, 105.

¹⁴ Anderson interview. *The Pittsburgh Press*, January 4 & 10, 1967. *The Progress-Index*, January 6 & 9, 1967. *The Danville Register*, January 10, 1967.

¹⁵ Chair Oren Harris of Arkansas resigned in February 1966 and Harley Staggers of West Virginia moved up. Williams's longevity on the Committee was greater than was Staggers's.

¹⁶ Drew Pearson, February 2, 1967.

¹⁷ *CQWR*, February 17, 1967, 267. Earl Black, 64-5, 181-3. Rankin. Wilkie, 169.

In the run-off Williams told voters to “come on under the big, white John Bell Williams tent. You don’t want to get in bed with that bloc vote.” Winter had avoided talking about racial issues or even implicit racial matters in the primary but declared himself a segregationist in the run-off and praised Alabama’s former Gov. George Wallace, the most nationally-known segregationist politician. Wilkie would note that Williams’ loss of seniority “elevated him to martyr’s status back home in Mississippi,” and the Representative took the runoff with 54%.¹⁸

Faced with Williams’ unassailable segregationist credentials, the Republican candidate and former Democratic Judge Rubel Phillips, who had run for governor in 1963 as a segregationist, tacked left. Phillips went on television to observe that “the whites cannot keep the Negro down without paying the awesome penalty of restricting his own advancement.” The Republican took 30%, and his moderation contributed to a collapse of rising Republican strength in the State. The Party lost all three legislative seats they had previously won. Only one of sixty Republican candidates in the State was victorious. Temperance on race proved not to be a winning strategy for Mississippi Republicans.¹⁹

Williams would leave the House on January 16, 1968, the same day he was sworn in as Governor of Mississippi.

Another member of the Class of ’46 left the House during the 90th Congress. Abraham Multer had been plagued with questions as to whether he was improperly trading on his House and, particularly, his Committee on Banking and Currency membership in his extracurricular activities in both overseas and domestic banking. The Liberal Party dropped their support for him after 1962 and he captured the Democratic nomination in 1966 with only 51% of the vote.

The Representative’s choice to give up the House was not an escape from electoral politics, as he ran with organization support for an elective judgeship in the judicial district that included Brooklyn and Staten Island. The incumbent was a Republican appointed to fill a vacancy. The Liberals also put up a candidate. Multer won with 55%. The change had two positive benefits for him. New York supreme (i.e. district) court judges received greater pay than members of the House without the necessity of maintaining living quarters in Washington, and Drew Pearson, who had hounded Multer in his column for some time, would be expected to pay less attention to the Brooklynite.²⁰

Multer resigned his House seat effective December 31, 1967, and was sworn in as judge on January 3, 1968.²¹

A year before Williams and Multer left the House, the 21-day rule died. On opening day, after Powell was denied his seat pending the results of the investigatory committee, Blackburn was admitted to membership on a voice vote, the party leaders were announced, the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, and Postmaster were elected on partisan voice votes, the Chaplain was elected without opposition, the Senate was notified that the House was organized, and a committee was chosen to notify the President, Albert moved that the rules of the 89th House be adopted. Allen Smith (R CA) announced that he wanted the 21-day period to begin after the chair of the relevant committee asked for a Rules Committee hearing

¹⁸ Wilkie, 170, 172. *CQWR*, September 1, 1967, 1698.

¹⁹ *CQWR*, October 20, 1967, 2140-1. *Time*, November 17, 1967.

²⁰ *The New York Times*, September 9, 1967. *CQWR*, November 10, 1967, 2297. Drew Pearson made a final stab at Multer on February 16, 1968.

²¹ *CQWR*, January 12, 1968, 65.

rather than after a bill was reported to Rules and that the Speaker agreed to interpret the Rule in that fashion. Minority Leader Gerald Ford indicated that his Party had more problems with the rules than just the 21-day rule and would vote against Albert's motion. All but two Republicans did so. Forty Southern Democrats, including Passman, Williams, and Dorn, joined the Republicans, and Albert's motion was defeated 195-225. The rest of the Class voted with their parties except for Abbitt, who did not vote. Smith then moved to strike the 21-day rule and the motion passed.

The expansion of the Rules Committee from twelve members to a 10-5 Democratic majority remained in force. Rep. Richard Bolling, Democratic loyalist and House reformer, considered the situation in the 90th House adequate to support Democratic policies without the necessity of the 21-day rule. He opined that only the new chair, William Colmer of Mississippi, remained a stumbling block as the Democratic leadership had appointed two loyalists to the Committee, and thus there was a normal 9-6 vote for Democratic policies.²²

The Rules Committee would usually prove not the barricade to Democratic accomplishments; the overall House membership was sufficient. The reduced Democratic majority, the perceptions by some in that majority that the 1966 election indicated voters were, if not hostile, certainly unconvinced of the value of Pres. Johnson's initiatives, and the weakness of the Democratic leadership resulted in the "conservative coalition" doubling its victories from the 89th Congress.²³

Speaker McCormack was 75 at the start of the 90th Congress, and his wife was seven years older and in failing health. Some liberal Democrats, who had tasted the long-awaited successes of the 89th Congress were wont to blame McCormack for the shortcomings of the 90th. Moreover, Majority Leader Albert was slowed. "Until his heart attack, Mr. Albert was one of the scrappiest fighters in Congress, lashing out at real or imagined Republican shortcomings in a high-pitched voice that carried to the far reaches of the chamber." The Democratic leadership was in a weakened period, both by their own aging and by the insurgency of their membership.²⁴

Still, the impetus of equal rights legislation had not yet run its course. The Johnson Administration, having failed with its open housing initiative in 1966, continued to push that, extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission, and protection from state persecution of equal rights activists and those attempting to exercise those rights. HR 2516, introduced by Emanuel Celler (D NY), Chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, to implement the last of these three was amended in the Senate to include open housing. Surprisingly, given the opposition of Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen (R IL) to the housing provision, it overcame a filibuster by the barest majority to reach the floor. Both the major contenders for the next Republican presidential nomination, Classmate Richard Nixon and New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller supported the bill, but the critical factor in overcoming cloture was that four Republicans supportive of cloture joined the Senate as a result of the 1966 election. This forced Dirksen to abandon his opposition, in return for which he weakened the coverage and enforceability of the housing provisions.²⁵

Supporters in the House of HR 2516, having already passed easily in their body as a protective measure for those seeking equal rights, were now presented with the possibility of a conference committee to

²² Bolling (1968), 244.

²³ *CQ Almanac 1968*, on-line.

²⁴ Nelson, 731-3. *The New York Times*, February 6, 2000.

²⁵ Graham, 267-71.

work out the profound differences between their version and the Senate's inclusion of open housing. House Minority Leader Ford sought a conference committee, which would likely endanger the open housing provisions. In Republican Conference, William McCulloch of Ohio fought for blanket acceptance of the Senate's major changes. Despite pleas from Nixon and Rockefeller, Ford did not change his support for the conference committee, but he did not invoke it as a requirement on his members. On April 10, 1968, the House agreed to the Senate amendments 250-172.²⁶

The assassination of equal rights activist Martin Luther King Jr on April 4 undoubtedly contributed to the House's action. So, too, did the report of the national Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders of February 29 that reported that the ongoing rioting in black ghettos reflected an entrapment therein through housing discrimination. McCulloch was a member of the Commission.²⁷ House Republicans voted 100-84 for the resolution to accept the Senate amendments, McCulloch supporting and Glenn Davis opposing. Northern Democrats supported the resolution 128-6, while Border Democrats split almost equally, Albert supporting and Garmatz opposing. Southern Democrats opposed the resolution 11-70. The rest of the Class split as the above summary would indicate, except that Karsten did not vote.

