

Jim Grant Bolling, Oral History Interview – 3/1/1966
Administrative Information

Creator: Jim Grant Bolling
Interviewer: Ronald J. Grele
Date of Interview: March 1, 1966
Location: Washington, D.C.
Length: 104 pages

Biographical Note

Bolling, a Kennedy campaign worker in 1960, and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare official for congressional liaison, discusses her work on John F. Kennedy's presidential campaign, on patronage requests at the beginning of the Kennedy administration, and on education and Medicare legislation as a congressional liaison, among other issues.

Access

Open.

Usage Restrictions

According to the deed of gift signed on October 23, 1967, copyright of these materials has been assigned to the United States Government. Users of these materials are advised to determine the copyright status of any document from which they wish to publish.

Copyright

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excesses of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law. The copyright law extends its protection to unpublished works from the moment of creation in a tangible form. Direct your questions concerning copyright to the reference staff.

Transcript of Oral History Interview

These electronic documents were created from transcripts available in the research room of the John F. Kennedy Library. The transcripts were scanned using optical character recognition and the resulting text files were proofread against the original transcripts. Some formatting changes were made. Page numbers are noted where they would have occurred at the bottoms of the pages of the original transcripts. If researchers have any concerns about accuracy, they are encouraged to visit the Library and consult the transcripts and the interview recordings.

Suggested Citation

Jim Grant Bolling, recorded interview by Richard J. Grele, March 1, 1966, (page number), John F. Kennedy Library Oral History Program.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

Gift of Personal Statement

By Mrs. Richard Bolling

to the

John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library

In accordance with Sec. 507 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (44 U.S.C. 397) and regulations issued thereunder (41 CFR 101-10), I, Jim Grant Bolling, hereinafter referred to as the donor, hereby give, donate, and convey to the United States of America for eventual deposit in the proposed John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, and for administration therein by the authorities thereof, a tape and transcript of a personal statement approved by me and prepared for the purpose of deposit in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library. The gift of this material is made subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. Title to the material transferred hereunder, and all literary property rights, will pass to the United States as of the date of the delivery of this material into the physical custody of the Archivist of the United States.
2. It is the donor's wish to make the material donated to the United States of America by terms of this instrument available for research as soon as it has been deposited in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library.
3. A revision of this stipulation governing access to the material for research may be entered into between the donor and the Archivist of the United States, or his designee, if it appears desirable.
4. The material donated to the United States pursuant to the foregoing shall be kept intact permanently in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library.

Signed *Jim Grant Bolling*
Date 10/18/67
Accepted *James B. Rhoads*
Acting Archivist of the United States
Date Oct 23, 1967

Jim Grant Bolling

Table of Contents

<u>Page</u>	<u>Topic</u>
1	John F. Kennedy (JFK) in 1956
3	1956 Democratic National Convention
7	Working on JFK's 1960 presidential campaign
21	Working on patronage after JFK's election
24	Bolling's position in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW)
27, 50, 56	1961 education legislation
48	Higher education legislation
52, 59	1963 Omnibus education bill
62	Edith S. Green
64	Federal aid to private schools
68	1963 House-Senate negotiations on education legislation
71	Members of Congress involved with education
78	Medicare bill
92	Kennedy administration congressional liaison officers
96	Congressional committees that dealt with HEW legislation
101	Contact with JFK during his presidency

Oral History Interview

with

Jim Grant (Mrs. Richard) Bolling

March 1, 1966
Washington, D.C.

By Ronald J. Grele

For the John F. Kennedy Library

GRELE: Do you remember when you first came in contact with or became aware of John Kennedy [John F. Kennedy]?

BOLLING: I think it would be before the vice presidential race in 1956. Probably at one of the dinners in Washington—not the President's Club, but whatever the equivalent of it was then—I think would be the first time that I was aware of him.

[-1-]

GRELE: A fundraiser?

BOLLING: Yes.

GRELE: Were you a prominent fundraiser for the party?

BOLLING: I raised a good deal of money for the party in Texas and other parts of the country.

GRELE: What were your impressions of John Kennedy prior to the '56

Convention?

BOLLING: Well, I will say that I hadn't thought about them very much. I thought about them very much. I thought that just the time I saw them that they were an attractive couple. I was impressed by his campaign in 1956 at the Convention. And then later in that campaign he did come to Dallas and make a speech. I was in charge of the reception committee that met him at the airport. I think we were more impressed with him then.

[-2-]

It was a smaller group, and they got to have some feeling what he was like.

GRELE: Do you recall if he would have spoken at the dinner, or did he speak at the dinner?

BOLLING: No, he didn't speak. This was one of those silly things they do where everybody has a senator at every table. That kind of thing.

GRELE: Did you attend the 1956 Convention?

BOLLING: Yes, I did. My attending conventions—I always go in strange ways because my delegations are rarely seated from Texas. At that particular convention I had delegates passes and press passes. And that's how I happened to be in that caucus of the delegates that we were talking about.

GRELE: Would you describe for us that caucus

[-3-]

of the Texas delegation?

BOLLING: Well, that was a large caucus of all the delegates and then all of the alternates and camp-followers and press and what have you. It was what they did in that caucus.... We were having a desperate time over what they were going to do about the vice presidential nominee. And Johnson [Lyndon Baines Johnson] spoke and introduced his wife [Claudia Alta "Lady Bird" Johnson] and his mother [Rebekah Baines Johnson]. Then Rayburn [Samuel Taliaferro Rayburn] spoke, which he rarely did at conventions. He asked that the room be cleared and that they take all the press out. This was a rather frantic scene where they were jerking them out from behind curtains and this sort of thing. I took off my press badge and stayed. Rayburn said very clearly that they were not

[-4-]

going to endorse Kefauver [Estes Kefauver] because he did not like him—the implication was that he drank too much. They were not going to endorse John Kennedy because he was a Catholic. The delegation was going to go out for Clement [Frank Clement]. Well, as we left the caucus, Clement was withdrawing. Then they were rather stuck with that problem. It was one or the other.

GRELE: How did the other members of the Texas delegation take this proposition?

BOLLING: They didn't. It was take it or leave it. It was not debated. That was it!

GRELE: How did Texas eventually vote?

BOLLING: I believe that they did vote for Kefauver, and there's some part of that on the recognition of Tennessee that was—I'd rather like to see that film

[-5-]

again, just thinking about it.

GRELE: Did you have any contact with Mr. Rayburn after the Convention?

BOLLING: Yes. I saw him a great deal in the campaign for Adlai Stevenson [Adlai E. Stevenson], and later. I've had not a great deal of contact with him. But I've seen him now and then.

GRELE: Did he ever discuss the 1956 Convention and his call to—I guess it was Mr. McCormack's [John William McCormack] call to him to recognize the Tennessee delegation?

BOLLING: No, I've never heard him discuss it. There are two parts of it. I think we can always wonder about that in historical terms, because the other thing is, of course, the old man could not see well. This was the thing many people did not realize about him, that

[-6-]

he was quite blind in the last years of his life. So it leaves it open: could he see or couldn't he; or did he or didn't he? I think that is something that we'll never know. I think that he, in terms of his feeling about the Catholic nominee, was greatly influenced by his experiences with Al Smith [Alfred E. Smith], who he did campaign for. But I think with many of the older politicians this was such a wrenching experience that they were fearful for that reason; that they didn't want to try to carry another one.

GRELE: Were you at the 1960 Convention?

BOLLING: No, I was not at the 1960 Convention.

GRELE: Why?

BOLLING: Well, I was from Texas, and I didn't want to go to the Convention.

GRELE: You worked for the Kennedy staff during

[-7 -]

the 1960 campaign. How did you come to work for that staff?

BOLLING: I met Bob Kennedy [Robert F. Kennedy] in St. Louis early after Kennedy was nominated. I told him then that I was going to Europe, but that I would be back and I wanted very much to work in the campaign. He said then if I would come up at a certain date I could work with Larry O'Brien [Lawrence F. O'Brien]. It was a regional meeting. He was doing voter registration then.

GRELE: Were you ever asked to work on the southern campaign?

BOLLING: No, I have never liked to work only with women in politics or only with Southerners. I think that you get slotted in a peculiar way. One thing I did do was interpret between the Kennedy people and the

[-8 -]

Johnson people on the headquarters on Connecticut Avenue—what they really meant—occasionally. That was the only contact I had with the Southerners.

GRELE: Did they have misunderstandings?

BOLLING: Yes, they had conflicts and misunderstandings among the staff.

GRELE: Do you recall any?

BOLLING: Oh, I think over scheduling and this kind of thing. I think two staffs that haven't worked together have—and are both very parochial....

GRELE: You said both staffs were parochial?

