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I think that’s the most important thing: to get to know people, and to get to know them on a personal basis. And just not mouth somebody else’s ideas or words that you hear about. Get your ideas out of your own head because we all have them, basically; we don’t share them, necessarily. But I think that’s a pretty good thing. But you have to have that desire to come here and work, and not be coming here to have people see you on the floor, or see you in a committee, or see you there, and then hope that you have some idea of what’s going on, that’s not it. We’re not television stars by any means, especially when they take the camera away…anyway, you have to have a deep desire for it. And I, apparently, must have had it after seeing what had gone on in my life and to have hoped I could make a difference. But at least be in the process of trying to help others. I think that’s the bottom line, always to do that.

Maura Patricia (Pat) Kelly
October 26, 2009
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Abstract

In 1957, Maura Patricia (Pat) Kelly, a recent graduate of Marymount College in New York, reported to Capitol Hill for her new job. But while the start of Pat Kelly’s House career followed a storyline familiar to many Hill staffers, she was no ordinary newcomer. For many years, politics were the Kelly family business in Brooklyn, New York. Her grandfather and father had held prominent political appointments, and her mother, Edna Kelly, had won election to the U.S. House in 1949. Pat Kelly was eager to participate in the political process; as she once put it, “I just felt the urge to do something.” That impulse led to a House career that spanned 54 years, beginning as a researcher for the House Un-American Activities Committee, and continuing as a legislative assistant in her mother’s congressional office and, later, that of Martha Griffiths of Michigan. More than half of Kelly’s time in the House was spent in the Clerk of the House’s Office of Legislative Operations, where she became the longtime editor of the House Daily Digest from 1979 to her retirement in 2011. In her series of interviews, Kelly discusses her mother’s early political career, first election to the House, and subsequent work on the Foreign Affairs Committee and on behalf of legislation related to women’s rights. Kelly’s recollections of the Congressional Staff Club, and her personal memories of leading women Representatives, such as Martha Griffiths and Leonor Sullivan of Missouri, and the effort to pass the Equal Rights Amendment, offer unique perspectives on the institution.

Biography

Maura Patricia (Pat) Kelly was born in Brooklyn, New York, on June 5, 1934, daughter of Edward L. and Edna Flannery Kelly; she had one brother, William. Her family had long been active in Brooklyn politics. Her paternal grandfather, William Kelly, served as Postmaster of Brooklyn during the Woodrow Wilson administration and, later, as the Clerk of Kings County. Edward Kelly became a lawyer, served as a City Court Justice of New York City, and was active in Brooklyn Democratic politics as head of the Madison Democratic Club. Edna Kelly also was politically active and helped revive the women’s organization of the Madison Democratic Club, and would later work as a legislative researcher of the New York Assembly.

Pat Kelly was educated in parochial schools in Brooklyn and Manhattan. She attended Marymount College in Tarrytown, New York, from 1951 to 1955, earning a bachelor of arts degree in political science and history.

After Edward’s death in a car accident in 1942, Edna Kelly became increasingly active in Brooklyn and New York state politics as a protégé of Irwin Steingut, the local political boss and minority leader in the New York Assembly. When New York Representative Andrew L. Somers died during the 81st Congress in 1949, Kings County leaders chose Edna Kelly as the Democratic nominee to run for the vacant seat. Kelly won the special election, beginning a 20-year career in which she
became a leading member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and a firm advocate for advancing women’s rights.

Pat Kelly arrived to work as a staffer on Capitol Hill in 1957, later recalling, “I just felt the urge to do something.” For a decade she was employed as a research analyst for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. She then worked as a legislative assistant in three Member offices: for her mother, during her final term from 1967 to 1969; for Michigan Representative Martha Griffiths, 1969 to 1975; and for freshman Representative Matthew McHugh of New York, 1975 to 1977. She then served as a legislative assistant for the House Committee on Rules, before joining the Clerk’s Office in 1979. For the next 32 years, Kelly edited the House Daily Digest in the Congressional Record—making her responsible for compiling information on committee meetings, subject matter, witnesses, and actions on legislation.

Pat Kelly was long active in the Congressional Staff Club during its heyday from the 1950s through 1970s. She served as an officer of the club, eventually becoming its president in 1976. For her work on behalf of the large and active staff community, Roll Call newspaper gave her its 1976 Staffer of the Year Award.

On March 1, 2011, when Pat Kelly retired with 54 years of service, House leaders celebrated her career on the floor and praised her for her devotion to the institution. Speaker John Boehner of Ohio, reflecting on Kelly’s role as longtime editor of the Daily Digest, “its clear Pat has not merely recorded the House history—she’s been a rich part of it, too.” Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi of California described Kelly as “a committed public servant, a woman of this House, a key thread in the fabric of the congressional staff.”

In retirement, Kelly resides in Alexandria, Virginia.
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In preparing interview transcripts for publication, the editors sought to balance several priorities:

- As a primary rule, the editors aimed for fidelity to the spoken word and the conversational style in accord with generally accepted oral history practices.
- The editors made minor editorial changes to the transcripts in instances where they believed such changes would make interviews more accessible to readers. For instance, excessive false starts and filler words were removed when they did not materially affect the meaning of the ideas expressed by the interviewee.
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Interviewer Biography

Matt Wasniewski is the Historian of the U.S. House of Representatives, a position he has held since 2010. He has worked in the House as a historical editor and manager since 2002. Matt served as the editor-in-chief of Women in Congress, 1917–2006 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2006), Black Americans in Congress, 1870–2007 (GPO, 2008), and the Hispanic Americans in Congress, 1822–2012 (GPO, forthcoming 2013). He helped to create the House’s first oral history program, focusing on collecting the institutional memory of current and former Members, longtime staff, and support personnel. He earned his Ph.D. in U.S. history from the University of Maryland, College Park, in 2004. His prior work experience includes several years as the associate historian and communications director at the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, and, in the early 1990s, as the sports editor for a northern Virginia newspaper.
WASNIEWSKI: This is Matt Wasniewski from the Office of History and Preservation in the U.S. House of Representatives. Today’s date is July 21, 2008, and this is part one of an interview with Patricia (Pat) Kelly, who is the daughter of former Member of Congress Edna [Flannery] Kelly from Brooklyn, New York, and also a staffer in the House for more than 50 years. Okay. Pat, can I have you state your name, place of birth, date of birth?

KELLY: [Maura] Patricia Kelly. And I was born in Brooklyn, New York, on June 5, 1934.

WASNIEWSKI: In one of your mother’s biographical entries in the Congressional Directory, it listed 1247 Carroll Street as your primary residence.

KELLY: Yes, yes.

WASNIEWSKI: Is that where you grew up?

KELLY: Well, we were on a different block on Carroll Street at one point. But, essentially, that’s where we lived when my father died. And my mother lived there until the late-'60s.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay, can you describe the neighborhood a little bit? This was the Crown Heights area?

KELLY: Yes, yes. It wasn’t very far from Brooklyn Preparatory School where some
other Brooklynite became famous, Joe Paterno. Football coach. And he was a senior when my brother was a freshman. So, that’s the setting there. They were very nice houses. And they were row houses, like they have in Georgetown, different places here. And it was a very nice community made up of all sorts of people. The Irish were very prominent in Brooklyn at the time. And we had a lot of Jewish friends and Italians. I mean, it was just a conglomeration of a lot of people, different ethnic backgrounds, that all seemed to get along fine.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: It was a very nice neighborhood. And we both walked to school at Saint Gregory’s in Brooklyn on Saint John’s Place.

WASNIEWSKI: And that was your—

KELLY: Grammar school. And grammar school for my brother [Bill], too. And then he went to the preparatory school, at Brooklyn Prep. As a matter of fact, he played a little bit of football there. And I went on the subway to New York City, to Marymount, Fifth Avenue at 84th Street and Fifth Avenue when I went to high school. He had the easy road. He rolled out of bed and went up the street and I took the subway. And sometimes I would take it twice a day, because there might be a dance or choral rehearsal in the evening, and you’d have to go back. Make all the subway switches and everything. But it was a very nice time in New York. Of course, that wasn’t until a little bit later that I went, that was 1948. But because of the war [World War II] and everything, it was a lot different. The blackouts we had, the rations, etcetera. And after that it was a lot easier, but a lot of different people started moving
in, as they all do in cities. I don’t know whether you’re familiar with Mayor Fiorello [Henry] La Guardia?

WASNIEWSKI: Yes.

KELLY: Fiorello La Guardia was the mayor of New York in the 1940s. He used to read the newspapers to us and the comics on the radio. And that was very interesting. He was an interesting character. But he brought a lot of people in from Puerto Rico. He was able to bring them in. You can’t ask me about the immigration laws or anything at that time or whatever, because I’m not familiar with that. But then everything changes in a city, and that was a big change in the city later on.

WASNIEWSKI: That was quite a commute. How long did it take you to get to school?

KELLY: Well, it took me over an hour. I had to make two changes on the IRT [Interborough Rapid Transit Company] subway and then I had to go up to 86th Street and Lexington and then walk to 84th Street. I don’t know if you’ve ever walked across Manhattan up there, but those streets are long and cold in the winter and hot in the summer. And, you know, it was interesting. But I loved Marymount and I always have. And there were a lot of people there that I still have as good friends. And my aunt, my father’s sister, was a nun in that order, the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary, Mother Saint Ann Kelly.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: It was a French order that started out in Sag Harbor, Long Island, when they
came over. And my Grandfather Flannery used to go up and get them to bring them to church and so forth. And at that time they didn’t have a priest in East Hampton. Since then, they have a beautiful church. Saint Philomena’s has changed its name. It’s Blessed Holy Trinity now, but it’s the same little church that my mother was married in.

**WASNIEWSKI:** What do you remember about the curricula at Marymount? Do you have any memories of certain classes you took or teachers who made an impression on you?

**KELLY:** Well, they did and I think I was trying to be a smart-alec because I made some impression on them. [laughter] I had a good sense of humor. Well, yes, they did, a lot of them did. The nuns, and we had laypeople too. Of course, I started, you’ve got to remember this, I started high school in January with a class that began the previous September, and I was a lot younger than all of them. I don’t know exactly why that was. I don’t know whether my mother had been sick or some other reason, but they used to have those break-up classes in grammar school in those days. So, what I did was my first year I did the second half of the first year. And then in May and June I did the first half. So, it was very difficult at the time, but I must say it really helped me in the long run to jump from one thing to another and then still go in the middle of it and get it done.

So, there was good and bad of it, but it was an awful lot of studying on my part. And I had to have a little bit of tutoring because, here it was your second year—your first year you were having algebra, all these things, you know, that were completely new to me. And my mother was a very good tutor. In fact, she was very good at Latin and other subjects.
And, in fact, during the war I remember one incident, during a blackout, where we had a warden, Mr. Borne, who lived down the street. And he came up the street one night, and we had to have all the lights out. Well, my mother and Bill were in a closet conjugating the verbs or whatever they were doing in there with Latin. And he had a lisp and he says, “Mithuth Kelly, Mithuth Kelly, turn off your lights! They’re on out there.” {laughter} So, I just remember that so well. I thought I’d tell you about that.

But, yes, it was a good time to be there. And I got involved in singing, which I’ve always liked. And the glee club. And I got into the Elite Few. And one of the juniors in there was Paul Whiteman’s daughter, Margo, and she was a nice gal.¹ But we only had 28 in my class, and that I liked very much. I was able to learn more and grasp more.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Did you have the same teacher throughout? For all four years, you were dealing with—

**KELLY:** No, we had what we called a home teacher.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Okay.

**KELLY:** But then they only did one particular subject, whether it was religion or what have you. And then the others came in and gave us the other courses. And we had a lady that taught French. And I guess I started a little uproar in the class one day. I’m sure my mother had to go up there. But, anyway, “Pat Kelly, we don’t want to see you, will you go around the corner!” {laughter} Oh, anyway, telling bad things about myself, but they’re not that bad. They were fun.
WASNIEWSKI: And from Marymount High School you went to—

KELLY: Marymount College, in Tarrytown.

WASNIEWSKI: And that’s up in Westchester County?

KELLY: Yes, Tarrytown, New York. It since has—well, let’s see, it’s changed to a college under Fordham University. And it’s no longer located on that campus. But the nuns still have their retirement home up there. Because my aunt (my father’s sister) died a long time ago, and she had been a French teacher. In fact, she got the Prix d’Argent, the highest prize at McGill University in Canada, for perfect French. And I learned about that from my classmates when I was in college. One came in, I loved dearly, came into the tea house we used to have, where we sat around and had Cokes and do what have you, what kids did that day and age. And she said, “Well, I just came from that French class and I tell you one thing, that Mother Saint Ann did not speak a word of English from the time she walked into the class until she left.” And I said, “Oh, Marcia, you shouldn’t have said that, that’s my aunt.” [laughter] “Oh, Pat!” I got a good joke out of that. I didn’t have her in class either, believe me.

WASNIEWSKI: At Marymount, do you remember any courses in particular? Now, you majored in political science and history?

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay, was that your interest from an early age?
KELLY: Yes, it was sort of ingrown, from the family and my mother and all was involved. You know, the daily application of all that I was learning at home. And then we had, one time, a Dr. Gillis up at Tarrytown and he was a very nice man, Hugh Gillis. But he was British, so whenever we got to talk about American government he would always call on me. I hope I had the right answer but, yes, that was interesting.

WASNIEWSKI: Do you remember any other professors who had an influence on you or any courses in particular?

KELLY: Well, history was my minor. What was her name? Mother Frances Desales. Frances Desales, she was very good. I had a course with her one time, French Revolution. Six months of that was just too much. It was very deep into everything that happened and all, but it was interesting. Very interesting. I learned a lot. And I also had an excellent teacher for American history, Sister Elsie Carello.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: Most of it I’ve probably forgotten. But I’d know how to look it up.

WASNIEWSKI: Tell me a little bit about your parents, their background. Where they were born, their upbringing.

KELLY: Okay, first of all, my mother was born in East Hampton, Long Island. And she went to grammar school and high school there. And then she went to Hunter College in New York. My father was born in Brooklyn and he
attended Columbia College. Before that, I believe he attended Saint John’s High School. And then he went to law school at Columbia and also Fordham, too. I think he went to both. And he was a little bit older than my mother. I guess he was born in 1900 and my mother was born in 1906.

WASNIEWSKI: And his father was William E. Kelly.

KELLY: The postmaster of Brooklyn. He started out as a letter carrier and he was a very friendly person. You’ve got to remember I never met the man. He died in 1929, November 1929. And everybody—I remember everyone coming to the house after his death, and they would have a yearly ceremony at the gravesite, a memorial. You know, how the veterans would come and all that, put flags on the graves. The postal people would come and, in fact, at his funeral there were 10,000 people. And there is a plaque on a sculpture in Brooklyn in a park that’s named after him, that mentions the details of his life and how he started out and how he did so well. And he was a postmaster under Woodrow Wilson—appointed by Woodrow Wilson.

WASNIEWSKI: And then he became—

KELLY: The clerk.

WASNIEWSKI: Clerk of the county.

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: Kings County.
KELLY: Which he preferred, I think. I think at that time he was moving on. He was also head of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and they used to always come to the house and all to see us and to see my mother and followed her career too, when she got active.

WASNIEWSKI: And the clerk’s office was an elected office at that point?

KELLY: Yes it was.

WASNIEWSKI: Tell me a little bit about your father, in terms of his background in politics. He was head of, I was reading in one of the obituaries, of the Madison Democratic Club?

KELLY: Yes, as everyone said at the time, it was the hub of political activity in Kings County.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: I believe he was president of it.

WASNIEWSKI: Right.

KELLY: He was. I mean, he was very active. And it was a very social time in Brooklyn. Of course, he used to have a good voice, a singing voice, and he had a lot of friends in Brooklyn. My mother and father went to dances and they’d go to different organizations where their friends all belonged. It was, it was a real hub of activity. So, he knew people from all over the whole borough, as his father had. And my mother gradually knew these people, too. They became
friends. And then the children ended up becoming fast and furious friends. But that’s all I can think of.

You know, he did die when I was eight. And that was a tragic auto incident out on the eastern end of Long Island. And he didn’t drive much. His father had a chauffeur, by the way, when he had his county clerk’s job. But my father would drive me up to get the newspaper in East Hampton or something like that, but he would never go out on the road. My mother was the principal driver of our car.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: And in this instance they went to celebrate, I think, his nomination for Justice or to the Supreme Court of whatever it was—anyway, and they were out in Gurney’s Inn in Montauk, which still exists.

WASNIEWSKI: It’s all the way out, the end of the island.

KELLY: Right, right. And it was a blackout. And he was riding in what we called the death seat in the car in front of my mother. And this guy came out the side of the road and smashed into them. And my mother was right behind, directly behind, in her car with some other friends that were with them. I think that’s mentioned in some of the obituaries. And apparently the man had been drinking. And my mother never pressed any charges or anything. But that was a tremendous loss.

I remember the morning that she told us about it, Bill and I. She took us, actually, into the little bathroom down in my grandmother’s house and told
us about it. And they announced it at church that morning. And I went over
to sit with the father of my friend, Anne Bradford Beard, I still visit down
there, and he rocked me in his chair. It was just very tragic. And what they
did say about my father and myself when he was waked in the house—they
did that in those days all the time—they said, “Well, Ed Kelly will never be
dead as long as Pat’s alive.” In other words, I looked like him. I had curly
hair and all of that. That was tragic. I mean, I didn’t really get to know the
man that much, when you’re at that age.

WASNIEWSKI: Right.

KELLY: Because they did a lot of different things with children in those days, some of
which I agree with. It was that children were seen and not heard. And we
went to bed and we had someone to take care of us in the home. And we
would be in bed, sometimes, just after he got home and then he would sit
down and have a chat about what was going on in the world and probably
have a cocktail and then have their dinner. And so, you weren’t part of that
except on weekends. I remember him one time giving me a little jigger of
beer. That was way under age. But anyway, I saw him drinking one and I
said, “What’s that, Dad?” or something like that. And he said, “Well, here,
try a little.” So, he got me a little shot glass and gave me a little sip of beer.
{laughter} I don’t think I liked it that much at that age. I think he was giving
me a little medicine. Anyway, so, he was a very friendly guy. Not as outgoing
as my mother was, to tell you the truth. He was a little more reserved. And
my brother Bill took after him that way. A reserved fellow, but very smart
and very much liked in the community.

I used to play stickball with the boys on what we called President Street and
Carroll Street and all. And then I played touch football with them, this was after my father died. I think it was a few years after that. So, we had another gal down the street, Barbara Donen. And she would be on one side and I’d be on the other side. They’d divvy us up. Well, they tried to get me out of the way one time, and this big guy pushed me down and my head hit the cement pavement in the street. Well, I went home with this terrible headache. And the one thing my brother said to me, “Don’t tell your mother.” So, you know, that honor system and all that kind of stuff. So, I didn’t tell her. But one day, they both came into the room and my mother said—I had a terrible headache, and said, “Now, Pat, what happened? Tell me.” And my brother kind of shrugged, “You better tell her.” So I told her what happened. “No more touch football on the streets!” I sort of played that—you know, with Congressional Staff Club [CSC] people we had little fundraisers for different things, men and women. I still got clonked on the nose a couple times, but no more on the streets. That was the end of that.

WASNIEWSKI: Your father’s death must have been not only a shock to you but a shock to the family. And I’m wondering how that changed your mother’s role outside the house. Did that all of a sudden force her into a position to need to go to work and did it change her political activity?

KELLY: I never had her say anything exactly like that to me. She was very involved. And I think the people realized that, who were associated with the Madison Club. And we had the likes of a lot of good people. Arthur Levitt was a seatmate of my father’s in grammar school, and he became attorney general, if you recall, in New York State. Very popular man. He and my mother were friends. And I think they all began to realize there was something that this woman can add to our organization. And that’s when she was charged with—
Irwin Steingut who was a great man, by the way, reviving the women’s organization of the club.

WASNIEWSKI: Had she been involved prior to your father’s death?

KELLY: Well, I think with the Red Cross and other activities. She was very involved in all organizations like that. There’s pictures of her I have here during the war. Yes, she was in war relief and all that kind of thing, helped very much. And of course everybody, again, knew her and what a tragic thing had happened. And a lot of the men had gone off to war, and my mother became very much involved in activities there. And a lot of women would come to say, “Well, Edna, can you do something about this?” That’s how all of that came about, she was very friendly.

Anyway, one time I remember when my brother was up in high school, no woman could go to what they would call weekly meetings of the fathers at Prep. No women were allowed. In other words, it was strictly a male-oriented thing, to see how the boys were doing. Well, these ladies, like my mother, had lost her husband, and the others went off to war and all that. So, she went up to a priest by the name of Father Hooper, who was a provincial at that time, or whatever it was. I can’t tell you his exact title. But he was chief of the whole operation at Brooklyn Prep. And she gave him an argument about, you know, “So-and-so’s talked to me and so-and-so and all this kind of thing.” He said, “All right, Edna, all right. Come back and we’ll have a little meeting with the women, too.” So, they did that.

But when she walked into the room, he sat down at the piano, he was a very good musician, and played “Pistol-Packing Mama.” [laugher] “Lay that
pistol down.” So, I thought that was very cute. But she made her point in that way, in the community, that it was time for them to realize that here, women had been left alone and needed some kind of support, emotionally, or whatever it might be.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Do you think that was an outgrowth—and I’m thinking back to World War II and how that changed women’s participation in American society generally. Do you think the war shaped her approach and attitude, or was it something that was kind of pre-existing?

**KELLY:** I think it was pre-existing. I think it was something that she realized. She realized what that woman and those women were telling her. You know, “Will you take the lead, Edna? Will you go up and speak to him?” So, that’s what she did. And that was just a little incident, but I’m sure she did a lot of those things that I don’t even recall. But I happen to remember that one. Because she came home laughing about it. So, I thought well, what’s going on?

**WASNIEWSKI:** Before we move on to talk about your mom’s involvement in local politics and in the House, I just—and I know we’ve talked about this in kind of our general talks before, but what most shaped your political awareness and your worldview about politics? Was it growing up in this era, the late Great Depression into World War II, or was it growing up—

**KELLY:** Well, let’s just say the late Depression, I didn’t know too much, I was only a child.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Sure, you were young.
KELLY: But in World War II, yes, yes, very much so. And I couldn’t understand. And we talked, we always talked about what the President was doing and this kind of thing. And I learned the ropes as far as that’s concerned. And, you know, I think I was sort of a back-up to her very much emotionally. And when she did come to Washington—which is a little ahead of us, I think. When she came to Washington, she was not quick in knowing a picture of somebody and recognizing them on sight. So, when you came down here—she came to the office—this was later on, I’m just digressing a little bit, she said, “I don’t know why everybody knows me. They all call me Edna.” I said, “Well, Mom, you’re just one of so many,” at the time, “And sure, they’re going to remember you, you know?” Of course, that was interesting. But I think that she evolved and developed in that regard, and she made me do that, too.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: I saw other peoples’ viewpoints, which some people don’t even know about anymore in government, which I’m very upset by. I mean, they don’t even listen to one another. They just talk to themselves. And that is not the way I grew up. You disagree with somebody, you told them. And I think at one time—I forget who it was, my grandfather or somebody running—it was with my grandfather. And the Republican Party, there, wanted to give him, you know, their endorsement, too. “No, we need the Republican Party. You just keep that there.” So, he knew the difference, and this was always taught to me. There’s a great difference in your opinions and you should not only pursue them, but you should share with other people, so you don’t have a one-track mind, which we’ve seen in government lately.
WASNIEWSKI: Very much that it’s good to have an opposition to exchange ideas with.

KELLY: Yes, yes. And it’s nice to have other people give you support, too, but you don’t want to tear that institution down. It was set up many, many, many years ago and that’s the way we should keep it. We have these splinter parties in New York, we’re known for that anyway. I think California has it, too. They don’t really get very far. But the two-party system is something that we need to continue and support.

WASNIEWSKI: We’ll come back to that, because that’s—when we get to your House career, I want to ask about partisanship and your perspective on that. But I want to move back to your mother for a little while.

KELLY: Sure.

WASNIEWSKI: You’ve answered a couple of my questions about her activity, socially and civically, prior to your father’s death. Do you think also her—for a lot of congressional widows who directly succeeded husbands in the House, their public service was, in a way, to memorialize their husband. Now your mom—

KELLY: You said was?

WASNIEWSKI: Was a way to memorialize their husband’s memory or political agenda.

KELLY: Or somebody may have wanted her to continue because she was a handmaid to her husband and got to know them.
WASNIEWSKI: Exactly.

KELLY: Yes, yes.

WASNIEWSKI: And I’m just wondering if any of that factored into your mother’s—now, of course, your mother didn’t succeed your father in the House, but do you think that her decision to move into elective office was a way to kind of carry on the political philosophy or any kind of political goals that your father might have had?

KELLY: It could be, it could be. He spoke out about a lot of things that you’ll see in these clippings here, about racial inequality and everything like that. I mean, that wasn’t even heard of being talked about, back in those days. And, yes, I think so. I think a little bit of it. And then she moved on. Because he was not at a national level, and that’s a big difference. Because then you walk on a stage, pardon the comparison, but you do walk onto a stage where so many other people have different ideas, come from different backgrounds, and all before the civil rights acts were initiated and voting rights. You know, you had a different South. And, unfortunately, we had to go where we did to get everybody, sort of, on the same page.

WASNIEWSKI: In one newspaper article—actually, a couple newspaper articles that deal with your mom’s first election to the House, it talks about her background and that she spent a number of years, six or seven years, doing research up in Albany.

KELLY: Well, she was research director, I believe, for the Democratic Party in the
state assembly.