This Civil Rights Act of 1968 required individuals who were denied housing because of their race to bring suit. The Department of Housing and Urban Development could provide assistance, but federal action was limited to the Department of Justice bringing suit in cases of a pattern of noncompliance. Nevertheless, as with the Act of 1964 that desegregated public accommodations, the major effect was to remove the competitive advantage of racism and to allow the free market to act.²⁸

The continued opposition of Southern Democrats to equal rights indicated that politics and politicians would be slower to change than society as a whole. Generals are prepared to fight the last war and politicians are ready to address a social problem that has already moved to its next stage. The tardiness of the presidency and Congress in dealing with the *de jure* apartheid of America bore fruit in the riots in urban ghettos of the middle sixties. In return, the perceived lack of gratitude of black urban rioters to equal rights laws resulted in a backlash that impacted the continued efforts of the Johnson Administration in extending and funding antipoverty programs, widely perceived incorrectly as overwhelmingly impacting African Americans and also, not too incorrectly, as failing to solve the fundamental problems of poverty.

Antipoverty programs were cut by the 90th Congress, and when the Administration's bills were passed it was with the imposition of restrictions on access to their benefits. S 2388, the Economic Opportunity Act authorization, was stalled so badly in the Committee on Education and Labor that Albert changed his membership from the Science and Astronautics Committee to help get the bill reported. In Richard Bolling's telling, "'Must' amendments to the antipoverty act became bogged down in Education and Labor. Albert ... moved to save the bill from its enemies - and from its squabbling friends.... Albert managed to have the bill, battered and maimed, reported to the House." Then a motion by William Ayres (R OH) to recommit the bill passed with instructions to reduce the funding by \$460 million. The Chair of Education and Labor immediately reported the bill as recommitted and it passed 283-129. Conference restored \$380 million in return for Senate agreement to a House provision that provided for the ability of local governments to control community action programs, most of which were run by private nonprofits.²⁹

²⁶ Graham, 271-2. *CQWR*, April 12, 1968, 791-2. Drew Pearson, March 27, 1968.

²⁷ *CQWR*, March 8, 1968, 469.

²⁸ Graham, 274-6.

²⁹ Busch, 102. Bolling (1968), 248-9. "Antipoverty Program Survives Assault, Gets \$1.8 Billion," *CQ Almanac* 1967, on-line.

The House passed the Administration's Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act on August 8, 1967, after amending it to provide for block grants rather than the categorical grants the Administration wanted. Albert opposed the amendment but voted with 377 other members for the bill, which imposed restrictions on interstate sales of handguns. The Senate added permissive wiretapping amendments, opposed by the Administration and Albert. Final passage by the House on June 6, 1968, was by 369-17.³⁰

Senator and presidential aspirant Robert Kennedy was fatally shot the previous day with a handgun, but King was killed by rifle shot on April 4, and Kennedy's brother, the President, was assassinated with a mail-order rifle in 1963. The 1934 National Firearms Act imposed stiff taxes on automatic and sawed-off guns and required their registration, although the Supreme Court in January 1968 ruled that punishment for non-registration was a violation of the Fifth Amendment. The Act also included restrictions on interstate shipment of firearms but did not ban them. Bills to expand restrictions on interstate sales in the 88th and 89th Congresses failed.³¹

With the two 1968 assassinations, Pres. Johnson increased his push for restrictions on mail-order sales of long guns, and the Administration bill, HR 17735, was introduced in the House on June 10. The Judiciary Committee failed to report the bill until McCulloch asked for reconsideration on June 20, though he did not support the motion to report it. The House accepted an amendment that excluded ammunition from coverage and passed the bill 305-118. Conference returned mail-order sales of ammunition to prohibition, and the report was accepted 161-129. Albert announced his opposition to the Administration bill early on and later explained that his constituents were opposed, particularly because ammunition was difficult to buy and everyone in his district hunted.³² Still, Albert voted against the bill on initial passage, when ammunition was excluded from coverage. The Southern members of the Class, other than Evins who did not vote and Hardy, joined Albert in opposition. The rest, including McCulloch and Glenn Davis, voted for passage.

An anti-poverty measure that provided rent supplements tied up Evins' appropriations bill (HR 9960) for Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies. The funds, which provided assistance for home renters, was an alternative to publicly owned housing, but the fact that the money was paid to private entities did not lessen conservative opposition to it. The Administration requested \$40 million for fiscal 1968, but Evins' subcommittee provided only \$10 million. When HR 9960 reached the floor, Glenn Davis moved to strike that reduced amount. His success on a teller vote led to a roll call, which confirmed the earlier vote, 233-171. The Senate added the Administration's \$40 million back into the bill, but this proved a stumbling block to conference along with another issue, the model cities program. A second conference agreed to \$10 million for rent subsidies and a figure for model cities that was a little less than half the Administration request, and the House defeated a recommittal motion to delete the rent subsidies again 184-198.³³

³⁰ "Congress Passes Extensive Anticrime Legislation," *CQ Almanac 1968*, on-line.

³¹ "Gun Controls Extended to Long Guns, Ammunition," *CQ Almanac 1968*, on-line. *Haynes v. United States*.

³² *CQWR*, July 5, 1968, 1698. Albert interview (1969), 3.

³³ "Model Cities, Rent Supplement Funds Cut Deeply," *CQ Almanac 1967*, on-line. The introduced bill also prohibited aid to veterans who did not receive honorable discharges. Teague got this changed by amendment to prohibit sales to veterans who received dishonorable discharges, there being a range between the two poles. The low vote on the conference report was appended by 142 members' announced pairings.

Opposition to rent subsidies was voiced as objection to a socialistic measure of taxing some to pay the rental of others, but an unvoiced fear was that subsidies might enable black urban residents the ability to move into the whiter suburbs.³⁴ Among the Class, on two of the three roll calls in which the rent subsidy was the issue, McCulloch joined his fellow Republican Davis in support of eliminating the subsidy, not voting on the question of concurrence with the Senate's restoration. Albert, Blatnik, Karsten, and Multer upheld the Administration's support for subsidies. Southern Democrats Abbitt, Passman, and Teague voted with Davis.

Beyond that it got interesting. Burleson, Hardy, and Jones voted for Davis's amendment and against concurrence with the Senate but opposed recommitment and elimination of the subsidy. Dorn and Evins opposed Davis's amendment as well as concurrence with the Senate. Dorn then voted for recommitment and elimination of all subsidies, while Evins voted against recommitment. Donohue and Garmatz both voted for Davis's amendment and against recommitment, that is, for \$10 million, but Donahue voted for concurrence (\$40 million) and Garmatz against. Finally, Williams paired for Davis's amendment and missed the other two votes.

Ignoring Williams, we could label seven of the sixteen inconsistent on the issue of rent subsidies, but a rent subsidy is not always a rent subsidy. Matters of regional, party, and personal loyalty, changes in contacts with influencers over the period of consideration, impatience with issues and processes, and commitment to the overall thrust of HR 9960, of which the question of rent subsidies was a miniscule proportion in dollars, all came to bear.³⁵ Then there is idiosyncrasy. There were 478 roll call votes in the 90th Congress and far more unrecorded votes. In stating this, one can hear the cry of the representative accused of this or that based on one or a few votes. The vote on Davis's amendment was identified by both Americans for Democratic Action and Congressional Quarterly as one of two dozen key roll calls in the 90th Congress that they used to define a representative. Another vote on HR 9960, not addressing rent subsidies, was also identified. But there were a total of eight roll calls on HR 9960.

Issues of income redistribution and race aside, Republicans had long positioned themselves as the party of government economy – low taxes and low government spending. Federal government outlays under the Johnson Administration had risen from \$118.4 billion in fiscal 1965 to \$158.3 billion in fiscal 1967. The escalating war in Vietnam was taking a larger share of this, but outlays by other than the Department of Defense still increased by 26% over two years. While Southern Democrats did not equal Republicans in their passion for government economy, they exceeded them in devotion to states rights, and the increased numbers of the Republican/Southern Democrat bloc in the 90th Congress presented opportunities for inhibiting the growth of the federal government. A little cut in rent subsidies from \$40 million to \$10 million would hardly reign in big government, but as Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen is reputed to have said, "A billion here, a billion there, and pretty soon you're talking real money." One should add parsimony as a motivating factor.³⁶

Congressional Republicans were not the only ones discomfited by the rising federal spending. Pres. Johnson found it necessary to ask for a tax increase, a 10% surcharge on personal and corporate income

³⁴ *CQWR*, July 28, 1967, 1318-9.

