

COPY

One question that so often arises is what is the difference between working on the Senate side and the work on the House side. Well, I served for eight terms in the House and in that time served on a variety of committees, including chairmanship of the Committee on The District of Columbia, but my main work was on the Appropriations Committee, and in the 80th Congress I served as chairman of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations. I did have a small committee staff and a very modest office staff, but when I moved over here I found that the volume of work compared with the House was simply beyond all comparison. I have thirteen on the staff and could use another five, and could use more office space. We have three offices here, one downstairs where we do our noisy work and one upstairs that I can use but I do not get to it much. Indicative of the volume of work, in a country 153 odd million people, the mail grows by leaps and bounds and constitutes a real problem. One wonders how a person can dispose of it and still do justice to legislative duties. I said to a group who were in here earlier this morning, at the peak the greatest number of letters in a single day was just about 15,000. Mail will shuttle between one and two thousand letters a day and, of course, we aim to answer everything that comes in. Consequently you have to avail yourself of every facility in order to give all attention.

(Miss Spraggs) One question, on letters, what is the usual tenor of letters about?

In that terrific volume of mail, we have had nearly 40,000

COPY

- 2 -

letters relating to the dismissal of MacArthur, but people are vocal on nearly every subject that gets press attention. For a long time there were at least 250 every day relating to abolition of the RFC, 200 a day dealing with taxes. An interesting thing is that in other years you heard from those in the tip-top tax bracket but today it is from those humble, ordinary folks who sit down and convey their thoughts to paper and send them to us on such things as taxes, P.F.C., loyalty in government, appropriation bills, agriculture policy, Korea-- and there is a tremendous interest, of course, in Korea--proposed treaty to terminate hostilities with Germany and Japan. There is scarcely anything that does not engage the attention of the public today.

(Mr. Hammond) You have quite a number of letters concerning dismissal of reserve forces?

Yes, I would say as a guess we would process 40 or 50 veterans and services cases a day--organized reserves, inactive reserves, people who want to be separated for reasons of hardship, people who want to be transferred in the service to some line of duty more consonant with their talents, boys with medical education who want to utilize it, boys who are architects or engineers who instead of slugging around want to make use of their talents, and also you have quite a variety, some want in, some want out, some want commissions, some want transfers. There is the whole gamut. You get lots of letters and you get lots of calls.

COPY

In addition to the heavy volume of mail, I doubt whether there has ever been so many callers that I can remember. I can only say this with proper modesty and it is told by the boys at the door over in the Senate. It seems I get twice as many callers as any other senator, even those close at hand. They come as individuals interested in material and controls, tax amortization and new plants, everything relating to defense program, service cases, and the whole gamut of governmental activities.

(Mrs. Copgraves) Would you say there is a relationship between the number of callers you have and the efforts you and your office force out forth to handle the various requests?

Yes, that, and one other thing. When you campaign you get acquainted with literally hundreds of thousands of people. They feel they know you personally and that is an invitation to feel that they will get sympathetic treatment.

(Mr. Hammond) Would you recommend that kind of campaigning (if you have the stamina to hold up) to get on intimate terms with the people?

It will serve as nothing that I know of to generate a little more respect for and confidence in government if they feel they have a liaison officer in Washington to ventilate their problems. If they feel there is a curtain, of course they will not do it. They will say, oh, well, he has his head in the stratosphere and a letter won't get attention at all.

COPY

- 4 -

(Miss Spraggs) That would suggest a much more active campaign on the part of the Republican party than there was in 1948.

Indeed so, for you find out what is in the hearts of the people and work at it actively and come in close contact with them.