WASNIEWSKI: It sounded kind of a little bit like a one-person CRS [Congressional Research Service] operation.

KELLY: {laughter} Could be. In those days, you know, it was a lot different. We didn’t have all this legislation passed. Now, I’m just talking from my experiences or from her talking about it and all that. There wasn’t so much emphasis on government until after the FDR administration. And that changed a lot of things. And her perspective was very good, giving a woman’s viewpoint. And then I worked on that same thing with Martha [Wright] Griffiths, too. It was the same thing, they wanted equality between both men and women, as far as pensions are concerned and things like that. Not that they had to be on first base right away or anything like that, no, I’m not talking about that. I’m just saying the viewpoint, “Listen to us, please. We have something to say.”

WASNIEWSKI: By the later 1940s you would have been somewhat more aware as a young teenager.

KELLY: Oh, yes.

WASNIEWSKI: Do you remember having discussions with your mom about that work up in Albany? Did she talk about legislative issues that she was researching?

KELLY: Yes, she did. She did. She was pushing it and they wanted that passed. And then she’d probably do some research on that particular idea and present it to the Democratic assemblyman and speaker, Irwin Steingut.
WASNIEWSKI: Do you recall what some of the issues were that she specialized in doing research, in particular? Was it education? Or was it—

KELLY: Oh, yes, education was high on the list, always. You had to have your education. And she had a historical perspective on all of that, herself. But she didn’t want to put down anybody, you know what I mean? She was trying to help people, and I really mean that. When she used to go over to the club every Friday, or when she came back up from Washington, and talk to people about their problems. And, in fact, we had a phone number that was listed in the telephone book for years and years. And we had telephone answering, and I was answering the phone a lot, too, for people, the constituents. Especially during the Korean War. And when women would call up crying that their son had been this or that, and then she’d try to do something. And that’s after she was in Albany and in Congress, of course.

But that’s the way it was. They’d come and knock on the door and they always wanted to give her a little something she made or he made for her. My mother wouldn’t take anything. She didn’t want to insult the people, but, you know, “I’m doing it, this is my job.” And a lot of times women don’t accept women in various places, but I think she helped to do that, as I think Mrs. [Hillary Rodham] Clinton helped to do in this primary season. To bring awareness of the women’s viewpoint. Not that we’re better, no way. [laughter] Just equal.

WASNIEWSKI: You’ve mentioned Irwin Steingut.

KELLY: Yes.
WASNIEWSKI: And he ran the Democratic political—

KELLY: Apparatus.

WASNIEWSKI: Apparatus.

KELLY: I don’t call it machine. No, no. I didn’t like that word. That didn’t start until much later, that word “machine.” And I believe it started in Chicago. And I won’t say anything more about that. I just don’t like that. That’s another journalistic way of saying something.

But, no, these people really helped one another. And we found jobs for them and everything they needed. And, you know, all they did was be precinct captains, go around at election time and ask people to vote for “so-and-so” and “so-and-so.” I saw that all that time. I saw the various people who would do that. And they were teachers and they were all sorts of different individuals who gave their time to what was in the Madison Club to do that help to people. And, you know, I don’t see anything wrong with that at all. But I do not like the word “machine.” [laughter] So, he got more votes than the next guy. You know, anybody would want to say—he was a very smart man, very nice man. I liked him a lot and he treated my mother very well.

WASNIEWSKI: Would you see him often at the house or at meetings?

KELLY: Yes, I would see him at the club. And they had a little beach house down in Brooklyn. I don’t remember exactly—but I remember when he became very ill and we went down to see him. And I went with my mother. I did go with
my mother a lot of places. And I guess she wanted the company, number one. And she wanted the back-up, number two. And we got along very well. And I was one of these people that I didn’t voice my opinion or say anything. In the younger days I got most everything by osmosis, you know, from listening to them talk and all. And they trusted me. I’d go in their houses and they’d all be talking around, whether it be the mayor or whoever it might be, and I was accepted. And other children would be there too, Irwin’s grandchildren and all. But anyway, he died—I forget what year he died. And that was a very tragic time for the organization, all the people of Brooklyn. He was a good man.

**WASNIEWSKI:** What were your perceptions or what were your mother’s perceptions about why he was so open to promoting women into positions of leadership?

**KELLY:** No, no, it never entered my mother’s mind. I just think the man realized, “Hey, you’ve got somebody here we could move on up.” And the seat became available. And, in fact, there were two men who really wanted it, and they didn’t get it.

**WASNIEWSKI:** You’re talking about the House seat that opens up in ’49?

**KELLY:** Yes. And they were different people, and he just said, “No.” He never really said anything about who it should be or what, he just said, “This is my candidate.” And she had been a part of the organization to set up the executive committee of the Democratic Party in Kings County. So, she knew the women and the men on all the other districts that we had in Kings County. I used to know them too, Joe Witty and all these other people, and James Mangano, who knew my father. And a lot of us went to the same
churches and all that. So, it was a community, it really was.

It wasn’t like people maybe have envisioned it. Walter O’Malley and Kay O’Malley were very good friends of my mother and father, and their two children, and they grew up in our area. And I don’t know that anybody knows what a difficult time Mrs. O’Malley had. She couldn’t speak. She had a larynx problem. I really didn’t ask questions in those days about things. But when she called on the phone or sometimes go {tapping sound}. You know, something like that. And you could hear her start to say it, but she really couldn’t. And it was just an affliction that she was born with, I think. But she was a wonderful woman, and the kids were good too. And they didn’t live too far away from us. He sold law books before he started doing anything else, Walter O’Malley. And then he became very good friends of another one of my mother’s sisters, Katherine Duryea, and her husband, Charles Rudolph Duryea. And they were very good friends too. And they had a home out in Amityville where my aunt and uncle lived.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: So, it was a family kind of a thing. But one got really, kind of, mad at my mother, you know, getting it. But they still came back and they were friends all along. It was just a little hot. He probably had asked for it and was told, the hard choice. And so, Mother had a little problem with that. But I still keep in touch with the daughter. All those years, it’s been a long time. She’s out in Arizona and Michigan. She just lost her husband so, we’re kind of friendly still. Pick ‘em and hold on to them, I say.

WASNIEWSKI: Can you describe the Madison Democratic Club a little bit? Was it located in
a building? Was it a place you went?

**KELLY:** Yes, yes it was. It was on Eastern Parkway. And the first time I went there when my mother was running—I’m sure I went there before that, but it just hit me right in the head. I was dressed in my Marymount High School uniform. She told me, “You better come up to the club this afternoon after school. There’s something going on here for me. So, don’t go home and change, just come up the way you are.” So, there I went up. And I walked in and all these peoples were around. And, of course, it’s a rally for my mother with the women’s organization in the club to get her going in the district. But anyway, they were doing something nice for her. So, they asked me to speak. Well, of course, all I could think of saying was, “Please vote for my mom.” And they all laughed and had a good time and clapped. [laughter]

I used to go with her every election night and get the results there. And the different people would be there. Judge [Nathan R. Sobel], who had taken my father’s spot on the city court, he put down each precinct as they came in. I learned that, how they did that. How many votes are in there, how many votes they expected, and all this kind of thing. And then they’d have a column for this, that, and the other, Republican, Democrat, all that. It would have that there. And it was just very interesting to me. All the wives of the members of the club would be there, so I just was the only child, I guess, for a long time that came to those things.

In fact, somebody asked me when I came down to Washington at one time, “How did you get to know all these Congressmen?” I said, “Well, I’ve been seeing them for years and I’ve been meeting them.” And they would all say, again, like my mother, “Miss Kelly, how are you?” And they were from
Michigan and all over. So, I had an interesting introduction to Washington that has remained with me. You know, I’ve never forgotten that.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Through the district, too, that’s interesting. And these were people who were from all over the country, but who would come through the Madison Democratic Club to speak?

**KELLY:** Not all over the country, no, no. Yes, they would. [Leonor Kretzer] Lee Sullivan came out and spoke for my mother at one time, there. But I’m just saying the people that came from the club, who were actually members of the club.

Members of the club would be there and then I got to know them. Abe Beame’s wife, Mary. And he was mayor of New York at one point. And he was one of the precinct captains. And I know him from going to the Democratic conventions. That’s another thing, I got to go to the ’56, ’60, ’64, and ’68 conventions. And I met other people there. And it was very much a learning experience, for me, and how to get along with different people from different areas. And my mother was a good teacher. But maybe I had a little bit of it in me anyway from the rest of the family. {laughter} Irish baloney, or something. Or blarney.

**WASNIEWSKI:** So, was the club also kind of a social place?

**KELLY:** Yes.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Would you have dinners there?

**KELLY:** Well, no, I don’t think they had dinners there. They didn’t have that
apparatus, that they could do that. They may have had coffee and cookies like that. And the women would meet and men would meet. It was a three-story building, if I remember correctly. You know, there’s a big brown house there. I forget the number on Eastern Parkway. But oh, yeah, it was different, and it had offices up above. And things had to be planned so they wouldn’t interfere with activities.

WASNIEWSKI: Your mother played a major role in kind of revitalizing the women’s organization within it.

KELLY: The women’s organization, yes. That’s what Steingut wanted her to do.

WASNIEWSKI: Do you remember what she did to do that? Would she bring in speakers?

KELLY: Well, she got them together to speak to one another. And then she had speakers come to speak to them on various subjects. And some of the people were members of the club, you know. Like Arthur Levitt and all those people would be there, available to answer questions or talk about their particular job at the time. We were always aware of what was going on in the community and in the world at the same time. I mean, we read the papers from cover to cover and all about different events that were going on.

And, of course, my mother was a big baseball fan, too. She was a big sports fan. And, of course, the Brooklyn Dodgers were everything to us. And growing up as a child, “Pee Wee” Reese and all those Dodgers players. And they used to call me “Pee Wee” at one point, because I liked to play shortstop. But anyway, then we would go to the ballgames. And you could hear them, the crowds, at night clapping and always going. We had the radio
on. Of course, we didn’t have television in those days. I don’t think it was even in existence. But my brother used to go up to the corner of, I think it was President Street, to get the newspaper in the evening. The early papers came out, I think it was the Mirror, the Daily News, with all the sports in it. And he’d go up there at night and get the early editions. And so, we’d go over that. In fact, I remember my father saying this too, “She knows more of the players’ batting average than she does her math!” {laughter}

So, I was brought up on that very young, very young. And my mother played a lot of golf. My father did too, on Long Island, when they went down there. But I think they belonged to a club out in Nassau County. And they’d go out there and play. And she was a good athlete. She was a good basketball player, too, for East Hampton. So, we got into athletics and we really stayed. In fact, when we were playing up during the war—my grandmother was still alive, she didn’t pass away until much later, but, you know, you didn’t have air conditioning. She had the windows open and she said, “The only voice I hear is Pat Kelly’s.” Oh, Lord have mercy. But we joined, we came together with the boys and girls. And we had good coaches and stuff like that. But it was just a pick-up game, you know. Pick-up games in the church lot in East Hampton.

But we always had that sports interest. And Bill would keep me abreast of all that was going on in the sports world. And, you know, there was four-and-a-half years’ difference in our age, but that wasn’t anything to worry about at that age. We would just share the same things. I’ll never forget, I was sick at the time, and they had bombed Pearl Harbor. I was reading the newspapers and I just couldn’t believe all this. You know, that’s before my father died. But anyway, we learned so much at the same time we learned all about what
was going on in the world. But we still had time for the baseball world and the sports world. And we all enjoyed that in the family. And my father had been a crew member at Columbia, he was a captain of the crew. Is that what you would call him? Okay, captain of the crew up there. I guess they all were showering and they’d go throw him in the water if they won. I don’t know, but anyway, something like that.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Oh, he was actually the coxswain, at the head of the boat.

**KELLY:** Yes.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Okay.

**KELLY:** Isn’t that what they do?

**WASNIEWSKI:** Just out of curiosity, what did your mother do when the Dodgers moved to L.A.?

**KELLY:** Well, of course, she was very, very upset. We all were. But nobody would do anything for Walter O’Malley, with the team to stay in New York. And I think Horace Stoneham, if you remember him from the Giants, they got together, I think, and decided to go out to California, because they wanted a new stadium. We wanted a new stadium. And I don’t think the city was willing to help, you know, like they do now. Help finance it. And it needed a new stadium, there was no question about it. I mean, it’s like old RFK here. And it was different then. It’s like the Yankees moving out now. And there was no support for it. So, somehow or other, they got the idea and the chance to go out to California. No, she didn’t feel very good about it at all.
There was nothing we could do about it. I mean, a business decision is a business decision. You can’t influence people in that way. You could hope that they would have stayed, but if you have no future staying there. And the city was changing, you know, and all after the war. Nobody came forth to do anything. And it was ironic, though, that not too many years after that we had the Mets out. Okay? That’s all I have to say. {laughter}

**WASNIEWSKI:** To get back to your mother and to local politics, do you remember any women in particular, local women, who were allies of your mother or local confidence?

**KELLY:** Yes. Judge Jeannette Brill was a very good friend of my mother’s and she was a judge. And Sarah Lieblick was a very good friend of my mother’s and active in the women’s organization of the Madison Club.

**WASNIEWSKI:** And what did she do?

**KELLY:** Well, her husband Neil Lieblick was involved in some things. I can’t remember exactly what his position was, but he was very active in the club and in activities. Very nice family, very nice family. In fact, they were Jewish and they would come to us at Christmastime to show their little boy, Eli, our Christmas tree and everything. And he, if I’m correct, what mom told me, Neil, when he graduated from Fordham, he won a religious medal award. And he was a very good Jewish person in attendance to his synagogue and so forth.

Judge Brill had been a judge. And she was older than my mother. But they used to go to functions together. She drove the car, the judge, and she was a
little bit older. And they came back in a snowstorm a couple times and I said, “What did you do?” And she said, “Jeannette just drove right down the middle of the street.” I thought, “Oh, God.” But she died of cancer, later on. I went to see her one of the last times and she was very nice and very good to my mother.

Then there was Gert Gleason, who was in another district, and she was also a good friend of my mother’s. And, you know, she had a lot of friends like that, that she involved through political activities and so forth. But she still was a family woman and not so much with that. But she paid a great deal of attention to my brother and myself, and what we were doing in school, and how we were doing it, and so forth. Very supportive of us both. And, you know, you watch your step. You fooled around a little. We got away with a little bit of it, you know. And, at the time, I was a class clown, I guess, but you had to have a sense of humor after all we had gone through. So, fortunately I had it, and I hope to this day I still have it. But she had a lot of good friends.

WASNIEWSKI: I’m backtracking now, again. Because when she was research director up in Albany, did she travel a lot? Was she up there?

KELLY: To and from.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay. On a weekly basis?

KELLY: Yes, whenever they were in session she’d go up to Albany from Tuesday to Thursday or something like that. And go up on the train. And she’d come home and she wouldn’t talk too much about it. She talked about what we
were doing. And, at that point in time her sister Elizabeth, whom we called Lyd, came to live with us because we were too young to be alone. So, she came to live with us and help, bring us up too, with my mother. She had been a very good student at Fordham University. But she had had some illness so she didn’t do very much herself—had not been too healthy. And my oldest aunt, Jessie, she came down with—what was that in 1919, pneumonia?

**WASNIEWSKI:** The flu. Influenza.

**KELLY:** The flu. Oh yes, she was sick for a long time and in the hospital. But she went back home to take care of my grandmother after my grandfather died in 1939. So, those two gals were not married, and then the rest of the three sisters were.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Your mom’s role models, you mentioned a few of these women who she worked with, and Judge Brill who was a bit older. Did she act as a mentor, a little bit, to your mom? Or did your mom have anyone that you recall, in either local or national politics, who she looked up to as this kind of a role model for women?

**KELLY:** I don’t think she ever spoke about that. No. I don’t think she thought that way. She thought of them as friends and co-workers. And she had information about different things that were going on in the community and all. I know she admired some of the women that she met in Congress, very much, for instance, Lee Sullivan and Martha Griffiths. And they had diametrically opposite views on some subjects, if you go through their backgrounds. And, yet, she could get along with all of them. And she just
stated what she believed and whatever, and that was it. And she probably was
influenced by a lot of the work some of the women had done. But they were
a lot older than I was too, so I don’t follow that too well, as being able to say
to you a particular person or that person.

WASNIEWSKI: Sure, sure. Let’s move onto the 1949 special election, when your mother ran
to succeed Representative [Andrew Lawrence] Somers. Do you recall your
mom’s early decision to do that? Was this something that she actively
sought? Was it something that—

KELLY: No, no. It’s something that I think they had an eye on her when something
would come along. Obviously, Irwin Steingut had probably talked to a
couple of other assemblymen and other district leaders, or something like
that, to make that link. And her background, of course, with my grandfather
and father in Brooklyn. When I introduced myself to Representative
[Anthony D.] Weiner, not too long ago, he said, “Oh, you’re one of the
famous Kelly family of Brooklyn.” Anyway, she was well-known, let’s put it
that way, and got better known as she went along. But, you know, I can’t
think of anything at this point in time to mention specifically.

WASNIEWSKI: Was it something that she consulted you or your brother about?

KELLY: Well, I don’t know what she said to my brother, but she really didn’t say
much to me about it, except to tell me that they wanted her for the
nomination and all. And she thought about it and said, “Yes.” No, I don’t
think she would have talked to me about that, as to what she should do, no.
She knew we could get along with Lyd being here. And it was a lot different.
It wasn’t the madness it is now. It was sort of like a local thing, really. And it
didn’t mean that much to the press either, I don’t think. I mean, politics was the last thing they were talking about around then, as far as national, you know, until the Korean War came along and then all the problems with World War II veterans and disabled people coming back from both wars.

In fact, my brother went into the Coast Guard (between college and law school). He went to the Coast Guard Academy in Connecticut. And he listed my mother down in his application, she showed me one time, as housewife. So, no one knew that he was a Member’s son. So, she kept that very separate from her family life and all. Of course, you had your cohorts in crime, or whatever you want to call them, that you got together with and discussed different topics. And I often went with her to those little gatherings. But more so when she came down here, to Washington. I used to just be there.

Martha Griffiths, before I worked for her, she autographed a picture for me and I hung it up on my living room in Washington. She inscribed it to, “The daughter I love the most.” She never had a child. Neither did Lee Sullivan. So, it was that kind of a relationship. They trusted me, that’s one thing. They trusted me, that they could talk about these things in front of me. Because I wasn’t going to go around and say, “So-and-so said this,” or, “So-and-so said that.” In fact, when I first came here to work no one knew I was a daughter of a Member. I kept that as quiet as I could until I got involved in activities and met so many staffers. And then all of a sudden, well, then some would know. But that was not anything I did.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Do you remember your reaction to your mother telling you that she was going to run for Congress?
KELLY: Oh, yes. I was elated. Because I knew we had put out signs for Mr. Somers when he was running. And she had helped him a previous time before he died and knew his wife and family. They lived on President Street and we lived on Carroll, and there was just an alley between. So, everybody knew everybody. Not necessarily socially, but politically and all. And I was very pleased. I was elated, for her, mainly.

WASNIEWSKI: The reason I ask is that I’ve come across a couple instances in researching the Women in Congress book, where a widow decided to run for office and sometimes the children are all for it and get out and help in the campaign. But other times the reaction is exactly the opposite: “I’ve lost one parent, I don’t want to lose another parent to political life.”

KELLY: No, no. My mother was always looking back and remembering back, but always forward in her thinking. And we got that as a result.

WASNIEWSKI: Do you recall the platform that your mom ran on in ’49? Some of the key issues?

KELLY: Oh, whatever the topics were at that time. Now, I’d have to go back and research that. As you will see in one of these articles, I have here, the next day the press came to the house and sat down and talked to her. And I was there when she was talking to them. And she talked about the things that she wanted to do down in Washington. Obviously, she had talked about them on the campaign trail. And don’t forget, now, I was still traveling back and forth to Manhattan to school and, therefore, I wouldn’t go with her to any of these events. When I got home at night, I’d have to do my studying, my high school studies. And there was no way I could do that. But I went when I
could, to be with her. Someone to be introduced by whoever was there or whatever.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Any memories of the campaign are pretty limited? You didn’t participate other than to perhaps travel somewhere on weekends?

**KELLY:** No, I think we handed out literature. They had some literature made up and we handed that out at corners of the streets and near subway stations. But everybody in the neighborhood realized what she was doing. And they didn’t put that much money into campaigns. Which, unfortunately, there’s just too much money involved in it now. It’s just unfortunate that it has to go that way, that route. And I think it prevents a lot of people from running. That is sad, too.

**WASNIEWSKI:** That, and the scrutiny, I think, would chase a lot of people away.

**KELLY:** That’s true, too. Sure, anytime. Anytime, that could have been back then too.

**WASNIEWSKI:** One of the things, in researching your mother’s profile, from the very first campaign she was very focused on some of the key foreign policies issues of the day.

**KELLY:** Yes.

**WASNIEWSKI:** The creation of NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Oraganization], she supported. The Marshall Plan, she supported.
KELLY: Right, exactly.

WASNIEWSKI: She supported the Truman administration policy against the Soviet Union, kind of the foundations of containment policy.

KELLY: Oh, she was an arch anti-communist. Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: Where did her interest in foreign affairs come from?

KELLY: Well, I think her schooling. I think partly because her father and mother were involved in politics in East Hampton, a little bit. You know, there were few Democrats, I think, in the town. But my grandmother, when she got the right to vote, she had to be driven down there to vote. But they were always talking about issues then, that she told me about, you know, in the local community that you’d see, that was going on.

And the war, oh yes. Of course, World War I, you’ve got to remember my grandmother used to sing all those songs to me from World War I. And you could tell that the lady was involved herself. So, I think that some of that came out in my mother, really. She realized she had five girls and a lot of things had to be done. And she was very—I don’t like to use the word progressive, but she was very advanced in her thinking about paying attention to world affairs and what’s going on, and having her own viewpoints about it.

Oh, yes, Grandma Flannery was something. They used to call her Nellie. Mary Ellen Flannery. You know, she had her views all the time. I don’t know how my grandfather ever got along with five women in the house. [laughter] Good Lord almighty. I remember when Grandma had the last daughter,
which was my mother, her mother got on the first train back to New York. She was a McCarthy and they had a home in New York. That was my grandmother’s maiden name, McCarthy, if you don’t know. But anyway, I’m surrounded by Irishmen. Hanrahan on the Kelly side.

WASNIEWSKI: Your grandmother sounds like quite a character.

KELLY: Oh, she was.

WASNIEWSKI: Do you have any memories of her talking about suffrage or the right to vote?

KELLY: Oh, yes, she did. And, “That old Hoover!” That’s what she used to say to us: “That old Hoover!” I’ll never forget that. Oh, yes, she was mad at him, really mad at him. Oh, yes, she went down and voted. And I think that everybody in the family was interested in doing that.

WASNIEWSKI: Was she active in any kind of suffrage protests?

KELLY: I don’t think so. No, no. She was busy enough with the five girls. No, but as a local name. She got her point across, I guess, to the local people, whatever it was that she wanted them to do. And hopefully women could vote. Oh, yes, that was a big thing in her life. Big thing in her life, that she could vote.

WASNIEWSKI: So, the interest in foreign affairs comes from her parents. Did your mom travel a lot as a child?

KELLY: No, no she didn’t. My grandmother was born in the United States, in the Bronx, New York. My Grandfather Flannery was born in Ireland. But she
would go over to Ireland, herself, and he never wanted to go back because of his persecution. He wanted to go to Black Rock College in Dublin. And, of course, no Catholic could apply. And it was just very bad for him and he was hurt by it. But knowledgeable about it and, you know, why go back and face the same thing? Now, of course, it’s a changed world. But then, he wasn’t accepted.

WASNIEWSKI: I’d like to stop there.
Pat, we’re going to pick up right where we left off last time, although we wanted to follow up with a few strands of discussion that we had raised in the previous interview.

Kelly: Yes.

Wasniewski: And kind of finish them off here.

Kelly: We can do that.

Wasniewski: You had one about your aunt, who is the linguist.

Kelly: Mother M. Saint Anne Kelly, RSHM. She was in the Marymount Order, the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary. And in the United States they began in Sag Harbor, which is near East Hampton, Long Island, and the connection therefore began at a very early age for my mother with the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary. Her father, Patrick J. Flannery, would pick up the nuns and priest to come down to East Hampton, because we
didn’t have a residing priest there. And that’s how that all began. And then later on when my mother met my father and, you know, married and so forth, of course Adele was in the order at that time, Mother Kelly, and she was a linguist. And she was very good. She completed two years of college at Marymount Tarrytown. And then she went in to get her M.A. in French at McGill University in Montreal and was awarded a medal and citation for her work there. She earned a doctorate in French at Laval University in Quebec, and in her obituary from Marymount at the time she died, 1958 I believe, she was described as a brilliant linguist. She served in Marymount schools in Paris, Rome, New York City, and the faculty of Marymount College Tarrytown, and at Marymount, Manhattan College in New York. And that’s what I wanted to add.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Excuse me if I’m forgetting this from the previous interview, but did you ever have her in class?

**KELLY:** No.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Okay.

**KELLY:** I think I told you this story. It’s a little story about Marcia Irving, who was one of my favorites in the class and we were over in the tea house having tea, coffee, and doing our bridge stuff. All that kind of thing that people did at that time. And she said, “I just came out of that Saint Anne’s course and she did nothing but speak French from the time she walked in to the time she left.” And I said, “Oh, Marcia, how could you say that? That’s my aunt.” And she almost died right there. I said, “Oh, no, don’t worry about it. I’m not in any of her classes either.” So, that’s where we left that.
But she was very good and she had a beautiful singing voice, too, so she was a great lady, but she didn’t live that long. It was cancer that she had. So, I just thought I’d add that in if I might.