BOLLING: Yes, one were Southerners, and I think some of the young men from Boston didn't realize that the world extended past the Mississippi. And their views of the world. This would make both groups fussy with each other sometimes.

[-9-]

GRELE: Do you recall any specifics with this kind of regional...

BOLLING: Well, they get into troubles just in definitions of words—what's the difference between a steak fry and a cookout? This is a problem for them. And I think that the Kennedy staff was much more organized and efficient and that they would become irritable with the slowness—you know, "Some day we'll get it done"—of the Johnson staff. And that was part of the problem. But it was just day-to-day things. I can't think of any....

GRELE: Were you working on fundraising during the campaign?

BOLLING: I worked on an involved telephone campaign that was called "Call to Victory" that was supposed to be the largest telephone

[-10-]

chain call. It was somewhat like chain letters. You call five people and ask them to call five more and so forth and so on. At the end of it, the President called somebody on the West Coast, election night. And it was that sort of a gimmick telephone arrangement. We did a good many things besides that in the office. Whatever Larry felt like needed to be done. Much of it was calling campaign managers over the country or getting them to place television time. That was one of them that we did with Steve Smith [Stephen E. Smith]. It was extensive in what they were doing—the coordination of the whole thing.

GRELE: Were you ever involved in any of the problems that came to the central coordinating committee of the campaign?

[-11-]

Were you ever called on to intervene in any particular state in the campaign?

BOLLING: Well, that's usually what you were doing, trying to get them to do something that they didn't want to do or they didn't have the money to do or they thought we ought to do. Just sort of taking their general complaints. And often during a campaign when they're that busy, they just want to talk to somebody at the national office. It really doesn't make any difference who it is, they just want to talk to somebody in O'Brien's office. One day I talked to this man—the one that brought Khrushchev [Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev] over to visit him from Ohio....

GRELE: Garst [Roswell Garst]?

BOLLING: Yes. I think Garst wanted to talk to

[-12-]

somebody about corn, and I was the expert on corn that day. All we had to do was listen to Mr. Garst. He told you all about it. I just told him, you know, that it was wonderful to talk to him. Well, that seemed to satisfy him. I think it's the same thing that happens in any campaign headquarters. They get out there and get lonesome. That's how I became the agricultural expert. I still don't know anything about corn, I'm afraid.

GRELE: Do you recall any other specific conversations that you might have had?

BOLLING: Well, I had one that was rather funny. I was up there one morning quite early, and the phone rang. It was a one that if it rang, the President was supposed to be calling. So there was

[-13-]

nobody there, and I answered it. And they said, "This is the Ambassador." And I couldn't remember who the ambassador was, and I said well, that was fine—sort of, "So what?" in a little while I figured out that this was Mr. Kennedy's father [Joseph P. Kennedy] and what he wanted was seven copies of his son's book autographed. We got those for him.

No, but most of them were, particularly in the last days, placing television time when the local campaign committees didn't feel they had the money and you were pressuring them to put the time on and have it on in some rational way where you weren't just overrunning the networks with it.

GRELE: Did the local committees or the National Committee supply the funds for the things?

[-14-]

BOLLING: Well, at the end on this particular campaign, as I recall, we were pressuring them to put on our spots and they would pay for it. Some of them weren't delighted to get this word.

GRELE: Do you recall in particular where they weren't delegated?

BOLLING: I could go back through my files and see. But I think that they were running out of money was really the thing that they were resisting.

GRELE: What did you do after the election?

BOLLING: Well, I think the last two weeks of the campaign, I traveled with the candidate. And then after the election we suddenly had won, and there

were all these people coming in and looking for jobs, which we had not anticipated. Patronage—everybody wanted a job.

[-15-]

And there were these long lines of applicants up and down the hall, around the corner. And we just tried to process who they were and what jobs they thought they wanted. We did that, I think, for about three weeks. I went to Europe, and then I came back with the congressional liaison officer at Health, Education, and Welfare.

GRELE: Going back now, you say you traveled with the candidate. Where did you travel?

BOLLING: Oh, those are the pictures. To Philadelphia and the last night was somewhere in New Hampshire, before, and then he flew back to Boston to make the speech in Boston Garden. Johnson met him in New York shortly after they had had that experience in Dallas where the pickets had spit on the vice presidential

[-16-]

nominee. That's about the best way I can place it in time because Johnson was very popular that night in New York because of the Dallas incident. I think it made more votes there than it did in Texas.

GRELE: What were your impressions of the road organization of the campaign when you came aboard?

BOLLING: I'm afraid that sort of like being with the circus. It's hard to say. They were very well organized. They handled their press quite well and took good care of them. And I think this has been reflected in some books of what was the matter with Mr. Nixon [Richard Milhous Nixon], where he just went off and left the press as baggage and this kind of thing. I think along towards the end

[-17-]

that that kind of campaign caravan is very exciting. We rode the press bus. I think it was well organized. Nobody got killed. The crowds were getting so big, and you had the jumpers and screamers. I always felt that we were lucky we didn't have two or three women under the wheels of the bus all the time. But I think that it was done very well.

GRELE: What were your functions in the campaign?

BOLLING: Well, they told me they wanted me to go and look at the candidate and just see that part of the campaign. I've forgotten what I was doing really. I

think just trying to get on and off the bus alive finally got down to being the function. I think just freeloading on the bus.

GRELE: Was this some kind of a reward for the

[-18-]

work you had done?

BOLLING: No. If you stay in an office all during a campaign, you lose touch, and I think it was to pick up the color and feel of the campaign and to see the candidate. One thing, the last night of the campaign was the end of this telephone campaign, and I did have to be with Kennedy then to place the call, to get the lines cleared and do all sorts of business with Mother Bell just to be sure that we could get through to California. They had plans for, instead of a picture of people going to the voting booth, this would be their picture for the morning paper. But I think by then with the Republicans' telethon going on that neither the candidate nor I were very interested

[-19-]

in that telephone call.

GRELE: Do you recall anything interesting or significant about your work with John Kennedy that night?

BOLLING: Well, that night he walked into the room, and I really don't think anybody had ever told him he was to make the telephone call. I just handed him the phone and said, "There's an old lady on the other end of this telephone. Say this." And he did it beautifully. That took care of that problem. He was doing some television shows that night with his sisters [Patricia Kennedy Lawford; Eunice Kennedy Shriver; Jean Kennedy Smith] and then with Hodges [Luther H. Hodges]. And it was just in between those.

GRELE: Did he say anything to you after he hung up?

BOLLING: Not that I can recall. I haven't thought

[-20-]

about it in a very long time.

GRELE: You then worked on patronage?

BOLLING: Well, we just worked on the paperwork that came to Larry of people who wanted jobs. I didn't know if that's wicked old patronage or not. We were

trying not to lose their papers, among other things.

GRELE: What level of appointments were these?

BOLLING: Well, Donahue [Richard K. Donahue], Dungan [Ralph A. Dungan] and Larry, I think, were doing Cabinet appointments. There were a good many people in the campaign who wanted to be assistant secretaries, and we didn't really know what jobs were available or what one did when you got them. All sorts of things. I have a friend who's an assistant secretary in a department that said if he'd have

[-21-]

known what the job was, he would have taken another assistant secretary position because he would have had more people working for him if he'd taken the other one. His job just looked prettier on the charts. We didn't really know what was available in the departments, say, from the little cabinet down.

GRELE: Do you recall the names of anyone who came into your office at that time who later took an important position in the Administration?

BOLLING: Well, Sterling McMurrin [Sterling M. McMurrin], who was later Commissioner of Education, came in to be interviewed during that time. Roger Tubby [Roger Wellington Tubby], who was working in and out of the office, is now, I think, some sort of an ambassador at Geneva, was very anxious about an appointment. Mr. John Horne [John E. Horne]

[-22-]

—the one that was head of the Small Business Administration. He'd been on Sparkman's [John J. Sparkman] staff, who was the first chairman of the SBA. He was then trying very hard to find the people who were going to work for him, just going through lists. Also in this office, people were trying to mail out invitations to the Inaugural. So it was a very peculiar operation. I'm sure there are job applications who still have their application up there in the out boxes to this very day.

GRELE: Were you at all involved in any of the decision making in any of these appointments?

BOLLING: I don't think so. No, I wouldn't think that I was. I didn't throw any away that I didn't like. I have some friends who did get some jobs, but I don't think that it was particularly through my

[-23-]

influence. I think that when you begin to get in that area of people who are making decisions, it's helpful to have friends to get you the next appointment. It would have been between them and, say, Larry or Dick Donahue or whoever they talked to.

GRELE: Moving on now. How did you come to work for HEW?