³⁵ Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen did a notable flip-flop on rent subsidies, attributing it to his conversation with a collection of business leaders, and thus enabling the Senate to restore the \$40 million figure.

³⁶ *Historical Statistics*, Series Y 457-465. See The Dirksen Congressional Center's investigation of the attribution of the quote, DirksenCenter.org/research-collections/everett-m-dirksen/dirksen-record/billion-here-billion-there.

taxes. This gave new impetus to Republican efforts to cut spending. Their efforts to amend seven of the fiscal 1967 appropriations bills in 1966 to cut 5% failed in the heavily Democratic House. They tried again in 1967 on seven fiscal 1968 appropriations bills and succeeded on two, but the cuts were dropped in conference.³⁷

But a new tactic beckoned. By the start of the fiscal year on July 1, 1967, only two appropriations bills had been enacted. This tardiness was not too unusual; Congress would simply adopt a continuing resolution to keep funding agencies at the old or a reduced level. Two such resolutions moved the goalpost incrementally to September 30 as two other appropriations bills cleared. Then, a third continuing resolution, HJRes 849, to extend authority until October 31, was recommitted on the floor by a unified Republican vote aided by 34 Democrats. Abbitt and Passman voted with the Republicans; Jones and Williams did not vote. Frank Bow of Ohio, ranking Republican on Appropriations, before moving recommitment, tried to amend the resolution to reduce total federal spending by \$5 billion. Since the resolution did not apply to all federal spending, the amendment was ruled out of order, and thus the recommitment.

The Appropriations Committee then brought a new resolution to the floor, but Republicans forced it to go through the Rules Committee and it came to the floor on October 3, delaying spending a few days for agencies covered by the ten appropriations bills that were still languishing. Amendments and recommitment were avoided by a successful vote on the previous question, which was opposed by all Republicans. Abbitt and Williams voted with the Republicans, but Passman voted for the previous question. The continuing resolution cleared on October 4, extending funding through October 23. Two more appropriations bills cleared by then.

On October 16 the Appropriations Committee reported HJRes 888, another continuing resolution extending budget authority through November 23, but also including restrictions on new obligations, on civilian employment, and on research and development funds, and a refusal to fund civilian pay raises already enacted. But the House adopted a substitute offered by Jamie Whitten (D MS) to restrict funding to the fiscal 1967 level for most agencies. Nine Republicans opposed the substitute, but most Southern Democrats supported it, including Abbitt, Burleson, Dorn, Hardy, Passman, and Teague. Williams did not vote. Joel Broyhill (R VA) added an amendment that cut even further into funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), and Passman amended the substitute to cut foreign aid by one-third. While this would seem that the Louisianan had finally achieved his life's work, it must be remembered that all this was on a continuing resolution and that once the relevant appropriations bills were enacted, this would all be subject to change. The House was working hard on short-term issues, which were only somewhat more relevant than the amendment offered by Wayne Hays (D OH) in the midst of the debate to abolish the Appropriations Committee.

This pantomime was rendered even more irrelevant in that the House and Senate could then not reach agreement on their differing versions of the resolution. After October 23 eight more appropriations bills were still in limbo, and the affected agencies were without funds. On November 9 the enacted District of Columbia appropriations bill included a rider that covered those agencies through that date, but HJRes 888 was still in limbo after that. On November 28, a new continuing resolution, HJRes 936, was enacted that covered the last two agencies until December 20 that were still not funded by regular appropriations, the OEO and the Agency for International Development. The bills for both of these agencies finally cleared on December 15.

³⁷ "Congress Orders \$4-Billion Cut in Federal Spending," *CQ Almanac 1967*, on-line.

It was not Passman's fault that the foreign aid appropriation was so late. The authorization bill, S 1872, was not passed by the Senate until August 17 and by the House on August 25. It was held up for weeks through a deadlock between the House and Senate conferees. Passman announced his intention on October 27 to seek a special rule to enable consideration of the appropriation without authorization. The authorization finally was enacted on November 15, and HR 13893, Passman's appropriations bill, could proceed. The fiscal 1968 authorization was \$787 million below the Administration's request and \$829 million below that for fiscal 1967. Passman's subcommittee reported a figure for economic and military aid, Title I of the bill, of \$2.2 billion, \$740 million below the appropriation for fiscal 1967 and one billion dollars below the Administration request for fiscal 1968. The Senate approved \$2.7 billion. Conference settled on \$2.3 billion.³⁸

The House voted against recommittal of the bill 135-177 and for passage 167-143, then recommitted the initial conference report 196-185 and supported the second conference report 198-158. Passman, Albert, Blatnik, Harold Donohue of Massachusetts, Karsten, Multer, and Teague consistently supported the Subcommittee. Glenn Davis, Dorn, Evins, and McCulloch opposed it on each of the votes, as Williams did on the first two votes, missing the last two. Burleson voted against both recommitments and against both passages, an indication of his lack of Democratic solidarity and of foreign aid opposition. Jones's votes were similar, but missed the vote on adoption of the conference report. Hardy opposed recommitment of the bill and supported recommitment of the conference report, while supporting passage of the bill and missing the vote on adoption of the conference report, rather a flip flop. Garmatz voted for recommitment of the bill and against recommitment of the conference report, and voted for passage and the conference report, not a flip flop and possibly indicating he wanted a larger sum for foreign aid, although the motion on recommitment was by an opponent of the bill. Abbitt missed the vote on acceptance of the conference report, but opposed its recommitment. On the other hand, he voted for recommitment of the bill and opposed its passage. Was he won over by an appeal between bill and conference?³⁹

Passman, of course, supported his own bill; he always did, no matter how much he complained about it. But he was very supportive of cuts. In 1968, foreign aid appropriations for fiscal 1969 was cut even further by his Subcommittee. The House passed HR 19908 with a total of economic and military aid for \$1.6 billion. After Senate action and conference, \$1.755 billion was appropriated.

Passman's mannerisms and dress on the floor had attracted press attention before and 1967 was no different. Drew Pearson contributed:

Passman ... is a dapper, likeable Congressman who keeps twelve suits hanging in the closet of his Congressional office, has more watches than any other member of Congress, and likes to spend April in Paris supposedly checking on our foreign aid spending.... Rep. Passman keeps two Cadillacs in his garage, has brought back a brilliant assortment of jewelry from his junkets to Hong Kong at taxpayers' expense and prides himself on being the No. 1 whittler-down of foreign aid.⁴⁰

The increased recalcitrance of Congress was far from the only worry for the Johnston Administration.

The year 1967 saw an increase in Labor strikes. The number of work stoppages was the highest in fourteen years and the number of workers involved was the highest since 1952, the last year of the Truman Administration. The largest was a two-day walkout of railroad workers. The threat of the strike

³⁸ CQWR, November 3, 1967, 2228. "1967 AID Authorization Lowest in History," CQ Almanac 1967, on-line.

³⁹ Votes are from *Congressional Record*, November 17, 1967, 32981; December 14, 1967, 36528; December 15, 1967, 37128.