**WASNIEWSKI:** That’s fantastic. And you sent me a little bit more information on your brother, William E. Kelly II, and I just had a couple of follow-up questions. We discussed him a little bit and you had some childhood memories about him. And specifically about sports and baseball, but we didn’t really go into his later career. And certainly everything that you gave me here, we can enter that into the file and it will be available for folks to look at to learn more about his career. I’m just interested—he went on into a law career, specializing in life and disability insurance. What moved him in that direction? What influenced him?

**KELLY:** I really don’t know the answer to that. I didn’t really know all of the things that he did until I read this that my nephew prepared, his oldest boy, Edward. And, I don’t know. He did talk about it a lot, but, you know, just like my father, they didn’t talk about business at home with their wives. It was not done. But I knew that he had an awful lot of cases, and my mother knew all about it too, what he had. And much litigation with Lane [&c] Mittendorf and taught so many other lawyers and he was supposed to be excellent in a courtroom. And then, of course, when he got sick then, he didn’t do that. He was of counsel to the firm. He was a lawyer’s lawyer. I would really say that. People appreciated his work.

**WASNIEWSKI:** He was a bit older than you were, so did he have the opportunity to work in your mother’s office at any point?
KELLY: No. No. He never worked in her office.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: Four and a half years older he was. He was born in November 1929 and I was born in June 1934.

WASNIEWSKI: And did he ever consider a career in public service at any point?

KELLY: I don’t think so. With eight children, I think there was a point where he could have, but no. He was just doing well. And he was a lawyer. He didn’t want to get involved in that. He never told me exactly why, but I’m sure that was it. The family. And he had to educate all of those children. No. So, I think that deterred him from anything. He made a successful life as a lawyer in a good law firm in New York and had a place down here at one point. And one of his people that he had with him, Bob Woody, who was an old friend of his, and he helped him along, and he was in the litigation department, too. Bob and I have been friends since then.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay. I wanted to move into a discussion about your mom’s time in the House and not only just about her career but also about your recollections being the teenage, high-school age, and college-age daughter of a Member. We talked about her election last time.

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: And I’d like to pick up with your recollections about the swearing-in ceremony, when your mom entered the House.
KELLY: Well, I remember being up in the family gallery in the House of Representatives. And I remember, there was just two people sworn in at that time. Special election. One was John [Francis] Shelley of California. I think he was from the San Francisco area. And his complete name escapes me right now, but he was a very nice man and he was sworn in with Mom. And at the same time, I believe, former Governor [Herbert Henry] Lehman came to the Senate the same year, being elected to replace former Senator Robert [Ferdinand] Wagner who resigned. He took his seat on January 3, 1950, the same day Mom did in the House, and there was a reception on the Senate side. Mom was one of the ones there, of course, being honored, as well as Senator Lehman. And they always had a good connection, Herbert Lehman and my mother and his wife.

WASNIEWSKI: Was the ceremony on the floor? Did she go to the well of the House and take the oath?

KELLY: Yes. Yes. Just like they do now. Sure.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay. And you were watching from the gallery?

KELLY: Yes, I was.

WASNIEWSKI: Was there a lot of family there?

KELLY: Yes. My uncle Rallie and Katherine Dunigan, her sister. And I don’t remember too many other people, but there were a few other people from Brooklyn, of course, that were there. But, no. I don’t think Aunt Lyd came down either. No, I don’t think she did.
WASNIEWSKI: You must have had a tremendous sense of pride at that point.

KELLY: Yes, I did indeed. Yes. Of course, it was sad because we had lost my father and all, but she did a good job and she put those things behind her, although he was always in her thoughts and I know in her prayers. So, it was a wonderful thing for her to enter the House.

I think she began with a very good service because I don’t think I told you this or not. There were files in the office when she got there, this is what she told me, regarding immigration. And I think it was her first, second, third day she was here, the FBI came in and wanted to know if she wanted to keep these files and pursue any of the cases. And my mother said, “No. My career begins right now. You can have all of them.” Now, I don’t know anything about that. What it could have been. It was just—maybe there was somebody in there they were looking for at that time and he had written to Mr. Somers or what have you. I don’t know what the situation might have been. But she said, “No. My files start right now, today.” And that was the end of any past things that—and I think there was a lot of talk about immigration at that time anyway. I mean, it’s a different version of it now than it was then.

WASNIEWSKI: In that context it would have been in the late ’40s, early ’50s, in the context of communist subversion.

KELLY: Exactly. And you know she was anti-communist all of her life.

WASNIEWSKI: She had a pretty exciting beginning, too. I’ve seen a couple of stories about her getting committee assignments to begin with.
KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: Do you have any recollections of her early efforts?

KELLY: I sure do. First of all, she went on the House Administration Committee and I think Katharine [Price Collier] St. George from upstate New York was on it as well. And they were on one of the first shows of *Meet the Press* by the way. And, I wish we had a copy of that, too. There are so many things the family would enjoy having.

WASNIEWSKI: How did that come about?

KELLY: Well, Larry Spivak was the originator of *Meet the Press*, the original moderator. When you think about Tim Russert and all of those, it goes all the way back to Larry Spivak. And, it was early on in television. I really couldn’t tell you, but it was probably in the early 1950s.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: Because she was invited to all of the receptions after that for the anniversary. But, the new Congress—after she was sworn in [82nd Congress (1951–1953)], the new Congress came in, and there was a vacancy on the Foreign Affairs Committee. And she said she wanted that. Well, the same time, there was a gentleman by the name of Franklin D. [Delano] Roosevelt, Jr., in New York who had been elected as a liberal. My mother was a Democrat, okay. So, Mr. Steingut actually called my mother up and said, “I just got a call from Sam [Samuel Taliaferro] Rayburn. I understand you want to be on the Foreign Affairs Committee.” And, she said, “Yes, Irwin, I do.” Okay. Well,
apparently Irwin Steingut told Sam, “Well, what does Edna want?” And he said, “Well, she wants Foreign Affairs and I’ve got a problem with only one seat being filled and I’ve got Franklin Roosevelt over here.” “Well, give Edna what she wants,” is what he said to Sam Rayburn. My mother later told me that story.

But what they did was then they created another seat on the Foreign Affairs Committee to put Franklin Roosevelt on and because she said, “Well, he’s a liberal. I came in as a Democrat.” So, that was her distinction between them. But they were friends, and she helped do things for him when he was running for office in New York State, but she made her point and that’s what she wanted to do.

Of course, a lot of her background was in that anyway and she had done a lot of reading and research on it and a lot of concern about the communism that was going on in the world and she was very supportive of Harry [S.] Truman. She was one of the first women to be in support of 1948 Housewives for Truman. And she went around the country with that. With Mrs. Barkley [wife of Alben William Barkley] as a matter of fact. And, I think all of that gave a great impetus with the people in Brooklyn. You know, here’s Edna coming around here and doing all of this. And so that was very good for her and very good for her to get on that committee at the time.

WASNIEWSKI: It’s interesting because it’s not a committee that’s typically considered a constituent-service committee.

KELLY: No, it is not. No, it is not. But she already did that. She already had that hold with the people in Brooklyn by doing things for them anyway,
regardless of what committee she was on. And, of course, nobody could get on Judiciary [Committee] at that time except a lawyer. And, of course, Manny [Emanuel] Celler of New York was on that. And there wasn’t much choice. An Interior Committee? No. And Appropriations [Committee] were a lot different. I don’t think she was even interested in that.

**WASNIEWSKI:** How did the living arrangements work out for you early on? Because you were still in high school at this point. Did you come down to D.C. immediately with your mother?

**KELLY:** No. No. Families didn’t do that in those days. Representative [Benjamin Stanley] Rosenthal of Queens was the first one to bring his family down here that I know of from New York. And that was later on, probably in the ’60s. And a lot of people thought that that was a mistake for anybody to transplant their children down here. But, of course, in those days, in the ’50s and all, they were not in session the whole year. Now it’s a great deal of difference.

As I said earlier, my Aunt Lyd came to live with us, so she was there to be with me during the week until my mother came back or whatever. She lived with us for a long time until I got out of high school and went to college, and then she went back down to East Hampton to take care of her mother who was elderly at that point. Along with my Aunt Jess. You know, all of the girls were busy taking care of somebody or other.

**WASNIEWSKI:** What were your mom’s living arrangements like in D.C.? Where did she stay and how long was she there?
KELLY: She stayed at the Hay-Adams. I love the Hay-Adams. I don’t know what the price of things are now, but I’m sure it wasn’t that much then. But she had a room there. I stayed in it later on when I first came down and they kept a suitcase full of some of her clothes someplace while she was not down here. Whoever was there, my mother knew. And that was taken care of. So, no, she loved it there. I had stayed there. And I think the only other Congressman who stayed there that I know about was Joe [Joseph William] Martin, [Jr.], of Massachusetts, and that’s all I can tell about the living arrangements, until I came down here and then we got an apartment at the Coronet up the street at 2nd and C Streets.

WASNIEWSKI: And that would have been in ’57?

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: That would have been almost 10 years.

KELLY: All that other time she was traveling back and forth and staying at the Hay-Adams.

WASNIEWSKI: That’s interesting. What was the typical work week like for her? Was she here—was it a Tuesday–Thursday type thing and she was up on the weekends?

KELLY: It was, mainly. Yes, she was up on the weekends. She always met the constituents in the Madison Club or some other club. Whoever called her and wanted to see her. They didn’t have individual district offices in those days. That came much later on, the Congressman having a separate office.
WASNIEWSKI: District offices?

KELLY: Yes. My mother had one later on, but in the beginning, no. So, they all knew where she was from and all of that, and they would either go through one of the other district people to get to her or, the assembly districts in the congressional district that she had. And someone would say, “Well, ‘so-and-so’ is going over to see you.” And she’d say, “Well, I’ll be there Friday night or Saturday,” or whatever it is. Monday. And oftentimes, they came by the house, too. I think I mentioned that before. Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: So, she didn’t have any staff dedicated up there?

KELLY: Oh, she had some staff.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: But there was no office. They worked out of Mom’s house. Our house—the phone, there. They did that. And then when my mother couldn’t get there, a Friday, supposing something came up and they couldn’t get out of town or whatever it was, they were in Washington, then Marjorie Jackson was one of her employees and she was a great lady and local person there. And, my mother had her to take care of what was going on in the New York area and be a liaison between the office down here.

WASNIEWSKI: How many people would she have working out of the house?

KELLY: A couple.
KELLY: Not a whole lot out of the house. They worked at their own fields of endeavor or whatever you’d want to say and then did some work for my mother. I don’t remember all of that. I actually never saw a payroll. So, I don’t have an idea.

WASNIEWSKI: It’s interesting. The district office really tends to develop in the later ’40s and ’50s for some people.

KELLY: Well, there is some good about that and some bad about it, too, because then the Congressman gets a little distant from the individuals. It’s more like you’re talking to a staffer. Like I would go in and talk to them and get the information and relay it. In those days, they weren’t as busy down here as they are now. I’m not saying they got anything more done when they’re busy like that, but I’m just saying that it was not the thing.

WASNIEWSKI: As the child of a Member, you had a perspective on the institution, the House, that was unique and certainly you must have visited at certain points. I’m just wondering if you have any particular memory of the Capitol in those early years.

KELLY: Oh, yes. I worked when, I think I was a sophomore in college, I came down for a month and I worked in Mom’s office. There was no pay involved or anything like that, but I just worked there. She gave me a little salary, you know, out of her pocket.

WASNIEWSKI: What were you doing for her?
**KELLY:** Well, I was like a—actually, I was a receptionist sitting at the front desk and anybody who came in, I would do whatever I could to help them or pass them on to somebody else who was there. And I’ll never forget. One day, I almost had a conniption. My back was turned to the door and in walked this man and he had a turban on and he had a flowing garment on and I thought, “Oh my gosh, what am I in for now?” And I think the other girls had gone to pick up lunch, and they came back up and saw him there and said, “Oh, Pat, he comes in to everybody’s office all the time. Don’t worry about him.” And I thought, “Oh my Lord,” I turned my back to the door and there he was standing in front of me. Oh, that was a little scary.

But then, I had fun with the staff and I got to know the staff very well and I learned to appreciate that segment of the Hill, too, what they were doing and how they worked and what the needs were and how they’d be there when you needed them at any time. And it was never nine-to-five. In fact, I don’t remember ever having to keep track of my time, ever, in any office up here except now, it’s a little bit different. And that bothered me. Sometimes I’d walk out and forget to sign out or forget to sign in or any of that and we never had any of that. We had to be there when the work had to be done. And you got a call if you didn’t.

**WASNIEWSKI:** How many people were in the office at that time in your mom’s office?

**KELLY:** Maybe four. I think four. And then she had a couple of people from the district who came down and brought case work down and anything like that and had discussions with her. Males as well as females.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Did she have a chief of staff, per se?
KELLY: Yes, Margaret Roach was the original and she had been with Mr. Somers before. During these times, everyone was a secretary. Titles came later. And my mother kept her on until she retired. And she taught me a lot of the ropes, too. And there was a pie on the Senate side and we used to go have that, whatever the famous cream pie was. Whatever it was. And, you know, they did a lot of good work for Mom, and they were protective. I noticed that too about her. Because I was just a teenager and I was just wondering, “Well, how is Mom getting along down here?” And, they were very good people.

WASNIEWSKI: And that must have provided for a very smooth transition to have some of his staff there.

KELLY: Yes. She had some people she didn’t re-hire. I know that but I still don’t have the names or that kind of thing. I don’t know. Margaret was very good. Mother eventually hired another girl there, Shirley Albert, and she was brought to her attention by our friend, Monsignor Farina, at that time Father Farina. And she was with my mother until my mother left Congress. And then she went with, let’s see, then she went with—Shirley Albert has since passed away, but she went with, was it Harold [Daniel] Donohue from Massachusetts? I’m sorry. But then she went with Jamie [Lloyd] Whitten and was with him until Jamie left. So, she was a very efficient gal. She took down shorthand like mad. Although I didn’t want to do any of that. I was not interested in that. She was a whiz bang and she has since passed away. A great gal. And she was a good friend of mine, and we got along just fine. Mom also had another secretary that I knew quite well. Her name was Rosemary Cummings, who had worked on the Senate Rules Committee.
WASNIEWSKI: Did you have any access to certain rooms in the building that you recall in your travels around? Were you able to see places in the Capitol? Do you have any memories of that from that time period?

KELLY: Well, not really. I can’t remember. I would go with my mother to any place where she was going to meet or something like that where I was permitted. But no, I didn’t have any access to any—I didn’t pursue it. I was never nosey. I didn’t really—where I don’t belong, I don’t belong. And she respected that, too, and she didn’t push me to do anything like that. Of course, as I told you, as I got—later on in coming down here, I got involved with the Congressional Staff Club and therefore, if you ask me about access, yes, we had the big receptions in the Longworth Cafeteria and in the Ways and Means Committee big room, and all like that, men, women, Democrats, Republicans, and all of that. And it was a great, great time. And, I think I got to know more and more people as I went along.

WASNIEWSKI: The reason why I asked is we had done an interview earlier with Cokie Roberts who remembered the House Dining Room as one place where children of Members would tend to gather and spend a lot of time.4 They may have been a bit younger.

KELLY: Yes, I think so. I think Cokie—I introduced myself to Cokie at that reception that you had as the publicity for the Women in Congress book. I saw you, there, too, Matt.

WASNIEWSKI: Yes.
KELLY: So, I had followed her career, but, no, she was quite a bit younger. I had met her a couple of times but—no, I didn’t have any of the Members that I can think of, unless it was daughters or something like that that I had met some of them, but they didn’t have their families here, and a lot of them, like Martha Griffiths and Lee Sullivan, they didn’t have children. So, there was no opportunity for me to meet up with them. And when the women Members of Congress went out to dinner, I went, too. I went with them, wherever they were going. And I got very friendly with a lot of them. They were very nice people.

WASNIEWSKI: I’m going to come to that in just a minute or two. But even though there weren’t many folks from the New York delegation who brought their families down, I’m wondering if in the 1940s and 1950s you remember any kind of—whether the House had any kind of group activities for Members’ families. Formal or informal.

KELLY: I don’t believe so. I don’t believe so.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: I’m sure I would have been invited. I know one time Mom asked me if I wanted to be—what is it, when they have the parade in the springtime? The Ms. New York or something like that in the Cherry Blossom Parade, and I said, “No, thank you.” I really did. I thought, sitting there with a light dress on and freezing to death and I wasn’t interested in showboating or anything like that. Not to say that other people wouldn’t like to do that but I wasn’t the type to do that.
WASNIEWSKI: And lastly, do you have any memories of any of the Speakers or the leadership during that time period? Rayburn or Joe Martin or—did you have any—

KELLY: Oh, yes. I met them many times. In fact, Mr. Rayburn sent an autographed picture to both Mom and I when he was Speaker. But, he was a great man. But then again, they all went back to their district. They didn’t really socialize that much. They did with the delegations. They had delegation meetings like they do all the time. But no, they didn’t do that much here.

WASNIEWSKI: That leads me to a question about your mother’s association with the Members of the New York delegation. Who was she close to on the New York delegation?

KELLY: She was friendly with a lot of the New York delegation. Eugene [James] Keogh, Donald [Lawrence] O’Toole, Hugh [Leo] Carey, Jim [James Joseph] Delaney, and Joe [Joseph Patrick] Addabbo, also Otis [Grey] Pike of Long Island. Jim Delaney, whom I worked for later on at Rules Committee when he was chairman. I was very friendly with him and his family and staff, actually. Mrs. Cook was his top secretary. Mom and Jim had suites in the Rayburn Building when it first opened in 1965. He lost his wife to cancer and he was a very good man. He was a district attorney at one point for Queens County. And I could just go in and say, “Hello.” Same thing I used to do with Mr. [Thomas Philip (Tip)] O’Neill, [Jr.]. Speaker O’Neill. But I was working and it was later on and I didn’t go around that much to see anybody, the different other speakers. But I did meet Mr. [Thomas Stephen] Foley and Mr. [James Claude] Wright, [Jr.]. I met them.
WASNIEWSKI: Do you have any particular memories of Rayburn? Any one anecdote or story? Encounter?

KELLY: No, not really. Not really. Except that one story I told you about my mother ended up getting on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I specifically remember that.

WASNIEWSKI: And he was getting a lot of pressure at that point from the Roosevelt family.

KELLY: Oh, yes. Yes. He got calls from God knows who. But I think it was written up in one of the biographies of my mother, who had been contacted by the Roosevelt family. But they worked it out, as they always do around here, if they have something like that. They get it worked out—but no, I can’t think of anything else about that.

WASNIEWSKI: You mentioned that your Mom formed a tight bond with other women Members. Martha Griffiths, who came to the House in ’55.

KELLY: And Lee Sullivan, who came earlier.

WASNIEWSKI: Yes, earlier. In her oral history, your mother also recalled a strong friendship with Frances [Payne] Bolton of Ohio.

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: Another member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I’m assuming—

KELLY: Yes, a Republican from Ohio.
WASNIEWSKI: And a Republican. But, what are your general impressions—what do you recall about your mother’s association with these women Members? At the time your Mom came in, there probably were a dozen women in Congress. That might be generous.

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: Were there gatherings? Was this kind of a support group or a legislative forum or a social forum or kind of a combination of all of those things?

KELLY: Well, I think they got together and talked and discussed some items. They had dinner together. I was there at some of them. And some, of course, I was not. But if they had a subject matter, “I’m interested in this or that,” they would discuss that amongst themselves, “And ‘so-and-so’ came in and asked me about this, what do you know.” And they were on different committees and so they were able to reflect on their associations with those committees and I think—that it was social, too.

And Lee Sullivan came up to the district many times and spent Thanksgiving with us, too, and out at my brother’s in Spring Lake, New Jersey. But they were very close friends, although they disagreed on a lot of things. Nobody agreed with everything, but as we said before, they talked to one another about it and they worked it out. But as I said, I went to a couple of those dinners with them and they had—they all talked individually about their problems in their districts. And, of course you get a cross-section of people from the whole country. I don’t remember exactly when [Thomas] Hale Boggs, [Sr.], came to the Congress, but when his service began, she was friendly with him.
WASNIEWSKI: That would have been the mid-’40s when he was first elected.

KELLY: Yes. She was friendly with them. He was a good man, and, of course, we were all horrified by the loss of his life in that plane crash. That was very, very sad.5

WASNIEWSKI: Did your mom go to a lot of their—Lindy Boggs was famous for hosting parties out at her house in Bethesda.

KELLY: I don’t remember Mom talking too much about that, but we did go out to dinner a couple of times with Mrs. Boggs together. But they were in touch, most of the times, about issues. But see what happens in Louisiana may not be what’s going on in New York. It was a completely different atmosphere and constituency as you can imagine.

WASNIEWSKI: Who was your mom—of the women Members, who was she closest to?

KELLY: Well, personally, I guess it was Lee Sullivan.

WASNIEWSKI: Lee Sullivan was a widow as well.

KELLY: Yes. But she was a widow of a Member. And she ran as Mrs. John B. [Berchmans] Sullivan—was John B. Sullivan instead of Leonor Sullivan for the first couple of times, and then she ran on her own name after that. But that’s the way she associated with. We always were giving her a hard time about that. But she did. That was way she operated and she was sort of old school, Lee. And so, I loved her. She was a wonderful gal.
But, she didn’t have the same opinions on a lot of legislation and so forth as some of the other women. But, as far as personal and being a good friend of my mother’s, she was. But then I wouldn’t say Martha Griffiths was a secondary one. My mother treated all of these people equally, but Martha would go home to Detroit to be with her husband, Hicks, and, of course, my mother and Mrs. Sullivan both had lost their husbands. So, it was a different situation completely. And she didn’t—Hicks came here a few times and we went out to dinner. And I always had interesting conversations with him. But he was in a mode of his own out in Michigan and doing various things, as you can probably see from reading the biographies and everything. A very nice man. But, no, and she told me one time that she loved my mother and I always knew she did.

**WASNIEWSKI:** What were some of the issues—just some illustrative examples of issues that Leonor Sullivan or Martha Griffiths would have agreed on with your mom and what were some of the issues that they disagreed on?

**KELLY:** Well, one would be was because when I was working for Martha Griffiths at the time and mother came down to visit and it was for the debate on the Equal Rights Amendment [ERA]. She was distinctly against that, Mrs. Sullivan. And Mrs. Griffiths took it and there was no to-do about it, but she wouldn’t sign this discharge petition at all. No, of course, not, to get it out of the committee and by Manny Celler who would be opposed to it and not to go to Rules Committee. I think we talked about that before.

Martha would say, “What did you find out from the Parliamentarians?” And I said, “Mrs. Griffiths, I think the best thing for you to do according to what I’ve heard is to file a discharge petition on this because it will not otherwise be
reported out of the committee.” “Well, what about going to Rules Committee?” Senator [Claude Denson] Pepper of Florida had talked to her. Of course, we all called him Senator. Senator Pepper had talked to me about it and I said, “You don’t have the votes there either.” So, and she said, “I’ll sign the discharge petition,” and that’s what it did and I don’t know how many days it took to get that passed, but Lee Sullivan was still adamant against it. Because I don’t think labor was in favor of it, either, generally speaking. I think her district had more labor influence.

**WASNIEWSKI:** And that kind of led to my next question because Manny Celler was opposed to it because of labor groups who were afraid it was going to overturn a lot of labor laws and that was his opinion as well. Sullivan was, you were saying, pretty much accepting of the same rationale or did part of her traditional—

**KELLY:** I wouldn’t like to speak for that, but she just didn’t believe that we should be doing it that way. I wouldn’t want to put words in anybody’s mouth, especially when they’re no longer with us. But Lee, she would argue with me in front of my mother. So, that was funny. They did a lot of other things that—I mean, the normal route would be to do what she suggested, but I think Martha wanted to get more attention to the problems of—after my mother had gotten the Equal Pay Bill passed, she thought, well, why can’t we take a step with this and found that it was no, no, no. She it brought more attention to the whole thing.

**END OF PART ONE – BEGINNING OF PART TWO**

**WASNIEWSKI:** Okay. We had to break away for a minute, but in the interim, Pat recalled the name she was reaching for.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: Yes, of Connecticut.

WASNIEWSKI: Right.

KELLY: And I met her in the subway, I think, the day after H.R. 1338, the Paycheck Fairness Act, got passed in the House on July 31, 2008, and I said, “Do you remember when we were down at the White House for the anniversary of the Equal Pay Act which my mother has sponsored?” And she said, “Yes, yes, yes,” and she gave me a big hug. “We just passed something yesterday.” I said, “Yes, I know. I’ve been following that, too.” So, she gave me another kiss. And I said, “By the way, we’re both Marymount girls.” She had gone to Marymount up in Tarrytown before she went on to graduate school, maybe. I don’t remember. I don’t know all of everyone’s backgrounds that well. It’s not like sitting down and reading a book about what they did and what they didn’t do. But I did remember that because then we said, “Yes, we are.”

WASNIEWSKI: Do you recall any discussions that your mom may have had with you or among any of these Congresswomen where they talked about having to overcome certain gender barriers in the House or whether they ever experienced discrimination. Do you recall any?

KELLY: No, not that. I think I told you a story about my mother walking the corridors with me. I don’t know where we were. It just stuck in my mind.
And she said, “Everybody knows me, Pat. How come?” I said, “Well, you’re only one of about 10 or 12, Mom. Why wouldn’t they remember you?” So, no, they—now, I suppose, there is more, and that could easily happen because a man doesn’t remember everybody, you know. Well, she’s over here in that female group or whatever.

WASNIEWSKI: Sure.

