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 11,000. 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
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, RFC, 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.
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.

(five o'clock) Would you say there is a relationship between the number of callers you have and the efforts you and your office force put 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.
(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 cutting into the District Government, the Recorder of Deeds Office, or of installing more modernized machines to do the work, shop men and Mr. Thompson 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 slovenly 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?
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 $10,000 to develop that bill. We had a substantial and specialized staff and developed a complete home rule approach. They wouldn't let us 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 cajoled 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 bill, 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.
One reason is that both parties carry the plank in the platform to the effect that they endorse Cove 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 Cherry 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 Cherry 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.
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.
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 H. 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 First Congress, is not too disturbing or alarming. It may be all for 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.

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
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
him to share with similar circumstances 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 3,000 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 1,000 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 go and plead and get on the phone and
finagle DuPont out of yea. The decision was not made in their minds
out there but it was made in the mind of some person in an administrative
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 own 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 social difficulty and the necessity
for the armament program I do not think you can get away from con-
trolled materials, but the danger is at what point do these 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.

(Mr. Spraggs) One other problem of business penny-
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
in 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
country in a central straitjacket. (One, David Noreau once said that for every case of being at the roots of a war, there is the real problem of the branches. If members of Congress would express themselves on the record, I believe they would agree that the real cause of control of inflation lies in fiscal matters. Then, let the smallest hole in your budget be in the military. I think it is the only real effort an economy has very unimpressive. If you agree to a trend, you must promise that inflation is the result of too high spending or too low spending at too low a demand, a static supply of consumer goods--things people buy and use everyday--then you have to be concentrating on controlling that price level and inflation lies in modifying the factors in that equation. Since the spendable funds in the economic bloodstream. You cannot do it by reproducing. Government spending in non-military fields and even in military fields there is extravagance.

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

I think you can control the flow of materials into fields that are not absolutely indispensable. In that connection, the field
of credit should be given back to 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 must then move in and increase those reserve requirements. If instead of sending ten per 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. Let's not cut 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
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 critical materials are involved. That is the part for government to exercise, and I was quite satisfied to go alone with that. My vote was something of a protest and I believe the ortodox economists in the country are in the corner.

(Miss Spraggs) You recall statement by Dean Rust.

Soem equality of rights, voting rights and protection against violence?

It is to be. I think it is in the speculative field, but this much is sure. A person can take the institutions that were developed in our political system and set them out and take them. It is sort 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 elaborating 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. 
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(Miss Sprague) Dean Auke 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-fourths 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-boat and they continue to argue we must do something about it.

There is such overemphasis in my judgment. Then I was in the Far Eastern countries I talked with many people. There is a feeling in the progressive field which is rather effective which is in India, Indonesia and Africa. There is a resentment about the promises and assurances and promises they will make in following out the red line. The limit is the limit. I remember setting on a coil of wire in a garage coal mine surrounded by hard driving communists. Here was their problem in digging coal. Where demanding they change production to meet allocation to France and Britain in addition to their autocratic needs. They were getting 1200 calories a day so we hit all sorts of devices like setting up canteens and offering sandwiches and chocolate at the noon hour. We soon discovered that instead of using the food as given them, the children and wives showed up at the canteen at noon. Then they men gave them the food. They said that would you do. I said I would do exactly what they did. Our family in a close you would take any sacrifice. And so all of these devices failed. Finally we developed a weakness. They said, let us turn in the direction of Japan. They said maybe they might be able to do something. Hanging on to a hope and hanging on to a promise.
With such low standards in India, China and Indonesia. I saw people die by the thousands in Calcutta and Cali. You get back to that economic practice - so long as there is no way of getting benefits due to those people they are going to be targets and victims, and that is economic rather than political. // think we would have to take more steps to at least minimize our shortcomings and act more positively on those world issues they could not have this as a propaganda weapon.

(ED) About 300-400 in the wrong box or so of a. I am firmly convinced you cannot buy friends in good will with dollars. You are more likely to be content for us rather than respect. Take for instance, West Germany. To take a gift is the worst thing in the world. It diminishes their self-respect, takes making out of them, makes them feel the problem is more acute. After all these emotional speeches on the Senate floor, then Sir Bajalal Talati states the situation wasn't nearly as bad as it was painted in the news that came from here. I go along with the joint floor to this extent. I think you can put it up to two or three hundred 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 so that we've improved agriculture and industry but no circumstances about scattering million dollars. I say that we've got no for the good out of us 117 million dollars that they led you to believe. One of the papers. I do not think the record is impressive at all. I think you are destroying some fiber over them to the point now where people like France are so dependent. France is in greater danger today than she was since the war's end.
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(Mr. Harman) An analysis of the vote shows population vote was bigger for communists than was ever recorded by the Chamber of Deputies before.

(Miss Sprague) Of course, concern about taking propaganda weapons - our own occupational forces have been just kind of 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 gets up problem as it is in western Europe and could break out any day.

(Miss Sprague) That's the interesting that the Republicans might regain the gnat's vote if it requires leadership on these issues.

(Harry) My stand, don't you. I introduced a bill in January of '47. I went up to a point. Miss White says it is a good as nothing. I told Mr. White I would 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 bill. I am afraid if you have to save my promise, I can't could assure you of so. He said, "I think you are probably the first one who hasn't lied on the basis of promising that you knew we couldn't keep and didn't want to keep. I said I think it is compassionate and all I can promise at this time. We've developed quite a fellowship and they are very kind. I think we just a work in the field. I undertook it in 1940 or '47, talked it over with the house leadership. This will get out of there.
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 Briggs) 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 FIRC, anti-poll tax and anti-lynching the record was 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.