⁴⁰ Drew Pearson, November 16, 1967.

alarmed the Pentagon, as did two others in which Taft-Hartley was invoked. Taft-Hartley was not invoked in the case of the railway strike because railway employers and employees were subject rather to the Railway Labor Act of 1926. After two laws on Johnson's initiative extended "cooling-off periods" for the impending railway strike, the President asked Congress to enact law giving him the power to impose a settlement. The Senate passed such a bill (SJRes 81), but the House struck the binding settlement provision. Conferees failed to resolve the difference and the strike began on July 16, 1967. The next day the House accepted the Senate version and the strike ended pending an imposed settlement in 90 days unless the parties reached their own settlement. The imposed settlement went into effect October 15.⁴¹

The omission of the imposed settlement from the House version of SJRes 81, which was HJRes 559 as amended by Claude Pepper (D FL), "came over the heated opposition" of Speaker McCormack, Majority Leader Albert, Majority Whip Hale Boggs of Louisiana, and Minority Leader Ford. Albert argued that the omission would have a "destructive impact ... on the nation's security."⁴²

This brings us to Vietnam, which in 1968 would bring Johnson's presidency to an end. As for Albert and his saber-rattling the year before, in his autobiography he would both plead ignorance on Vietnam and rewrite his track-record. "Even at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and Lyndon Johnson's subsequent injection of American power, I had had no great enthusiasm for the Vietnam War." Yet he records that he posed no objections, no doubts, no concern of the human cost of the war. "We could not know We could not tell We could not imagine We could not envision We could not foresee We could not imagine We could not foresee ... We could not know" On and on until he ran out of synonyms for willful ignorance, Albert excused his lack of perception, his lack of questions, his lack of compassion, and his lack of history. His own military experience was as an Army lawyer, his experience of death and destruction that of defeated Japan, the aggressors, the Asians. Now more Asians were challenging the United States and his knowledge of history ended in 1946 rather than after the French failure in Indochina in 1954. In this he was both typical of and reflective of the members of the House he had led since 1955. Albert was, after all, right in the mainstream of the House. By his account, "Between 1966 and 1972, Congress voted 145 times on Vietnam. Right up until the very end, it gave two presidents everything they wanted." And Albert helped lead the House to those votes.⁴³

In the 90th Congress a rare vote specific to the war was on a motion to recommit HR 4515, a fiscal 1967 supplemental appropriation authorization for \$4.5 billion largely for the war, and to ban the use of any such funds for military operations over North Vietnam. The motion failed 18-372. None of the Class of '46 were among the 18. Blatnik and Evins failed to vote. The conference report was approved 364-13. None of the Class were among the 13. Five did not vote: Albert, Donohue, Evins, Hardy, and Passman. In 1968, Blatnik did join a group of 18 House Democrats calling on the Administration to accept a Vietnam settlement that gave the Viet Cong a role in a new government for South Vietnam. The same month, Teague inserted in the *Congressional Record* a criticism of "the dirty-looking riff-raff that flocked into

⁴¹ *Analysis of Work Stoppages 1967*, 1, 4. *United States v. Davidoff*, 359 F. Supp. 545 (E.D.N.Y. 1973). "Compulsory Settlement Imposed in Railroad Strike," *CQ Almanac 1967*, on-line.

⁴² "Compulsory Settlement Imposed in Railroad Strike," *CQ Almanac 1967*, on-line.

⁴³ Albert with Goble, 136-40, 299-300, 335, 337. It is perhaps attributing too much to the perceptiveness of Frederic Coudert and Burr Harrison of their attempts to put a governor on American involvement in Vietnam during the 83rd Congress. Still....

Washington last October to march on the Pentagon.” Unlike Albert, Teague had seen the underbelly of war, but he emerged as an injured hero.⁴⁴

Teague continued his chairship of Veterans’ Affairs, but the pace of bill introductions under his name decreased appreciably. Only 78 veterans bills were so introduced in the first session; 2 were reported and passed the House and 1 was enacted. This compares to 115 introduced, 13 reported, 12 passed by the House, and 7 enacted in the first session of the 89th Congress.

There were three reasons for this relative lack of activity on the part of Teague and his committee. On January 31, 1967, President Johnson announced that a panel of the Veterans’ Administration would consult with veterans groups to study and recommend changes in benefits. The Veterans’ Advisory Commission resulting from this panel did not report until over a year later on March 19, 1968. Held in abeyance were introductions and committee actions.⁴⁵

The second cause of veterans inactivity on Teague’s part was the death by fire in an Apollo capsule on the ground of astronauts Virgil Grissom, Edward White, and Roger Chaffee on January 27, 1967. Teague had been the chair of the Science and Astronautics Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight for four years and the chair of the Subcommittee on NASA Oversight for two years; the incident fell squarely into his jurisdiction. He was having dinner in Fort Worth with another astronaut, Vance Brand, when he got a call from NASA Administrator James Webb with the news. NASA’s review of the disaster, submitted to Congress on April 9, led to Teague’s characterization of it as a “‘broad indictment’ of both NASA and its contractors,” primarily North American Aviation, Inc. Teague began Oversight Subcommittee hearings on April 10, with hearings on six dates through May 10. NASA personnel were defensive and protective of its relations with its contractors. Teague, despite his initial public statement, was protective of NASA. The major effect of the hearings was that the Committee’s authorization bill in 1968 mandated an Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel. Teague was occupied with the hearings but also, in the words of the official Committee history, in efforts to “repair the shattered morale of the NASA Apollo team” with calls to NASA and contractor personnel, contacts with the press, appearances on television, and visits to astronauts and their families.⁴⁶

Thirdly, apart from his second seat on Science and Astronautics, Teague acquired a second seat on a new committee, Standards of Official Conduct. Established as a direct result of the Powell case, during which the Special Committee struggled with what the accused representative could be held accountable for, the new committee was equally populated with Democrats and Republicans and was to establish standards but not enforce them. Enforcement would be, in theory, up to the Committee on House Administration, still under the chairship of Burleson, who renamed his Subcommittee on Contracts to that of Ethics and Contracts at the same time. It was this Subcommittee that investigated allegations against Powell in 1966. Teague, as well as classmates Evins (third seat) and Abbitt (fourth) were appointed to the

⁴⁴ CQWR, March 15, 1968. 531-2. *Congressional Record*, March 13, 1968, 6449. In re Teague: “Nearly every day, a stocky man with graying hair scampers nimbly around the paddle ball court in the House gymnasium. On his left foot he wears a special shoe with a rocker sole because of a missing ankle bone.” *The New York Times*, April 18, 1967.

⁴⁵ CQWR, January 12, 1968, 42.

⁴⁶ Hechler, 194-200, 203-4. *Investigation into Apollo 204 Accident*. Dodge and Beuttler, 31.

new committee on May 1, 1967. Dorn, in testimony before the new committee on August 23, proposed that members and candidates for the House be required to file financial statements.⁴⁷

Standards of Official Conduct reported a Code of Official Conduct on March 14, 1968, that was adopted by the House. It made the Committee permanent and empowered it with investigatory authority. The Code also required members and major staff to file financial disclosures, open to the public. Burleson had never shown much interest in policing members (Drew Pearson labeled him “complacent”) and was likely happy to cede enforcement to the new committee.⁴⁸ The greatest ambition of most members of the House was a chairship, yet Burleson, now in his eighth congress as Chair of House Administration, acquired little from his position. He acted largely as the accountant for the House and reaped accusations from opponents for facilitating members’ abuses of their staff, travel, and supplements. Challengers would state that Burleson’s chairship did nothing for his district. In the 90th Congress, an out presented itself.

