

## ABSTRACT

### A RHETORICAL STUDY OF THE APPROPRIATIONS SPEAKING OF CLARENCE ANDREW CANNON IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1923-1964

By

William Measey Fulkerson, Jr.

This study provides an historical evaluation of the speaking of Clarence Andrew Cannon in the House of Representatives. The primary emphasis of the examination lies in the analysis of Appropriation speeches, and on speeches by Cannon which might significantly affect the appropriations for the historical period, and/or would affect Cannon's appropriation philosophy.

Chapter One explains the goals and methodology of the study. Chapter Two illustrates the materials which provided Cannon with a background for public speaking and politics, and also describes Cannon's methods of speech preparation. Chapters Three through Eight deal with six specific speeches under six different Presidents.

Each chapter begins with a general setting of the period and then relates the significant items which might affect the speaker, speech, audience, and the occasion. The writing of the chapters attempts to create a sense of the times, and informs the reader about the historical occurrences which place the speech situation into perspective.

The chapters (Three to Eight) analyze Cannon's speaking under three headings: logical analysis, emotional analysis, and ethical analysis. The speeches are described, analyzed, interpreted and evaluated within the text of this thesis: the actual speeches follow the text. Finally, the concluding chapter makes an evaluation of Cannon's speaking and points

out certain rhetorical principles employed by Cannon throughout his career.

The results of this study reveal two major things about the speaking of Clarence Andrew Cannon. First, his speaking as an experienced Chairman of the Appropriations Committee changed significantly from his early Congressional speeches. Second, the change in his speaking demonstrated the validity of a rhetorical concept which has received a great deal of attention in recent speech journals.

Cannon's early Congressional speaking was based on the use of evidence and reasoning. These early speeches demonstrate careful preparation and careful deployment of argumentative techniques as the major emphasis of his speaking. For proof he relied heavily upon testimony, examples, statistics, and historical documentation to support disjunctive and hypothetical syllogisms. He also employed several cause-effect relationships, analogies, and examples to arrive at the conclusions.

Cannon's later speeches depend almost entirely on his personal experience as chairman of the Appropriations Committee and as a Congressman. This study illustrates the gradual change from a young Congressman relying on someone else for evidence, to the mature Congressman relying on personal experiences. The study also demonstrates several mistakes in judgment and changes in techniques during the growth and maturity of the speaker.

The rhetorical concept of ethos received special attention in this theses. Since Cannon's early speeches depended on documented evidence and reasoning, while his later speeches depended on experience and position, the development of ethos over this forty-one year period was evident. By

developing careful, documented work, by being prepared to respond to his colleagues' questions and arguments, Cannon was able to establish a reputation for accuracy and dependability. As he gained stature in the House he relied less frequently on specific documents and more frequently on his personal experience and opinion. The study demonstrates that his colleagues trusted him " . . . about things in general, while on points outside the realm of exact knowledge, where opinion is divided, . . . " they trusted him absolutely (Cooper's The Rhetoric of Aristotle, p. 8).

A RHETORICAL STUDY OF THE APPROPRIATIONS  
SPEAKING OF CLARENCE ANDREW CANNON IN  
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1923-1964

By

William Measey Fulkerson, Jr.

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Speech and Theatre

1969



©, Copyright by  
WILLIAM MEASEY FULKERSON, JR.  
1970

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis was accomplished because of the dedication of those teachers at the B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. level. Of particular significance are those professors (other than my committee) at Michigan State University who gave me encouragement and who spent extra time relating their knowledge and personal experiences: Dr. Fred Alexander, Dr. Gordon Thomas, Dr. William Lashbrook, and Dr. Jerry Anderson.

I am extremely grateful to my committee for their patience and their promptness in reading my materials. Dr. David Ralph has provided me with excellent guidance in the preparation and decision-making of the thesis material. Dr. Kenneth Hance and Dr. Madison Kuhn have provided me with invaluable assistance in suggesting changes in writing, style, and material for the thesis. Dean Jack Bain has been gracious in taking time off from his administrative duties to assist in the completion of this project.