You remember way back, the question of abolition or of putting into the District Government, the Recorder of Deeds Office, or of installing more modernized machines to do the work, Shep Baker and Mr. Thomson came in and they had sympathetic treatment. In one appropriation bill, remember, they proposed to mechanize the office. Of course it would end a good deal of help. It might be useful, and yet we had always felt that that office belonged to your people, and at the same time we did not want that to become a weapon for cutting off a good many people you had on the payroll. Also an effort was made to bring it within the purview of the District Commissioner. We were against it and ventilated it in the newspapers. Had it become law it would have made it so that patronage would have been in those hands under some members of the Commission. I developed some felicitous feelings for him (Recorder); he was a good, capable public servant. If he had been slouchy or neglectful it would have been different, but he did a very worthwhile job and no one could say otherwise. You will recall it remained in his hands.

(Miss Spraggs) As Chairman of the District Committee for a long time, what do you think about a vote for the District of Columbia?

COPY

I can just tell you this much out of my own experience over there. When I was chairman it was the first time we finally developed a home rule bill for the District of Columbia. We spent \$30,000 to develop that bill. We had a substantial and specialized staff and developed a complete home rule approach. They wouldn't let me bring it on the floor until the shank of the last session of that Congress and under the rules the District gets one day every other week. When a bill is not finished that day it goes over as unfinished business for two weeks. When you are at the end unless you get special dispensation you cannot make the effort and I was up against a good many members below the Mason-Dixon line and that work was not completed. Now there is pending a bill in the Senate District Committee. It was streamlined and capped up a good deal. Now when you look down the road to see what you can get you anguish yourself and put lots of labor in something which will die at the other end of Congress.

Members have talked to me about it. Unless you can get something that has a reasonable chance of passage in the House, it is love's labor lost. Once you establish some kind of a pattern you can pick up from there and probably pick it up as time goes on. Two or three versions pending at the present time in the mill, modify it here and there, at the appropriate time and give good consideration to it. This is to say, what we can work out at least starts us in that direction.

COPY

- 6 -

One reason is that both parties carry the plank in the platform to the effect that they endorse Home Rule for the District of Columbia. At least it is on the boards.

The chairman of the Committee on the House side is John McMillan. He has been forthright and says "I am against this bill. I will fight it every way I know how." He was the ranking democrat when I was chairman and assured me "We will leave nothing undone to bring about its defeat. The filibuster is still effective if you can get enough people to work at it.

(Miss Spraggs) What is your feeling about proposed change in the cloture rule?

The matter is not alive now but the question has come up as to whether to bring it into the plan to modify it under the substitute proposal offered by Senator Wherry two or three years ago whereby a vote of a constitutional two-thirds, meaning two-thirds of the entire membership of 96, you can modify or do anything you please. I do believe if there is enough interest you shouldn't have too great difficulty to get it.

(Miss Spraggs) Senator Wherry went to Senate Rules Committee recently and stated he, as the author of the previous changes in the bill, was willing to have it drawn up and be responsible for delivering the Republican vote.

COPY

- 7 -

I believe as a general thing that some further modification of the existing law is necessary and along with this, I hope sometime to give sustained attention to the Senate rules. As the thing is now, while it does preserve the maximum of free discussion, some changes are desirable in the interest of expediting legislation, because you can start with an appropriation measure, you may get one speech on the matter and then someone spends two hours on Korea, someone gets recognition from the Chair and discusses the oil situation in Iran or foreign trade and you may never get to the bill again that day. I do believe that in connection with some legislation there ought to be a rule that they could not take time unless the discussion was germane to the thing at hand until it was disposed. We had the Interior Appropriation Bill on the floor for nine days and here we are so far behind that it will be quite awhile before we get to other appropriation measures. Already we have passed a Resolution to continue appropriations in effect beyond the fiscal year.

(Miss Spraggs) Do you mean to say that would require two-thirds of the members on the floor present and voting?

Well whether I could go that far or not, but I do believe there ought to be some modification of what is up at the present time. It is a matter that merits immediate survey and if we get a little time to get away from this press of legislation, I think that matter will have attention.

COPY

- 8 -

(Miss Spraggs) There has been a great deal of criticism of the small number of bills passed at this moment.