BOLLING: Well, I'd enjoyed working in the campaign, so I thought since I was there I would like to be part of the Administration. I said that I would like to have a job, and I think that Larry and some of the other people in the office felt that I understood organization and was reliable. They were looking for people to go into a department and be more of a representative

[-24-]

of the President or of the legislative part of the White House than of the secretary of the department. Secretaries and Presidents don't always agree on legislation. And the White House wanted to have people in each department that they felt were reliable in terms of the legislation they wanted from the Department.

GRELE: Did you work under Wilbur Cohen [Wilbur J. Cohen] or under Larry O'Brien?

BOLLING: Well, I worked for Larry O'Brien. At that time, the legislative liaison part of the Department was under Quigley [James M. Quigley]. But I worked a great deal with Wilbur. This whole Department.... Each agency has its own lobby really, and it was very hard to keep up with all of them. It's a department where each agency or little bit of

[-25-]

it wants its own independence. HEW was badly organized to begin with. It was just sort of collected up and given to Mrs. Hobby [Oveta Culp Hobby], and it has never really recovered from that. So you have to be careful that one part of the Department doesn't out-lobby the other.

GRELE: You were working on education?

BOLLING: I worked on the major bills in the Department: the education legislation and particularly education and Medicare, which were the big bills.

GRELE: Did you have anything to do with the drug legislation?

BOLLING: I had very little to do with the drug legislation. I think this was what they wanted least and got the fastest.

GRELE: Could we go through the education bill

[-26-]

and then perhaps discuss what was agreed upon?

BOLLING: Yes.

GRELE: Who drew up the first aid to education—the one that was presented to the Congress in early 1961?

BOLLING: Well, my impression of that bill—I think this gets sort of lost in time, too.... My feeling at the time was that Sorensen [Theodore C. Sorensen] drew that bill, known as the Thompson Bill—the elementary and secondary bill.... There were actually three bills going at the same time. They killed each other. And I can't image now why the elementary and secondary bill was pushed in the first part of the Congress. I don't know what the thought was behind it because if you look at the history

[-27-]

of the bill in preceding Congresses, there was no reason to believe that anything would happen to it except that it would die in the Rules Committee.

GRELE: Was there any relation between that bill and the task force reports that the President had received?

BOLLING: Well, they had the Hovde Report and thought it would be great to have an education bill. I think a lot of this was sort of, "My God, we've won. It's marvelous. We're going to have an education bill," without too much thought really how hard it would be to get it, and that we were all just delighted that Kennedy was elected and that we were going to do all these things—without really thinking of the problems that the Murray-Metcalf bill had had in the previous session. I think it's easy

[-28-]

to second-guess these things, but the one with the possibility was the higher education bill—alone—but that the three of them, NDEA and the elementary and secondary and higher ed, were dragging each other apart.

GRELE: You say that you had the feeling that Ted Sorensen had drawn up the elementary education bill?

BOLLING: That was my feeling from my conversations with Wilbur Cohen. Everybody tinkers with these bills. The major part of it might have been

his and Wilbur's. It's hard to say where those bills first come from, but this is my impression. And I've forgotten what Ted says in his book where it came from.

GRELE: John Kennedy urged this legislation in his State of the Union message. Was the legislation that he discussed in the

[-29-]

State of the Union message the same bill that Sorensen and Wilbur Cohen had worked on that you know?

BOLLING: I really don't know. Let's see. It seems to me in his State of the Union he was just talking about an education bill—just generally. When we get into the specifics of it.... I think one of the troubles that the House has is that it doesn't know its own history. The only reason that they ever got the preceding education bill in the Eisenhower Administration [Dwight D. Eisenhower] out of the Rules Committee is that I think it was Congressman either Reese or Scott, a Republican, had decided to vote for it to give it a chance to come to the floor. After it came to the floor, he wouldn't vote for it to go to conference. Well, you were going to need somebody, and

[-30-]

later, in '61, if the bill had been such that it would have pleased, say, Congressman Delaney [James J. Delaney] on the church-state issue, it would have displeased one of the Southerners, say like Judge Trimble [James W. Trimble], who had gone off on a previous.... It was one of these things where I think you would have had to chop the child in half to take it through the Rules Committee. As the higher education bill was debated, more and more members of Congress found out that construction aid was given to church schools and that the world hadn't come to an end; that this had been going on in NDEA, and that the world really wouldn't end. I think this helped their own education on the whole problem. But I think it's because the House doesn't know its own history that it does these

[-31-]

peculiar things. I think sometimes before they take up bills they ought to have a booklet on what the past experiences have been with similar pieces of legislation. They just forget. I forget. We all forget. I can't really remember what was in the education bill of '63 at different stages.

GRELE: Was it generally felt in HEW at the time that the roadblock in the House Rules Committee could be broken?

BOLLING: I don't think they ever thought about the House Rules Committee in HEW. I think they only worried about the Education and Labor

Committee. This is one of the mistakes that is made generally in lobbying in Congress. All people with a piece of legislation are inclined to think about the committee before which the legislation is heard, and they never do worry about the

[-32-]

Rules Committee except on a last minute, crash, hysterical basis. And then it's a little bit too late. It's conceivable you might be able to educate Delaney on this kind of thing, I don't know. I always felt that it was a matter of conviction with him, and he probably would not have changed.

GRELE: I note here that the *New York Times* reported on February 15 that the Administration message to Congress was delayed after a secret meeting between Secretary Ribicoff [Abraham Alexander Ribicoff] and liberal Democratic senators over a disagreement over the allocation of funds. Do you recall what that secret meeting was about?

BOLLING: No. They got to where they had so many secret meetings. Ribicoff liked secret meetings with the Senate. And again,

[-33-]

many of those were with the Senate when they, the Department, should have been worrying about the House. This particular one could have been over Senator Hill [Lister Hill] and his feeling on his formula where the formula is weighted in favor of the South. This doesn't please the city people because they feel that their prices are higher in the city and the land is higher so why should you overweight it for Southerners? I think, in all frankness, that Senator Hill knows a good deal more about hospitals than he does about schools.

GRELE: Was the opposition of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States ever taken into consideration?

BOLLING: Yes, they did. They talked to—what's his name—Hochwalt [Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt].

[-34-]

There was a good deal of talking to him and all of the various education lobby groups. There was a pool of lobbyists on education. Ribicoff talked to them in the beginning. But he generally offended them. They felt that he had told them that he could handle the legislation and didn't need their help. There was a friction set up early on a personality basis that got them to going in all different directions. The education lobbies of all varieties are not strong in a positive sense. I don't believe they could pass a piece of legislation, but I think they could beat one. And that was their strength.

GRELE: In general, how did Secretary Ribicoff handle this legislative battle?

BOLLING: Well, one thing he did that was pretty

[-35-]

startling was—and I wasn't there so I don't really know what happened—
Mr. Rayburn felt that on the issue of teachers' salaries Ribicoff had lied to
him. And then he, Rayburn, was never the same. He used to sit in his office and tell people
that Ribicoff had lied to him about what was in the bill. And that set that relationship askew
because I think Mr. Rayburn was afraid of aid to teachers' salaries would do something to
textbooks, and this was never clear to him. I don't know if Ribicoff did lie to him or he had
the wrong information when he talked to him, but at any rate, the Speaker felt that he had
been lied to.

GRELE: Could this have had anything to do with the report in the *New York Times*
that Rayburn had passed up a chance to back

[-36-]

the Administration on the church-state issue of March 8, 1961?

BOLLING: It might. I know he was damn mad.

GRELE: At that time Congressman Powell [Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.] did not
introduce a desegregation amendment to the education bill. Were you at
all aware of why he did not want to do that this time?

BOLLING: Powell had just become chairman of the Committee. I think that when he
started, he started with good intentions; that he wanted to be a good
chairman and he wanted to pass this bill. He was really trying, and that's
the reason he didn't amend the bill. There was discussion about this, and that's why he didn't
put on his Powell Amendment. He's very proud of the number of bills that he turned out of
that Committee during that session,

[-37-]

and I think that sort of reflects this desire to have the bill succeed.

GRELE: How effective was he, once turning out the legislation, in getting it
passed?

BOLLING: Education and Labor, I think, is famous for passing bills out of the
Committee that can't pass the floor of the House. He very effectively got

them out of his Committee, but I don't have a scorecard of how many of them passed.

GRELE: On the issue of the constitutionality of the bill, what was the opinion of the officials at Health, Education, and Welfare on this issue?

BOLLING: Well, we had the belief from Justice that we got for Senator Morse [Wayne L. Morse], and I believe that this left it again all in the twilight zone. It didn't settle the issue for him. I think that the

[-38-]

Department felt that this bill would stand up. By this time we were just all hoping for the best because it was very involved.