Clark Thompson, Democrat of Texas, retired from the House at the end of the 89th Congress. He held a Texas seat on the Committee on Ways and Means, a seat important to his state in protecting the depletion allowances in the tax code for oil and gas. Burleson would later say that he had long wished to be on Ways and Means, which in substance, prominence, and influence far outranked House Administration. Its members not only wrote tax legislation, “the power to destroy” in Chief Justice John Marshall’s words in *McCulloch v. Maryland*, but they, under leadership direction, chose the Democratic members of other committees. Burleson would say that while he was good on oil and gas taxes with Sam Rayburn, he was too conservative on some other matters for the former Speaker and had been denied the Committee.⁴⁹

Burleson made an all-out run for Thompson’s seat, but so did Jack Brooks of Beaumont, Texas. Burleson was more senior and was the preferred candidate of the oil industry, but Brooks was more liberal and thus more of a national Democrat. The Texas delegation put their lot in with Burleson, but the Party Caucus on January 17, 1967, voted for Jacob Gilbert of New York 115-113. Two Alabama representatives were missing from the Caucus, having gone off to Montgomery for the inauguration of Lurleen Wallace as Governor, and this may have swayed the outcome. Gilbert got the seat and Texas had to be satisfied with a new Republican addition to Ways and Means, future Pres. George H.W. Bush of Houston.⁵⁰

But opportunity knocked again. Sydney Herlong, Democrat of Florida, announced his retirement in 1967 and added that he would resign early from Ways and Means if the seat would go to Burleson. Then Herlong, only 59 and under pressure from supporters in Florida to stay in the House, wavered. Seats on the Committee held by members from California and Pennsylvania and Missouri were expected to become available after the 90th Congress, but the two big states would insist on retaining their places. The Missouri position would be a possibility for Burleson, but Herlong did indeed resign early from Ways and Means. The Caucus on July 30, over the active opposition of Richard Bolling of Missouri, endorsed Burleson for Herlong’s seat, and Burleson took it on that day. A House staffer observed that for Burleson it was “a place to keep his head below the parapets,” as a fifteenth seat would be.⁵¹

⁴⁷ “House Ethics Committee,” *CQ Almanac 1967*, on-line.

⁴⁸ “House Code,” *CQ Almanac 1968*, on-line. Drew Pearson, February 18, 1967.

⁴⁹ *The Paris News*, November 26, 1978.

⁵⁰ Barone, Ujifusa, and Matthews (1975), 843. *Abilene Reporter-News*, October 7, 1966. Drew Pearson, January 20, 1967.

⁵¹ *The Corpus Christi Caller*, March 26, 1968. *Abilene Reporter-News*, July 29, 1968. Drew Pearson, October 20, 1968. Smith and Burka, 121-2.

Further evidence of a desire to hide behind the ramparts might be found in Burleson's attempt in 1968 to relinquish leadership of conservative Democrats, the so-called Boll Weevils Club. He contended he was only "coordinator of efforts" because he had a meeting room, that of the Committee on House Administration. When he gave up the chair, he told the group they needed to find someone else to lead or coordinate, but they would not let him go.⁵²

Teague turned more to veterans affairs in the second session. The President messaged Congress on January 30, 1968, before the Veterans' Advisory Commission reported, urging increases in guarantees on home loans, on vocational rehabilitation training, and on life insurance for veterans and on a new program to encourage veterans to take public service jobs, and on Congressional action to encourage private employers to hire veterans and to protect veterans from pension losses from increases in Social Security benefits. Teague announced the same day he would start hearings on the home loan issue.⁵³

The Commission report advocated raises in disability compensation, home loan guarantees and direct loans, and burial allowances among 79 recommendations. Teague's one major exception to the advocacy of the President and the Commission was on public service incentives, saying it rewarded veterans for a civilian activity rather than a military one.⁵⁴

Through both sessions, Teague introduced 104 veterans bills, compared to 156 in the previous congress. In the 89th Congress his committee reported 31 of his bills, 29 passed the House, and 20 were enacted. In the 90th, 7 were reported, and 6 passed the House and were enacted. Perhaps less needed to be done, or perhaps the Chair was too busy or was simply losing interest.

Garmatz, chair of Merchant Marine and Fisheries, did not appear to lose interest. The 53 Merchant Marine bills under his sponsorship in the 90th House exceeded the 39 in the 89th. In the current House, 23 were reported, 21 passed the House, 18 passed the Senate, and 16 were enacted. Two were vetoed by the President. One, HR 1620, involved the priority of liens on ships, Pres. Johnson contending that giving a priority to suppliers would endanger private financing for ship construction.⁵⁵ The other, HR 159, was Garmatz' continuing effort to create an independent agency of Maritime Administration. He had prevented the transfer of the administration from the Department of Commerce to the new Department of Transportation in 1966.

Garmatz and his committee also clashed with the Administration over shipbuilding subsidies. Since 1936 the United States had subsidized the building of merchant ships in American shipyards. In 1968 the Administration proposed aiding foreign countries in building American ships, arguing that less than eight per cent of American foreign commerce was on US ships and that an increase in ships was preferable to the support of domestic shipyards. Garmatz' reaction to the press was, "You wouldn't be able to print what I have to say about this double-cross." Garmatz' HR 17524 extended the existing subsidies for another year after the Senate reduced his two-year extension.⁵⁶

Multer left the House after the first session and decided to seek the New York court seat no later than August but still sponsored 324 public bills, more than in any previous congress, even given his previous

⁵² *Abilene Reporter-News*, June 8, 1968.

⁵³ *CQWR*, February 2, 1968, 170.

⁵⁴ *CQWR*, March 2, 1968, 595, August 23, 1968, 2263-4.

⁵⁵ *CQWR*, December 22, 1967, 2596.

⁵⁶ *CQWR*, May 31, 1968, 1243-4. "Shipbuilding Subsidies," *CQ Almanac 1968*, on-line.

profligate use of the bill hopper. This number, however, requires the understanding that the House changed its rules on April 25, 1967, to allow joint sponsorship of bills. Thus, instead of 25 identical but separate bills introduced, one bill could be introduced with 25 sponsors. A result was the number of bills introduced by an individual member increased. Eight of the seventeen members of the Class of '46 sponsored more bills in the 90th Congress than they had in any previous congress. This work does not differentiate between the second name on the list of sponsors of a bill and the twenty-fifth, but it does treat the first name as the prime sponsor. If Multer is the first name on the list and the bill is reported, Multer is credited in this work. If his name is the second on the list, he is counted as introducing the bill but not accorded a win if the bill is enacted. The number of public bills introduced by the Class in the 90th Congress was 778, even with Multer and Williams absent in the second session. This cohort's previous best, which was in the 89th Congress, was 632. On the other hand, only 51 of these bills were reported in the 90th, compared to 73 of their bills being reported in the 87th. In the 90th, 34 were enacted versus 39 in the 86th.

Tacking his name on someone else's bill enabled Multer's 324 public bills in the first session to totally swamp the 211 he introduced in the first session of the 89th Congress. Clearly, the Representative or his office remained active despite being berated for perceived ethical lapses as well as casting his eye elsewhere than the House. Now in his eleventh term, he had moved to second in seniority on Banking and Currency in the last congress, but was still not having success with the multitude of bills, 63 this session, that he sent to that committee. Over his tenure he sponsored 354 of their bills, and not a single one was enacted. He had better luck with his other committee, District of Columbia, in which he moved up from fifth to fourth in seniority this session, Rules Chair Howard Smith having been denied renomination. He introduced 163 DC bills and six became law.

In 1967, four public bills of which he was the prime sponsor passed the House and two were enacted. HR 4765 dealt with the income tax treatment of certain investment distributions. HR 13402 authorized the use in chancery of certain buildings in the District of Columbia. He also succeeded with three private bills. In the second seat on Banking and Currency he tangled with his chair, Wright Patman (D TX), on HR 10595, a bill to prohibit banking institutions from participating in state lotteries. Multer successfully amended the bill twice on the floor to limit the restriction to the institution itself and not to other offices in buildings that they owned and to delay the implementation date. The Senate weakened the bill and conference complied. The bill was enacted.⁵⁷

New York was one of two states that had begun such lotteries, and Multer and some other representatives from the State were protective of its lottery. Surely, however, its members were not immune to the accusations of Multer's involvement in Bahamian lotteries and banking. He was nonetheless effective in his modifications of the bill.