I owe a special debt of gratitude to Mrs. Clarence Cannon for her gracious letter allowing me to use her husband's papers. The Western Manuscripts Collection staff at the University of Missouri was extremely cooperative, and the staff of the Truman Library also assisted me in my search for Cannon materials.

I would like to thank my wife and family for allowing me a short temper and for providing me the time to finish this thesis. I would also like to thank the staff and students at Fresno State College for providing encouragement and patience.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. A STUDY IN CONTEMPORARY PUBLIC ADDRESS . . . . .	I
Methodology (2)--The Purpose of the Study (5)--Sources (7) Justification of the Study (8)	
CHAPTER II. BIOGRAPHY AND SPEECH PREPARATION . . . . .	11
Speech Preparation (25)--Conclusion (34)	
CHAPTER III. CANNON BEGINS WITH COOLIDGE: 1922-1928 . . . . .	36
Logical Analysis (40)--Emotional Analysis (48)--Ethical Analysis (52)--Conclusion (56)	
CHAPTER IV. CANNON AND HOOVER FACE THE DEPRESSION: 1928-1932 .	58
Logical Analysis (61)--Emotional Analysis (66)--Ethical Analysis (69)--Conclusion (70)	
CHAPTER V. ROOSEVELT AND RELIEF . . . . .	72
Logical Analysis (75)--Emotional Analysis (80)--Ethical Analysis (82)--Conclusion (84)	
CHAPTER VI. THE TWO MISSOURIANS . . . . .	86
Logical Analysis (88)--Emotional Analysis (96)--Ethical Analysis (98)--Conclusion (101)	
CHAPTER VII. CANNON AND EISENHOWER . . . . .	103
Logical Analysis (105)--Emotional Analysis (111)--Ethical Analysis (112)--Conclusion (114)	
CHAPTER VIII. CANNON STALLS KENNEDY . . . . .	116
Logical Analysis (119)--Emotional Analysis (124)--Ethical Analysis (129)--Conclusion (130)	
CHAPTER IX. CONCLUSIONS ABOUT CLARENCE CANNON . . . . .	132
Cannon as an Appropriator (132)--Cannon's Use of the Modes of Proof (136)--Cannon's Effectiveness (138)--Evaluation (142)	

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	147
APPENDIX A . . . . .	153
APPENDIX B . . . . .	166
APPENDIX C . . . . .	175
APPENDIX D . . . . .	181
APPENDIX E . . . . .	198
APPENDIX F . . . . .	206

## CHAPTER ONE

### A STUDY IN CONTEMPORARY PUBLIC ADDRESS

Clarence Cannon, powerful political figure and grandfather, has carved a firm niche for himself in our Nation's history. The chroniclers of our times must give him their attention, for he was instrumental in molding a responsible, responsive Government to lead our Nation in times of peril and plenty.<sup>1</sup>

When a man can control the expenditures of a government, and is not the President of the government, then that man, and perhaps the government that he is controlling, should be investigated. There have been several books and articles which have dealt with the power of the Senate and House committee system. There have been debates about changing the seniority system, but the solutions have generally been disregarded or considered unwise. Clarence Cannon was one of the products of the seniority system; and though he received adverse criticism about his leadership, at least one member of Congress pointed to Cannon's rise to power with pride. Representative Ben F. Jensen of Iowa included in his eulogy of Cannon an editorial from the Washington Daily News.

The death of Clarence Cannon plus the succession of George H. Mahon offers the country a glimpse into how our Government works. There is nothing secret about it. The glamour of the Presidency simply distracts attention from a handful of powerful men in the House of Representatives whose influence in their chosen fields is second only to that of the man in the White House. Since they stay on, and on, while Presidents change, this influence even may be greater.