GRELE: There was a report at one time that the bill was so drafted that the sponsors hoped that the amendments granting aid to private schools would be impossible. Was that one of your function in drawing up that bill?

BOLLING: No. I didn't draw legislation. All I tried to do was convince people that they wanted to support it in the Education and Labor Committee and then later on the floor. And I think that perhaps this is a better job overall. I think that when legislative liaison people get involved in the drafting of it, they are less effective, because I find that people who

[-39-]

draft legislation—any criticism of it they feel is somewhat like criticizing their children, and that they're less involved if they don't draw the legislation.

GRELE: The bill first went to the House Education and Labor Committee. Who did you work most closely within that committee?

BOLLING: Frank Thompson [Frank Thompson, Jr.] on this particular bill. On the other, later, I worked very closely with Mrs. Green [Edith S. Green]—on the higher ed bill. One of the criticisms of the whole thing would be that there was not enough communication with the members of the Committee on what the possibilities of the bill were. I was in one early meeting with Frank Thompson and the Secretary, but it was not a very substantive meeting. The legislation had gone up to the Hill by that time.

[-40-]

It would have been better received with better grace by the Congressmen if they had felt like they had had some part in the drafting of it.

GRELE: What was Congressman Thompson's opinion of the bill at first?

BOLLING: He did a very good job with the bill. He took an awfully lot of pressure on it. They began to fill up his office with little pictures of children saying, "You have abandoned me." I think that he was hopeful at first. When they got the idea of holding NDEA and bringing it on as a later bill to appease the private schools groups, by that time, realistically, you couldn't expect very much.

GRELE: Who devised that strategy?

BOLLING: I think that was sort of a catch-as-catch-can thing in the middle. When you couldn't

[-41-]

have the education bill, it was hoped that this would please Delaney. I don't know why. I don't know that there were any conversations with him that would lead you to believe it would because he stated that it didn't please him.

GRELE: Do you recall any particular problems in that House Committee on Education and Labor?

BOLLING: Well, that's a very funny Committee. They have problems. Sometimes that Committee is a little like getting a school play together. Yes, I think between the subcommittees there was friction, and particularly later with the second bill, the higher education bill—there was a good deal of feeling about that both political and personal. And then between the subcommittee chairmen and the

[-42-]

chairman himself. Everybody was making different arrangements or felt they had different commitments. I thought it was very badly coordinated.

GRELE: The bill had a easier time in the Senate. Did you work with anybody in the Senate?

BOLLING: I talked to Jack Forsythe [John S. Forsythe] some on the bill in the Senate. I lobbied the House. I find that senators would rather talk to the secretaries about their problems, but I did talk to staff people about it. And I can see why they would have an easier time in the Senate. They had passed a better bill in '60. It's hard to say why. It may be that they better staff work on the Committee.

GRELE: Were the debates between Senator Javits [Jacob K. Javits]

[-43-]

and Hill over allocation of funds ever reflected in the House Committee?

BOLLING: I think that they were in the executive hearings, yes. Particularly between, say, the representative from big cities, from Chicago, but they always.... I think that they know in the House Committee that this is the price they pay to Senator Hill and the other body. They like to talk about it, but they finally get used to it.

GRELE: At one time Chairman Powell simply ruled out of order two amendments which were going to give aid to private schools. Was there resentment over this tactic?

BOLLING: I remember that Committee meeting. I think there was resentment, but not a great deal. I believe that was a very short meeting of the Committee.

[-44-]

GRELE: Two motions and two rules.

BOLLING: I think that completed the day for them. As I recall, by that time they weren't very surprised or too upset.

GRELE: Was Wilbur Cohen at all involved in the legislative process of this bill?

BOLLING: Oh yes, I think he was very much involved in it. And I think one of the problems is that, again, he had personality problems. I think it's conceivable that, say, Edith Green wouldn't let him in the office to talk to her about it.

GRELE: Why not?

BOLLING: She didn't like him. I think she felt that he was not frank with her. And she simply didn't like him. And I think that the Department, or Wilbur, was not candid with her, and I think that there was not enough honesty in the dealings between....

[-45-]

And I think that perhaps Frank Thompson came to feel this way, too—that they just weren't being honest with the members of Congress about the bill. I think that the feeling in the Department was that they could make the legislation and cram it down the Committee's throat. Well, there's a resistance to this. Committees don't like that. Although I think they might have been able to do it through consultation. You know, "We tried hard to get what

you wanted into the bill and we couldn't make it," would have been some compromise or salve to these people. They didn't get it.

GRELE: Did you ever suggest this to Wilbur Cohen?

BOLLING: Oh yes, I suggested this, but people who are education experts are very firm.

[-46-]

I think that they were more taken with the substance than they were with their political problems here. And again, they think that was reflected to the idea about "What are we going to do about the Rules Committee?"

GRELE: How did Wilbur Cohen and the Secretary coordinate their activities? Were they well coordinated or...

BOLLING: Well, they must have been. I think they worked very closely with each other and only with each other, leaving out a good part of the Office of Education. I always felt that there was some difference of opinion—and it's hard to pin down—between O'Brien and Sorensen on this bill; that you had sort of a four-way split.

GRELE: Your husband [Richard W. Bolling] in his transcript talked about a compromise that Ted Sorensen

[-47-]

at one time agreed to make that he didn't feel was necessary. Do you recall that?

BOLLING: On the education bill?

GRELE: Yes.

BOLLING: I don't on elementary and secondary. I don't remember it. I don't recall it, though I think I remember the higher education bill a little better because we finally did get it, or most of the parts of it passed.

GRELE: The higher education bill that was defeated the first time, was that the same as the bill that was introduced in '63?

BOLLING: Yes. Well, that's Mrs. Green's bill. We seem to have most of it now except that it's not funded. Maybe we can do that this year.

GRELE: Were any of these amendments, such as

[-48-]

Pucinski's [Roman Gordon Pucinski] amendment urging all tuition being deductible from federal income tax.... Were any of these seriously considered by the Committee?

BOLLING: I believe that the income tax deduction was seriously considered by HEW, but we found later—and I did do some work on this with Joe Barr [Joseph W. Barr]—that with our Treasury Department this was impossible. It got a good deal of support on the Senate side and became very attractive for a while, but it was messing up the tax bill. The idea still floats around. I don't think that it was considered in any depth in the Education and Labor Committee at that time. I think it found most of its support on the Senate side. And Senator Ribicoff now sponsors one of these. I think it would have been

[-49-]

all right with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that they would have gone. But they couldn't.

GRELE: Who first devised the proposal that the aid to education be coordinated to impacted areas?

BOLLING: Well, impacted areas, that's 815 and 874; that's somebody else's. This bill was passed during the Eisenhower Administration. There was a Dent bill, that the way to get federal aid to all schools would be just to extend impacted areas. I think Congressman Bailey [Cleveland M. Bailey] had a bill that got fleeting support at this time from HEW. It was on some sort of extended impacted areas bill. This was going to be the fallback position.

GRELE: As we go on here, I become more and more confused as to what bills were where.

[-50-]

Is this just my misunderstanding or was that your impression at the time?

BOLLING: At the time it seemed to me that.... We had three bills on our mind. We had the elementary and secondary bill; and then the National Defense, the NDEA, was expiring, and there was always the fear back there if these hearings went on too long and we fooled around, that we'd wind up without it, too. There was the pressure of that, and then impacted areas was expiring too—they all had to be extended. And so these were left to tinker with and were always in the discussion because

they were still there. And then there was a higher education bill which Mrs. Green felt very strongly about and felt that she was losing her bill for this other hopeless one. So they had a

[-51-]

lot of trouble about those.

GRELE: How were all of these conflicts eventually resolved?

BOLLING: Well, let's see. We extended NDEA and broadened it that time around, and impacted areas was overwhelmingly passed. And let's see, we have public school aid; we've gotten that. Federal insurance and commercial student loans; they've gotten that. Well, another bill that I hadn't thought of that was floating about this time was adult illiteracy, which did not pass in that session but passed in 1963. Teachers training. Much of this was in the second, the omnibus bill of 1963, which was split up by the Committee.

GRELE: Was one of the reasons for the presentation of an omnibus bill the fact that all

[-52-]

these bills were floating around at the same time?

BOLLING: Well, I think that they needed to make some choices in '61 and in '63 of what they wanted. I don't know why the omnibus bill went the way it did. Because of the organization of the Education and Labor Committee it was perfectly clear that they would have to split the bill up. I never understood the thought behind sending it all at once. It might have been that the more you ask for and the more it's cut back, that you still get a great deal. That was a very cumbersome....

GRELE: Just from our conversation here it seems to me that this might have been an attempt to pull all those things together into a rational package rather than...