As a matter of fact, I think instead of meriting criticism, it should merit commendation. The reason is that I always felt there was a good deal in what Thomas Henry ~~Buckley~~^{Buckley} had to say that "Human progress is made by not so much what goes on the statute books as by what comes off." So whether they pass fifty bills this session, as compared with two hundred bills in the first session of the 81st Congress is not too disturbing or alarming. It may be all to the good for if you think of forty-eight legislatures grinding out laws, in addition to the Congress, we become suffused with law. I think if the legislative bodies are just a little critical and a little more careful and improve the quality of what they do rather than quantity, I believe it would have a salutary effect.

(Miss Spraggs) I notice you just came back from a tour to test out sentiment. What would you say are the chances for the Republicans in 1952?

I feel reasonably optimistic about it for the following reasons:

There is a hostility as distinguished from frothy anger. There is real concern today. I doubt whether I have ever seen the country so alert and vocal in fields like economy, taxation, spending, inflation, and all those are in the fiscal field. One could not dramatize the budget a few years ago but now people are developing that interest

COPY

- 9 -

for themselves. I think what they see is this. They see an 80 billion dollar expenditure which necessarily has to be considered in line with the expenditures in the states.

(Miss Spraggs) I was going to ask about that issue -

I am of the opinion from what I have seen. I have been in twenty-three states since January and I have been in some four or five times, and the more I see the more I am inclined to believe the issues are, as never before, the fundamental issues, taxes and spending. I think what people see is that if you move in the direction of insolvent budget it is bound to have two effects. The first one is a complete extension of federal control on the theory that once you get saddled with budget and a heavy debt, there will come a demand for more and more authority in order to manage the whole structure, and advance the argument we are in grave danger of going through the wringer, and must give more power to manage this whole thing. It will then leach away the whole structure as controls bear down what happens is you move further and further toward the situation in England. In the minds of the people they have great difficulty in spelling it out. It brings into play the issue of communism. The average reaction to communism is not emotional at all. As I probe people's thinking I feel what they see is an economic levelling off process whereby a man who is frugal and works hard fears the government will ask

COPY

- 10 -

him to share with similar circumstanced folks who through lack of diligence and frugality has frittered away confidence and opportunity. It is not emotionalism at all. It is very real, related to the whole basic issue today.

No fear of overthrow of government so much as a fear of overthrow of the economic structure.

People sense the economic implication of this at work. They want to preserve the free enterprise system where economic decisions are made in the market place instead of in government.

Here we have an emergent period and have a controlled materials plan. A little plant down in the lower end of the state makes mail boxes. They have twenty people working steadily but they can get no brass. They need 2,000 pounds a year. They have to send delegates down here, they have to argue, contact Defense Production Authority, we contact the authorities down there and finally say, if you can't give them 2,000 pounds, give them 2,000 pounds so they can keep going.

Or there is the case of the little hosiery mill back home who suddenly discover they had not been in business long enough to have a base and suddenly 20 or 25 people will be laid off, which means a great deal to that little town. They had just four days before going out of business and I had to beg and plead and get on the phone and finagle DuPont out of ~~them~~. The decision was not made in their minds out there but it was made in the mind of some person ~~in~~ an administrative

COPY

capacity in government controls. When you transfer all those decisions of control you see your control is complete. You can get in the United States the same thing as in Britain with the taking over of plants. Britain thought it easier to take over plants, mills, airlines, meat packers, etc. Here you don't have to take over. You make them come to the government for every decision. It can be just as complete.

How would you propose to channel essential materials into non-essential production?

Right now because of the war difficulty and the necessity for the armament program I do not think you can get away from controlled materials. but the danger is at what point do those controls terminate and become permanently frozen in the country. Once we have gone in that way we lose sight of the larger objective. People say it should be kept and control should be enlarged even though the critical aspects of control are gone.

(Miss Spraggs) One other problem of business pending - inflation. How do you propose that we deal with it?