---

<sup>1</sup>Representative Clement J. Zablocki, Memorial Service Held In The House of Representatives And Senate Of The United States, Together With Remarks Presented In Eulogy Of Clarence Andrew Cannon (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Office, 1964), pp. 200-201. Cited hereafter as Memorial Services.

Appropriation legislation must originate in the House, hence this committee, and particularly its chairman, may be said to hold the Government's purse strings. Chairman Cannon fought the spending trend, working long hours at it. Overall it was a losing fight, but his sharp pencil saved billions.<sup>2</sup>

Since the committee system does exist and since Clarence Cannon was head of this committee on Appropriations for nineteen years, it would seem that an investigation of his political oratory would be interesting and valuable. As Jensen points out, "It is not likely that Congress will abandon its seniority system any time soon, particularly not so long as, even occasionally, it produces men of the caliber of Clarence Cannon."<sup>3</sup> Perhaps the analysis of Clarence Cannon's speeches will aid in our effort to understand our government and the men that run it.

#### Methodology

The methodology of this study is historical and descriptive. It is an analysis of a contemporary political speaking problem. The subject deals with the development of a man as he emerges on the political scene, matures, and passes from the America that he attempted to guard financially. This study will reveal glimpses of the man in his accomplishments as a public speaker and public servant, and it will reveal his political philosophy through his verbal activity. Clarence Cannon spent more time as appropriations chairman than most Congressmen spend in the House. According to a press release in Columbia, Missouri: "Cannon . . . went

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 234.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

on the Appropriations Committee in 1929. He was chairman longer than any other person in history.<sup>4</sup> The Kansas City Star indicated that he was " . . . chairman from 1941 to 1964, except during four years of Republican control of Congress."<sup>5</sup> This length of service certainly gave him sufficient time to learn the workings of the committee, and as chairman he was required to defend the decisions which the committee made regarding United State expenditures.

Representative Cannon's main addresses deal with the financial problems of the United States through the eyes of the appropriator. In Mr. Cannon's case, the eyes are experienced and somewhat widened by the gigantic expenditures of the Federal machine which controls our way of life. According to one political scientist, the members of the appropriations committee felt that there were three major functions of their job. They were supposed to guard the Federal Treasury, cut every budget estimate submitted, and serve the constituencies to which they owed their elections.<sup>6</sup> This study will attempt to show the development of the ideas and the actions of a man who spent his life studying and justifying the expenses of the largest global power. It will reveal whether he is typical of the members of this large committee, and his speaking will demonstrate the work and decisions of the committee that he heads.

The main focus of this study will fall on the Appropriations speeches that Mr. Cannon presented to the United States Congress and to the

---

<sup>4</sup>Kirksville, (Missouri) Daily Express, December 23, 1965.

<sup>5</sup>Kansas City, (Missouri) Star, December 21, 1965.

<sup>6</sup>Richard F. Fenno, Jr., "The Appropriations Committee As A Political System," New Perspectives on the House of Representatives, ED. Robert L. Peabody and Nelson W. Posby (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963), pp. 82-83.

United States people. There is evidence that the head of the Appropriations Committee is an extremely important power in the Federal government. The Mexico, (Missouri) Ledger of July 6, 1962, states an editorial view of Cannon's position as Head of the Appropriations Committee.

Clarence Cannon, our Congressman, is one of the most powerful men in the world.

And one of the best.

His power comes from his chairmanship of the House Appropriations Committee.

It has been said that next to the President, himself, the chairman of the House Appropriations committee is the most powerful man in our government.<sup>7</sup>

Representative Robert L. F. Sikes of Florida noted that Cannon was regarded as an influential man in the House. "Some called him the most influential man in the House. Certainly he was one of the most powerful in this great body."<sup>8</sup> If Representative Cannon is that strong or that powerful in government operation, then the stand which the Head of the Appropriations committee takes on the budget and its expenditure would seem to be a vital matter for the country and for the President of the United States. The study of the Appropriation speeches should provide some important insights into the vast expenditures of this country. The philosophy of the President and the Congress, on matters of spending, should be evident by their reactions to the speeches of the Head of Appropriations Committee.