KELLY: But I don’t remember that much. I think they had to fight for where they might be excluded from little conversations that were going on within committee jurisdictions or something like that. But that was done away with fairly soon after they realized that these women just didn’t come down here to have a good time or anything. I mean, they were very serious. Just like the men. And they took them seriously, too. And there wasn’t any, that I know of, swinging parties or anything like that, where the Members would go or anything. I think I told you about my mother going to a ballgame one time with Jim Delaney and another Member, Louis Gary Clemente—they called him Gary. He has since passed away. And my mother had gone to college with his wife. So, they went to the ballgame and, oh gosh, there was a rumor going around the next day that my mother was going out with these two men. “Well,” she said, “that’s the end of that.” But that was very unfair. Very unfair.

WASNIEWSKI: This was something that was in the papers, or this was something else?

KELLY: I don’t think so. I think it was just a, “Well, I heard you were out with the boys last night.” Something like that. And my mother took—well, that’s why a lot of times after that she had me with her. I went and she just
 objected to that kind of treatment, because that, in a sense, would indicate a little sexism to me.

WASNIEWSKI: Right.

KELLY: And she didn’t want that. You know, she was very respectful of not only her own legacy but of the family. Not to be doing something she shouldn’t be doing. Not that that was anything wrong, but, see, people read it the wrong way.

WASNIEWSKI: Did your mom have any role in helping Martha Griffiths get on the Ways and Means and the Joint Economic Committee in ’61?

KELLY: Well, yes. My mother did with the Ways and Means Committee. She went over to the Speaker and spoke to him about it. I believe that she went to him and said, “It’s about time we had a woman on the Ways and Means Committee.” On behalf of the woman delegation, she went in one group and there were a few more then. So, I think they all did support Martha to get on, because she had the tremendous background of being a lawyer and a judge and she had common sense, too, about equal pay as far as equal work and equal benefits as a result.

WASNIEWSKI: Do you remember any other instances where she might have gone and talked to the leadership and lobbied for certain women to get certain positions?

KELLY: Well, I’m sure she did, but that’s not anything that I would necessarily know about. Because I knew the connection between Lee and Martha and my mother, so I had heard that story, many times, but I didn’t go around and say
anything to anybody. As I told you before, I didn’t discuss this with anyone about it at the time. But these things are the things that happened that I can see from my perspective and they were helpful with one another, except the Equal Rights Amendment thing, “Why are you doing this?”

**WASNIEWSKI:** You mentioned that you would argue with Lee Sullivan. Just for the record, where was your mom on the Equal Rights Amendment?

**KELLY:** Well, she was in favor of it. Yes. But she was out of Congress by that time it was happening.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Right.

**KELLY:** And there was nothing that she could do. She may have disagreed. She was on the floor when they passed it. It was in the newspaper that she had come down from Brooklyn and was sitting on the floor with Martha when the vote occurred and I was up in the gallery.

**WASNIEWSKI:** In your mom’s oral history interview with the Association of Former Members of Congress, she did not describe herself as a feminist, per se. Where in the spectrum of people from Lee Sullivan or Julia [Butler] Hansen, who were very traditional on the one side, to, maybe moving toward the Martha Griffiths or Patsy [Takemoto] Mink, or the women who came in later in the ’60s and ’70s. Where would your mom kind of fit on that spectrum in terms of women’s rights? And how she would look at herself as an advocate for that?
KELLY: Well, I think the best way to describe that was that she was a moderate on most issues. She voted with, of course—New York was quite liberal, and she would go along with that. But, she wouldn’t be extensively interested in just that subject matter. She was interested in a lot of other matters. And not a one-issue person, like some of them may have been later on. Pushing this and pushing that. For example, I can only speak from what I’ve read about her and what I’ve seen myself, but Bella [Savitzy] Abzug for example, my mother was not a Bella Abzug. She had her own role to make and I think she would have been a little annoyed with some of the women who have come here. Too outspoken. Too—I don’t know, I just have a gut feeling that that’s how she would feel. She wouldn’t criticize them necessarily, but she wouldn’t be that way. And my mother, by the way, wasn’t a prude at all. That’s not what I’m trying to say. No. It’s not that type of a thing. She was thinking all the time about where would this get the woman or where would this get the servicemen or how can we do something better for that person or that group.

WASNIEWSKI: You mentioned the Equal Pay Act. Do you remember any of her discussions about trying to get that passed? That was a bill that, in one form or another, had been raised in the House since the 1940s and she was successful in the early ’60s pushing it through. Do you remember her work on it?

KELLY: She introduced that when she came to the House in ’49. I think it was around that time. Maybe not that first year. Something like that. But she did push for it and see if there could be hearings on it or anything like that and I don’t recall any. They just weren’t interested. I don’t know. Nobody rallied them around. Maybe some of these women did get that going, too, and of course, President [John Fitzgerald] Kennedy supported it and that was one
thing that helped. It came from the top. And I think Lyndon [Baines] Johnson, too. Because, you know, he was that type.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 would never have gotten passed if it hadn’t been for Lyndon Johnson. Read the editorial by Joe Califano, who, by the way, was a Brooklyn boy and he was also in the administration, I believe, with Mr. Johnson. And he was a friend of my brother’s. So, it’s a little family routine there. But he pointed out very recently in an article about that. It would not have happened if President Johnson had not pushed it. Even though Manny Celler wanted it and other people wanted it, it wouldn’t have gone anywhere.

WASNIEWSKI: We’ve talked a little bit about your mom’s focus. You said that she was not a single-issue person, not necessarily a women’s-rights person.

KELLY: No.

WASNIEWSKI: And what she’s known for, I think, is her record on foreign affairs and she was the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on European Affairs.

KELLY: Europe. Wasn’t it called the Subcommittee on Europe at that time? Yes, they change these names around.

WASNIEWSKI: She became chair in 1955. In Martha Griffiths’ oral history, in kind of typically colorful fashion, Martha Griffiths said that Edna Kelly “had more contacts than Mata Hari” when she went abroad in terms of access to diplomats and foreign diplomats and the network that she had. Did you travel often with your mother? Did you go on trips?
KELLY: No. No. The only trip we went on—I went on with her, and I didn’t go with her, and I think I may have told you this but I may not have. I have two good friends, identical twins, the Devlin twins, Mary Louise and Louise Mary Devlin of Manhattan, and I went to high school with them and college, too. And I was very friendly with her parents, with their parents, and in 1955, I graduated. My mother wanted to give me a graduation present and she wanted to have a trip to Europe. So, what we did was, she put me in charge of getting this done and all that. And the Devlins wanted to go, too.

So, we paid for all of our trips and all of our planes and we went separate planes, but we followed her around to all of the different places that they went. Now, we didn’t get into one place because the weather was bad or something like that. We took a train overnight one night and ended up sitting up in a car going in from Spain to France, and that was a little bit scary. And going in to Berlin. So, all of that, we paid for individually. I mean, she paid for me, but the Devlin parents paid for theirs and we were with her from about, oh, from September to November sometime, traveling to Greece and all over.

And of course we got to go to receptions. That was fun. And had lunch at the French Embassy and the American Consulate, too—the Embassy. And I met so many people on that trip and learned so many different things about how to track change and you had to get off this train to get on that train in order to go to another country. Of course, we didn’t have any of that here. And beautiful scenery and we met a lot of Members going over on different trips, too. And on the ship to the United States. We went over on that. It was very educational and it was fun. I can’t remember the Member’s name from New York. I wish I could. I’ll come back with that later on.
WASNIEWSKI: Sure.

KELLY: He was on the trip and he was so funny. He was a very nice man. And then Tom [Thomas Joseph] Dodd was also a member of her subcommittee at that time, the father of the present Senator, Chris [Christopher John] Dodd of Connecticut.

Yes. And his wife. And lo and behold, one of my mother’s friend’s cousin was the captain of the ship. So, he had us up into his office, up to the bridge. His name was Sutherland and my mother had a real close friend. My mother and father. Conrad Sutherland. And this was his cousin. So, it was very unique. Very unique little things happened like that. And we sat with the Pope. We had a private audience with the Pope. The Devlins and myself and the staff. And that was the name of the Congressman, [James George] Donovan from New York. He was on that trip, too. He defeated Vito [Anthony] Marcantonio, if you remember back at that time, who was an announced communist. And he beat him in that race.

WASNIEWSKI: What Pope did you have the meeting with?

KELLY: Pope Pious XII.

WASNIEWSKI: And this was at the Vatican?

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: That must have been an amazing experience.
KELLY: Oh, it was at Castel Gandolfo. It was the Pope’s summer residence we went out to. A special trip out there. But in the back of all of this was Mother Saint Anne, too, the religious order there. And as you know, they were always calling us: “Edna, do you need anything?” “Or we need something done for us, Edna?” You know, that kind of thing. And, they wanted to make sure that we got in there, and they put a good word in for us, too. Not just through the channels of government.

WASNIEWSKI: That kind of leads into the next question I had. One of your mother’s great legislative accomplishments came in 1952, when she managed to block aid to communist Yugoslavia. This was partly because of her role as a proponent of religious freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

KELLY: Right.

WASNIEWSKI: Do you have any memories of that?

KELLY: No, she came up. She came back after being and seeing Tito and she refused to shake his hand. That’s the only time I’ve ever seen her do it. She wouldn’t be photographed shaking his hand. And she went to the meetings and she did the same thing with Franco and so forth. They were in a different vein, but they were the same dictatorship sort of that I gathered, say, at this point in time looking back at that. People are much better off in those countries now without those two people. But at the time, it was something that was needed. It was an interim thing. The same thing we’re going through in the Middle East when you think about it. We have to have interim people in there and everybody doesn’t understand why we just can’t go to democracy, including
our President. And that’s not the way it’s been done over the years. It won’t come about that way.

**WASNIEWSKI:** In hindsight, a lot of people would agree with that perspective. At the time, it must have been somewhat politically risky for your mom because there were people in the U.S. who were making the distinction between supporting communists on the one hand and everyone fit under that big “C” communist, and then someone like Tito, who was a communist, but who was also independent of Moscow.

**KELLY:** That’s right. That’s right.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Do you remember any of her thoughts on that or people?

**KELLY:** She probably had a lot of thoughts on that. She came back every time she was on one of those trips and she’d put out a report on the trip and I have not seen any of them recently. I know that they are there, but when in your own life you’re so busy, you don’t get a chance to look at all of those things. But, no, she took a lot of political risks, I’m sure, at doing things like that. And, she felt it was right. And, I could never question her on that. I could never question her on that, because I had a feeling, too, about some of those people. That, I’m a private person and—I’d just talk to her about it. That’s all I know.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Your mother spent a long time on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

**KELLY:** Yes.
WASNIEWSKI: Roughly 20 years.

KELLY: Almost.

WASNIEWSKI: She worked with a lot of different chairmen. Do you remember anyone who she worked with together particularly well, who she talked about being close to or was receptive to her?

KELLY: Well, Clem [Clement John] Zablocki was a very good friend of my mother’s. In fact, one of Mom’s counselors on the committee was a good friend of Pete [Peter Hood Ballantine] Frelinghuysen, [Jr.’s]. I’ll have to think of that name in a minute, too. But she liked Clem very much and who else would be there while she was still there? I can’t remember who else was on Foreign Affairs. Because she was two—no, one place ahead of her in seniority. “Doc” [Thomas Ellsworth] Morgan was another chairman. That’s right. Another good chairman and a good friend of my mother’s, too, from Pennsylvania.

WASNIEWSKI: And I believe John Kee would have briefly been chairman right when your mother came in.

KELLY: Really? When she went there. I don’t remember. Let’s just say it wasn’t—she didn’t go on that committee until ’52 maybe. ’51 or ’52. Somewhere in there.

WASNIEWSKI: He may have passed away. He was chairman when he passed away and his wife, Maude [Elizabeth] Kee, of West Virginia came in.

KELLY: I don’t remember that name. There was another Kee.
WASNIEWSKI: There was another Kee in the ’60s. Their son.

KELLY: Yeah, that’s the one.

WASNIEWSKI: John.

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: I don’t know if it’s John. I’ll have to go back and check that name. But it was a father, mother, son succession—

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: Unique in U.S. history.

KELLY: Yes, I do remember that much about it.

WASNIEWSKI: Do you remember anything in particular that she worked with Clem Zablocki on that—any bill or project?

KELLY: Well, I do know that she went to Krakow, Poland when he went over there on a mission and that was not her subcommittee on Europe. It was something else. See, they all had like two or three titles on the committee. They belonged to this. They were chairman of this one and members of—Wayne [Levere] Hays on the State Department Operations and stuff like that. He was chairman of that and he was chairman of something else and so on. But their only major focus was on what they did. But then all of these
things intertwined with one another. National security and all of that. And she was very close to Clem about that. The subject of communism, too. Marion Zablocki was the name of the counsel. Marion Zablocki was my mother’s. It’s a difficult name to spell, and I won’t do that right now, but Marion, excuse me, I used to correspond with him.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Okay.

**KELLY:** He lives down in Virginia, and he was a long-time employee of the Foreign Affairs Committee and my mother’s counselor at one point.

**WASNIEWSKI:** We’ve about come to the end of our time for today. Before I leave the early 1950s, though, I want to end by asking about an event that we often ask our oral history interviewees who may have memories from that time period, and it’s the 1954 Puerto Rican shooting in the House.

**KELLY:** Yes.

**WASNIEWSKI:** What were your memories of that?

**KELLY:** Very, very shocking. My mother—I think I may have told you this. I don’t know for sure. But she was in a seat on the floor of the House, not too far from Manny Celler when the bullets started flying and she hit the deck, as she said. She went down and saw where it was coming from and how she ever had the presence of mind, but she went out—crawled out to the cloakroom and got on the phone and told the office to call Marymount up at Tarrytown and, “Tell her that I’m okay.” So, that was number one.
Number two, she called the press, and I think it was a woman by the name of Ruth Montgomery. There was a big article in the Daily News the day after that happened. I have some of them someplace at home, which would describe all of those activities, and she said, “Be sure and tell them,” that from what she could see, “that the Members from New York were okay.” Because I don’t know. They must have been over here and the others were over there and she shot down or he shot down into that section. And one of her good friends on the Foreign Affairs Committee, from Michigan, was shot and now again I have to remember that name. I haven’t seen him since years ago.

WASNIEWSKI: Was this [Alvin Morell] Bentley?

KELLY: Yes, that’s it. That’s it. Very good friends with Bentley and he was a Republican, right, from Michigan?

WASNIEWSKI: I believe so.

KELLY: A very nice man. And, in fact, he was on that trip in 1955.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: When we went overseas. He and his wife. Pardon me, Mr. Bentley. I couldn’t remember it.

WASNIEWSKI: That’s good recall. You knew the state. Do you perceive that this affected your mother or any of her colleagues in a certain way? Were they more security conscious after that?
KELLY: Well, I think the House was beginning to be a little bit more security conscious, and, of course, with the Truman thing, too, downtown. It was all around the same time, was it not?

WASNIEWSKI: I think Truman was the late ’40s, but I’d have to go back and check on it.

KELLY: Well, it happened then and it came up to the House.

WASNIEWSKI: And it was Puerto Rican nationalists as well.

KELLY: Yes. And it was—I got called in to the office of the president. I think it was the college president. And she said, “We have this news for you, Pat. Your mother called and she’s all right.” So, that was very trying, because we had not heard it. There wasn’t that instant television, now, or anything like that and, of course, we didn’t have that. We were in class, or something, I believe, and they came and told me that she was okay.

WASNIEWSKI: Along that vein, one last question. After that, or at any point during her career, was security really ever a concern for her or for you? Were you that much more conscious of it after that?

KELLY: No, I wasn’t. We just knew things—things that happened in New York, you know, when I was brought up and I was going to high school, my brother and mother sat me down and told me about what I should and shouldn’t do on the subway. No eye contact. Don’t do this and that. And so, I was always very conscious of that kind of a thing. And when we’d go to Greenwich Village, you know, a date. We’d go and visit “so-and-so’s” house and my brother would say to me, “Pat, don’t have anybody else’s cigarettes. There are
things that are going around now that they’re putting in cigarettes and be careful what you have to drink,” because they’re dropping these aspirin or whatever crazy thing they’d do at the time. But some of these kids would do it and then you’re in trouble. So, I was always that security conscious because I was traveling on the subway alone and back and forth sometimes the same day. And, then later on, my mother would have someone take me over if there was some social event later in the evening or I’d stay over at the Devlin’s house, something like that, on Park Avenue, and visit with them.

But I think my mother was always security conscious in her travels and everything. But then toward the end of her career, there was a lot of protesting and stuff like that around the city and after the riots and all of that. There was a lot of that. And I was worried about her being up there. So, it was a two-way street, then, but it was not an easy time. That time, was not easy at all in the cities and so down here, it was just—it happened down here. It happens in New York. It happens everywhere and we have to be careful at all times and speak to children about it because they’re the ones who are most vulnerable. And there are always derelicts and everything like that. I mean, that’s another thing we had. So, we had a young education. Very young.

WASNIEWSKI: Well, good. I appreciate talking to you today.

KELLY: Okay, Matt. Thank you.

WASNIEWSKI: It’s been fun again and I look forward to talking to you when we pick up next time.

KELLY: Okay. Thank you so much.
WASNIEWSKI: This is Matt Wasniewski from the Office of History and Preservation in the House of Representatives. This is the third interview in a series with Pat Kelly, longtime Clerk employee and longtime House staffer. The interview is taking place on December 16, 2008, in the Madison Building, Library of Congress.

We’re going to shift gears a little bit here. We talked about your mom’s career and your family background in the first two interviews, and we’re going to move into your time as a staff member with HUAC [House Un-American Activities Committee] and with the Rules Committee and then in the Clerk’s Office. But before we do that, I’d like to step back and take a look at your perspective on social interactions among staff on the Hill during your time, beginning in 1957 when you first came. And maybe we could use the Congressional Staff Club, which, as you’ve talked about, seems to have been a pretty important part of your time here on the Hill, and talk about that a little bit. How you became involved with the club and when you became involved.

KELLY: Sounds good. Sure.

WASNIEWSKI: So the Staff Club grew out of the Little Congress back in the 1930s. It was called the Congressional Secretaries Club for quite some time.
KELLY: Yes, until we amended the club’s constitution, I was an officer at the time, to make it “staff.” Congressional Staff Club. Because that made both the women and the men feel better. [laughter]

WASNIEWSKI: And this was because “secretary” was a term that was kind of widely used then.

KELLY: Universally used on the Hill. Everybody was a secretary or clerk when I first came, and that’s the way they were listed. And I don’t know how exactly they list it now on the payroll or anything like that, but they are, in the various directories, listed as “legislative assistant,” “staff director,” or what have you, in categories like that. And I guess they’re paid according to that title. Or whatever the Member wants to—of course, as you know, that’s always the Member’s prerogative.

WASNIEWSKI: When did you first join the club?

KELLY: I joined it on August 19, 1957, the day I came to work on the Hill. I was given a paper to sign. I can just see Julie Joray, who was the secretary of the committee, I don’t remember exactly her title—on the Un-American Activities Committee. And she had all the papers out in front of me, and she had the retirement slip, which I signed, and I signed coming to the committee, and the third little white paper with little blue lettering on it was the Congressional Secretaries Club Membership. So, “You best join this,” said Julie, “because everybody gets involved here on the Hill with that.” And I said, “Okay.” And in fact, I went home that night and told my mother that I’d joined it, and she said, “Well, that’s a very good organization.” I
remember her saying that, “And they do a lot of good things, and you’ll enjoy it. And you’ll meet a lot of people that way,” which I did.

WASNIEWSKI: So, this was almost part of the hiring process.

KELLY: Well, I guess so. Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: You fill everything out, and they had the form there ready for you to sign.

KELLY: Oh, yes. Years later, when I was involved in the Congressional Staff Club, we gave out membership applications to various committees to spread around word about the club, and what’s the function, and what does it do, and the preamble and all those kinds of things, which is not, of course, in my head right now, but it was on paper in the constitution we had. It was very fair. And as I told you before, just chatting, it was nonpartisan. And you know, the president was a Democrat, the first vice president had to be Republican, and so on, down the line.

WASNIEWSKI: So, it alternated by party, going down the leadership list.

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: How big was the club when you joined? Do you have any sense of that?

KELLY: It was in the thousands. I’d say maybe when I joined, maybe about 5,000, something like that. It was a large contingency of people. And everybody joined, and from our meetings that we used to have, our regular monthly meetings, we’d meet in the caucus room and discuss what was needed at that
time. Everybody. And at the beginning of every Congress, we had the Clerk of the House come over and speak to the membership, and the Sergeant at Arms’s Office was represented and all, and then the members could ask questions, if they wanted to, about that office. I think the Historian’s Office right now is doing a little bit like that, I think, but it’s a little bit—it’s different. It’s within the organization, as opposed to being this type of a thing. It wasn’t just that the officers were doing that.

WASNIEWSKI: And who was eligible to join the club? Did that change over time?

KELLY: Well, I believe it changed a little bit. It was for staff members of the House and the Senate. Because then, they had their own club. At one time, they had a club, and it folded. It came back for a while. However, it dissolved before ours did. But it was not open to policemen. I think we felt it to be a little bit more along the lines of the Members and their workers rather than the services given by other staff. And they may have opened it up to them, but they came—a lot of the officers came to our social events, anyway. Well, a lot of them used to. You know, got friendly with some of us and all, and came and danced at it with us and all this kind of thing. But that was about it.

But I feel the general membership didn’t feel that’s what it should be. It was strictly for those employed by the Members of the House and the Senate—and the committees. For example, two employees of Senator Quentin [Northrup] Burdick’s staff, Yvonne Eider and Connie Koehmstedt, were very active in the Congressional Staff Club and both were in the bowling league. Yvonne was active for years and Connie eventually became president of the club.
WASNIEWSKI: Were Officer staff allowed to join? Like Clerk staff, Sergeant at Arms staff?

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: Where did the—you mentioned the caucus room.

KELLY: Cannon.

WASNIEWSKI: This is the Cannon Caucus Room? And that’s where the club met on a monthly basis? Or at least the officers met?

KELLY: It depends upon what they were talking about or what the event was, whether we expected it to be large or not. Lots of times, we would take a committee room over if that would be needed. And one of the people on the board might have been working for the Interior Committee, or some other committee, and say, “It’s open this night, we’ll have it there.” Then we advertised it, and people would come there. But if we had a general membership meeting or an election, nomination for officers, it usually ended up in the caucus room. Because you had to have somebody nominate you and then all this thing, and say a few words or what have you. Or a lot of boos, who knows? {laughter} I can’t remember now.

WASNIEWSKI: How often were the officers elected? Was it every Congress?

KELLY: Yearly.

WASNIEWSKI: Oh, it was yearly? Okay.
KELLY: Yes. Yearly.

WASNIEWSKI: And what were some of the typical activities? It seemed, from what I’ve read—from what Hyde Murray put together, and in a couple articles that mentioned the club—what is the range of activities that people would participate in?

KELLY: Well, you know, it depended on what they would like and what they needed. We had various trips around the world. We had trips to New York, a yearly trip to New York. That would take up two or three buses up to New York and stay in a nice hotel, and then have dinner at different places, and then the theatre people would buy their tickets to the theatre and all that. And I don’t think for the actual trip—I’d have to look this up, but it goes back—when we first started doing it—I know, because I was involved in it—it was a very cheap trip. We were able to—because of the membership money that we had and all—I think it was—the trip would maybe be $30. Yes, it was very inexpensive. And then everything else added in.

I mean, if you wanted to go to the theatre, of course, you paid for that theatre yourself, or if you wanted to go out to dinner, not be with the group. And it was sponsored by a lot of different people. I mean, if somebody knew someone in those days, you could do it, and if somebody was involved in a good organization, that would be nice to sponsor something. And then they would have a reception for us, a cocktail reception someplace or other. And everybody loved it. I mean, it was lots of fun. Lots of singing on the bus going up and going back. [laughter]

WASNIEWSKI: What time of year was this trip up to New York? Was it a set time?
KELLY: Spring. Usually in the spring, if we could do it then. Yes. I think it depended on the schedule of the House, too, or the Senate because the majority of members were from the House side—but the Senate and the House schedules. And it was a weekend trip. We’d go up on Thursday night and come back on Sunday, to go to New York.

WASNIEWSKI: International trips, you mentioned?

KELLY: Oh, yes. I worked on a couple of those. But to Europe and to Costa del Sol, to Venezuela, and then A and B—a side trip to Aruba and Curacao. But it was very nice. And if somebody wanted to just go on A and not on B, I had to organize that to make sure that they were on the right plane. {laughter} But it was a lot of fun, and people enjoyed it. And they weren’t that expensive, to tell you the truth. But of course, everything is, taken in the context of a different time. But some of those that I’m talking about were in the ’60s.

I remember Jean Gilligan (staffer for Rep. Vernon [Wallace] Thomson of Wisconsin) and I took a side trip to—in 1965, I think it was to Ireland, because I’d never been to Ireland. The rest of the group was in Paris, where we would have to return to D.C. We had this nice young man on our trip by the name of Charlie Bechtel, and everybody else were all girls. {laughter} So, we left him in Paris and said, “Well, we’re going over, and you watch the girls, okay?” So, “Yes, okay.”

So, we got over to Ireland and I went to the embassy there, and I guess they knew my mother who was chair of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I said, “Well, we’re going over to
Castlebar, County Mayo. That’s where my grandfather, Patrick Flannery, was born.” So, we rented a car. They said, “You’re doing what?” “Yes, I’m renting a car, and we’re going over there.” “Really? You’d better be careful.” And one of them intimated to us that they’d never been to the western part of Ireland. And obviously, when I got home, I told my mom about that these people have got to get out and see the rest of the country. I don’t know if that would be the same now, with conditions the way they are in the world. But then, they were fine, as far as that was concerned.