Multer was nominated for the New York bench on September 8. While election was not a certainty, it was quite likely. Before his nomination, Multer missed only 15 roll calls on the floor, casting yea or nay on 88% of them. Between nomination and election his voting participation dropped to 54%. Roll calls are not a daily occurrence and there were none on weekends, but there were roll calls on 31 days over the 41 weekdays. Multer cast votes on 19 of the days. After his electoral victory, his participation went up to 60% and he voted on 12 of the 17 days there were roll calls. His overall voting participation for the year was 72%. In the 89th Congress it was 82%.

⁵⁷ "Lottery Sales by Banks," *CQ Almanac 1967*, on-line.

Williams, the other Class member who left after the first session of the 90th Congress, had a much different voting participation in 1967. He was denied his seniority by the Democratic caucus on February 1 and announced for governor of Mississippi on February 11. Before the announcement he participated in all eight roll calls, which occurred on only two days. Before the primary on August 8 he voted on only 18% of roll calls. Between the primary and the runoff on August 29 he missed all 17 roll calls. Between the runoff and the election on November 7, which was a bygone conclusion, he made 23% of the roll calls. After the election his participation dropped to 15%. For the year, he voted on 21% of roll calls. In the 89th Congress he voted yea or nay 72% of the time.

Williams asked to be assigned to no committees. None of his Classmates had any major changes in committee seniority. Now in their eleventh congress, those above them in seniority had been in the House longer and, one can conclude, were even more secure in their districts and less likely to exit due to defeat at the polls.

The biggest bump was Evins' promotion from tenth to eighth seat on Appropriations. Two more senior members, Albert Thomas, 67, of Texas and John Fogarty, only 53, of Rhode Island, died, a greater hazard for the more senior members than electoral rejection. Thomas died on February 15, 1966, so one of Evins' promotions was in the second session of the 89th Congress. Fogarty died the day the 90th Congress convened. More important than his seniority on the Committee remained Evins' chairship of its Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development. He also retained the chairs of Small Business and the Speaker's Committee on Personnel, and he was handed membership on the new Standards of Official Conduct.

Mr. Evins was a busy man but found the time to introduce HR 9060, a bill to encourage rural development through tax incentives. While his bill failed to be reported, it provided a model for S 2134, which was enacted.⁵⁸

Karsten moved up one seat to fifth on the Ways and Means Committee when Eugene Keogh returned to his New York law practice. Karsten was a bit player, like other members on a committee dominated by Chair Wilbur Mills of Arkansas.

Abbitt had the same jump on Agriculture, thanks to Chair Harold Cooley's defeat by a Goldwaterite Republican in North Carolina.⁵⁹ Abbitt and Cooley both represented tobacco growing districts, and the new Chair, W.R. Poage of Texas, was from a cotton district. This would have lessened concern from the Committee Chair about tobacco while increasing Abbitt's influence on the issue as Chair of the Subcommittee on Tobacco. Three of his tobacco bills became law in the 90th.

Donohue advanced from seventh to sixth on Judiciary with the November defeat of Frank Chelf of Kentucky. The Bay Stater had his name on 50 public bills in the 90th Congress, more than in any previous one, but none got reported, including the 15 sent to Judiciary. He was more successful in the previous three congresses.

Donohue also was appointed to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, one of four people named by the Speaker. Commissions were common. Albert, Jones, and McCulloch would serve on three each during their times in the House. Blatnik, Donohue, Karsten, Carroll Kearns of Pennsylvania, and Katherine St. George of New York would be on two. Claude Bakewell of Missouri, Laurie Battle of Alabama,

⁵⁸ "Congress Considers Plans to Aid Rural Development," *CQ Almanac 1967*, on-line.

⁵⁹ Christensen, 205. Cooley survived his refusal to sign the Southern Manifesto in 1956, which sank the other two non-signing North Carolina Democrats that year, including Class of '46 member Charles Deane.

Frederic Coudert of New York, Burr Harrison of Virginia, Frederick Muhlenberg of Pennsylvania, Prince Preston of Georgia, Wint Smith of Kansas, and Teague would serve on one each. Commissions usually included a large majority of the public, and how much members of Congress participated was up to the members. Donohue scored the big one. The Bicentennial celebration, with its acme on July 4, 1976, was only nine years away. It would avoid the racism implicit in the Civil War Centennial celebration just past, the biggest conflicts being over the degree to which corporate America was funding and capitalizing on the celebration and, as the complexities of the Watergate scandal emerged, the fear that America would be fiddling while the Nixon Administration burned.⁶⁰

On Judiciary with Donohue was the ranking Republican McCulloch. The Ohioan's introduction of bills in the 90th illustrates two characteristics of the new rule allowing multiple sponsors. Never a frequent initiator of bills, he had introduced a total of 86 public ones over 11 terms, he reached a new high with 21 in the 90th Congress, but he was the prime sponsor of only 8. As a Republican in a House that was majority Democrat for nine of his terms, only five of his public bills before the 90th Congress were enacted; two had been in the Republican 83rd Congress. In the 90th he could claim success on three other public bills for a total of eight over his tenure; however, on those three bills he was not the prime sponsor, but rather an add-on. The new sponsorship rule increased both his nominal introductions and his nominal successes.

McCulloch also was named to a new Select Committee on Western Hemisphere Immigration. He served periodically on a Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy in the 86th, 89th, and 90th Congresses. That committee, created by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, never met until July 1963 and would be abolished by the Legislative Reform Act of 1970. The 1952 Act, more generally known as the McCarran-Walter Act, was passed over Pres. Harry Truman's veto and essentially reconfirmed the Immigration Act of 1924, which established national quotas for immigration based on the ethnic makeup of the country in 1920. The Joint Committee was to "make a continuous study" of the administration of the 1952 Act and immigration in general. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 still provided national quotas and extended them to Western Hemisphere countries, but provided a number of exceptions. It did not address the moribund Joint Committee. Many of the private bills introduced over the years were attempts at end runs around the restrictions of the various immigration laws. This would become a scandal in 1970, when there were accusations that Senate staffers were selling the introductions of such bills. The new Commission was active and reported in 1968, recommending the delay of the new Western Hemisphere restrictions for a year, which the House but not the Senate approved.⁶¹

Blatnik's initiatives were also affected by the new rule on bill sponsorships. Before the 90th Congress his efforts on water pollution legislation were largely under his name. Now, of the eleven Public Works bills he was credited with introducing, he was listed as the primary sponsor on only three. Two of the three were water pollution bills, but two other water pollution bills were attributed to "Mr. Fallon and Mr. Blatnik." George Fallon of Maryland was in his second term as Chair of Public Works. None of the four bills were even reported and no major water pollution bill was enacted during the 90th Congress.⁶²

In January 1967 Blatnik became chair of the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the Government Operations Committee, taking over from Committee Chair William

⁶⁰ Hall.

⁶¹ The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, PL 82-414, Sec. 401 (a). "Administration's Immigration Proposals Not Enacted," *CQ Almanac 1964*, on-line. *Congress and the Nation* (1973), 424. Hartley.

⁶² "Congress Acts on Pollution But Clears No Major Bills," *CQ Almanac 1968*, on-line.

Dawson of Illinois. Blatnik had been on the Committee since the 81st Congress, except for a hiatus during the Republican 83rd, and was chair of a different subcommittee in the 89th. The Committee reported out a clean bill, HR 18826 under Blatnik's name, modifying his earlier HR 16718, to implement the Administration's request to improve the process of grants-in-aid to the states. HR 18826 was then substituted for S 698, which was adopted after conference modifications.⁶³

Jones also acquired the chairship of a new subcommittee, that on Roads in the Public Works Committee. Jones was now the chair of three subcommittees in Public Works and one in Government Operations. The Tennessee Valley Authority remained his primary concern and a TVA bill of his was enacted.