With this rationale in mind, the objective of this research will be to utilize the goals of rhetorical criticism as Albert J. Croft outlined them:

---

<sup>7</sup>Editorial, "The Blessings of a Cannon," July 6, 1962.

<sup>8</sup>Memorial Services, p. 66.



(1) to report and interpret the manner in which a speaker's social values have been related to the social values of his audience in the course of his rhetorical adaptation -- this is the historical function of criticism; (2) to evaluate particular speeches and speakers by estimating the appropriateness and evaluating the uniqueness of the idea -- adaptation in them -- this is the evaluative function of criticism; (3) to re-examine, re-evaluate, and if possible to modify contemporary rhetorical theory through the examination of the adaptive processes in speeches -- this is the creative function of criticism.<sup>9</sup>

From these three criterion the ensuing study will examine the speeches of Clarence Andrew Cannon as he spoke to Congress and to his constituency, with a primary emphasis on those addresses which reveal a development in his political or rhetorical theory.

#### The Purpose of the Study

The thesis will be constructed so that Chapter One explains the arrangement and goals of the thesis. Chapter Two will be a biographical study, and an explanation of Cannon's speech preparation. Chapters Three through Eight will contain an analysis of six selected speeches given by Cannon during six Presidential administrations: Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy. While Cannon spoke during President Johnson's administration, the speeches concerned the budgets and programs of President Kennedy, and Cannon died before Johnson was elected President.

Chapter Nine will be a chapter of conclusions, and finally, there will be an Appendix, which will include the texts of the selected speeches.

The speeches have been selected from the Congressional Record on

---

<sup>9</sup>Albert J. Croft, "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," The Province of Rhetoric, ed. Joseph Schwartz and John Rycenga (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1965), p. 409.

the basis of the most representative addresses during each President's administration. The criteria for selection were interest, subject, length, and Cannon's uniqueness in rhetorical approach. Each chapter is based on the speech which best represents the combination of the above criteria.

Each chapter starts with a general setting of the period and relates the significant items which might affect the speaker, speech, audience, and/or the occasion. The writing of the chapters attempts to create a sense of the times before the speech was given, and it also informs the reader about the historical occurrences which may help put the speech situation into perspective.

The chapters then analyze Cannon's speaking under three headings: logical analysis, emotional analysis, and ethical analysis. Logical analysis is an analysis of the evidence and reasoning that was used in the speech. Emotional analysis concerns those factors which would appeal to the emotions of the audience or in some way affect them psychologically. Ethical analysis concerns those factors which affect Cannon's reputation as he is speaking to the immediate audience and the effect of the speech on later audiences. By using those particular items, a definite change and growth is observable in Mr. Cannon's speaking. The development of the paper relates this change and reveals one of the rhetorical values in the dissertation.

The analyses were performed by constructing rhetorical outlines including topical, logical, emotional, ethical, and stylistic outlines. From these outlines conclusions were drawn; and these conclusions were supported by representative examples. The chapters do not include specific sections on style, arrangement, or delivery as separate variables

of the speaking process. Comments on arrangement, style, and delivery which help recreate the mood or the intent of the speaker are included within the chapters, and in the final chapter. This methodology is used because the emphasis of the study is on Cannon's ideas, and the stylistic, organizational, and delivery techniques are covered under the three concepts of invention (logical, emotional, and ethical) used as the tools of analysis.

At the end of each chapter there is a section of conclusions which are drawn from that chapter in an effort to keep the speech and the speaker in historical perspective. This methodology will help the reader follow the techniques of the speaker within that part of his political career. The individual chapter conclusions demonstrate any immediate effectiveness of the speech, if that judgment is available. The final chapter attempts to draw general conclusions about the speaking over the long span of time that Representative Cannon served in Congress. Therefore, the procedure of the study is describing, analyzing, interpreting, and evaluating the methodology of the speaker, the immediate effects, and the long term effects of Congressman Clarence Cannon.