So, we went there, and we got back. And the fog was so bad, when we got to Shannon Airport, our plane couldn’t make the one in Paris going back to the United States. And we could see the plane out on the runway when we got to Paris. We could see the plane out there. “That’s our plane; why don’t you take us out there?” Didn’t even pay any attention to us. Not one word was said. So, that plane went, and Charlie went home—took all the girls home. [laughter] That was fun. And we met friends, and I have been friends with Charlie and his wife Miriam. In fact, they met on that trip, Miriam and Charlie Bechtel. And I’ve been friends with them ever since. So, it must have been a good trip, right, in a lot of ways. [laughter]

**WASNIEWSKI:** It sounds like it.

**KELLY:** Yeah, we had a lot of fun. Venezuela was another place. Venezuela, Aruba, and Curacao. You take that plane. It’s a wonder we didn’t lose somebody in all the changes. But anyway. [laughter]

**WASNIEWSKI:** Were people allowed to bring family members along if it worked out that way?
KELLY: Well, husbands and wives, that kind of thing, but I don’t think the children would have been allowed. I think there was a question of insurance and a lot of other things Hyde would be leery about, and Fowler West, too. Because I know you know that Hyde Murray was counsel to Agriculture Committee whose father had Reid F. [Fred] Murray, a Member of Congress from Wisconsin. And the staff director of the Agriculture Committee was a fellow by the name of Fowler West. And he was also a very good friend, and still is to this day, as a matter of fact, and a former president of the Staff Club.

WASNIEWSKI: So, if you had to describe the purpose of the Congressional Staff Club, was it entertainment, was it networking? What was its reason for being?

KELLY: Well, I’d say mainly to get to know everybody, and then you had certain people you could call in different committees and something. “Oh, I know a person,” and that person’s on Foreign Affairs, or that person’s on the Agriculture Committee. And if I had a question about anything, I could call. And these various connections with people—and be it Democrat or Republican, there wasn’t any difference. People were all talking to one another then, and they should get back to that now. That was the primary thing.

Then we had—I know we had some kind of insurance program—accident insurance. They had other things available for people if they wanted it, once they joined. And, it was just—at the time I started, I think it was about $5 to join the club, or $10, something like that. I mean, it wasn’t any big amount of money at all. And we had social events, that some of them were sponsored by people that a lot of us knew. It was not the big lobbying push, I don’t mean that, either. You know, they may have been on the Hill at one time,
and they knew what we did and how we did things, and then they would get around, and then we would tell our bosses about, “I met ‘so-and-so.’ He used to be up here.” And then the Members came to many functions. Oh, yes.

**WASNIEWSKI:** That was one of my questions.

**KELLY:** We had annual dinners, too, mostly at the Shoreham Hotel downtown. We’d have 500 people there, and have a “Man of the Year” or “Woman of the Year.” So, it was a lot of fun, it really was. But you did go—and people I know and I learned to know them met—it made me more diverse. When I was in high school and college, there were people from all over the world who were in Marymount School and College. And then when I came down here, my mother had known people from all the different states. Well, then I got to do the same thing.

We were busy, but it wasn’t a 9:00–9:00 job—you know? 9:00–6:00, 9:00–5:00 sometimes or whatever—but we got our work done. And I don’t think there was so much—in the time I came until late in the—oh, let’s see, ’70s, or I should say ’80s—there wasn’t that much attention on Congress. It was mainly on the local level, which you probably have read about and know about yourself. But then once it turned a circle to the federal ’round the clock for some people. No, it was very, very good.

But the goal was to help individuals, really, and if they were experiencing any difficulties in a position or anything like that or whatever, if they wanted to talk about it, they’d talk about it with all of us. And we might be a liaison to go and talk to a Member.
And then we had a bowling league. I was captain of the team, the Congressional Staff Directory bowling team, started by former Rep. Charles [Bruce] Brownson of Indiana. We had 12 teams, and then it dwindled down to just a few. But we had Members of Congress who were captains on the bowling teams. And some of them weren’t captains, some of them were just members of the teams. And one was Bob [Robert Henry] Michel of Illinois, another one was Sil [Silvio Ottavio] Conte of Massachusetts, and—oh, I can’t think now. I’ll have to give you the rest of the names of the people. But they were a lot of fun, and they enjoyed it. The other Members were Bob [Robert William] Kastenmeier of Wisconsin and Bruce [Reynolds] Alger of Texas.

In the late 1950s and the 1960s, the club sponsored men’s and women’s softball teams. In 1965, the women won a division softball title in the D.C. Softball League. At that time, Jean Gilligan was the manager in 1965 and I was the captain of the team and played shortstop and had a very good batting average of .300 something. We had some really good players on the team who were active in the club and remain friends to this day. Gregg McCornack played first base and was working, at the time, for Representative Bill [William Edward] Miller of New York. Mary Ann Fronce was an outfielder, who worked for Representatives Mel [Melvin Robert] Laird, Bill [William Reynolds] Archer, [Jr.], and George [Herbert Walker] Bush, and was also with him when he was Vice President. She was president of the club in 1977. She is retired now and living in her hometown of Mt. Vernon, Ohio. Dorothy Ballanger was our pitcher and a darned good one. She was on the staff of J.J. [James Jarrell (Jake)] Pickle of Texas and the House Rules Committee.
WASNIEWSKI: Were Members allowed to join as club members?

KELLY: No, they were given an honorary membership, a different kind of a card than we had. Oh, yeah. They were honorary members.

WASNIEWSKI: Who were some of the key individuals in the club that you remember?

KELLY: Well, because you know we mentioned Hyde, mentioned Fowler, mentioned—Virginia Butler of Texas. Yes, she definitely was. On Ways and Means Committee, and a very knowledgeable person, and very friendly. And she taught me a lot about what the club meant, too. And we went on one trip, and she said to me, “Well, now, Pat, you’re”—how did she say it? She said, “You’re taking this trip. We’re taking care of your flight.” So, in other words, when they had enough money to have board members or officers that were on the trip, they would help give them some money out of the amount for the trip, to cover our expenses, because we had been working overtime to help organize the trip. I mean, there was no money involved as far as pay for being in the position. But they just give you a little bit of a thank-you for your help. And we weren’t—all of us weren’t making a lot of money. I started off at $5,000 in 1957. So, I mean, when you talk about big pay, no. But of course, that was 52 years ago, almost. [laughter]

WASNIEWSKI: Five thousand dollars went a little ways further than today. It was a little different. [laughter]

KELLY: Exactly, exactly.

WASNIEWSKI: Any other names that come up?
KELLY: Lacey Sharp also was with the Agriculture Committee in the House was another one.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay, that was one.

KELLY: That was one of the founders of the Little Congress, I believe. Help me, Lacey—he’s no longer with us, but [laughter] he’d probably say, “Oh, Pat, I don’t go back that far.”

WASNIEWSKI: Herb Wadsworth was another one who was active?

KELLY: Herb. Yep.

WASNIEWSKI: And he was with a Member from Florida, if I’m remembering correctly?

KELLY: Yes, he was. Representative Don Fuqua. F-U-Q-U-A, Fuqua. A very nice man.

WASNIEWSKI: And Ron Martinson is another name.

KELLY: That was later on. That was after I was—Ron came along later on. And he could play—really could play a mean piano, and he was very good. Very sociable guy, and I think he helped the club in a lot of ways that way. There were other talents that he had in addition to working here.

WASNIEWSKI: You were president of the club in 1976.

KELLY: That’s right.
WASNIEWSKI: What were some of your goals as president for the club?

KELLY: Well, because we tried to keep the membership up, so we tried to circulate information about what we did, our constitution. So, we rewrote the handbook that we had, which I would like to find in my attic for you—a copy of that. And we circulated that around, and that helped to get a little bit more interest in the club. And you know, it had a constitution.

We weren’t just fly-by-night people—because I don’t think any of us would do that, because, I mean, we may have been different sometimes with Democrats, Republicans, and maybe it showed at some time, but we were very individual people, and had a lot to say when we wanted to say it.

[laughter] To one another, that is. No, and that was one of the goals, to keep that membership up and keep the interest up. And we supported a baseball game each year at RFK Stadium, and we used to go out to that, too.

WASNIEWSKI: This was the Congressional Baseball Game that the Members are in?

KELLY: Yes. Right. And then we sold tickets to that, too, and we had a little party along with Roll Call, with that Sid Yudain. Because Sid Yudain had been a member of the Staff Club when he was on the Hill. He was with Representative Al [Albert Paul] Morano’s office, from Connecticut.

And he was also in that office with a former president of the club, Ann Bolton. And then she later went to Representative Ed [Edward Joseph] Derwinski’s office. So, I mean, we all keep friendly and all that, and we kept active that way and encourage one another to do more. And then there’s Lee McIlvaine. He was counsel to the House Interior Committee. And he was
president before I was. And we still see him. And in fact, I spent
Thanksgiving with he and Carol at their home here in Virginia. And to me,
that’s a long time to know people.

WASNIEWSKI: It is, yes.

KELLY: We went to the Market Inn the other day, because we heard that it was going
to fold and close down.

WASNIEWSKI: Oh really? I didn’t know that.

KELLY: Yes, by the end of this month. But then when we got there, and we made the
reservation—we had nine of us there, and we got the reservation there, then
they said, “Well, now, the idea maybe is to go on another month.”
Apparently their rent is going up on the place in the area, what have you. I
don’t know the real reason, but little rumors get out. But they did say that,
and I said to myself, “I bet they’re going to stay open through the Inaugural
and get a little bit of that moolah that’s going to be coming in here!”
{laughter}

WASNIEWSKI: That would make sense.

KELLY: Yes, it does. I mean, I’ll pay the rent if you want to pay all this—the food is
still delicious, so go to the Market Inn. {laughter}

WASNIEWSKI: Taking the broad view, what impact do you think the Congressional Club
had on staff relations and on bipartisanship?
KELLY: Well, I think it had a very, very big impact. Even people who couldn’t come to some of our events still became a member. I mean, if you had—Shirley Albert in my mother’s office, and a couple of other people, they had growing children at home, and they had to get home. They couldn’t come to all those events, but they still became members. And you could get license plates if you wanted a license plate that had the Staff Club logo on it, and some of that was pretty good. When I was president, my number one got stolen so they gave me another one. {laughter} I don’t know why anybody would want to steal it, but anyway. But then—it’s good things. Some people didn’t believe in it. You had to be careful about it—what you did when you put that on your car. You should be careful anyway, where you park your car. If you’re going into a little bar or something like that, go around the block and park it, {laughter} or don’t take that car with you. You know, that’s only teasing.

But anyway, it was—before they had all these—I don’t know where all these IDs came into existence and all the cards. This—at least a police officer in town here, or around town, would know, “Oh, they are from the Hill, that’s where they’re from.” And because with everybody having different license plates around here. And then these policemen would know about, “Well, that is a place on the Hill that we know, and we know where that person [is from].” It was either good or bad for you, to have it on. {laughter} So—but that was one thing that we did.

And we had various health programs, and we had people talk to us about Social Security, and people coming over to talk about anything that was topical at that time. You know, everybody was worried about this or that. “Well, let’s have a little meeting.” And we’d call in people from SSA [Social Security Administration], and all those different offices, and they would
come and speak to us. And then when we had a trip, we would—lots of times, when we went to Venezuela—or was it another one? Well, anyway, we had—the ambassador would come up and speak to us, or send a representative up to speak, to tell about the country we’re going to see. And then they would have a little reception for us down there when we arrived.

WASNIEWSKI: At the embassy or the consulate?

KELLY: Yes, it was something like that. There was a consulate in most of the places; you know, the islands would be more like that. But that was nice. It wasn’t any big to-do about that or anything, but it was just a nice little affair. And we’re coming to see your country, and you’re showing your country to us and talking about it.

WASNIEWSKI: Did you ever have any interaction with staff from other, this is just coming to mind, staff from other parliaments around the world?

KELLY: Well, if they came into town, and if there was something going on, they would notify the president of the club. I believe that happened, for instance with the staff of the Diet of Japan. And if they thought that it would be a good idea to come and speak to them, then they would. I mean, we could have a little group and get together. But it would have to be sometime—it wasn’t just a thing that happened today and you could have it tomorrow. We had to get things out rolling, to let people know to ask for the time off. If it was going to be at 5:00 and they had to finish their work. You know, that kind of thing. And make sure the time for the person who was coming here. But that would be up to the clerk to notify us, or sometimes somebody from the Foreign Affairs Committee.
WASNIEWSKI: Was the Staff Club involved in any kind of local charities? Was it a service organization in any way?

KELLY: Yes, we were involved in charity. We collected for charity. And now, I don’t have all that in my head right now, but we did. We did do charitable work. Definitely. We donated to a number of charities, such as Hines Elementary School in D.C. and House of Ruth, among others.

WASNIEWSKI: You included, along with your résumé, a 1978 Roll Call feature article in which you’re talking about staff on the Hill and the club. And there were a couple of quotes I wanted to read you. One is, “Half of the game here on Capitol Hill is getting out and finding out what other people want and how they feel.” And you also note, “The idea is that it broadens you by being with other people. You find out what they’re thinking and what their problems are, and you work together to solve these problems.” Do you believe that still holds true?

KELLY: That people are doing that now? No, no. That’s what I hear. I mean, I’m in an office in the Clerk’s Office that is not out among the different Members now. I mean, it’s a little different situation to say that. But they tell me that “so-and-so” doesn’t speak to “so-and-so,” and they might be right across the way in an office building. You know, and that is reflective of the Members. I mean, if the Members aren’t trusting one another, that goes down to the staff. And I think that’s been what’s happened. And also what’s happened is because—one of the reasons of the demise of the club was that so many other organizations were set up that were just geared into one area of interest.
If you look in the back of the directory—the telephone directory of the House, you’ll see how many caucuses there are. So, all those are splinter groups of interests, of what a particular Member would want to belong to. And that’s okay, but if they’re not talking to one another, and they’re just talking within their caucus, that’s what they’re losing. They’re losing that talking together in a social way. And it wouldn’t be so difficult when they had to get somebody’s vote for a particular bill that they want. It’s always better to be aboveboard about that, I think, and to talk to people on a one-on-one basis if you can. And that’s been lost a lot. And the staff is, too. You don’t have the opportunity because the Member doesn’t present it either for them, because they—“Oh, I have to go off to this caucus, or the Rural Caucus,” or, “I have to go to this caucus, I have to go to that.” And that’s the end of the day, and as you know, the day goes so fast now with all this technology we have and everything. And some of it’s good now, don’t get me wrong, but we still have the same amount of paper. {laughter}

WASNIEWSKI: That doesn’t change.

KELLY: No, it doesn’t change.

WASNIEWSKI: Well, in fact, in that article, you were indicating that there had been a decline in that kind of staff interaction, even in the late ’70s. And I’m just wondering what—part of it, you were indicating, is because you had all of these caucuses—special-interest caucuses that pop up.

KELLY: Well, I think that started a lot of it, yes.
WASNIEWSKI: And are there any other factors that, from your perspective, that may have caused this?

KELLY: You mean the demise of the club?

WASNIEWSKI: Demise of the club, yes.

KELLY: Oh, sure. I mean, things move on, I guess that’s generally a lot of it. And people didn’t have time for it. I mean, they wouldn’t volunteer their time. We got down to one of the late—it was kind of sad—one of the last elections, and I think there was a handful of people in the room. And Hyde said to Jean Gilligan and myself—Jean is very good friend of mine, was a two-time president of the club, “Let’s—we’d better just leave this. This is ridiculous.” And that was the year that it folded.

WASNIEWSKI: What year was this, do you remember?

KELLY: Oh, gosh, no. In the ’80s. I’d have to ask Jean that or something. It was in the ’80s, early ’80s, I think it was. But that was just so divided—the House is so divided with different things going on. And it’s not the Members’ fault. It’s just—I think that is the way the politics has been. Used to have the time when Members got together with Members, went out to dinner, and maybe had lunch or something like that over in the Members’ Dining Room and possibly talked about the events that were going on in their committees or something, and what interest is yours, and things like that. And at that time, when I saw the demise of that, I felt, “Well, this isn’t good for the club either.” They don’t—in other words, it wasn’t needed, and it wasn’t needed
because they didn’t want that kind of an activity, and that was sad. It really was. But I still have all of my friends that I’ve had for all those years.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Yes, it sounds like you made some wonderful connections.

**KELLY:** Yes, yes, I did. And you know, it was just like real friends. I mean, you could call up and say, “I don’t know whether you can do anything for me, but I have such-and-such I need to do right away.” Oh, I forget the young man’s name, but he was from a Texas Member’s office. Representative Griffiths wanted to see about this certain lady who was having trouble in Washington, and what it was regarding. It was a nice black lady, and Mrs. Griffiths wanted to talk to her, and I’d seen something about it in the newspaper and mentioned this Member’s name. So, I happened to know the chief of staff, and so I called up. “Oh,” he says, “Pat, I’ll have her number for you this afternoon.” And when Mrs. Griffiths came back into the office she said, “Did you find out anything?” And I said, “Yes, you have a number to call so that if you want to see this lady, you can see her.” I mean, that’s the way it was. She said, “How did you ever do that?” I said, “You know, I have some friends around town.” {laughter}

Anyway, he was one of our bowlers, too. So, it just worked out that way, but right now, I can’t remember the people’s names after all these years and pinpoint each one of them. And it wasn’t using, because then they’d ask me for something. “I’m going to New York, and I need to know something about du-du-du-dut.” And I’d say, “Well, I don’t know if that’s such a good idea. That’s an expensive night,” or whatever that was. And nothing I could do about that, or I would give them the name of a place to get their tickets for a play. So it was—you did something, and then they did something for
you. It was just the old-fashioned way of doing things, maybe people would say now, but it got things done.

**WASNIEWSKI:** And it was a smaller community of people, too.

**KELLY:** The whole Hill was smaller.

**WASNIEWSKI:** It was real small.

**KELLY:** I don’t know how much. Was it 12,000 or 10,000?

**WASNIEWSKI:** I looked up the House statistics, and in 1960, there are about—there were less than 4,000 people on the House side. That’s Members, committee, and staff.

**KELLY:** I think you did look that up for me at one point, too.

**WASNIEWSKI:** And 30 years later, in ’91, there were 12,300 people on the House side of the Hill.

**KELLY:** That’s it.

**WASNIEWSKI:** So, greater number of staff, but less interaction over time is the irony.

**KELLY:** Yes, yes, right.
WASNIEWSKI: Let me just conclude with this last question, which is, do you think the club could be started up today? Could there be a Congressional Staff Club today, and how would that happen? Who would have to support that?

KELLY: It would be a tough thing to do, I believe, and I think Hyde and others would tell you that. You would have to get a number of the people from a cross section of the country, I think, to try to get together and make the suggestion, and bring out some of the material about the club, and the handbook, as I said. That was the last handbook that was put out by the club. You know, “So, do you think there’s any need for this? Do you guys see any need for this kind of thing to occur?” And then see what they said. But just don’t be a little group, something like that.

I think Hyde even mentioned to me, which—and I love Hyde, don’t get me wrong, but he said, “How about if we—if you and Jean wanted to set up a retired members’ club?” And I said, “No, there’s no way I could do that.” First of all, I’m not retired, and secondly, there are not many Hill retirees around. I mean, a lot of people leave here. They disappear to different parts of the country, and then you’ve got your postage involved in keeping in touch with them, and then maybe some of them get sick and they can’t travel. I mean, that was asking too much, I think.

But to get to the club itself, you’d have to do what I said. You’d have to go in and tell them what it was and ask if anybody wanted to pursue it. If the climate was good for it, it could come back. But then we’d have to have some support from the Members to go ahead and say, “Yes, go ahead. Why don’t you try it?” Because some of them would remember the original club, I know for a fact. And we could get the support of somebody like Bob Michel.
who was with us for so long. But he’s not getting any younger, and neither are any of us, but he’d be willing to give suggestions, I know that. In fact, I’ve got a Christmas card from him the other day, and on the outside of the envelope—it’s one of your messages like you send to the family and so on. On the outside, “We missed you at George and Mort’s.” In other words, we were invited to a party that Saturday night, and I guess I was sick and Jean was sick, too, and so, we didn’t go. “Missed you at the party” was on the outside of the letter.

So, I mean, you could go and ask somebody like that for help. And another member of his staff was very good and very nice with the club was Linda Steele, she was on the staff of Rep. Michel. And I had a party in September, and Linda came. So, I keep a lot of the people together, but most of them are retired now. I’m the one who’s still working. {laughter} They think I’m crazy, but it’s all right. “You are?” Do you remember Gigi Kelaher?

WASNIEWSKI: Yes, I do.

KELLY: It’s so funny about her. She said, “You came to the House the year I was born.” {laughter} So, she always remembers when I came. I said, “All right, Gigi, no more.” That was the end of that, but anyway.

WASNIEWSKI: Well, thank you very much. I appreciate you taking the time today.

KELLY: Well, thank you very much, and we’ll get on with other thoughts at other times, I guess.

WASNIEWSKI: That sounds good
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So, Pat, thanks for coming back in today to talk to us a little bit. Today we were going to pick up with your time working in Representative Martha Griffiths’ office.

Right.

Which was after your mother left Congress in early 1969.

Correct.

You’d worked for her for a term.

Yes.

What were your options when she left? Were you considering other positions at that point, and how did you come to work for Representative Griffiths?
KELLY: Well, I went around and talked to a lot of Members, and I talked to Jim Delaney, as I eventually worked for him later on. And I went in to see Martha Griffiths, and she said, “Pat, well, you’re coming to work for me.” And that’s exactly how it happened. You didn’t—what do you call it—fudge around with Martha. [laughter] You were on the right side or the wrong side. And she had always been a good friend of my mother’s, as you know, and had been up to our apartment. She lived in the same River House building that—Lee Sullivan, Martha Griffiths, Edith [Starrett] Green, and my mother were in the same building, so. We used to see one another occasionally, socially.

And as I said to you before, she knew me, because of the many times we were at dinner, and I went along with all the women Members, which was very interesting. And a lot of things to learn from them, and the way they differed with each other on some things, and especially how they got together on so many others during those times, and needed to do that to help men and women.

WASNIEWSKI: And you worked in Representative Griffiths’ office from 1969 until she retired at the end of 1974.

KELLY: Seventy-four.

WASNIEWSKI: Who were some of the key people in the office when you arrived? Who were some of the staff that you came to work with?

KELLY: Well, Marilyn Mikulich was the AA [administrative assistant], and Mary Bernhard was a case worker and personal assistant, whatever you want to call
it. I don’t know what it said in the books or anything like that. And then, Pat Thomas was a case worker, too. And Mrs. Griffiths had many contacts with people who either worked on the Ways and Means Committee or other places. A man by the name of Phineas Indritz was very much into the legal end of all this, and I don’t know where he actually worked. All of the staff did everything we were assigned to do. We were multi-tasking.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: But he [Phineas Indritz] and Mrs. Griffiths were both lawyers, and they talked about all these things that she was proposing. Because she had many pieces of legislation that were individually introduced on different parts of where the sex discrimination appeared in law. Social Security, and so forth. And she became an expert on it, and of course, she didn’t get on that committee, I don’t believe, until 1962, the Ways and Means Committee. My mother, who was dean of women in the House at the time, was one of her supporters, who went over to John [William] McCormack and said, “Well, we need Martha on that committee.” And, from then on, she got on the Joint Economic Committee, and she had a wonderful study. I can’t remember exactly what date it was published, but from the Joint Economic Committee on the status of women, it’s a different title about it.

She mentioned to me, at the time, and at many times, the Commission on the Status of Women that was brought about by President Kennedy and the Department of Labor brought out a lot of these inequities that people were not aware of. And from there on, the ball started rolling. My mother got it rolling with the Equal Pay Act, and that was signed into law in 1963. And then you had the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and people were getting on the
bandwagon to correct these inequities. And they both were inequities, both with men and women. Not just necessarily women. And both, my mother was like that, too. I mean, they weren’t just all feminists. They were not that way. And not that there’s anything wrong with some of them, but it was equally on the level with both sides, to make sure that there were no inequities in the law.

**WASNIEWSKI:** We’ll come back to the Equal Rights Amendment.

**KELLY:** Sure.

**WASNIEWSKI:** I just wanted to come back a little bit to the office at the time. And it was relatively small, by comparison, to today’s office, correct?

**KELLY:** Oh yes, we had, let’s see—

**WASNIEWSKI:** There were six or seven staff?

**KELLY:** In the main office, we had two in the back room, that was Marilyn and myself, Mary Bernhard and Pat Thomas, and there was about four out in the main office. And, I don’t know, they had some other people, but they weren’t permanent staff, that I know of.

**WASNIEWSKI:** How long had Marilyn been with Representative Griffiths at that point?

**KELLY:** She’d only come—I think she told me the other day—came in the early ’60s, after President Kennedy was inaugurated. Because we had different times.
She said, “I thought it was ’62.” And I said, “No, Marilyn, it was in ’61, he was sworn in.” [laughter] But, anyway, she was there about that time.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay. Had she worked with any other Representatives up until that point?

KELLY: Not to my knowledge. She came right from Detroit.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay. And that position at the time, the administrative assistant, was essentially a chief of staff position?

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: Generally speaking, what were your day-to-day responsibilities? You were the legislative assistant, at that point.

KELLY: Well, each year and each Congress, you had to get all of her bills that hadn’t been enacted into law, and get them prepared for introduction, and had to answer mail on any particular subject that she was interested in. And then I would bring certain things to her attention that I read in the Wall Street Journal, or in some other magazines or papers about what was going on. And she was a very interesting person to work for. Really was. And she had a great deal of knowledge. And she let you know about whether you were doing it right, believe me. [laughter] Or wrong.