BOLLING: Well, it would be rational except that you

[-53-]

know how the Committee on Education and Labor is set up. The whole Committee was not going to hear the whole bill. It's going to have to go, part of it, to the Committee on Special Education, and the one on higher education, and first one thing and the next.

GRELE: At one time in the deliberations on the first bill, a reported conflict

between Speaker Rayburn and Majority Leader McCormack reached the newspapers. Was there any substance to this?

BOLLING: I believe there was. You have the vote of Delaney and O'Neill [Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill, Jr.], when they tried to force the hearing on the bill, which would indicate to me that the present speaker was opposed to the bill. I would think that that was valid.

GRELE: Majority Leader at the time McCormack

[-54-]

denied that he had challenged Speaker Rayburn's leadership or his power to schedule or that he lead a "Catholic Bloc." Was there any substance to any one of those charges?

BOLLING: No, I don't think that he has challenged his leadership. I think that he had.... And I don't think that he strongly opposed the bill. I think he just was opposed to it. I don't think there was a great stir over it, but I do think this would be reflected on O'Neill's and Delaney's vote on the Rules Committee.

GRELE: Does this conflict mean that by that time Speaker Rayburn had come around to support of the bill?

BOLLING: It's difficult to say what he had decided about teachers' salaries, but I think that it was in the nature of Speaker Rayburn

[-55-]

to support the Administration's bill. And I think that by this time, if we were getting around to construction and to teachers' salaries, I would think that surely he was supporting the bill.

GRELE: What was the motion that Congressman Bolling made which was checked by Judge Smith [Howard W. Smith] in the Rules Committee?

BOLLING: As I recall, he asked for a hearing for the bill. And it was defeated eight to seven with Delaney and O'Neill voting not to have a hearing. It was just to start the hearing on the bill. And that really was the end. We didn't need to get to the next one.

GRELE: Was it apparent at the time in HEW that this was the end?

BOLLING: No, it wasn't. I don't think it was

[-56-]

apparent to them. It was apparent to me, and I told them that it was apparent to me; that this was the difficulty with the Rules Committee; that that's where the trouble was. But I just think that there's some failure to grasp the way the House functions and that surely there must be some tricky way to get around the Rules Committee—that you could do Calendar Wednesday, or maybe something would come along and save us.

GRELE: At any time in the long process did the President intervene?

BOLLING: I believe that he talked to members of the Education Committee, and I'm sure that he talked to Powell. I don't know how many times because Powell went through a phase in here where he announced every

[-57-]

day that he had just talked to the President on the telephone. I don't know if he did or not, but I am sure that the President did work with the subcommittee chairmen and the chairman of the Committee.

GRELE: Do you recall anything interesting or significant that we haven't touched on in that bill? Any discussion you had with anyone on the Hill pro or con on the bill?

BOLLING: No. I think that the thing I will always remember most about the bill was the bad feeling between the Committee and the Department; that that was the most significant thing to me—and it would always be a very stormy bill and that it would have a lot of trouble.

GRELE: Was this feeling at all allayed by the time the second bill was introduced in '63?

[-58-]

BOLLING: Well, they didn't have the first bill so the.... I think that the debate on the whole problem was helpful, and everybody got used to everybody and learned a good deal more about it. Many people in the Department of HEW had no experience with Congress, and by that time they had had a good deal. And then I think the church-state issue—in a way, that the debate on it was helpful. As I say, they found out that their aid was given to colleges and that nothing had happened, that the world hadn't ended. So just everybody had more experience with each other and with the issue.

GRELE: Who originated the omnibus school....

BOLLING: Well, I would guess that Wilbur Cohen's department at HEW, the program analysis

[-59-]

people, and Sorensen and Lee White [Lee C. White] put that one all together. I went to some planning meetings on that bill. I was surprised that they put the bill together.

GRELE: Did you express surprise at the time?

BOLLING: Yes.

GRELE: What did they say?

BOLLING: Well, it was the feeling of the Department that they'd just put the whole bill together and let Education and Labor take it apart. Now I think that there was some feeling that the Department couldn't believe that the Education and Labor Committee would take the bill apart, and it might be able to stay together. But that was unrealistic.

GRELE: In the meantime, Secretary Ribicoff did become Senator Ribicoff. Did the change in Secretaries...

[-60-]

BOLLING: I think that left it very much up to Wilbur Cohen. I don't think that Mr. Celebrezze [Anthony J. Celebrezze] knew anything about education legislation and I think was frightened to death at this point by the parochial school issue.

GRELE: He did not take as active a part as did Secretary Ribicoff?

BOLLING: No, he didn't. I don't think he had as many opinions on it or knew as much about it and was in a difficult position because he was going.... There he was. He was trying to find out what sort of Department he was supposed to be running. And I think he came in at an awkward time for him and left the next legislative planning session very much to Cohen.

GRELE: I believe that the first split on the omnibus bill came with vocational

[-61-]

agriculture. Was this an attempt to win southern support for the various parts of that education bill?

BOLLING: You're speaking of thing like...

GRELE: When the omnibus bill went to the Committee, was it not broken off Vo Ag first?

BOLLING: That went to Perkins' [Carl D. Perkins] committee. This is the one about home economics and that part of it. Yes. And I think it was also felt if it was broken in that way, they would get a friendlier hearing. They would rather have it in front of Perkins than have it in front of Green, who was by this time outraged.

GRELE: Why was she outraged?

BOLLING: Well, from her experience the year before with her higher education bill and the personality conflict between her and Mr. Cohen,

[-62-]

that they preferred to deal with Perkins. While all this went on, there was another one that was storming around which was the medical education bill that went to Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and there was a good deal of feeling that it belonged to the Education and Labor Committee and Mrs. Green's subcommittee. She had a similar bill, and there was a lot more bad feeling created about that. That's HR 12; that bill did pass that year. That was the one education bill that was new that passed.

GRELE: I have been told that Mrs. Green became increasingly bitter towards the Administration because of her experiences with the education legislation. Is this true?

BOLLING: I don't think she was as bitter with the

[-63-]

Administration as she was just with that Department and particularly, I think, with that individual. It became intensified—and perhaps with the office of Education.

GRELE: The bill introduced in 1963 still did not contain aid to private schools when it was introduced.

BOLLING: When it was introduced. This is '63. Are we talking about the one that passed?

GRELE: The omnibus bill. Various parts of the omnibus bill.

BOLLING: No, it didn't.

GRELE: When were they introduced into the bill?

BOLLING: Were they introduced into the bill?

GRELE: Well, eventually these bills when they went to committees...

BOLLING: They only one that I think they were, really, was just on a weighting of the formula to cities. That that was the way that it

[-64-]

was done. Because I don't think that it did not have the share-time share-teachers as the last bill did.

GRELE: Excuse me a minute.

[BEGIN SIDE II TAPE I]

BOLLING: They did pass a bill in '60 through both bodies with no aid to church schools, but it just never got to conference.

GRELE: Do you recall who first brought up this form for weighted aid to the cities and shared time?

BOLLING: No, I don't. And I don't think.... I didn't work for the Department after the assassination. I really don't know what they did then.

GRELE: Do you recall the opinion in the Department and on the Hill at Cardinal Spellman's [Francis Edward Spellman] continual attacks on any aid to education which did not encompass aid

[-65-]

to private schools?

BOLLING: I can't remember that they were pleased at all. I think they wished he'd go away. I feel that the Catholic community were not all of one opinion on this. I mean, as you found with Jewish groups—some opposed it; some supported it. Neither group was rock hard on it.

GRELE: On the second series of bills, was there any attempt to coordinate the activities of the lobbyists?

BOLLING: Well, Frank Keppel [Francis Keppel] tried when he came to the Department. I think he tried to get the lobbyists just not to do anything. This, he felt, would be helpful if they would just leave it alone and not fight with each other. The superintendents of schools and the different parts of the NEA will fight with one another. And if

[-66-]

they'd just be quiet, maybe the Department and the Administration and the Education and Labor Committee could get the bill through. And I think he feels he had some success with it.

GRELE: Do you recall who the chief lobbyist for the NEA was?

BOLLING: On the higher education bill it was to a very great extent Wilson [Roy Kenneth Wilson]. I can't remember his name right now.

GRELE: On July 17, 1963, Congresswoman Green and Commissioner Keppel exchanged a rather bitter dialogue over male-female pay scales in the aid of education bill. Do you recall that hearing?

BOLLING: Yes, I recall the hearing. I think he sent her flowers after that, and that made it even worse.

GRELE: What were her criticisms?

[-67-]

BOLLING: Oh, well, I don't remember it specifically, but I think her general feeling was—again, she at one time expressed some disagreement on the GI bill because it didn't include women—it would be on an equal rights basis.