### Sources

The primary material from Cannon's personal files constituted much of the information on speech preparation, and this material reveals many of his attitudes toward governmental policies and politics. It was with Mrs. Cannon's kind permission that the files were opened. When the materials were deposited at the University of Missouri, it was with the stipulation that they were not to be opened until Mrs. Cannon's death, or fifteen years from the date of the gift, except with her express

consent, which she has graciously given. Other materials come from letters and materials from Congressmen, other collections in the University of Missouri library, and newspaper articles concerning Congressman Cannon.

The other materials are primary accounts of a less personal nature. The Congressional Record and the Washington, St. Louis, and Kansas City newspapers are frequently used. Various history and political science texts, and periodicals are referred to in order to help recreate the scene in which Representative Cannon spoke.

### Justification of the Study

Not many people know about the fiery Clarence Cannon, but here is a man who helped control the purse strings of this nation for over thirty-four years. His speeches reflect the nature of our spending or not spending, and his stubborn tenacity perplexed and embarrassed more than one President. The speeches deal with great changes in the American policy of spending. The pocketbook policy of the nation can be viewed through the speeches of Cannon during periods of inflation and depression, war and peace, silver and gold crises, hot and cold conflict, Democratic and Republican administrations. He aided and defended, attacked and repulsed government expenditures. His speaking portrays a man of long term insight and experience in governmental affairs. There have been no studies on Clarence Cannon; no biographies, not a thesis or dissertation, and few articles other than newspieces. This study should give the readers and critics an unusual view of a powerful figure in a mixture of experiences and rapidly changing times. It is an opportunity to see the government and its representatives portrayed through public speaking.

The machinery of politics and the recording of the resultant policy was viewed through these selected speeches.

There is further justification for the study however. Too long contemporary speech criticism has been ignored and underdeveloped. Some lip service has been given to its value, but little progress has been made for its utilization. The contemporary study is justified because it is an effective and useful way to get expert analysis recorded. Even though the recorder may be bound by sociological context, he is still the best qualified individual to analyze the speaker from that sociological viewpoint. Why should the journalist, the diarist, and the participant (speaker) be the only contributing experts on speaking? Why not have the speech critic analyze the speaker as he sees him so that later writers can make judgments on the speech standards as well as provide valuable information about the speaker and the times? There is nothing distasteful or degrading about having revisionists rewrite history, especially if they have new methods and new information. The socio-influence which surrounds the writer and the speaking of the individual, when critiqued by the professional speech person, should help the later analyst view the speaker with a wider and more valuable evaluation. Clarence Cannon is too important, and his addresses deal with too vital a subject, to let history wait fifty years for an analysis. The speeches in this paper are directly concerned with the expenditures of our current government or in the development of the present spending policies. The importance of the monetary situation was emphasized by William McChesney Martin, Jr., when he indicated that the United States is in " . . . the worst financial crisis we've had since 1931."<sup>10</sup> While our gold problem is constantly fluctuating, and

---

<sup>10</sup>U.S. News & World Report, April 29, 1968, p. 19.

there are various money problems, the study of the appropriations speeches and related incidents should aid the readers in realizing what the government philosophy has been in the last forty years.

A survey of Ph.D. studies in speech reveals a total of forty-three studies in the area of contemporary public address. "Contemporary" is being used as including speakers and movements or organizations within the last twenty-five years. There were seventeen studies which dealt with political speakers: John F. Kennedy, Adlai Stevenson, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Richard M. Nixon have had more than one study done about them: Alben Barkley, Paul Douglas, Birch Bayh, George Romney, Ralph McGill, Barry Goldwater, Douglas Mac Arthur, William Z. Foster, and Lyman Bryson complete the list of speakers who deal with popular and political issues.