WASNIEWSKI: How so? [laughter]

KELLY: Yes, right.
WASNIEWSKI: Do you have any anecdotes?

KELLY: Yes, I do. Mr. Griffith came out to the office one day after she had hired me. And she said, “You know, I loved your mother.” And I said, “Yes, Martha, I know that.” And she says, “She was a great gal,” and all this. And, you know, it was a friendship type of thing in that way. But if you didn’t do something right, it didn’t matter. Just like my mother. [laughter]

WASNIEWSKI: Typically, how much interaction would you or would Marilyn have had with her on an average day in the office? Would you have briefed her in the morning, or how would that have worked?

KELLY: Well, Martha read every piece of mail that came into the office. And Marilyn gave that to her, because she opened the mail. And she put a check on the part that she wanted her to see, at first, anyway. But she read all the mail. And we got into a situation where we knew what she would want to say. And that trickled down from Marilyn to us. And then the subject matter, too, would be different. She was not involved with one part of the Equal Rights Amendment as much as I was, as far as contacting people from the outside. The staff of the Republican National Committee, the Democratic National Committee, both of those committees. I had contacts at those committees, once the amendment started to move. And, seeing what they were doing, and where extra work was needed, and where Mrs. Griffiths might be of help to them, and vice versa, where they could be of help.

WASNIEWSKI: Did you find yourself drafting speeches for her? Drafting talks?
KELLY: No, not really. Not really. She did pretty much that herself. She had all that knowledge and she’d just go ahead and speak about it. It’s a different type of training than a lot of people had, that I was very grateful to work for somebody like that. She was very knowledgeable, and she could speak about anything, in a couple minutes. But, no, she didn’t, she didn’t really have to have too many speeches drafted. That was not—if it was a major thing, a college commencement or something like that, then Marilyn—we might get together on the latest information on what was going on in that particular area. That kind of a thing. But specializing in certain things that were going on at the time, to help her out. But she did a lot of her own speech making without any assist.

WASNIEWSKI: Sure. Now, one other thing about the staff that I noticed, looking at the staff directory, and the few positions that were listed, and it really only listed legislative assistant and administrative assistant, everyone else just appeared as staff. It didn’t look like there was anyone on staff who was designated as—now, every office has a communications director—

KELLY: No.

WASNIEWSKI: Or a press person.

KELLY: She didn’t need one. [laughter] A lot of people in those days didn’t have them. They didn’t need them. You know, she was very close to the people in her district, and she’d go out there all the time. Of course, as you know, every weekend, practically, to be with her husband Hicks. I mean, she was very down-to-earth type of person, and she went around to the different areas, and that’s how she got the campaign to begin with, around in a—Mrs. Griffith
had a truck, and she went around speaking off the back of a truck. And, those were the days for that kind of thing. And you didn’t need a communications person. And you made your own news.

But, again, in some places here that I’ve read, she disagreed with the fact that the women weren’t given credit in the newspaper that they should be given on a particular issue. It was more male-oriented. And she would say that. And then, I think she referred to that in her interview with the Former Members of Congress Association—that was in 1978, after she had left Congress. But, she was very outspoken and had knowledge about a lot of issues.

WASNIEWSKI: At the time, as you had alluded to, Representative Griffiths was on the Ways and Means Committee, which was an exclusive assignment. It was her only committee assignment at that point.

KELLY: Well, she had been on Banking and Currency, right?

WASNIEWSKI: Right.

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: But, by the time you had joined the staff, Ways and Means was the one.

KELLY: Oh, yes, she was there. Many times I went down to the counsel in Ways and Means to talk about various letters she had gotten on Social Security and on different things like that.
WASNIEWSKI: How would you describe your work with Ways and Means? Were you a liaison with the committee, or how did that work?

KELLY: Yes, I was, in a sense. To ferret out information that would be needed for her responses to certain letters, and make sure I was up-to-date on what the legal aspect was at that time. So, that these people could be helped out.

Lots of times, the people would come in themselves. And, I don’t know if there’s a story in here, but this man had a couple of children. He worked for the House. I don’t know what he—I can’t tell you exactly what it was. But he did not get the benefits that should be coming to him after his wife. He didn’t get benefits to take care of the two children. Two or three that he had. And, boy, Martha went down and—she would go down herself and tell a different people down at the committee, about, “This is the things I’m getting in here. We’ve got to do something about this.” And, being the only woman, I think it was a help to the Ways and Means Committee, to have another aspect, from a woman’s viewpoint and a legal background to get these things done for them. For men and women.

WASNIEWSKI: Were there any staff in particular that you would’ve dealt with on Ways and Means that you recall? Looking through the old directories, the Chief Counsel?

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: And his deputy.

KELLY: Oh yes, I’ve been down to see the Chief Counsel.
WASNIEWSKI: John Martin.

KELLY: John Martin.

WASNIEWSKI: And J.P. Baker was the deputy counsel.

KELLY: No, I went to John a couple of times, but—oh, gosh, I wish I had that—you don’t have a directory here, do you?

WASNIEWSKI: I do, back in the office. We can look it up later.

KELLY: Yes, there was one particular counsel that I went down to for a few issues. I don’t like to drop a name, because I’m not sure that it’s the right one, so.

WASNIEWSKI: Sure.

KELLY: So, if, you know, if we get the right one in there, we can put it in.

WASNIEWSKI: We can come back to it.

KELLY: Okay. I thought of the name—Rob Leonard. He was very helpful. This gentleman was, if we can verify that.

WASNIEWSKI: Martha Griffiths was the first woman on Ways and Means, she was the only woman there for nearly a decade.

KELLY: Yes, that’s right. They knew she was there, too. {laughter}
WASNIEWSKI: And this was a time when, you know, Wilbur [Daigh] Mills was the chairman, longtime chairman. And it was pretty extraordinary for a woman to be on an exclusive committee like that, the revenue committee, the tax committee.

KELLY: Well, she had the background for all of that, from her legal background. I mean, there’s no question, being a judge in a city court, there in Detroit and all. And experience in law practice. She and her husband, and G. Mennen Williams, who was later governor of Michigan, were in a law firm together. And I’m sure they came across a lot of things that could be changed, and she brought them all down to that committee {laughter} and gave them the, “What for,” that’s it.

WASNIEWSKI: We’ve talked about this before, that when you’re kind of living the moment, even if it’s a historical moment, that you aren’t always cognizant of how pioneering it might be. At the time, working for her, and doing liaison work with the Ways and Means Committee, did you ever have a moment where you kind of stepped back and thought, “Wow, this is really a pioneering effort on her part?”

KELLY: Oh yes, I felt that way all along, being with her. I mean it was a whole thing that she was a very good, decent woman, and she wanted the rest of the people to have what they deserved as their work rights. And it was a very nice place to work. I really enjoyed Martha.

WASNIEWSKI: Aside from ERA, which we’ll come to shortly, I wanted to know, were there any other key legislative issues, or interests that you recall working with Representative Griffiths on, in particular? ERA was probably the big one.
KELLY: Well, I think I mentioned them earlier, about the different inequities in the laws. And then she would point that out all the time, and we got mail, and if anybody came in with a problem—that young man that had lost his wife—she’d go right down there, honest to heavens, and just tell them, “This is not right. We’ve got to change this.” So, that’s working with her on whatever came across the deck, or whatever was called up, and people crying, and all this kind of stuff. And, wherever she could get information about, about anything that was an inequity to either men or women. She tried to do that. We tried to bring that to her attention, if we found anything, and that was, you know, should be directed. Have her direction, attention.

WASNIEWSKI: I’d like to move into ERA, because this is something of historic proportions, as well. And discuss your role in helping get the discharge petition out, and I want to explain that, but the ERA had a little bit of a history, dating back to—

KELLY: The 1920s. ’23.

WASNIEWSKI: 1923.

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: Alice Paul, and the National Woman’s Party, had the amendment introduced.

KELLY: Who was the sponsor, do you remember? I mean, they mention it someplace or other, but I—
WASNIEWSKI: It was a man. And I believe a Senator had sponsored it. But I’d have to check on that.\(^\text{11}\)

KELLY: Yes, I can’t remember those things myself. Probably at the time when we were working on it, I did, but that would be unusual if it was a man. But, of course, there weren’t that many women in Congress, so it had to be a man.

WASNIEWSKI: In 1923, it would’ve only been one or two women in Congress. \{laughter\}

KELLY: \{laughter\} And they wouldn’t have been supporters of the Equal Rights Amendment.

WASNIEWSKI: More than likely. And it had a long history. It was bottled up in the Judiciary Committee in the House—

KELLY: Oh, for years.

WASNIEWSKI: For decades and decades.

KELLY: Yes, it was.

WASNIEWSKI: The Senate considered versions, but not exactly what the proponents wanted.

KELLY: With the—if it was an obstacle, Senator [Samuel James] Ervin, [Jr.], would be the one who put something on there. And, they thought it was going to take away the protections to women, you know. Martha always talked about the story about, “Well, do you expect a woman to pick up a 150-pound man,” or something like that. And that’s just not—that’s not equality, that’s
just—she couldn’t do it, physically. And that kind of thing. Which was absurd, in a way. But we weren’t—they weren’t trying to get something more than men. They were just trying to get equal pay, which was what my mother proposed. And the other, goes with it, for their children. And, as Martha said, when she first signed up, she didn’t get the benefits for her husband. If she died before he did, he would not get the benefits that she had put money into, the pension plan.

WASNIEWSKI:  Exactly. That’s the same situation you talked about with the constituent.

KELLY:  Right. And that was wrong, dead wrong.

WASNIEWSKI:  At any rate, Representative Griffiths, for years and years, re-introduced the amendment. Not all women in Congress supported it.

KELLY:  No.

WASNIEWSKI:  Because some sided with the labor views, that it would strip away protections for women, and that certainly was the view that was held by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the longtime chairman, Manny Celler, who kept it bottled up in committee. And so, she settled eventually on a method to get it out of committee.

KELLY:  Right.

WASNIEWSKI:  The discharge petition. Which dates back to the early part of the 20th century, and—
KELLY: Very few have acquired the necessary total of 218 signatures that you had to get to get the legislation from the committee onto the floor.

WASNIEWSKI: Right.

KELLY: For it to be discharged from the committee.

WASNIEWSKI: To get pulled out of committee and brought to the floor. How did she, how did she settle on that method, was it something—

KELLY: Well, I went to the Parliamentarian’s Office. I knew she wanted to do something, and I went to the Parliamentarian. Now, don’t ask me what the name of the gentleman that I saw, or visited with now. I’d have to go back and pull that one out of the sky.

WASNIEWSKI: Was it Lew Deschler?

KELLY: No.

WASNIEWSKI: Lew Deschler was the Parliamentarian.

KELLY: No, no, not Lew. Yes, I know, but I didn’t speak to Lew. I knew Lew Deschler very well. But, anyway, I went in there, and I told him, and then he knew the opposition to it, from the committee, and this gentleman said, “Well, I think the best thing to do is file a discharge petition.” And so, I had the information on that, and I went back to Mrs. Griffiths and told her, and she says, “Oh, why couldn’t we go through the Rules Committee?”
See, she had forgotten about Rules at that point, and just briefly, I think, that Rules Committee was dominated by the same type of people that ran Judiciary Committee. Judge [Howard Worth] Smith of Virginia was the chairman at the time, I believe, and some of the others there. Senator Pepper was one. And I don’t know that he really was supportive of it, but he kept saying, “Well, why don’t you bring it before the Rules Committee?”

So, when I went back, I said, “I don’t think you have the votes, Mrs. Griffiths, to get it out of Rules Committee.” And, of course, they were very—you’d have to go look at the membership at the time. And I just mentioned a few of them. Some were—would be supportive of it, and some would not. But they couldn’t depend upon that route. So, I suggested to her that you file a discharge petition on it. And, and that’s what she did. And I think it was in—it was [H.J. Res.] 264 in that Congress, and I believe, at some point, it was about three months after she filed it, she had the votes.

**WASNIEWSKI:** It was even less, that she—well, she may have filed it earlier. She came to the floor June 11, 1970.

**KELLY:** Yes.

**WASNIEWSKI:** And said she had it at the clerk’s desk ready for everyone to sign.

**KELLY:** Correct. {laughter}

**WASNIEWSKI:** And she said she was going to drag the Supreme Court into the modern era if it was the last thing she was going to do.
KELLY: She had to do it. Right, right.

WASNIEWSKI: And, so, but really, it took two months for her to get the signatures—

KELLY: That’s right.

WASNIEWSKI: Because it made it onto the floor in early August of 1970—

KELLY: Oh, she went around to all the chairmen and talked to them, and she went around to some of the Members who were reticent about it, and wanted to discuss it. And she did that herself. We didn’t do that. We didn’t have anything to do with it. She buttonholed them. And she was a very persuasive woman, and she had the background to be able to answer their questions very quickly, and so that was, that was a great help. And she was personable, and people did like her. Not that they would take a stand on that because of that, but because of the information that she provided them with at the time. And that, to me, was just amazing, that she was able to obtain those—

And then, Hale Boggs, at one point, I believe, he said, I think Jerry [Gerald Rudolph] Ford, [Jr.], did the same thing—Hale Boggs said, “Martha, if you get—when you get to 200, let me know. I want to be 200.” See, see, he wanted to just see how—being from Louisiana. You got to remember about all these things, is the Member has to consider their district. And, it shouldn’t be a detriment to them. But if they knew something about it, and it was explained to them, they could, in turn, explain it to their constituents, if there was any problem. And that’s the way she did, she went right to the person involved, and then went to each delegation and around, and that’s
how I think she was able to do it. We didn’t have to do any of that.

{laughter}

WASNIEWSKI:  A lot of shoe leather. {laughter}

KELLY:       Oh yes, she did. She did, indeed.

WASNIEWSKI:  So, what was your part, other than suggesting a route, using the discharge petition? Did you go around to offices?

KELLY:       Oh, no, no, no. I didn’t get involved in that. I spoke to many, many people about it, and they called, and all that. But, no, that was her bailiwick, and that’s how she wanted to do it. And when it first got, when it got discharged, when was that, in August?

WASNIEWSKI:  Early August of 1970.

KELLY:       Yes, I mean, after that, sure, it was out in the public eye and everything like that. And then we started to get the women’s groups interested in it. They were—women’s professional groups. And she would call them too, and Margaret Raywall was one of the people that was very helpful with that. And she was also—lived in the River House. So, she had been a long time worker on this material from the professional women’s groups.

WASNIEWSKI:  Was she associated with any one organization?

KELLY:       Well, if I could look through this and tell you, I would. I just can’t remember. Maybe I’ll ask Marilyn about that, who she was with. It might be
in one of these things, here, too, because her name has been dropped a couple of times in the things that I’ve read since then about Martha. But, I mean, I knew her very well also. And she was helpful. And she’d give us different ideas of different people that were a little bit this way [makes a motion indicating they were “on the fence”] and contact them, or tell Mrs. Griffiths about it. And, as I said, I was in charge of contacting the Democratic National Committee and the Republican National Committee to find out about the different people, and their support for it, and where they could help us out to get it rolling. Even for the discharge petition, too, at that point.

WASNIEWSKI: Sure.

KELLY: We did that, we did that, but we didn’t go around to the Members—no, no. She did that herself.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay. At any point, either during discharge petition, or after it had come to the floor of the House and been passed, and you were waiting for the Senate to act on it—did you ever, as an office, identify key Members to talk to over on the Senate side, or did you have a press strategy that you had kind of worked out?

KELLY: Don’t forget, there was no press involved in this. Mrs. Griffiths spoke with many people. No, she went. It was Birch [Evans] Bayh of Indiana, who was a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and he became a very big supporter of it. And he had hearings on the Senate side. And he was very supportive of it. So, he would be contacting other Members over there. But she went over there, too. And she never told us where she was going, she was
off. [laughter] Shoe leather, again. And she knew all these people, too, and from Michigan—that was a little difficult for her. And I think, eventually—by the way, I mentioned that before, that Jerry Ford did sign it, eventually. So, she got most of the delegation to sign the petition. But it wasn’t easy.

Because they really didn’t understand the need for it. And they didn’t want to have women hurt. And I can see that, in those days. I mean, you got—you’re talking about 40 years ago, now. We’re not talking about today. And, now, there are so many women involved in so many different things, and I don’t think there’s any problem with it. I mean, some of them were too aggressive, but then, of course, there are some men that are overly aggressive, too, in different ways. So. It’s the person that does it. And that’s what she did.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Who were some of the key staff, or Members, that you may have had interactions with during this time frame? Especially when it was over on the Senate side. Did you go over to the Senate and work with the committees?

**KELLY:** No, no, no. I talked to them over there. I talked to the committee staff over there. Yes. But, I think that they were able to have the votes over there, so there wasn’t that much to do. It’s just, when it got out of committee, and went to—when it was going to the floor. Mrs. Griffiths didn’t really want us to call unless they were—I mean, she didn’t say no, or anything like that. But unless you had a good tie with somebody. You know, “I’ll do it.” Or, “Let me know if you hear anything about someone over there that needs a little assist in deciding what to do.” And, we’d pass that information along to her.

But that was—she was her own press person in this whole thing. I mean, she did it all. And she was so knowledgeable about it. That’s the whole thing.
And we couldn’t possibly take her place on that, because of her background, being a lawyer and a judge. And then her husband, a lawyer, too. And they probably talked about this a great deal.

No, I can’t remember—some of the staff, of course, and some of the staff in the Michigan delegation, I was close to, too. And, I just can’t from the top of my head, get it to tell you the names now. I didn’t keep them down on paper, I don’t think. You know? If I go back through a few boxes in the garage that belonged to my mother, too, and {laughter}, Mrs. Griffiths and all, but—the day is so short now, anymore, with all these things we have to do now, that it’s not possible to do that.

WASNIEWSKI: Do you have a memorable anecdote or moment from the whole ERA episode? One that sticks out for you, personally?

KELLY: Not really. Well, I think we were so positive about getting it done, and when another person said, “Well, the state’s going to come in,” or that, like that. And we were all elated about it, and wondered why, well, “so-and-so,” “Why didn’t that state do anything about it?” But we were on the phone a lot about it. But, then again, we had to answer the mail, and we had to do all these other things. So, the ball got rolling over there, mostly by Mrs. Griffiths. And, as you know, the Senate is a different animal anyway. And, as a result of her Joint Economic Committee work, and the [Commission on] Status of Women thing, she broadened her look and outlook, on everything, because she—and the names that she knew, and the people she knew. They came in very handy. And we’d get told about it after the fact. “Well, I think I have ‘so-and-so.’” {laughter} “I think I have ‘so-and-so.’” But, no. We had to get their office going, and keep it going so that she could do all that.
WASNIEWSKI: Were you on the floor, or in the gallery, the day it went to the floor?

KELLY: Yes, I was in the gallery. And my mother came down from New York, I think for that, or was it passage of it? Well, she was down on the floor, too, and it was in the paper that she was here. I think it was probably when it passed that she came down. Because nobody knew exactly when Mrs. Griffiths was going to get 218, so she did come down. No, I think they went out to dinner that night, a few of them, including my mother with Martha Griffiths when they passed it. And, a couple of others that I know of. But not I, said the fly.

WASNIEWSKI: {laughter} Now, the Senate added an amendment—

KELLY: Oh, yes.

WASNIEWSKI: —that October, which exempted women from the draft, and it killed the whole thing. It killed it, temporarily . . .

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: In the 91st Congress [1969–1971]. It came back in the 92nd Congress [1971–1973]. Do you remember doing any work? Because Representative Griffiths was instrumental in getting it back on track in the new Congress. Do you remember doing any work at that point on the issue?

KELLY: Sure. I went with her when she testified before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. And was there accompanying her. And, of course, her friends up there, Representative Andy [Andrew] Jacobs, [Jr.], of Indiana and, different people, were on the committee. She spoke very eloquently about it,
and the need to get it done again, and that’s about it. But we didn’t have to prepare anything for her. She had it all right there. There was nothing to prepare, except to tell her—well, she knew, even how they voted, and how they felt about it. So, it was just—I shouldn’t say the word “rehash,” but it was just bringing it back to light, so that they could get it on the House Floor again. And that’s all I can think of right now. I mean, we just—answering that mail again, and getting things out, and bringing anything to her attention, whether it involved any discrimination like that. We brought it to her attention by reading various newspapers and everything.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: There were hands in the fire, or whatever you want to say.

WASNIEWSKI: I’d like to come back to Representative Griffiths for just a second.

KELLY: Sure.

WASNIEWSKI: Why, do you think, Martha Griffiths took this issue and ran with it? Why was she so successful with it? What kind of traits did she have as a Member, and as a woman?

KELLY: Well first of all, she had to believe in the issue, which she did. And she was able to explain it to people well, in the way only Martha could explain something to you. You know, “This happened here, and that happened there, and that, and we’ve got to stop this,” and obviously we can’t pass all these laws, taking care of everything. And it’s a very, took her a long time to get some of those inequities removed from Social Security and the pension plan
that she had signed up with, for her husband. And it took her a long time to have those corrected. And if all of this hadn’t come to light about it, I think she was a very good spokesman for it. That was one of the things. She was articulate about it, and she knew what it involved, and why it had to be. And it may not have been the route for everybody to go. They’d rather, “Oh, let’s pass a little amendment to this or that,” but she wanted to get on with it.

And she thought it was beginning to mushroom, what with the Commission on the Status of Women’s reports. The Equal Pay Bill that my mother was involved with for so many years. But that took a long time for her, to get that passed. Yes. From the time she went in, from ’49, or ’50, when she introduced it the first time, and it wasn’t signed into law until 1963, by President Kennedy. June 10th, I believe, 1963. So, I mean, when you took that scope of it, and all these things were in there. But they—and so many people were being hurt by inequalities in the laws, you had to shake up the group, and get it on the move forward. And she, they also had a number of Members—I don’t know how many were women. And only one was against it.

**WASNIEWSKI:** It would’ve been a little less than two dozen women at that point, right?

**KELLY:** Yes. But they were still in different sections of the country, and they were able to explain it to others. And, especially, in the states. Now, the one, really, problem, I think, that’s brought out in all of this, is, once it got out to the state legislatures, people didn’t know too much about it. And they weren’t necessarily—state legislators weren’t talking about it that much. And they didn’t—they were maybe not that knowledgeable about it, just as the
House had been not knowledgeable about it until Martha hit them on the head with it. [laughter] But that’s what was. That was a downer.

But she also, I remember, she went out to the states to, when she was even out of Congress, and tried to get it passed. She went around to the different states and made speeches, and at commencements and what have you, and that still didn’t work. And, as you know, they tried to get an extension to the time limit, which was seven years to begin with, which—I don’t think a time limit had been put on anything before, in any of the history of these discharge petitions. Am I correct on that?

WASNIEWSKI: There had been a couple—

KELLY: Maybe—

WASNIEWSKI: I believe it was a child labor amendment.

KELLY: Oh, yes.

WASNIEWSKI: There had been a few that had years tacked onto them.

KELLY: Yes, that’s right. That’s right. That was one of the reasons why they put it on again, that’s right. Other people argued it should be put on again. But when Mrs.—who was it, Mrs. [Patsey] Mink, or somebody, after that, that tried to get the extension?

WASNIEWSKI: Elizabeth Holtzman was one of the big pushers.
KELLY: Holtzman, okay. Of course, she was on the Judiciary Committee, right. And that didn’t even work, for the few—and then, the question about being able to rescind the amendment came up. And I don’t know how they ever resolved that. Because some of the states did rescind it, and I thought, “Well, why did they pass it to begin with?” I thought it was very stupid, excuse me. Unless the legislature’s changed from one party to another, which is very possible, but no one had been a student of the proposal in the states. See, we were on the federal level, and nobody had been a student down there, to teach them the same thing that we learned, up on the Hill. And I don’t think the newspapers were very helpful. They had that old feeling about these things, anyway.

And, I think, the only one that really wrote a great article about Mrs. Griffiths getting it passed in the House, and how she did it, and all that, was Eileen Shanahan of the *New York Times* wrote a wonderful article about what Mrs. Griffiths had done. And that, for the *Times*, would’ve been really progressive. And, in this way—I mean, they’ve always been progressive in other ways. But, in this particular area. But they didn’t say anything, too much about it. There was a great deal of, “I don’t know about these people,” you know, “these women.” And when they got to know them, I think, it was a lot different. In their own lives, and what they did themselves. But then, of course, as I said before, then the women libbers came along, and that didn’t help either. They were telling the wrong things about the amendment. And the burning the bras, oh, I’ll never get over that, oh my God. This thing will never get through the states, never. {laughter} Oh, Lord. But that was a different time. And I don’t know. It was sad, that that’s the way it ended up.

WASNIEWSKI: That leads to another question.
KELLY: Sure.

WASNIEWSKI: Thinking of why Representative Griffiths was able to push this issue through, and you’ve alluded to some of the traits: she was very knowledgeable, she had the background as a judge—

KELLY: Well, they were—a lot of them worked with her on committees, too. And they knew of her knowledge and her alertness. And she’d get right to the point. She’d cut right through a theme. When somebody else—the committee members had been talking about it for 15 minutes, a half-hour, what have you. And she’d say, “Well, this came—,” and that would be it, and she would just bring it to the forefront. She had that knack, to do that. Cut into issues, and bring it right down to, basically what it was about.

WASNIEWSKI: How would you distinguish her—I mean, she seems like, in one way, part of the leading edge of feminists in Congress. But yet, she comes in much earlier than the group we typically associate as being the feminist wave. And there, I’m thinking about people like Bella Abzug, or Shirley [Anita] Chisholm, or Pat [Patricia Scott] Schroeder.