Hardy's Subcommittee on Special Investigations in the Armed Services Committee remained his go-to activity; he was heading it now for his third term and had been a member since the 84th Congress. A student of congressional committees would report, "[I]n the late 1960s ... Hardy's Subcommittee on Special Investigations was recognized as the most independent operating unit with the full committee and the one most deeply involved with legislative oversight. This subcommittee chose its own inquiry topics, held hearings, and had its study reports accepted by a mere pencil okay of the full committee chairman." In his established role as regulator of military spending, Hardy turned his attention to NASA, contending with Teague in his amendment to HR 10340, authorizing funds for the Agency, to restrict contracts with commercial providers if the Agency could provide the function internally. Hardy succeeded with his amendment in the House, but conference removed it.⁶⁴

On August 1, 1967, Hardy was named to chair a new Subcommittee on National Defense Posture. By October 1968 it produced two reports, one on the Vietnam War and its effect on military commitments abroad, and a second on an evaluation of NATO versus Warsaw Pact forces. The Subcommittee's report advocated escalation of the war, denial of war materials by blockade, and the denial of any sanctuary. It contended the battle was with the Soviet Union and Communist China and that the United States could not afford to lose the war.⁶⁵

Drew Pearson attributed Hardy's investigation and those of two Senate committees with critical roles in the departure of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. Pearson reported that Armed Services Chair Rep. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina hated McNamara over Naval issues, the Charlestonian feeling the Navy was his constituency, and that he set up the new Hardy Committee to get the Secretary. But on November 1, 1967, McNamara wrote President Johnson that the Administration's course in Vietnam was unsatisfactory, that there should be no more increase in American ground troops, that the ground war should be turned over gradually to the Vietnamese, and that the bombing of North Vietnam should stop. Without telling McNamara, Johnson began finagling to ease the Secretary into the presidency of the World Bank. McNamara left on the last day of February.⁶⁶

Dorn's 43 public bills in the 90th Congress exceeded his previous per Congress activity and did so even if the seven on which he was not the primary sponsor were discounted. He had been in the second seat on Veterans' Affairs since the 84th Congress, stuck behind Teague. Over the years he introduced 51 veterans bills and none became law, while Teague's name was on 750 introductions and 104 enactments.

⁶³ "Intergovernmental Cooperation," *CQ Almanac 1968*, on-line.

⁶⁴ William Morrow, 193. "Congress Trims Space Authorization Below \$5 Billion," *CQ Almanac 1967*, on-line.

⁶⁵ *Hearings, Reports and Prints of the House Committee on Armed Services*, 11219-22.

⁶⁶ Drew Pearson, September 8, December 1, 1967. Shapley, 451, 436-7.

HR 2068 that he introduced in 1967 to increase pensions was expanded in committee and then rolled into S 16 with two other bills to substantially expand veterans benefits. Whose name was on the enacted S 16? Sen. Joseph Montoya of New Mexico was the prime sponsor.⁶⁷

Dorn's greatest publicity in the 90th Congress was his criticism by Drew Pearson as the mouthpiece for textile manufacturer J.P. Stevens & Co. Pearson emphasized the Company's hostility to union efforts and reported that when Frank Thompson (D NJ) invited company representatives to appear before his Special Labor Subcommittee, it was Dorn who appeared to represent the Company. The Company would gain the reputation as the greatest enemy of unionization in the country in the 1960s and 1970s.⁶⁸ The 1979 film "Norma Rae" would portray the corporate-labor battles. J.P. Stevens' headquarters was in Greenville, South Carolina, just out of Dorn's District, but he counted employers and workers as constituents.

Representatives going to bat for a major district employer and, presumptively, donor, even at the expense of employees (who possibly did not support unionization, given a general Southern hostility to such "socialism") was hardly novel. What was even more interesting was a constituent contretemps that embroiled Blatnik.

The Minnesotan stated he was the major instigator of federal government support through the Area Redevelopment Authority and the Small Business Administration (SBA) for a company named Universal Fiberglass in his district. The Company received a government loan and a \$13 million contract to build three-wheeled mail trucks for the Post Office. The Government Accountability Office and the SBA recommended against the loan and contract in 1964 because they assessed the Company would be unable to fulfill the contract in a timely fashion. They were correct and the Company shut down in 1966. An Iowa Republican representative called for an investigation in January 1968. Blatnik took responsibility for pressuring for the loan and contract, but his inconsistencies in detailing the process began to reveal that Vice Pres. Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota had also been deep in influencing the government's actions. Humphrey became the Democratic presidential nominee in August 1968 and, while involved in the Universal Fiberglass situation, Blatnik appeared to be falling on his sword to attempt to protect Humphrey.

The situation got worse over time. The General Services Administration charged there was a plan to siphon federal funds from the little company in Minnesota to its parent corporation, Rand Development of Cleveland, Ohio. The federal government sued the insurers of Universal Fiberglass to recoup its funds. The Company sued the government for violation of contract. In 1969 the owner of Rand Development was indicted for mail fraud and stock manipulation in efforts to get a loan to prop up Universal Fiberglass.⁶⁹

As an illustration of the dangers of constituency involvement, the Universal Fiberglass case, while impacting Two Rivers, Minnesota, was less broad than that of Voyageurs National Park in affecting Blatnik. The State proposed a national park along waters dividing Minnesota from Ontario in 1963. Removing a land from commercial development invariably is controversial. The area was within Blatnik's District, and he had been cautious about acting on the proposal. The national Forest Service had reservations. Timber and resort interests were opposed. Individual residents were opposed. Blatnik said he would introduce a bill when support firmed up. Apparently, he considered that to be the case on July 19, 1968, when he

⁶⁷ "Veterans' Benefits," *CQ Almanac* 1967, on-line.

⁶⁸ Drew Pearson, April 2, 1968. *The Washington Post*, July 3, 1988.

⁶⁹ *The Des Moines Register*, January 21, February 1 & 2 & 3 & 10 & 11, October 24, 1968; April 10, 1969. *The Winona Daily News*, January 22 & 25, 1968. Drew Pearson, February 19, 1968. *The Journal-Tribune*, December 19, 1968. *The Times-Reporter*, January 15, 1969. *Hearings: Appropriations for 1990*, 219-20. *Universal Fiberglass Corp. v. United States*, 537 F.2d 393, June 17, 1976.

threw HR 18761 into the hopper. The bill would go nowhere in the 90th Congress, but an editorial in a district newspaper contended that his support for the Park was the reason two filed against Blatnik in the 1968 primary as well as the two Republican challengers. Enactment of Minnesota's only national park would await the 91st Congress.⁷⁰

Constituencies were rarely if ever united on any issue, and the representative picked his way carefully through the divisions but would inevitably irritate or even alienate some as he pleased and won over others. Perhaps it was safer to sponsor small matters not rooted in constituent concerns.

Glenn Davis had a bill enacted in 1967. HR 3351 provided annuity benefits for widows of employees of the Lighthouse Service. The Ninth District's ten miles of frontage on Lake Michigan does not appear to have had a lighthouse. Perhaps there was a widow in his district. He was not on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which handled the bill. There were no cosponsors. A mystery? Well, the bill and three other similar ones, two of them by Chair Garmatz of Merchant Marine, were a product of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, which claimed 133,000 members. Some of these were likely constituents of Davis.⁷¹

Scandal brushed Blatnik in his claim of pressuring federal agencies to support a questionable constituent employer. It also touched, though lightly, on Republicans Paul Dague of Pennsylvania and Ralph Harvey of Indiana, both of whom ended their congressional service with the last congress, the former by retirement and the latter by failure of renomination. Thanks to a quirk of the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962 and the Federal Retirement Pay Act of 1965, by resigning their seats before the ends of 1966, they increased their pensions by 4.9%.⁷²

They both resigned effective December 30, 1966, while their terms ran until the swearing in of the new congress on January 10, a difference of eleven days. Would one say that they cheated their constituents of eleven days of service each? Neither was running for the House again. Did anyone care?