I was the only member of the Banking Committee that voted against the control bill and was one of ten who voted against it on the floor of the Senate, not because I do not have an interest in controlling inflation. As a matter of fact, I think my interest is as deep if not deeper than the interest of many people, but my difference is as to method. I think you accomplish nothing by

COPY

- 17 -

putting the country in a control straitjacket. Henry David Thoreau once said that for every man hacking at the roots of a tree, there are a hundred hacking at the branches. If members of Congress would express themselves on the record I believe they would agree that the real nose of controlling inflation lies in fiscal reasons. There is not the slightest hope of containing the government's billions and billions of dollars into the economic bloodstream with any real effort at all. I think our current effort on economy is very unimpressive. If you agree to the general premise that inflation is the result of too much spending, then moving at too high a rate against a diminishing or a static supply of consumer goods--things people buy and use every day--then your hope of controlling that price level and inflation lies in modifying the numbers in that equation, namely the spendable funds in the economic bloodstream. You cannot do it by reducing it. *To do it* -- you can cut government spending in non-military fields and even in military fields where there is extravagance.

Secondly, you can more effectively control credit. That has not been done.

Thirdly, you can control the flow of materials into fields that are not absolutely indispensable. In that connection, the field

COPY

- 13 -

of credit should be given back the power of the Federal Reserve Board which they once exercised , and raise the requirements of the reserves in banks.

Deposits under law by banks must be so much, known as excess reserve requirements. At one time it was very low - five and 10 per cent. It is higher for the two large reserve cities - Chicago and New York, a little lower in the twelve federal reserve cities and lower for all the rest of the banks in the country. A modest reserve is all right as long as you do not have inflation, but when you have inflation the Federal Reserve Board must then move in and increase those reserve requirements and instead of sending ten or cent, send twenty per cent, and as you insist on higher reserves from the banks you leave that much less to be loaned, for it is the loans that become the basis for inflation credit.

We have been dealing with symptoms instead of causes, so you can put all of the controls on the line and not get good effect. The danger if it runs for two years is suddenly controls form a whole explosive force which will be there to shake the ceiling. I think it is so necessary to look down the road. Lets not put the country in a straitjacket if there are some more effective weapons that deal with basic causes rather than effects and symptoms. I think the Federal Reserve Board is much to blame. The control law went into effect in September of 1950 and not the slightest move

COPY

- 11 -

was made by the Federal Reserve Board until after the first of the year to start coping with credit controls. We had a combination of scare buying and expanded credit when we went into Korea. Control people take credit for only a modest price rise. I think as things bottled up people said there will be enough to go around and buying pressure relaxed. Some prices went down. I think if we will leave it alone it will slip on off the thing causing inflation and you won't have to put the country in a straitjacket except where military materials are involved. That is the part for government to exercise, and I was quite satisfied to go along with that. My vote was something of a protest and I believe the orthodox economists in the country are in my corner.

(Miss Spraggs) You recall statement by Dean Rusk. Soem equality of rights, voting rights and protection against violence?

It is in the. I think it is in the speculative field, but this much is sure. A person can take the inequities that have developed in our political system and set them out and make them the core of a propaganda effort in Europe that can be very effective. If you have two speakers on a platform in Austria and one was industriously belaboring the American system and its glories and delights and another comes and says there are segments of people in America who don't have the right to participate in elections and then proceeds to prove it by the book, that makes a very persuasive subject.

COPY

(Miss Spraggs) Dean Ausk said with respect to negotiations in Korea in many of the Far Eastern countries that this is repeatedly thrown up and with the world three-fourth colored particularly, and you have the factor of illiteracy, low income and day by day living, when you try to sell them democracy this comes up as a real scare-goat and they continue to argue we must do something about it.