GRELE: Who did you work with on the second bill, or the second set of bills, in the House?

BOLLING: Well, I worked with Mrs. Green on the higher education bill, and with Perkins—he had adult illiteracy too besides the vocational aspects of the bill—and with Powell and the various staff members.

GRELE: Were you at all involved in any dealings with the Senate?

BOLLING: Just with the staff members. And very little.

GRELE: Do you recall any of the details of the House-Senate Conference Committee on these legislative proposals?

[-68-]

BOLLING: About all I can remember about it is that I worried about it a great deal and how Senator Morse and Mrs. Green were getting along together.

GRELE: Why weren't they getting along?

BOLLING: Well, that may be their state politics. You might interview her, and she can tell you about the conference. But we could not go to the conference. I've been to the executive meeting of the Committee, but they did not have executive staff people in the conference.

GRELE: Were you getting reports on the conferences?

BOLLING: Yes.

GRELE: From whom?

BOLLING: Well, I'd get them from the members on the House side and from the staff. This is usually the best way; the staff members are almost, sometimes, too vocal about what happens in the conference.

[-69-]

GRELE: The personalities on that Committee have always struck me as being almost as significant in terms of the passage of the legislation as the legislation itself.

BOLLING: Sometimes I believe that this is particularly true in the Senate that sometimes a Senate staff member often knows more about a particular field than his member. I think that the House members do more work on the legislation themselves.

GRELE: Did you receive any reports about Senator Hill's objections to the bill?

BOLLING: Well, I think he was objecting to the formula. I can't recall the conference particularly, but he was always very worried about the church-state issue—as Morse did worry from time to time.

GRELE: Morse did worry?

BOLLING: Yes.

[-70-]

GRELE: He eventually argued for passage of the bill.

BOLLING: Yes, and I think this is one place that he got enough information, particularly in terms of higher education, that he changed his mind and made different decisions during the course of the legislation.

GRELE: Did you ever have the need to confer with or contact Congressman Frelinghuysen [Peter H. Frelinghuysen, Jr.] on this legislation, or did you work exclusively with Democrats?

BOLLING: No. The Republicans that I worked with were Quie [Albert H. Quie] and Goodell [Charles E. Goodell] more than Frelinghuysen.

GRELE: Why?

BOLLING: I don't really know. It was perhaps the subcommittees that they served on. And I think that perhaps Frelinghuysen was busy with foreign affairs, too, that

[-71-]

there was little reason to see him.

GRELE: I asked the question because I was wondering if you had just written him off as a bitter, die-hard Republican.

BOLLING: No, I call him "Peter Frozenhosen" but.... You know, all the people on that Committee have names.

GRELE: Oh, really?

BOLLING: They all have nicknames.

GRELE: What are their names?

BOLLING: Well, I think that Perkins is called "the Grin." And all different kinds of names. Interview Mr. Thompson on their names. He named the Committee.

GRELE: Who was particularly effective in the House on passage of the legislation?

BOLLING: I think that Thompson was effective. I think that Mrs. Green is effective. I think that Powell is not effective

[-72-]

because he doesn't understand the bills in depth. They're taken poorly before the Rules Committee, and when he takes them himself, the presentation has to be made by the subcommittee chairman. And I think his understanding of handling a bill on the floor is a disgrace. That will scare you to death.

GRELE: In what ways?

BOLLING: Well, I don't think he understands the rules or what he's doing with the bill, really. He is very quick and superficially quite bright. But it is work to handle a bill on the floor, and I think that he would sometimes risk a bill just by not knowing enough about it when it's on the floor or before the Rules Committee.

GRELE: Did Wilbur Cohen handle himself any better with these bills than he did with the

[-73-]

bill of 1961?

BOLLING: Well, I suppose he must have gotten better. It's hard to say. There was no place to go but up.

GRELE: Those bills were still in conference committee at the time of the assassination and eventually came out of that committee in December of '63. Do you feel that the assassination had anything to do with springing those bills?

BOLLING: I think that the.... One thing that did help these education bills was the passage of the civil rights bills. Of course, that took a lot of weight off of the whole problem of the Powell Amendment. That was why I was very strong to have the Powell Amendment in the civil rights bill because I thought that it would then make education legislation possible; that it

[-74-]

couldn't carry civil rights and all the other problems of education. I think the bill would have passed if the President hadn't been assassinated. It might have taken a little longer. I think that perhaps the assassination speeded up some bills, but they would have come along.

GRELE: Did you ever confer with Congressman Delaney about the allocation formula that made his bill substantially different from the earlier bills?

BOLLING: I have talked to Congressman Delaney, and I think that probably the office

of Education needs somebody just to go and sit and talk to him. He likes to talk about various pieces of legislation and problems that HEW has, particularly health legislation. This may be because of problems that his wife is ill, and he feels some bitterness, I think, towards the Food and Drug Administration and things that have happened

[-75-]

there. He does not talk about education legislation. I think that he's highly emotional on it and doesn't really want to know many of the details. But I think he does harbor some ill will towards different parts of that Department. I think that perhaps if he was lobbied by somebody who knew a good deal about his district and the Church in his district and their relationship to this, they might be able to change his mind some.

GRELE: Was there any attempt made to do this with various congressmen?

BOLLING: No, but as I say, nobody really thought about the Rules Committee that much. I did try to talk to him. I knew that we were going to have trouble with him. I tried to get him better service and this sort of thing from the Department where

[-76-]

he had not gotten it in the past. Just good old public relations. The archbishop, or whatever he is, from Delaney's district that later went to Puerto Rico and was the one we had trouble with during the 1960 campaign about Muñoz Marin [Luis Muñoz Marin].... The Church must be very conservative in Delaney's District and I think, again, he is very emotional about this and feels it very strongly, and it is a conviction.

GRELE: Did you ever discuss this problem with Larry O'Brien?

BOLLING: Well, I think we all talked about it but hoped it would go away. It was never thought about enough, and that would be all our faults; that wouldn't be any particular person. I think they rather believed that because Delaney and O'Neill were good Democrats, they

[-77-]

wouldn't leave.

GRELE: Can you think of any incidents surrounding the passage of this education legislation that we haven't touched on that you'd like to talk about?

BOLLING: No, I don't think I can. I wished I could remember more about it. I asked Carl Albert [Carl B. Albert] the other day what he could remember about

it, and all he said he could remember is that he kept telling them it wasn't going to pass, and they kept telling him it had to pass. That's all he could remember about the substance of it. I'm afraid I'm in about the shape myself.

GRELE: Moving on now to Medicare. What was the genesis of the Medicare bill in HEW?

BOLLING: Well, that was the.... Let's see, we started out with the King-Anderson bill

[-78-]

and that was clearly—we were always one vote short—that the chairman wasn't going to let it go. And it just sort of sat there. I think that one of the problems that HEW had was that it had too many pieces of major legislation all at one time. At one point during all this, water pollution got to be rather controversial, and you had the Food and Drug bill, and there were really not enough people to center in. And then the Department was very badly split. There was a fight between Wilbur Cohen and the Under Secretary Ivan Nestingen [Ivan A. Nestingen] on how this bill (Medicare) should be handled.

GRELE: This is the...

BOLLING: The Medicare bill and what was to be done about that. As I recall, Nestingen wanted to build up a great deal of public

[-79-]

pressure and opinion for it and Cohen wanted to deal with the chairman only and that—which way you tried to do this—and this fight finally, I think, ended with Nestingen leaving the Department.

GRELE: Who drew up this bill?

BOLLING: This is the place where Cohen is very good. He does know a great deal about Social Security. And I would think that the details of that bill would probably have been drawn by him and the counsel in Social Security.

GRELE: Over the years Senator Hill has built up a kind of solid basis for control of any medical legislation. Was there a particular effort to deal with him in any way?

BOLLING: Oh, we used to say as a joke that part of the week Senator Hill ran HEW and part

[-80-]

of the week Congressman Fogarty [John Edward Fogarty] ran HEW. I think that there was a feeling for a long time that who we dealt with on that bill in the Senate was Anderson [Clinton P. Anderson] and that the bill could pass the Senate. Of course, it failed actually by one vote. That was that they were less disturbed about it in the Senate. There the problem was the House of Representatives, and they had focused on that. And that was true.

GRELE: The problem was that House of Representatives?

BOLLING: Yes. Just getting it to the floor for a vote, getting it out of the Ways and Means Committee.

GRELE: Why?

BOLLING: Why was there the problem? Well, they didn't have enough votes to get it out of the Ways and Means Committee, and I

[-81-]

think there was a feeling always that if it could come out of there, it would pass on the floor.

GRELE: What were the objections in Ways and Means?