Members of the Class of '46 who were no longer in the House achieved a number of electoral victories in 1968. Chief of these was the election of Richard Nixon as President. With the slaughter of right-wing Republican presidential nominee Barry Goldwater in 1964, the more moderate Nixon, the presidential nominee in 1960, returned to the fore, confirmed by his active campaigning for Republican candidates nationwide in 1966. Nixon had three major potential opponents for the nomination, Nelson Rockefeller, Ronald Reagan, and George Romney, Governors of New York, California, and Michigan, respectively. Rockefeller was the de facto leader of the more liberal wing of the Party, Reagan, with his recent election as Governor, was an emerging leader of the most conservative wing, and Romney was more centrist within the Party as was Nixon. Romney had little space to occupy for the nomination, if Nixon's longer history did not defeat him, and was an early drop out. Reagan's wing was discredited nationally, even if resurgent in California, and Rockefeller's was waning within the Party; the New Yorker's failure to back Goldwater neutralized him. Nixon made no dominant march to the nomination, arriving at the Convention a little short of firm delegates, but succeeded with the critical assistance of South Carolina Sen. Strom

⁷⁰ *The Winona Daily News*, January 12, February 11, March 28, August 1, 1968. *Fergus Falls Daily Journal*, July 10 & 13, 1968.

⁷¹ *Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation*, 22-3.

⁷² *CQWR*, January 27, 1967, 128.

Thurmond, the States' Rights presidential candidate of 1948. Nixon took 228 of the 315 Southern delegate votes, compared to 63 for Reagan.⁷³

Also in 1968, Republican conservative Norris Cotton of New Hampshire was elected to his third term in the Senate over the three-term Governor, slipping a little from his 1962 win, though Nixon carried the State. Republican liberal Jacob Javits of New York also won his third term, but sank appreciably from his 1962 victory even with the support of the Liberal Party, which he did not have in the previous election. James Buckley, the Conservative Party candidate and brother of conservative pundit William F. Buckley, cut badly into the Republican vote. Javits nonetheless defeated Democrat and former New York City Councilman Paul O'Dwyer by 17 points. Javits had defeated O'Dwyer, at that time the brother of the City's Mayor, for his House seat in 1948.

Republican Thruston Morton surprised Kentucky by announcing he would not run for a third Senate term in 1968. He was considered the likely victor, and his Republican successor did win the race. He gave the reason as "compelling personal reasons." Alcoholism was the most compelling reason. Democrat George Smathers of Florida also surrendered his Senate seat, having completed three terms. He announced his retirement in January 1966, citing a "serious, complex but not incurable" illness. He would live another 39 years. In 1991 he would tell a newsman he had been just tired and bored.⁷⁴

James Patterson of Connecticut announced in February 1968 that he would challenge Edwin May for the Republican nomination for the Senate. May served one term in the House and was State Party Chair from 1958 to 1962, when he failed to get the Republican nomination for governor. In April Patterson dropped out; May won nomination over a final challenger then lost to incumbent Democrat Abraham Ribicoff by ten points.⁷⁵

Republican Edward Miller, out of office since 1959 and defeated for the Senate in 1962, had a win in 1967. He was elected to Maryland's Constitutional Convention. But he died on January 20, 1968, in Easton Memorial Hospital where he had been since December 1. He was unable to fulfill his service to his State. He was 72, wife Josephine Ford Miller surviving. The Convention's proposed constitution would be rejected by referendum.⁷⁶

In appointments, the spoils principle survived.

Idahoan Abe Goff was not reappointed to the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1967. He had served since 1958 and reacted to President Johnson's passing over him by saying, "Apparently I am too staunch a Republican and advocate of the independence of the Commission to be reappointed by this highly partisan administration." He had been appointed to his seven-year term by Republican Pres. Dwight Eisenhower.⁷⁷

Glen Johnson of Oklahoma, who had worked in the Department of Interior since Democrats returned to control in 1961, moved up from an attorney position to Chair of the Oil Import Appeals Board in 1967.

⁷³ Gould, 94-6. White (1969), 137-8, 242, Appendix B.

⁷⁴ CQWR, March 3, 1967, 313; January 19, 1968, 83; March 1, 1968, 424. Baker interview. *The Orlando Sentinel*, June 9, 1991.

⁷⁵ *The Hartford Courant*, February 27, 1968. *The Bridgeport Post*, April 26, 1968. *The New York Times*, June 15, 1968.

⁷⁶ *The Baltimore Sun*, January 21, 1968. Pullen.

⁷⁷ "Biographical Note," Goff Papers.

Howes Meade, who lost his Federal Housing Administration job when Democrat John Kennedy became President in 1961, was appointed Commissioner of Personnel for the Commonwealth of Kentucky after Republican Louie Nunn took office as Governor on December 12, 1967.

It also pays mentioning that Watkins Abbott, a stalwart of the Byrd organization in Virginia and Chair of the Virginia Democratic Party since 1964, was reelected to a new four-year term in July 1968. His previous unopposed election was not repeated. He had followed Sen. Harry Byrd's silence on the 1964 presidential election, and the State Convention reelected him by a margin of 33½ votes over Joseph Fitzpatrick, the Democratic chair of the Second Congressional District, that of Hardy.⁷⁸

James Lewis Marcus, the husband of Lily de Pourtales Lodge since 1962, was indicted in December 1967 of accepting kickbacks on a reservoir cleaning contract when he was New York City Water Commissioner. He pleaded guilty and received a fifteen-month sentence. After his release he was sentenced separately on State charges to twelve months. Lily was a daughter of John Davis Lodge of Connecticut.⁷⁹

Three wives of members of the Class of '46 died.

Elizabeth Stoddard Muhlenberg died in Reading, Pennsylvania, Hospital on October 1, 1967. She was 76. Architect Frederick Muhlenberg survived at age 80.⁸⁰

Louise DePuy Keating died at home in Brighton, a suburb of Rochester, New York, on September 17, 1968. She was invalided with multiple sclerosis since 1949. She was 68. New York Justice Kenneth Keating survived her, also at age 68.⁸¹

Anne Phinizy Lanham died October 14, 1968. She was one day past her 79th birthday. Henderson Lanham had died in 1957, and they had been divorced by 1950.⁸²

Four members of the Class also passed away. We have already mentioned Edward Miller.

Donald Nicholson of Massachusetts died on February 16, 1968, in Wareham. He was 79 and had been retired since leaving the House at age 70. Wife Ethel Patten Nicholson survived.⁸³

John Sanborn of Idaho died on May 16, 1968, in Boise, where he had been in hospital for two months. He was 82 and, despite a number of attempts, had not held public office since leaving the House in 1951. He went into the mining business. Overall, he ran for lieutenant governor, governor, the Senate four times, and the House three times.⁸⁴

Frank Wilson of Texas died on October 13, 1968, in Dallas. Wife Ruby Lee Hopkins Wilson survived. Ill for the previous three months, he finally resigned from the district bench a month before he died, reportedly of a heart attack. He was 67 and the 23rd in the Class to go.⁸⁵

⁷⁸ *The Progress-Index*, July 29, 1968. *The Washington Post, Times-Herald*, June 2, 1969.

⁷⁹ *The Bridgeport Post*, May 13, 1962; October 10, 1970.

⁸⁰ *The Evening Sentinel*, October 3, 1967.

⁸¹ *Kingston Daily Freeman*, September 18, 1968. *Time*, October 30, 1964.

⁸² Anne Phinizy Lanham stone, Riverside Cemetery, Albany, Georgia. *The Daily Herald*, November 11, 1957. 1950 Census schedule, District of Columbia.

⁸³ Ethel Patten Nicholson stone, Centre Cemetery, Wareham, Massachusetts.

⁸⁴ *Idaho State Journal*, May 16, 1968. *Nevada State Journal*, March 16, 1952; October 9, 1955.

⁸⁵ *The Amarillo Globe-Times*, September 18, October 14, 1968. *The Honolulu Advertiser*, November 22, 1968.