(Ausk) There is such overemphasis in my judgment. When I was in the Far East and Eastern countries I talked with many people. There is something in the propaganda field which is much more effective which is in India, Indonesia and Africa. There is no restraint about the lures and assurances and promises they will make in following out the red line. The sky is the limit. I remember getting on a coil of wire in a german coal mine surrounded by card carrying communists. Here was their problem in digging coal. We were demanding they change production to meet allocation to France and Britain in addition to their domestic needs. They were getting 1200 calories a day so we hit on all sorts of devices like setting up canteens and offering sandwiches and chocolate at the noon hour. We soon discovered that instead of eating the food as given them, the children and wives showed up at the canteen at noon. Then these men gave them the food. They said what would you do. I said I would do exactly what they did. Your family is so close you would make any sacrifice. All so all of these devices failed finally and developed a weakness. They said, let's turn in the direction of Russia. They said maybe they might be able to do something. Hanging on to a hope and hanging on to a promise.

COPY

Now with such low standards in India, China and Indonesia. I saw people die by the thousands in Calcutta and Delhi. You get back to that economic practice - so long as there is no way of getting benefits down to those people they are going to be targets and victims, and that is economic rather than political. (Miss S.) Do you think we would have to take some steps to at least minimize our shortcomings and act more positively on these world issues they would not have that as a propaganda weapon?

(EMM) Except we act in the wrong way so often. You finally convinced you cannot buy friendship and good will with American dollars. They are more likely to give contempt for us rather than respect. Take for instance, the gift to India. To make a gift is the worst thing in the world. It diminishes their self-respect, makes monkeys out of them, makes them feel the problem is more acute. After all these emotional speeches on the Senate floor, then our Bengal state states the situation wasn't nearly as bad as it was painted in the words that came from here. I go along with some point four to this extent. I think you can put it up to two or three people in a country who are technicians and who are not politicians, and give them a little money and find out whether or not the countries will cooperate and get some technical learning started to encourage improved agriculture and industry and the circumstance about scattering American dollars. I do not think we got nearly the good out of the \$3.5 billion dollars that they led you to believe out of the paper. I do not think the record is impressive at all. I think you are destroying some fiber over there to the point now where people like France are so dependent. France is in greater danger today than she has been since the war's end.

COPY

(Mr. Hammond) An analysis of the vote shows population vote was bigger for communists than was ever recorded by the Chamber of Deputies before.

(Miss Spraggs) Of course, concern about taking propaganda weapons - our own occupational forces have been just reading the State Department and Defense Department to send them materials to offset propaganda. They even use our own dollars as propaganda purposes and everything they can latch on to. I think it is not only in France. The situation only, of the problem we have in Western Europe which can break out any day.

(Miss Spraggs) What of the danger that the Republicans might regain the negro vote if it requires leadership on these issues?

You know my stand, don't you. I introduced a bill in January of 1947. I went up to a point. Mr. White says it is as good as nothing. I told Mr. White I could vote for this from a feasible standpoint. I think we have got to make some progress under a moderate bill like this. I remember a session on South Michigan when the Bishop said to the group - that bill doesn't go far enough. I said, Your Eminence it is as far as I can go. He said you are abrupt. I said

I wouldn't tell you a lie for a vote for the world. I am afraid if you have to give my promise, I can't assure you of so much. He said, "I think you are probably the first one who hasn't lied on the basis of promising what you knew you could not keep and did not want to keep." I said I think it is aggressive and all I can promise at this time. We've developed quite a fellowship and they were very kind. I think we must do work in that field. I undertook it in 1946 or 1947, talked it over with the House leadership. ~~This will get out of there and~~

COPY

- 18 -

I drafted and introduced that bill. Although it died, Mr. Campbell of Pennsylvania put his name on it in this session and they passed it in the House. I have been hoping to get around to introduce it in the Senate and probably shall one of these days.

(Miss Spragg) If these issues are raised in the Senate you would give it support.

Support to the one I have introduced, and labor at it the best I know how. In that issue, on FEPC, anti-poll tax and anti-lynching the record is abundantly clear. I have been on the record on each of those over the years in the House because I felt I should make some start in the civil rights field. While it may seem modest, it is a start in the right direction.