BOLLING: Well, I think the objections were Chairman Mills' [Wilbur Daigh Mills] objections. He had Kerr-Mills, and I think that the argument in the beginning was that Kerr-Mills had not had long enough to work to see if it really could work and we didn't know if we really needed to Medicare bill or not. He's very bright and very able and runs that committee quite well, and you couldn't get it out unless you had some agreement with the chairman. And with the change in the ratio of the Committee, he could see then it was going to come out of his Committee and let even

[-82-]

a broader bill through the Committee than the King-Anderson.

GRELE: Did you confer with Congressman Mills at all about this?

BOLLING: Yes, and I think he always felt technically, and I can't remember why now, that the bill was not well drawn—and his staff people did, too—but that again, this man has a very great problem, and he's caught in his district between the American Medical Association and the labor movement, and that he just didn't feel it was time for the bill, and he didn't like it.

GRELE: You mentioned Congressman Fogarty's name. Did you work through

Congressman Fogarty, or work with him?

BOLLING: He worked mostly with the Public Health Service. Yes, I've seen him and talked

[-83-]

to him about minor bills and, oh, changes in legislation. I think his problem with the Public Health Service is that he always gave them more money than they knew what to do with. I've found working for them—HEW can involve nineteen committees. So you find yourself in some very funny committees sometimes.

GRELE: Did you ever receive any instructions from the White House or from the President concerning Medicare? How to deal with it, or who to deal with?

BOLLING: Well, we did have a campaign. We worked very closely with the Senior Citizens—I've forgotten its entire name, but it was the lobby for the Medicare bill. And during that time—during the 1962 election—we tried to help the congressmen and the candidates who were for Medicare.

[-84-]

As a part of that I found a man in New York who was a printer, quite a larger printer, who printed some 70,000 leaflets for these candidates on Medicare. And then we had their picture made shaking hands with the President. Each leaflet was different, for Congressman X and Y and so forth. And this man's heart's desire was to meet President Kennedy. So on October the sixteenth I took him to see the President, and that was the day he found out about the missiles in Cuba. He did go on and see the man and talk to him for a minute. And after we left, the man said he felt that the President was awfully nervous, he wondered what was wrong with him. As I read about the missile crisis, I always laugh a little bit. One of the things that we

[-85-]

tried to do with the Medicare bill was to give support—try and elect more congressmen that did support it.

GRELE: Was this an acceptance of Ivan Nestingen's...

BOLLING: No, I don't think. I think eventually he actually lost the argument. I used to speak on Medicare. And there was some discussion then if Department people should or should not. There was a lag; that sort of fell off where they didn't. But I think that we did try to help the congressmen who supported it or the candidates for Congress who would support it if they got in.

GRELE: In the Senate, I believe the deciding vote was cast by Jennings Randolph.

BOLLING: That was...

GRELE: Were there any pressures or any...

BOLLING: All kinds of pressure happened to

[-86-]

Jennings Randolph on that. That was over the feeling that West Virginia, I think, was going to have that give back three million dollars, and I think it was a mistake in the legislation—that it was just quickly drawn, and that was just a tactical error that was made in the Department on the drawing of the bill.

GRELE: West Virginia would have to give back three million dollars?

BOLLING: Well, that they would owe it.... You see, this was an amendment to welfare legislation, and in that welfare this was the ten points of reforming welfare legislation. They added Medicare to it in the Senate. In that legislation it was in some way West Virginia didn't conform. So Randolph felt he couldn't vote for it. And there was a great deal

[-87-]

of pressures brought on him, and I think that if he had voted for it, then Hayden [Carl T. Hayden] was going to change his vote. They expected to win that on the count, as I recall, of O'Brien. We had counted that and expected to win it by one or two votes.

GRELE: In the Senate?

BOLLING: Yes.

GRELE: Did you give it any chances in the House?

BOLLING: Well, I believe—and I think this was the whole general theory—that if it could have come before the House, it would have passed; that the problem was the Committee, not the House.

GRELE: Was there ever any feedback from the Senate that they had passed that bill and now the House wasn't going to pass it?

[-88-]

BOLLING: Well, I think they knew what had happened to it in the House was that it

simply couldn't come out of.... There was not any way that you could snatch it out of the Committee to get it before the House. It didn't even get as far as the Rules Committee to hang. So it was a completely different problem. No, we kept an elaborate book on who was for Medicare in the House and what speeches they had made on it and how they felt about it sort of, you know, day by day. And I think it could have passed the House and if it couldn't it needed to be debated before the country.

GRELE: Was this a normal practice that you kept this log, or was that something special?

BOLLING: Well, it was just a thing that my office did to see how everyone was feeling, and I feel it could have passed the House.

GRELE: Did you work on any other pieces of legislation?

[-89-]

BOLLING: Oh yes, I worked on the welfare amendments we were talking about. I think at this time we had Cuban refugees, and we had a little piece of legislation in front of Foreign Affairs on that.

GRELE: Was there any problem?

BOLLING: Well, yes, there was a problem on it. They never would do anything about it, so we added it as one of the amendments on the welfare legislation.

GRELE: Why wouldn't they do anything about it?

BOLLING: Well, it was too small a bill. You just couldn't ever get anybody to focus on it, so we just put it on the Social Security amendment and it passed. At HEW there were always minor bills that were very important to the Department people—vocational rehabilitation, things that they do for the blind and this kind of thing. There's lot of comparatively

[-90-]

little legislation around there.

GRELE: Were you at all concerned with the drug legislation?

BOLLING: No, I wasn't.

GRELE: Why?

BOLLING: Most of the work was done in the Senate. There was a young man that I

think Ribicoff hired—and is now on his staff—Sanosky [Jerome Sanosky], to handle that. And he had done quite a bit of that work for Blatnik [John A. Blatnik], and he handled it on the Senate side.

GRELE: Richard Harris in his book on the drug legislation, *The Real Voice*, claims that Sanosky and Wilbur Cohen had a meeting with Eastland [James O. Eastland] and Oren Harris to draw up that legislation to counteract the Kefauver legislation. Is that your impression on how that bill...

[-91-]

BOLLING: Well, my feeling was that he was essentially correct about what he thought happened. I don't believe the Department wanted the legislation, and I think it was only the thalidomide scandal that got it. I don't think that top Department people were interested in it at all. I don't really know quite why. But I didn't like the handling of the food and drug legislation at all.

GRELE: Why?

BOLLING: Well, again I think they weren't dealing in good faith on the Senate side, but as I say, I didn't handle it, and I don't know that much about it. It was just an impression I had that it was a high-pocket sort of deal. In this operation of legislative liaison people that Kennedy had, all of the CLO's

[-92-]

[Congressional Liaison Officers] from different departments would sometimes lobby each other's bills. This was unique. We all, for example, lobbied the farm bill.

GRELE: Who had a job like yours in...

BOLLING: Well, Kenny Birkhead [Kenneth M. Birkhead] had a job like that. Joe Barr had before he became Undersecretary of the Treasury. They (the White House) would have a meeting, not with any regularity, but say once or twice a month in the Fish Room at the White House, and then we'd all go over how we felt different people would vote, what we thought they would do, and then we would split up who we'd see that we were doubtful about. We all worked on the civil rights bill. Sometimes everybody would work on a tax bill or an

[-93-]

education bill, and sometimes it was quite funny.

GRELE: You would each take a different aspect of the bill or...

BOLLING: Well, no, we might take different people that we felt were doubtful, to see who would talk to them about the bill.

GRELE: Who was doubtful on the civil rights bill that you talked to?

BOLLING: By the time they did the civil rights bill, I wasn't.... I didn't work for them after the assassination.

GRELE: You said there were some funny incidents?

BOLLING: Well, I worked on the farm bill some and lobbied some young liberal congressmen I know from the cities, and neither one of us knew anything about the farm bill. It really worked out quite well in many ways because you could at least find out who was doubtful or how people were going

[-94-]

to vote. It was another way of doing sort of a whip call. I think it was valuable. Then you knew different problems. I don't think you could ask a congressman from a certain sort of district to vote with you every time, and it gives you some feeling of where you can let him go on an educational bill and really push him on, say, a farm bill. You have a better understanding of what their problem is, too, so you aren't asking too much all the time.

GRELE: Had this type of organization ever been undertaken by an earlier administration?

BOLLING: Not that I know of. It's my impression that Truman [Harry S. Truman] had two people who did some work in Congress, and I've forgotten the man that Eisenhower had, but it's never been that

[-95-]

finely coordinated, and I think it's a very good idea. It's not as well done now. And I think that it's a pity because it's helpful to the new congressmen in terms of the service you give them, if nothing else, from the different departments.

GRELE: Over this period of two and a half years, did you build up any special contacts?