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: How do you think she was different, from those Members?

KELLY: Well, first of all, she had a good personality. And, and she was able to talk both to men and women about these situations. And she didn’t get anybody riled up about it. And this is prior, probably before all these other people came along. Some of them didn’t help us any. Believe me! Women, I’m
talking about, didn’t help. They didn’t help themselves, in a way. Bella Abzug didn’t last that long in Congress. And, it was just a different type of person. And that’s what I think, the men thought all of these ladies might have been, earlier. And they weren’t. They were knowledgeable about what they were doing, and they didn’t try to go all over the place. “I’ll put in 20 bills, and I’ll try to get all 20 of them done,” or something like that. They concentrated on what they were doing in that field. And that was hers. And she just—she was able to handle it. And she was able to get along with men. In a lot of ways. And my mother was, too. It just seems to be that way, they’re not alienating them. They didn’t alienate anyone. They knew their, pardon me, place. And you don’t tread over that.

The swimming in the House Gym together, and all that kind of stuff. I mean, that was just—all these things are brought out later, because the men like to, pardon me, go skinny-dipping, and they didn’t want the women around, and all. Oh, Lord. It was such a mess. And why? Here, today, we have different problems. And they’re off on the swine flu, or they’re off on something else that has nothing to do with where we want to go with our country. And that’s where she was able to handle it. Was able to talk to people. And she was reasonable, too. I mean, she’d go right to you. If she wanted something to ask them, “Now, when are you going to vote for this Hale?” “Well, I’m {makes drum roll sound} right back.” “Okay, I’m going to have 199 today, we need another one. Your 200’s coming up.” {laughter}

That’s the way she did it. I mean, in other words, in between, I don’t think—she didn’t keep bugging people. But, she knew what she was doing, and who came in, and she knew everybody’s feelings about it. And once they signed up, she was going around and thanking them, and all that, so. She was
the one to push this, really. The type that was not an extreme feminist, like some that came along later on. And the men understood that. And Hicks Griffiths was a good man. And he was very helpful to her, too, I know. With his connections with the Democratic Party out in Michigan. And, it’s a man’s world, still. We all believe in that. Doesn’t stop us, and neither did it stop Martha, but there’s inequities in the laws, and they have to be straightened out.

**WASNIEWSKI:** You mentioned a couple of outside groups that you worked with after the ERA went out to the states.

**KELLY:** No, during that time.

**WASNIEWSKI:** During that time.

**KELLY:** They were trying to get different Members to sign up to, and they were helping.

**WASNIEWSKI:** One group that is mentioned in Representative Griffiths’ Association with Former Members interview is NOW [National Organization for Women]. She was a charter member of NOW. Although she said that she wasn’t working that closely with them.

**KELLY:** No.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Do you remember working with groups like that?
KELLY: Oh, sure. We’d been in touch with them, yes, and they’d been in touch with us. And then she’d say, “Okay, give them Pat,” or something like that. {laughter} I’m just teasing, but—she knew what they were up to, and if she could get a few votes, and have them do a little bit of work. If they didn’t go out and do some of the things that, later on, some of these people did, and protesting, getting involved in Vietnam, getting involved in this and that, and all. She watched her step on those things, because she didn’t agree with all those. At least it appeared to me that she didn’t. And I know she wasn’t the type to go that extreme, and I think they hurt it, more than helping it, with the men. And that’s what we needed, the votes.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay, I just would like to, to wrap up, summarize. You left when Martha Griffiths retired, in 1974, and we’ve spoken both on and off tape about your memories of her, and you seem genuinely fond of her.

KELLY: Yes, I was.

WASNIEWSKI: Do you have one or two memories that make you smile when you think of Representative Griffiths? {laughter}

KELLY: Well, I wanted an autographed picture. And this was before I came to work for her. And Mary Bernhard, I think, brought it over to my office, wherever I was at the time. And she’d signed to me, “To the daughter I love the most.” That was Martha. And she signed it, “Martha Griffiths.” So, I always had it up in my apartment when I was on C Street. And I was always proud of that. The fact that she really cared about people. If she really liked them, she really cared about it. And, I told you what she said about my mother, too, so—it was all in the family, I guess. {laughter} But, that was a good memory, but I
have many memories of how good she was to people, and, if you needed anything, you could go to her and talk to her about it. And she really—she was missed after she left.

I think she knew the time to go, though. Hicks wasn’t that well. And then, of course, she ran for lieutenant governor, and all that. But that was being out in Michigan. That wasn’t commuting from here to there, so. I just probably remember a lot of things, because she was a very funny woman.

Oh, I know, she was up in the apartment one day, and waiting for my mother to come home from the office. I think she hadn’t gotten in there yet, and she was coming over to have a drink with us, okay? So, I didn’t know how to make a Manhattan, but I tried, because she liked them. Anyway, I made the worst Manhattan in the world. [laughter] I said, “Do you want a—” “No. That was pretty bad, Pat.” [laughter] I haven’t made a Manhattan since then. But that was a cute little personal thing, and she said, “I’ll have a beer,” or something to that effect. [laughter] So, Mom finally got there—little things like that, but I can’t remember a lot of them, but we were all very proud of her, and—you felt comfortable. If you knew her, and she knew you, very comfortable. But she could tell a faker, too, a mile away. She was a very smart woman. And I, too, loved her. So, no question about that.

WASNIEWSKI: Did you keep in touch after she left Congress very much?

KELLY: Yes, yes. And, in fact, my mother had a stroke. We were up in Massachusetts in December of 1981 for the wedding of my nephew, Edward. And we got her to the hospital fast. We were in a car with a couple of people going from the church to the reception, and Mom and I were in the back seat. And all of
a sudden I saw a flower fall off of her jacket. And I said to the people in front, I said, “Something’s wrong here.” So, I said, “You’d better—” But we pulled up to the front of the hotel where we were staying, and everybody came out, and we got her in an ambulance, and took her over to the hospital up there. And, well, one of the first people I called, once I knew that she was going to come through—and we missed the whole wedding reception. And then she was up in the hospital and I was commuting back and forth after that to the house in New York. And I called Martha. And she said, “Well, how’d it happen, what did it do?” And I said, “Well, I got the ambulance.” Well, she told everybody that the one that saved my mother was me, that I got them going fast, to do something about it. And she told Hicks that. I could hear her telling Hicks on the phone, at the other end.

But, oh yes, we were in touch with her. And she came to see my mother when my mother came down from New York. We sold the house up in Westchester. In 1981 she had the stroke. 1982, we sold the house up there, and then we came down to live in Virginia. My brother drove us down. And she came to see her, with Marilyn, they came to see my mother, and visit with her. So. And Lee [Sullivan] did, when she had retired. Come back. So, they kept in close touch over the years, and I did, too, with them.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Thanks for sharing your memories today. Is there anything else that you wanted to add, or anything else we haven’t touched on that you wanted to talk about? At least in terms of this episode of your congressional service?

**KELLY:** No, not really anymore I can tell. Again, I got to meet very many people by being in that office. And being in the Staff Club and being very active, so I—that was very fulfilling for me, to know these people, and to have lifetime
friends, which I still have. And then run for the Staff Club offices that I did, and I had their support. Usually, there was sort of a run-up, go this way, and I’m going to say that, and don’t go from here to there, like president or something like that. But, every step.

Well, at one time, they would sit around with a former president, and—president in 1975, or whoever it was. I can’t now—Ann Bolton, I think. And, well, “What does everybody want to do?” So, I was first in line, and I said, “I’m going to run for first vice-president.” “Oh. Well I was going to do that,” said one of the board members, or something like that. Well, I didn’t have any opposition. Because I’d made all these friends, over the years.

And, I think that was very fulfilling for me. And then my mother came down to the dinner, and my brother was coming up from Sea Island, where they had been for Easter in 1976. And they came and attended the dinner, and I got a very nice person to come that was a longtime friend of ours. And his name was Sammy Fain, he was a writer, a songwriter. And, originally came from New York, after living in California. And he wrote, “Love is a Many Splendored Thing,” “Secret Love,” and the most famous one of all was “I’ll Be Seeing You.” So, there were a lot of songs, and he came and entertained everybody at the banquet. And, the name was not familiar to people, but, of course, it was familiar to us, because we were very good friends of his family. And a couple by the name of Ethel and Tommy Grace. And both she and Fannie Schofield were related to Sammy.

So, that was a very fulfilling moment for me. And, by the way, it would alternate from Democrats—excuse me, to Republicans, to get the “Staffer of the Year,” from the Congressional Staff Club. Plaque from them, and all that.
In recognition. So, I picked Bob Michel, and it was time to have a Republican in there. And, he had a good, a great singing voice too, as you know. And he wrote me a note on his card, he said, “I love you, I’ll never forget you, for this award.” Because he had been a staffer. So, that’s digressing a little bit, from what we were talking about, but, those are moments you remember. And, a lot of them involve Martha Griffiths. At the dinner, Sid Yudain named me the Roll Call staffer of the year.

WASNIEWSKI: In terms of staff, this sounds like it was kind of the high-water point for staff interaction.

KELLY: I think so. I really do. And I—that’s something you asked me, I think, before, if you could bring the club back, and, I don’t think so. It showed a very great need at the time, for people. And, to get to know one another. And that was the greatest thing of all, is knowing people. And, Democrats and Republicans, it didn’t matter. We weren’t fighting. It was not ideologically driven in any way. Excuse me. And, we disagreed, sure, just like the politicians who disagreed and the Members who disagree. But at least, we talked about things. And we helped one another.

And, I don’t—Martha wanted—I think I told you this. But there was an article in a paper about a woman, a black woman, who needed help in D.C. And she was living someplace in the area. And there was an article in the paper, and she said, “I want to speak to that woman.” She came out and told me. I said, “Oh, you do? Okay.” Well, maybe it was in Texas. Anyway, I called somebody in that office. And I said, “Can you do anything to help, Martha Griffiths wants to speak to this lady.” Well, I got a call back that afternoon. And they had been in the touch with the person. It was a
Member’s office that helped me do that because he was in our bowling league.

So, I mean, all these things were—and we helped one another, and there was no animosity towards anybody, because of their party affiliation, or anything. And that’s what bothers me about—not so much the Hill, but it starts from there, too. But, how we can’t get anything done. It’s all so partisan. And, I’m a Democrat, and everybody knows I’m a Democrat. They’ll bury me a Democrat, but that’s not the way we help the country.

WASNIEWSKI: Different world, now.

KELLY: It sure is. Much different.

WASNIEWSKI: Thank you for sharing your memories, and I’m looking forward to talking about the latter part of your career the next time we meet.

KELLY: Thank you very much, Matt. I enjoyed it.
WASNIEWSKI: This is Matt Wasniewski from the Office of History and Preservation in the House of Representatives. Today’s date is October 26, 2009, and this is the fifth interview with Pat Kelly, long time House employee. It’s taking place in room H-128, the Board of Education Room in the Capitol. Okay. So, thank you for coming in this morning, Pat.

KELLY: Certainly.

WASNIEWSKI: We were going to pick up where we had left off last time, which was after you had left Representative Griffiths’ office.

KELLY: Yes.


WASNIEWSKI: Okay. How did you come to make that transition into his office?

KELLY: What with Representative Martha Wright Griffiths retiring in 1974, I had a number of interviews just like everybody else did that year. I had an interview with Mr. McHugh, and I guess he was impressed with my background in New York and even though I wasn’t from upstate—he was born in Brooklyn.
I traveled to Binghamton, New York, and he offered me a job, a position as legislative assistant.

**WASNIEWSKI:** And what were your principal duties as legislative assistant? Was it legislation based? Or you had mentioned at one point that you had done a lot of work helping him set up the office.

**KELLY:** Oh yes, I did that, too, because I knew a lot of people who would help with whatever had to be done—furnishing, equipment. Those things like that are important to the Member, and to make the office look nice. And I guess, really, a little bit of information concerning his district and what committee in the House he would like to serve on, and that turned out to be Agriculture, which I didn’t know too much about. But you just don’t get calls or letters from people about agriculture even though you’re from an upstate New York district. There are lots of other things people have always been interested in, foreign affairs and what’s going on in the country, especially what they’re doing at the time. And we had different people in the office that I suggested he might interview for positions in the office in Washington. Mr. McHugh really didn’t know any staffers in the Washington area.

**WASNIEWSKI:** He was one of the Watergate babies.\(^\text{12}\)

**KELLY:** Yes, he was indeed, and they weren’t too much in favor of what was going on in the world and in the Congress. They wanted to do things differently. But first of all, they had to know what’s going on and how things are done in the House and in the Senate, as a matter of fact, just like today. But I did that and well, time went so fast. One time, after he was assigned to serve on the
Agriculture Committee, my friend, Fowler West, chief of staff of the Agriculture Committee, came up and visited with him, and said that he’d do all he could to help him. Later, McHugh requested that I set up a hearing for him in his district. A group of agriculture people testified. So, those are things that we did. When assigned, you did whatever was needed to be done to assist the Member. You may have one title or one thing like that, but oftentimes found yourself doing a lot of different things.

WASNIEWSKI: Sure. And were you involved at all in helping set up district offices in the district?

KELLY: Oh, no. He did that with people in the district. He opened an office in the district.

WASNIEWSKI: So, you were just in the D.C. office itself?

KELLY: Yes. I couldn’t be traveling back and forth.

WASNIEWSKI: Can you describe that time period, 1975, with the Watergate babies? What was the culture of the House like? Because it strikes me, in my reading about House history, that that was a turning point in time, a real time of ferment and change.

KELLY: Yes, it was. It was the beginning of what we have now, too. They didn’t trust too many—I’m not saying that about Mr. McHugh, but there was not much trust in the long-term Members who were serving as chairmen of the House committees. In fact, if you remember, there was objection to some of the senior Democrats who were chairmen of committees.
WASNIEWSKI: Right.

KELLY: They had a certain block, and I can’t recall right now, how many came in that year, and how many new Democrats and Republicans were elected. The Democrats had a large number of new Members.

WASNIEWSKI: It was, I believe, somewhere between 70 and 75 new Democrats came in. It was a large class.

KELLY: Yes, it was big. It was one of the largest groups of new Members. I didn’t know where they were going to go and whether they were going in the right direction or if they came out against a lot of interests of that time.

WASNIEWSKI: Right.

KELLY: Regardless of the person’s age, there were some older Members, for example like Representative [William Robert] Poage, chairman of the Agriculture Committee at the time, who knew his business and came from an agriculture area. But, of course, it was farther away in Texas. I suppose that they got into disagreements in the committee about how you would treat agriculture matters in upstate New York. Not too many people realize how much of New York State is farm area. New York is a major dairy state. Some people were naïve enough to think that New York City is all of New York State and that’s far from it.

WASNIEWSKI: Right.
KELLY: So, that’s about it. In the time frame of 1975, I would like to discuss my association with the many staffers on the Hill and how we tried to help one another through our association with being members of the Congressional Staff Club.

When I first joined the Club in 1957, I really did not know too many fellow staffers. However, through the years I got to know a lot of people on the Hill through the activities of the club. I played on the women’s softball team and was captain of a team in the bowling league and participated in many activities.

In 1976, I became president of the club and prior to that I served on the board. We had an annual dinner where we nominated a person as the man or woman of the year from the House or Senate. That year, I suggested that we give the honor to Robert Michel of Illinois who was a Republican. The club alternated every year presenting the award to a Democrat or Republican. That year I was president, it was a Republican’s turn. At the banquet, Bob, who had been a staffer himself, was rewarded for his support of the staffers and also he was a member of the CSC bowling league. It was a good occasion and I was awarded the staffer of the year by Roll Call owner, Sid Yudain, who once had been a staffer for Representative Albert Morano of Connecticut. What a surprise that was and I was very grateful for the award.

So, in 1978, I went to the Committee on Rules. But I’d known Chairman James J. Delaney of New York for years, and his wife, Lola, and son, Pat Delaney, and my mother were very good friends for years. They were from Queens and they often spoke to one another about certain legislation of interest to both concerning New York. And he would talk to me, just as,
“Hello Pat. Hello Jim,” type of thing. He was sort of like a father or older brother, I suppose. He wasn’t that much older, but it was a very nice relationship. At one point he said, “Well Pat, you’re going to work for me.” That’s just the way Martha had done. It was too short, really, but very hectic. Jim did not resign. He decided not to run again and retired from the House in 1979.

WASNIEWSKI: Let’s move on to the Rules Committee. You were with McHugh’s office for two years, and you came to the Rules Committee in much the same way, you looked for a job after a term. What were your duties working for the Rules Committee?

KELLY: Oh, I did a little bit of everything. As you know, the Committee on Rules has two modes of action. One, it serves as a “traffic cop” for the legislation to be considered on the House Floor, granting rules for bringing legislation to the House Floor for consideration. The other is the role of jurisdictional legislation referred to the committee. I served as a liaison between the individual committees, the committee itself, and the Office of the Parliamentarian. In those days, the committee did not have individual staffers for each Member on the committee. I wrote the floor statements for the Member who was assigned to bring the rule to the floor for consideration.

Representative Delaney had been in the House, but he had been an unsuccessful candidate in 1946. Rep. Delaney came back to the House in 1949, and was, at one time, chairman of a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the use of chemicals, pesticides, and insecticides and something with respect to food products and their relationship. That was back in the 1950s, the 81st and 82nd Congresses [1949–1953]. We still talk...
about the same issues. In 1979, Rep. Delaney was named chairman of the Rules Committee, a committee on which he had served for many years.

With respect to my service on the Rules Committee, I enjoyed working there and meeting all the people I did meet, and continuing their friendships later on. But that was a time when staffers on the Hill were very friendly towards one another, and I think that is the same way the Members were at the time.

Unfortunately, staffers don’t have the time to go around now and meet other staffers. We don’t have any central place or organization just to meet, and we don’t have anything to say, “Hello, how are you? What are you doing?” and sharing views on various subjects of interest.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Yes.

**KELLY:** Well, only for the part about assisting Members on the floor. Of going to the floor and being there, I never went to the floor at all before. Even when my mother was in, or Martha Griffiths, the staffers didn’t do that. Now, you find so many of them on the floor, more than the Members, sometimes. I felt honored to assist Members with the presentations of the rules reported from the committee.

On one occasion, Speaker O’Neill came to the Speaker’s Room on the way to open the House for the day. Speaker O’Neill—of course, I called him Tip on the side, too—said in a booming voice, he said, “Pat! Jim tells me you’re doing a good job.” And I think I just about fell through the floor because the Parliamentarian and others were all standing around, it was just before they went to the House Floor with the Mace and everything. I thought, “Oh God,
where can I go?” That was an interesting time and a friendly time, and I’m glad I was able to serve there.

WASNIEWSKI: I’m curious to know how you made the transition to the Clerk’s Office, because that was something different for you. You had worked for Member offices and with committees for 20 years, and what got you interested in making that transition to work for an Officer of the House?

KELLY: Well, to tell you the truth, I believe, it was hard when Chairman Delaney retired. I was unhappy that I didn’t know what I was going to do. He asked me what he could do to help me, and he said he would talk to the Speaker. A few days later the Speaker came to a CSC party we had over in the Longworth Building one evening and he said, “Pat, you’re going to have a job in the Clerk’s Office.” That was the end of the conversation, and I didn’t know anything more about it than that.

The *Daily Digest* had an opening, and I started there and I’m still there after all these years. [laughter] But that, too, is an experience, because in a way it follows my getting to know so many staffers, because I have to contact all committee clerks and others and inform them that they have to inform the Clerk. “Oh, do we have to do that?” Yes. It’s a rule of the House and so forth that you report to the Clerk within a set time and date about all hearings that are scheduled daily or weekly, and actually update the *Daily Digest* whenever the committees have a change. So, Pages ran to my office with envelopes. We now do it on e-mail. We didn’t get the computers operational, I don’t believe, until the early ’80s. So, that’s been a big help.
WASNIEWSKI: I want to step back just a little bit. Can you describe in a nutshell for people who might be reading this and not understand what the Daily Digest is, what is the Daily Digest? And what, in particular, were your responsibilities for helping assemble it?

KELLY: Under Rule XI (g)(3) of the House, all committees are required to notify the Clerk of the House regarding hearings every week. Then they’re compiled in what is the Daily Digest of the Congressional Record on a weekly or daily basis. I have outcomes first of that day’s activities, and then I do the ones for tomorrow, put that together, then I bind that together and send it down to GPO [Government Printing Office, now the Government Publishing Office]. As times have changed, things have not come as smoothly as I thought they would because the clerks [on committees] are changed a lot. The chief clerks have changed quite a bit, plus subcommittees change.

The biggest change was, of course, when the House went over to the Republicans in 1994 because a lot of people lost their jobs. So, I had to educate the clerks to the fact that they had to comply with the rules of the House and inform me of the information to put in the Congressional Record on a weekly and daily basis. And then afterwards letting me know what happened at each meeting, “Did they mark up such and such a bill? Or was it just a hearing and the witnesses were the same as you’ve sent me yesterday?” Lots of people don’t show up, they may not show for one reason or another. So, we have to take them out. I just can’t put names in without verification.

WASNIEWSKI: Sure.
KELLY: So, it’s just a matter of getting to know people and getting to know what their duties are. Now, if the counsel and the chief of staff and the chief clerk are knowledgeable about the person who’s doing this job, then they would tell me right away. Sometimes, it’s the last thing they might inform a new group of people in the Clerk’s Office. But most of the time they’ve been very good and very helpful. And I’ve called up a couple of people, I’m not going to mention names but, “Okay, I’m putting so and so and so and so in it.” “Whatever you want, Pat, that’s right.” They do give me compliments on that, and I’m appreciative then, and they are also very cooperative.

So, that’s the whole story. And it’s printed daily in The Daily Digest of the Congressional Record and when either the House or Senate is in session, and its program for the next week is put in on Thursday or Friday depending upon if they’re both in session or one is in session. So, I have to keep in contact with the Senate to make sure, and sometimes they don’t know until late in the night on a Thursday that they’re not going to be in on Friday. So, I send a copy down anyway Thursday night to be printed. And if there are a lot of changes, and we or the other body is in session, I have to put another updated copy out Friday. It’s a difficult job at times, and sometimes you make mistakes like everybody else does. Most of the time I proof all of my entries myself. I don’t have anybody who proofs my job. May have to now, made a boo-boo the other day. But someone said, “Oh, forget about it Pat, how many have you made?” And I said, “None.”

So, did those things bother me? Yes. I’ve enjoyed it, though. I’ve learned a great deal, too, from the various people I’ve met and talked with at the full committees and the various subcommittees.
WASNIEWSKI: When you first came in, the *Digest* job was in what we now call Legislative Operations. It’s been there from the beginning?

KELLY: Yes. I’ve been mainly over with the enrolling clerks in one room at one point in the Capitol, H-157, and then in HB-6 Capitol.

WASNIEWSKI: Do you remember where that was?

KELLY: On the first floor of the Capitol and then in HB-6, opposite the cafeteria.

WASNIEWSKI: Okay.

KELLY: It was a step up into the office. And that’s on the way over to the Senate. So, the Pages would come running in with numerous notices. And then we were moved to HT-13. Also for a few years I was in the Official Reporters’ office in 1718 Longworth Building, to begin using a computer.

WASNIEWSKI: Do you have any memories of some of the Clerks you had worked with early on? Some of these names I had listed were Edmund [Ted] Henshaw . . .

KELLY: Oh, yes, I knew Ted when he was in the office of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee in the Cannon Building when I was with the Un-American Activities Committee.

WASNIEWSKI: Ben Guthrie?

KELLY: Yes, I knew Ben, he had been with GPO. I think they picked him up from GPO. And then Donn Anderson—I remember him as a Page from
California, and a lot of people knew him very well. Yes. So, I remember them very well. Donn is quite a man and he was very knowledgeable about a lot of things. And I enjoyed him and Ted Henshaw, of course.

Also I must mention Jeff Trandahl of South Dakota. He was Clerk from 1999 to 2005. Jeff was a very special person with all the staffers because he had been one. At the time the Clerks were not as close to all the Clerk’s staff as the present Clerk [Lorraine C. Miller] is. They had their own job to do, and they didn’t get involved too much with staff. They’re there for the Members. And so, if you did your job that was just fine and if you made some mistakes, be knowledgeable about it and see what they could do to help so we wouldn’t do it again, the whole unit. And they did a good job, I think, as far as the Members are concerned.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Your time in the Clerk’s Office spanned an era when it shifted from—well really, in the ’60s and into the ’70s it shifted from kind of a patronage organization, and Donn Anderson’s career spanned the same time period as well, to an era when it became more professionalized. But what are your observations about the Clerk’s Office in general and how it changed in the 30 years that you’ve worked there?

**KELLY:** Well, I’m not particularly knowledgeable about who was patronage on the staffs and all that, and who wasn’t patronage. That didn’t mean anything to me, really, and yes, there are always some of the people, I didn’t even know how they got their jobs. I mean, we didn’t discuss that. They just know who you were and where you’d been before, and all of that. But as far as patronage discussions, I don’t remember having one, and nobody approached me on it
either. So, I can’t really say. And I really don’t think I should, because I don’t know how it changed over.

I do know it’s more operational and it’s a much better organization now. My heavens, I think every other year I get a new computer. There’s something new coming all the time. I mean, I remember coming on the Hill using a manual typewriter, and then we went to the electric and all of that, but it’s helped our jobs immensely. Sometimes a little bit too much.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Was there a big turning point, in terms of technology, that you can recall?