BOLLING: Well, you get to know the ones.... Since there is just one of you and 435 of them, you can't know them all, but you learn the committees. That's one of the troubles with HEW; you deal with so many committees. For example, if you lobby for agriculture, you'd just have your two committees—the House committee and the Senate committee—and that would be it. But you have Education and Labor, and then Interstate and Foreign Commerce,

[-96-]

and then, say, Ways and Means, and it's very hard to know that many members of Congress really well. I mean you just keep going back to see them all the time, to say nothing of, well, we had some trouble with Appropriations. And old friend of mine is Al Thomas [Albert Thomas] who had the committee on supplemental appropriations. You need to know some of those people, too. One of the troubles is that there are too many committees that handle education legislation, to say nothing of health and welfare and everything else.

GRELE: In general, what were the relations between the officials of HEW and Congressman Harris?

BOLLING: Well, I think that they had to get along with Congressman Harris. I think Cohen got along quite well with him. Ken Roberts [Kenneth A. Roberts] then had the subcommittee—he

[-97-]

had since been defeated—that handled much of the legislation of the Department, and he was very amiable and friendly about the legislation. I don't think particularly knowledgeable. I think the Interstate and Foreign Commerce people and really sort of mystified with why they have HEW at all.

GRELE: Did Boisfeuillet Jones ever work in this congressional liaison operation?

BOLLING: I beg your pardon.

GRELE: Did Boisfeuillet Jones ever work in this...

BOLLING: Yes, particularly on—he was very helpful on—HR 12, the medical school bill, because he was a Southerner and he knew some of these people well, he did a very good job with it. I think he could have done a better job if he had been an

[-98-]

assistant secretary. That's another little bill we worked on. We couldn't get anything done with that bill because Johnny Dingell [John D. Dingell] didn't like him for some reason that I've forgotten—I think it's about air pollution or something like that. But he was bitterly opposed to the bill because it was known that Jones would become the assistant secretary if the bill passed. But I think he was able to capable.

GRELE: Can you think of anything we might have missed?

BOLLING: I can't think of anything except that they should probably organize the place like the Department of Defense. That might be helpful, after thinking this all over for a long time.

GRELE: Were there ever any discussions about

[-99-]

reorganization of HEW?

BOLLING: Yes. This is the one that goes on. Ribicoff wanted to make it smaller. We have a theory that it should be a department for human welfare and take some of the functions, say like the Children's Bureau at HEW, the Women's Bureaus at Labor—that's sort of silly—and the Veterans' Bureau at somewhere else; that many of these things could be in one big department and have more staff.

GRELE: That would make it bigger then.

BOLLING: Yes, it would make it bigger, and it would give them the staff to coordinate it. Now they've just reorganized it a little bit, and we haven't had time to see how that will work out. But it could be very helpful to it to see how it goes. But there are a lot of these things that are

[-100-]

interlocking—education and welfare and this sort of thing—that probably need more coordination.

GRELE: Other than the campaign and the day you took the printer to the White House, did you ever have any personal contact with John Kennedy?

BOLLING: Yes. I used to see him when I would go to the White House to see O'Brien or Donahue, occasionally, because he did just walk around the White House. If you were talking to Dungan or something, he would just come in. I think that last time I saw him was when we had a meeting on the civil rights bill at the White House, and Bob Kennedy was explaining the bill, and he came in to talk about it some more.

GRELE: What did the President say?

BOLLING: Just that he wanted the bill and that he

[-101-]

wanted all of us to work on it. I did see him this way in the White House.

GRELE: Did you ever talk to him at all when you ran into him this way?

BOLLING: Yes, we'd just sort of talk. Well, I think that.... Chuck Daly [Charles U. Daly] was telling me about the day we took the printer to the White House that he was saying "I don't know why Jimmy wants me to see this man, but we'll see him." And I could see why he was confused on that day about why he had to see that printer.

GRELE: Can you think of anything else?

BOLLING: No, I can't. I can't think of anything else. You know, whatever the bill was that we were having trouble with at the moment, I have had him call me a time or two to ask me what was the matter with

[-102-]

the Secretary of HEW, whoever he was at the moment. But I don't really think he thought I could explain it when he called.

GRELE: What did he say?

BOLLING: Well, once he asked me what—he just wanted to know what our silly Secretary was doing that day or something like that.

GRELE: Which Secretary was that?

BOLLING: I can't remember which one it was, but he had become very irritated. And I think this may have been over the education bill, that they did have conflict over the handling of the bill, and I think that the Department wanted things that he didn't. I don't know what the grim details of it were, but they had differences of opinion. And I think this happens more in departments than people realized—that the secretaries would get into conflict with the President.

[-103-]

And I think that's perhaps one of the reasons that Ribicoff was not too happy as the Secretary. He was used to being a governor and making his own decisions, and it wasn't quite the same being a member of the Cabinet.

GRELE: Well, thank you very much.

BOLLING: Okay.

[-104-]

[END OF INTERVIEW]

Jim Grant Bolling Oral History Transcript
Name Index

A

Albert, Carl B., 78
Anderson, Clinton P., 81

B

Bailey, Cleveland M., 50
Barr, Joseph W., 49, 93
Birkhead, Kenneth M., 93
Blatnik, John A., 91
Bolling, Richard W., 47, 56

C

Celebrezze, Anthony J., 61
Clement, Frank, 5
Cohen, Wilbur J., 25, 29, 30, 45, 46, 47, 59, 61, 62,
73, 79, 80, 91, 97

D

Daly, Charles U., 102
Delaney, James J., 31, 33, 42, 54, 55, 56, 75, 77
Dingell, John D., 99
Donahue, Richard K., 21, 24, 101
Dungan, Ralph A., 21, 101

E

Eastland, James O., 91
Eisenhower, Dwight D., 30, 50, 95

F

Fogarty, John Edward, 81, 83
Forsythe, John S., 43
Frelinghuysen, Peter H., Jr., 71, 72

G

Garst, Roswell, 12, 13
Goodell, Charles E., 71
Green, Edith S., 40, 45, 48, 51, 62, 63, 67, 68, 69,
72

H

Harris, Oren, 91, 97

Harris, Richard, 91
Hayden, Carl T., 88
Hill, Lister, 34, 44, 70, 80
Hochwalt, Frederick G., 34
Hobby, Oveta Culp, 26
Hodges, Luther H., 20
Horne, John E., 22

J

Javits, Jacob K., 43
Johnson, Claudia Alta "Lady Bird", 4
Johnson, Lyndon Baines, 4, 9, 10, 16, 17
Johnson, Rebekah Baines, 4
Jones, Boisfeuillet, 98, 99

K

Kefauver, Estes, 5, 91
Kennedy, John F., 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 19, 20,
25, 28, 29, 57, 58, 75, 84, 85, 92, 101, 103
Kennedy, Joseph P., 14
Kennedy, Robert F., 8, 101
Keppel, Francis, 66, 67
Khrushchev, Nikita Sergeevich, 12

L

Lawford, Patricia Kennedy, 20

M

McCormack, John William, 7, 54
McMurrin, Sterling M., 22
Mills, Wilbur Daigh, 82, 83
Morse, Wayne L., 38, 69, 70
Muñoz Marin, Luis, 77

N

Nestingen, Ivan A., 79, 80, 86
Nixon, Richard Milhous, 17

O

O'Brien, Lawrence F., 8, 11, 12, 21, 24, 25, 47, 77,
88, 101
O'Neill, Thomas P. "Tip", Jr., 54, 55, 56, 77

P

Perkins, Carl D., 62, 63, 68, 72
Powell, Adam Clayton, Jr., 37, 44, 57, 68, 72, 74
Pucinski, Roman Gordon, 49

Q

Quie, Albert H., 71
Quigley, James M., 25

R

Randolph, Jennings, 86, 87
Rayburn, Samuel Taliaferro, 4, 6, 36, 54, 5
Reese, 30
Ribicoff, Abraham Alexander, 33, 35, 36, 49, 60,
61, 91, 100, 104
Roberts, Kenneth A., 97

S

Sanosky, Jerome, 91
Scott, 30
Shriver, Eunice Kennedy, 20
Smith, Alfred E., 7
Smith, Howard W., 56
Smith, Jean Kennedy, 20
Smith, Stephen E., 11
Sorensen, Theodore C., 27, 29, 30, 47, 60
Sparkman, John J., 23
Spellman, Francis Edward, 65
Stevenson, Adlai E., 6

T

Thomas, Albert, 97
Thompson, Frank, Jr., 40, 41, 46, 72
Trimble, James W., 31
Truman, Harry S., 95
Tubby, Roger Wellington, 22

W

White, Lee C., 60
Wilson, Roy Kenneth, 67