**KELLY:** I was talking to the others in the office as to when we got computers. Technology has done a lot for us and speeded us up, but still we have as much paperwork because we have to keep our records. And we can’t depend completely on the computers. We have to keep examples of what we do so we can teach others. And I know that it has helped the tally clerks a lot, especially because I see them doing their work late at night and everything. And everybody in the office is part of the legislative process on the floor. Right from the bill clerks, the digest clerks, the enrolling clerks, the reading clerks, then the journal clerks, and the tally clerks, and all, and it’s really an operational office and it’s constantly in motion when the House is in session. I mean, there’s something going on all the time to get material to GPO each night. I don’t know how often the journal clerks have to really get it finalized, but they have a little bit more time. I mean, the staff just wants to get it out so they can tell what the Congress has done every day.

And they can look it up and have a record on it. And if there’s some mistake in it, well, then it has to be corrected. But I’m surprised there aren’t more
mistakes made due to deadlines faced, because of the newness and the depth of the information that they can obtain from it and put it together to make a good publication.

**WASNIEWSKI:** What would your typical day have looked like in 1979? Coming to the office—walk me through a typical day when you first started versus now.

**KELLY:** Well, first it was starting up a brand new job, which I didn’t know anything about. It was difficult. And I had not been left with a lot of information, and that’s why I went right into the office. I told you, the enrolling office, and we only stayed together there for a while because that was a time when a lot of Congressmen were looking for these nice suites in the Capitol. I mean, that was their prerogative. But we had a nice room up on the first floor of the Capitol (H-157) with a fireplace and everything, not that we used it. I was in an alleyway, I walked in the door and I was in a little alleyway like this, an alcove like, and then you went into the bigger room, like a little entrance room.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Okay.

**KELLY:** I’ll show you where it is upstairs if you want me to, later.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Sure, that’d be great.

**KELLY:** And I sat at my desk and I had all this material coming in. It came in all sorts of forms, hand delivered or inside mail or via the Pages. And well, I thought to myself, am I going to be able to cope with all of this? And then with the typewriter, and then with the Pages running in and out, the telephone calls,
and trying to get all of this together, “This is for today, this is for tomorrow, this is for next week.” I said, “Well, I’ve always had to do that.” It took a while to get myself acclimated to what I was going to do, how I was going to do it to make it faster, especially with the darn old typewriters we had. I mean, it was good then. We all thought that was wonderful to have that electric typewriter. The other one, “clang, clang, clang.” And so, that’s about all I could tell you.

And I consulted with the enrolling people about how this material was used before I came. And so, they knew, basically, and they did help me at that time. They had four staffers, so if their time was down in the office for a while, they might help me out a little bit, “Hey, Pat, this is the way I think they’ve been doing this.” So, there’s no book on how to do the job, you just had to find out what was done, how it was done the best you could, and then apply it yourself and try to update it as best you could.

WASNIEWSKI: Right. So, the particulars of the job haven’t changed so much over time, it’s just the way that technology has allowed you to do a lot more.

KELLY: Yes, yes it has, definitely. But as I said, it’s still a lot of paperwork.

WASNIEWSKI: In a more general sense, I’d like to ask you to step back from how computers changed the way you did your work. When you look at the way technology changed the House during your time here, and I’m thinking everything from electronic voting, to television, to computers, to the internet. If you had to summarize in one word or a phrase, what’s your perception on the way that technology has changed the House as an institution.
KELLY: Well, I don’t think it’s changed what they have to do to begin with, just how to get things done faster. But it has made people more knowledgeable about what the House does and what they have to do under the rules. They have rules to follow. And I think that, in a sense, has made them more involved—inolved would be the word, I think, involved in how things are done and knowledgeable about how they are done. And each year, I think there’s some changes that are good.

Now, I was on the Committee on Rules when we had the hearings about whether the House proceedings should be televised, and apparently Speaker O’Neill wanted it to go forward and a lot of people were skeptical about it. And the Rules Committee—I mean the Members, they weren’t all in favor of it. Some were very passionate about having it, and Rep. Jack [Bascom] Brooks of Texas, who was chairman of the Oversight Committee at that time, testified in support of it. And I think that changed a lot of how people reacted in the House, and seeing how the Members felt. The only problem seemed to be it might prolong proceedings in the House, doing a bill and all, because everybody wants to say something, and sometimes the chairman of a committee can allow just so much time for debate. Because the Committee on Rules only allows a limited time for debate on a measure. It is different in the Senate. They could have a filibuster.

And so, they have to use those minutes properly, and the person who’s in favor, and against it, and so forth. So, they all get time to talk about it, talk about their concerns with the pending legislation. But it, I think basically, has helped. The only thing that is really a little difficult in our office is at the end of the day when they have special orders.
That’s a problem. Because that keeps people there until—sometimes you’ll have two hours, sometimes you’ll have four hours just to speak about anything they want. But in a sense, it’s got a good thing about it because the people from California can say some things that maybe they didn’t get to talk about during debate before. So, they will talk about it in the special orders time frame. So, it’s good for people far away. And I don’t know how they handle it in Hawaii. But, I mean, it’s giving Members more time to talk about what they believe in and how they feel about a particular issue or subject matter and not within the confines of two hours of general debate.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Right. In a way, it’s almost democratized the process for rank-and-file Members.

**KELLY:** Yes, it has. Yes, I believe that’s a good way of putting it.

**WASNIEWSKI:** It allows them to get a message out that might be a message that the leadership necessarily wouldn’t have time to put out.

**KELLY:** Well, that’s right, I agree with that.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Just out of curiosity, what were—and I’ve heard some of the objections, I’m just curious to know if they were along similar lines. But what were some of the concerns for people who may have—you don’t have to give names, but the concerns people voiced about having television during that debate at the time?

**KELLY:** Well, as I said, I think they thought maybe it might end up like the Senate’s filibustering. And they had to be really careful about controlling the time,
because that’s not what we have here in the House. The chairmen of the various committees, in bringing the legislation to the floor, have to keep within the confines of the measures being considered and within their Members’ interests, so that they can put so and so on their committee to talk for or against it. And that’s a little bit different, I think, because the others, well, they just didn’t get a chance anyway. So, there wasn’t any reason to get up on the floor too much to talk about it.

But during a special orders session, I can talk about all that’s wrong with that bill. I can see it coming when the health bill [The Affordable Care Act] comes to the floor again. But right now, it’s a whole different atmosphere in the House that I can see, and I’m sure a lot of other people would agree with me. With the Members not getting along or even knowing each other. Maybe not so much in a delegation, but in their committee work, I think. I don’t go to the committee meetings, so I can’t tell you what statements are made there, but lots of times, I think when they are in their offices where there’s some Democrat and Republican who usually socializes with other Members and their staffs. And it’s not that we didn’t have any more business at that time, because depending upon the bill being considered, or the subject matter, then it could be very busy, busy, all the time. And more so than others, I guess.

But generally speaking, I think it lacks comity—is that the word I want?—is bad. And you can have very different opinions about particular legislation, but it’s gone beyond that, I think, where it’s personal. And maybe they think that’s good for television, or they’re good for something else, I don’t know. But that’s also in the newspapers. Very much so about finding something bad about somebody or something and putting it in the newspaper. You feel
badly about hearing somebody chastised for publicity that may not be true. That’s basically what I feel about that, but they’ve got to get back together again and talk to one another, Democrats and Republicans.

And that should be really something that happens in the committees, because if it doesn’t happen there, it’s not going to happen later on. And it doesn’t—if you have a caucus of Democrats and Republicans, it’ll be, “Okay, let’s get together, let’s talk to one another. And by the way, who’s your neighbor there?” And they’d be a Republican—“Why don’t you try to engage that person in conversation about a particular bill or particular legislation?” And that was done years ago, I know it was, because I was in the room with many, many Members where they talked about certain legislation they were absolutely opposed to. And in this way when they got their ideas then they came together with a compromise.

And I don’t see that now, and that’s why health took so long. But, of course, we have to blame Mrs. Clinton for that in 1992, right? When she came before the Ways and Means Committee? Well, that was handled wrong, but it shouldn’t have been pounced on as bad, because she had some good ideas. Obviously, she’s an intelligent woman, she’s now Secretary of State and been a Senator from New York. So, I mean, on her own, she’s a smart woman, but maybe that was the wrong approach then, in the year ’92. Who knows? It was too voluminous, and as a proposal, because we had to do so many things to correct it, we still haven’t corrected all those things. And financial problems were not explained.

One of my own nieces, in August of 2009, I think it was, said to me, “Pat, what are they going to do? I’m paying enough bills, I have five children.”
She was afraid that she was going to be paying more and more for health coverage. I said, “Listen, Ellen,” that is her name, Ellen Kelly Gerard, and I said, “It’s only started in the Senate. In fact, this is just the beginning.” But by the newspapers, you thought it was really about to come up to a House vote the next week or two, and that doesn’t help the Congress in any way when it was just starting in Senate. And I said, “Don’t you understand that no action has been taken in the House yet?”

WASNIEWSKI: Yes, half the equation.

KELLY: So, I have—yes. I have to talk to my own family about it. “Hey, just wait. We’ll see what happens.” But you can always call and always go talk to your own Member and send him or her a little note or an email and say, “Look, I don’t want you to support this or that.” And they do take that into consideration when it is being considered in committee and on the floor. I learned that from my own mother. But you shouldn’t pounce on these people without writing to them. Do not believe everything you read in the newspaper.

I know that I might have told you this story, but years, and years, and years ago we had a Bishop Fulton Sheen who has passed away. He was a bishop in New York, later a cardinal, and a very, very good man. And someone asked him, “Well, how long does it take you to read the New York Times?” He said, “Oh, about 10 minutes.” I mean, that put down the newspaper then, and that’s many, many years ago. And I got his point. You have to find out things in your own district, your own area, and learn what’s going on. And that everybody should be involved in learning the issues and not just the opinion of the media. “Oh, this must be correct, because it’s in the
newspaper.” No, no. Some of them are very good journalists, some of them are not. One of my favorites was Walter Cronkite and I mean he spoke right to the point and said what he had and that was it. There was no embellishment of anything, and that’s why so many people liked him. Tom Brokaw is another one, but I mean I’m just mentioning these names for an example of good journalism, not slanted one way or the other.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Sure.

**KELLY:** And you just can’t take what the newspapers or TV broadcasts say without studying it yourself. I know people don’t have enough time to do that, but when it involves a particular issue of interest like health, you go in and talk to your Member, or send a letter or an e-mail to them. Or anyway, they all have Internet, too, all have computers, so why don’t you send a note to your Member and see what reaction you get.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Just to follow up on that, people are frustrated with the political process. If you look at the way that the House, and Congress, in general, is rated so lowly in polls, it’s a 10-percent, 15-percent approval rating nowadays. But there’s one side of the equation that would say, “Well, that’s because of the media, and the way that the media portrays politics. And the media has become much more partisan over time.” Basically, it’s a post-Watergate phenomenon. And there’s another group of people who have said, “Well, we’ve always been partisan, and really it was that era after World War II where there was a lot of bipartisan consensus because you had so many people who had fought together in the war and came from common backgrounds.” Because your career spans this era, I’m wondering what’s your perspective on that?
KELLY: On what in particular?

WASNIEWSKI: Increasing partisanship—

KELLY: Yes, right.

WASNIEWSKI: —in the latter part of the 20th century. Do you attribute that more to the generational change? That World War II generation that had to cooperate on so many things and their passing? Or that we’re in a time when the media tends to focus on partisan issues?

KELLY: Well, basically, I think we have many, many other things that people have gotten knowledgeable about through the media, which is good. I mean, that they know about issues. But they have to do more in-depth reading or pursuing of the issues. Look at the issues from various sides before making a final decision on a particular issue. I think it’s very much needed to have bipartisanship in some way, in some fashion. Take, for example, just recently in the Senate, when Senator Olympia [Jean] Snowe went along with the health bill. Senator Snowe went along with the bill that was passed out of the committee. “But this may be my only vote in favor.” Now, see, that’s what I’m talking about is what they pick up and what they say about some issue. Not so much that she was the only Republican, but that Republicans want to punish her.

And bipartisanship was just something I grew up with, I guess. I mean, just feeling that always listening to the other person and you didn’t have to necessarily agree with them or disagree with them. Even talking to one another about it, “Maybe we can do better. Maybe we can compromise on
this thing. Just try it again and see what happens.” But it’s not very helpful. Let’s just say that media has not helped it that much. They like to stir up the pot a little. But basically, it’s a wonderful group of people trying their best but maybe not doing it the right way.

**WASNIEWSKI:** You mentioned the Republican takeover in 1995 when they came into the majority.

**KELLY:** Right.

**WASNIEWSKI:** I’m just wondering, you had worked in a House that was solidly Democratic your entire career up until that point—

**KELLY:** Yes.

**WASNIEWSKI:** What were some of the structural changes you saw? Or what were your impressions about the way that changed the institution? Did it affect you at all?

**KELLY:** No, not really. Oh, except the whole committee staffs were changed, from the minority to the majority. In the Clerk’s Office, we are bipartisan. As you know, my mother was a Democratic Member and a lot of Republicans in Brooklyn voted for her. But it was just when she got into a primary fight, which she did, a lot of those people were Republican and they couldn’t vote in the Democratic primary. So, that’s ironic, I think, to have that occur. But basically, I think that they’re doing a good job and they just need to pursue it and just get down and get the work done, and not be critical of other people’s views. But I think that criticism comes with the media. That’s where
it’s difficult, I think, for them to take because then they have to respond to that and that’s what happens: back and forth.

But in 1995 I don’t think there was that much difficulty in seeing that—well, it depends, maybe it’s about time that we have a change. Who knows? Of course, times change with new people coming into the country and different districts changing through immigration. I don’t mean illegal, I’m meaning legal immigration. And people move around, they go to where they can go to schools or they can go to a place where they can afford to live and can get a job.

Look at what’s happening in Michigan, it’s terrible now. The unemployment in the auto industry, I mean, this is just my personal opinion. That should have never occurred. The industry did not pay attention to all the influx of different autos, Toyota, Honda, all those different groups. And we just kept building the cars just the way they’ve always done it, and that was a mistake of the industry. And people pick up on that, but gee, that’s their livelihood, that’s their kids going to school. When I just talked to somebody in my office today, “I can’t imagine paying $30,000 a year for high school. I can’t imagine it.” And my brother had eight children, and now I have 23 great nieces and nephews all going through high school, college, and, some, law school. I think that the prices are just unbelievable. Money is the whole root of this problem we have. Root of all evil in some ways, and it should be resolved as soon as possible.

**WASNIEWSKI:** So, in 1995, your job, your responsibilities didn’t change.
KELLY: It is a rule of the House, Rule XI, clause (g)(3), to report to the Clerk of the House the schedules of committee meetings, daily and weekly. And every two years the House adopts new rules. They don’t have to change them, but they have to pass them, they have to approve of them in the House. And if anybody wanted to change the rules, they could do it, but I don’t think there was any objection to it because it is important information that is part of the legislative history.

WASNIEWSKI: Right.

KELLY: Would you be covering up something? And would you be letting television do it all? I mean, there are certain things we should have records of, and The Daily Digest is part of the legislative history of all measures. And the Senate has their rules. So, we have to have those things.

WASNIEWSKI: Major component of what the Clerk does.

KELLY: That’s right.

WASNIEWSKI: It’s institutional.

KELLY: Yes.

WASNIEWSKI: Institutional record keeper. I want to wrap up the Clerk portion here and then have a couple of general wrap-up questions. These are questions we ask of everyone who’s been here a long time about two events in 1998 and 2001. It was kind of a, “Where were you? What were you doing? What was your perspective?” First, the shooting and the Capitol police officers in 1998,
which is for people who have worked up on the Hill, is a big institutional benchmark in terms of security up here and people remember it because it was a tragic day. What were you doing that day?

KELLY: I was in my office working. It’s just like when 9/11 occurred. We got the word, we had to run down the steps of the Capitol, and we saw the smoke coming up over on the other side of the river in Virginia at the Defense Department. I mean, it was just unbelievable. And it was unbelievable that anybody could get in and do the things that they’re doing in the House, to the U.S. Capitol Police. It was unbelievable.

WASNIEWSKI: Yes, on the East Front.

KELLY: Right.

WASNIEWSKI: Where were you on September 11th, since you started off with that, what steps did you go running down?

KELLY: We went down the West Front of the Capitol steps. We got out the main door, and went down the steps. And everybody gathered on the Mall. We ran down to the Mall, and all hand in hand. Florence Heacock, assistant journal clerk, and I were holding hands running down to the Mall. Florence is from South Dakota. She bowled with us in the CSC bowling league when we had a league. So, we just happened to be walking down—“Oh, come on, Pat, hurry up!” And then we got down at the bottom of it and then I guess it was Gigi Kelaher, chief of Legislative Operations, who was trying to take a count of, “Do we have everybody out here?”
So, they’re going on and all of a sudden some TV news reporter put a microphone in front of me, I forget who it was on the television, and of course we were all so nervous at that time. “Well, how did you get here?” I said, “We were told to leave, and we left,” that’s all I said. It was on the news that afternoon. But it was very scary, let’s put it that way.

And I think it brought a lot of attention to what people should do to be careful and to watch out themselves to help the police if there’s anything suspicious going on. We can’t have a policeman on every corner. And I don’t mind the inspections and all that, taking your shoes off at the airport and all that, it doesn’t bother me. But I must say, sometimes I wonder, and I’d just like to cringe. I’m sure a lot of people feel that way. There’s a new group of officers who don’t know you, and that’s a problem too. We can go overboard on anything if we want to, and sometimes we do, but I’m not saying that as far as the security up here. And you have seen them yourself, I’m sure, in the newspaper with people shooting people or just blowing each other up. I mean, I just don’t understand how anybody can kill anybody.

Unfortunately, we have a different climate in the country and some people, I don’t know whether they are sick themselves, or what they are, but they’re causing a lot of problems and that diverts the policemen from the things that they have to do. And another thing, parents aren’t very careful, I guess, in some ways, when they let their children out of their sight for even a moment. There’s a lot of things that we have to do that we never had to do before, and we have to do them with calmness and knowledge that things will go all right. And also believe in God more and hope that He will help us.
WASNIEWSKI: On September 11th, did you go back to your offices at any point, or did you just go home for the day?

KELLY: No, we were sent home. We were sent home for a couple of days and then we came back in, because they didn’t know where it all emanated from and what we should be doing and all that. But it was just awful. I just couldn’t imagine anything like that happening here in the U.S.

WASNIEWSKI: And as a New Yorker it must have been doubly—

KELLY: Oh, yes, because I have one nephew who works with the Federal Reserve System in New York, and he takes the ferry to New York from New Jersey every day. And then I had others in the area. And you just didn’t know. They all had to come back to New Jersey, or they stayed some place or what have you. I’m the only one left on my side of the family.

And Grace, my sister-in-law, had to worry about all eight of her children, where they were and how they were. And it was very scary. But these things can happen anywhere. People get a hold of explosive material and they just throw it at a car or do anything like that just to disrupt and to hate one another, that’s just really the basis of it.

WASNIEWSKI: I’d like to just wrap up with two final questions and I think I had proposed these earlier. I talk to a lot of people who have got 25 years or 30 years here. Some people almost count down the days until they can head out the door, but you’ve been here well past those milestones. So, I’m curious, what’s your motivation for working for this institution for so long? You’ve been here for 53 years.
KELLY: Because I love the institution itself, and I like my work. I have met so many Members and staffers through the years. I like the people I have to work with to get the information I need, on a daily and weekly basis. I just don’t know. I just really have enjoyed it so much that it’s going to be hard to leave. Over the years, I remember some of those people just counting down the days and flipping the calendar, but I don’t know what they’re doing now, or what their motives were, or anything. I just don’t—I don’t understand that feeling about, “Oh, boy, it’s a terrible thing to work.” Maybe, I don’t know—don’t understand thinking or feeling that way. I’ll leave when I think I should leave.

WASNIEWSKI: One final question, that is, if you were approached by a young person who was in college or just coming out of college and they said, “I’d like to get your advice on how to get a job in the House and how to survive, how to succeed in that institution,” what would your advice be?

KELLY: Well, I guess my advice to them, like if I was talking to one of my own nieces or nephews, first of all, you have to be knowledgeable about many things. You have to be knowledgeable about issues of the world, and about state and local concerns. And think of service to your fellow countrymen in one area or one legislative body, whether it be in the state, in the Congress, or local government, whatever it might be. Think, “I wonder if I could really do something to help them do a better job?” And not just to be picking up a paycheck, but to really say, “Well, what can I really do?” If they have to have the desire to do it, number one, it’s just not a job to go up and apply for. I mean, you have to have a feeling, like I do, about the institution itself.
And I, of course, I had my mother as a great example of integrity, honesty. And I knew that from a child. My father, who had been a city court justice in Brooklyn, New York, as you know, was killed in an accident during a blackout on eastern Long Island when I was eight years old in 1942. So, my mother brought up both my brother Bill and myself, who was 12 at the time. And we were inspired by her, by what she did, and whether she was assisting others during World War II, for example, Red Cross work, or whatever she was doing, and then she was very busy in local politics because she knew everybody. And the fact that she may have taken advantage of that, and they took advantage of her, and their use of her because of her knowledge of these people and their needs.

Irwin Steingut, who was the speaker of the New York state assembly from the 18th district in Brooklyn, had her come on board to help the women’s organization after World War II to just get going again because they’d been so busy with their husbands being away or whatever the reason might have been. So, she did that and was very successful. At one point, speaker Steingut appointed her as research director for the Democratic Party in the state assembly. And then after that then she just got active more and more and a vacancy came about in the 10th Congressional District. Irwin Steingut and the Brooklyn delegation nominated her for Congress.

But that all is part of my background. And I’ve seen that, and I’ve seen the death of my father, and I’ve seen the end of World War II, the beginning of the Korean War, and people going off to war and not coming back. And so, I said, “Well, I don’t know what I want to do.” I was very interested in music there for a while. But I thought, “I don’t know, I’m not good enough to do that.” I enjoyed it, myself, but I’m not good enough. “I believe I would like
to go to Washington and work for the House.” And that’s the way it all started.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Given that background, and given that kind of training that you had through the family, interest in politics.

**KELLY:** Yes.

**WASNIEWSKI:** What’s the single most important trait, you think, for a successful staffer up here on the Hill?

**KELLY:** Loyalty to and honesty for whomever you work. And because then you’re only loyal to yourself and your ideas. If you’re not, and if you can’t go into somebody and say to them, “Well, I can’t agree with you,” which I did many times, I went in and I said, “I’m sorry, I disagree with this approach,” or something like that. “Do you mind my speaking my mind?” Because when you are a legislative assistant, for example, you have to help a little bit with ideas. Or I’d just say, “I’m hearing these things. Do you know about that?” And that’s not being disloyal, that’s being honest about what you’re hearing and learning from others. And the Members depend upon that.

But don’t come in and mouth a bunch of stuff that’s been in the newspaper and things like that. Just think it through yourself, but the main thing is for people, even if they don’t run for anything or they don’t come to work here, is to get involved locally and know the issues of the day. Go in and ask the Member, or tell him something that you are concerned about in proposed legislation. And if you can’t get him just speak to the administrative assistant or speak to somebody else. But be active in your local community. So, we
don’t get any clinkers coming in here. [laughter] Not only that, but the safety of the country is very important to me, and to you, I’m sure.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Yes, it is. Well, I’ve really appreciated our discussions. Do you have anything you want to add, or have I missed anything?

**KELLY:** No, I don’t think you have missed anything. There’s a funny side to it too, I mean, you have to have a little bit of humor to work up here. You really do. As you say, that’s why I say that there are so many diverse people here, and I don’t see it as much now because I’m not usually in a Member’s office or a committee. But I think that’s the most important thing, to get to know people, and to get to know them on a personal basis. And just not mouth somebody else’s ideas or words that you hear about. Get your ideas out of your own head because we all have them, basically. We don’t share them, necessarily. But I think that’s a pretty good thing.

But you have to have that desire to come here and work, and not be coming here to have people see you on the floor, or see you in a committee, or see you there, and then hope that you have some idea of what’s going on. That’s not it. We’re not television stars by any means, especially when they take the camera away, that’s what I was worried about, a little while ago, at my picture. [laughter] Anyway, you have to have a deep desire for it. And I, apparently, must have had it after seeing what had gone on in my life and to have hoped I could make a difference. But at least be in the process of trying to help others. I think that’s the bottom line, always to do that.

**WASNIEWSKI:** Well, good. Thank you very much, Pat. I’ve appreciated our talking.
KELLY: Thank you. I have, too.
NOTES

1 Paul Whiteman was a popular jazz band conductor and showman in the 1920s.
2 The William E. Kelly Park, located in Brooklyn, NY, was named in 1929.
5 Hale Boggs first entered the House in January 1941 and ran unsuccessfully for renomination at the end of that term. He won the seat again and re-entered the House in 1947 and served 12 additional terms after that. When he died in a plane crash in 1972, his wife [Corrine Claiborne] Lindy Boggs, succeeded him and served from 1973 to 1991.
8 James Kee was the son. John Kee was the father.
9 The assassination attempt against Truman occurred on November 1, 1950, outside Blair House, the President’s official residence for guests of state.
10 Founded in 1919, the Little Congress Club—an organization comprised mainly of congressional aides—offered staff first-hand exposure to parliamentary procedures and public speaking experience. The Little Congress modeled itself after the House of Representatives, adopting similar rules, electing officers, and even debating legislation. The club disbanded in the 1940s.
11 Senator Charles Curtis of Kansas and Representative Daniel Read Anthony, Jr., of Kansas.
12 “Watergate babies” refers to the class of 75 Democratic freshmen elected to Congress in 1974 in the wake of President Richard Milhous Nixon’s resignation.
14 Lorraine C. Miller served as Clerk of the House from February 15, 2007 to January 5, 2011.