There were eighteen studies on organizations, with debates over Supreme Court decisions heading the list. Religious groups, parliamentary debates, Congressional debates and convention speaking were the subjects of the other studies.

Finally, there were eight studies on ministers ranging from two studies on Martin Luther King to studies on Edward Earl Cleveland, George Vandeman, Fulton J. Sheen, Gerald Hamilton Kennedy, Clarence Edward McCartney, and Paul E. Scherer.

Obviously, there is room for more studies of the political and religious nature. The writing of these studies would help leave an historical and rhetorical legacy of our schools and of our new critics, and by completing these studies, each writer should be better equipped to help form the rhetorical theory of his time. This is sufficient reason for viewing contemporary figures, but the importance of the position and the oral viewpoint which he gives that position is justification for the study of the Honorable Clarence Cannon.

## CHAPTER TWO

### BIOGRAPHY AND SPEECH PREPARATION

The chapter on biography and speech preparation will concentrate on describing the man, the man's ideas, and the preparation of those ideas for his public addresses. Initially the chapter will try to reveal the colorful characteristics of the Missouri Representative, followed by the events which led him to his eventual position as spokesman for the appropriations committee. Finally, there will be a descriptive section on his speech preparation.

. . . we shall miss his counsel, his candor and the courage which he held steadfastly to his convictions about what was right and best for America.<sup>1</sup>

For all of the comments about his looks and his stubbornness, there is little doubt that Clarence Cannon was respected and admired for his tenacious ability to fulfill his job with a steady, unwavering watchfulness.

Cannon participated in at least two vocations which would have attracted public notice, and he was excellently prepared for both responsibilities. Convention delegates and television audiences will remember him as the parliamentarian for the Democratic convention. People who are observant about public affairs will remember him as

---

<sup>1</sup>Missouri Historical Review, V. LIX, (October, 1964), p. 141.  
A comment by Lyndon Johnson in the obituary section of the magazine.

the Head of the Appropriations Committee and member of the House of Representatives for twenty-one terms from Missouri. The South Side Observer in St. Louis characterizes the two careers which kept Cannon in front of the public for this long period.

Millions of TV viewers of the Democratic National Convention saw sitting next to the convention chairman a sour, tight-lipped man whose face will long be remembered by the audience, although few knew who he was and fewer knew his antecedents.

That man of sour visage happens to be Clarence Cannon of Elsberry, Missouri, who has served fourteen terms in Congress, is chairman of the powerful House Appropriations Committee and probably knows more about government fiscal policies than any man alive, and generally is regarded as one of the most powerful, able and valuable men in public life.<sup>2</sup>

Cannon was probably remembered by television audiences and colleagues because of his features and his personality. The newspapers and magazines are filled with descriptions of this Missouri Congressman. His length of service aided these descriptions and comments, and his increasingly active role in government brought him extra attention. The Saturday Evening Post comments that "He has been a main prop in the House scenery for so long that it has led to the waggish theory that he must have been created on the House floor by an act of Congress."<sup>3</sup> Newsweek depicted his features poignantly.

There was about him a quintessential air of wry comedy, a suggestion that he might, at any moment, start reciting the Mad Hatter's lines from Alice in Wonderland, or lay about him vigorously with an inflated rubber bladder. He reminded many of a sort of dehydrated W. C. Fields, others of a Cruikshank drawing from Dickens. He had a light-bulb for a nose, a temper of

---

<sup>2</sup>South Side Observer, St. Louis, Missouri. This was an undated clipping in the unsorted files of the Cannon collection in the Missouri University Library. Fourteen terms would make the date of the clipping around 1951.

<sup>3</sup>P. F. Healy, "Nobody Loves Clarence," Saturday Evening Post, V. CCXXII, (March 25, 1950), p. 39.



mercury fulminate, and a voice like Donald Duck's. To certain of his colleagues (at least three of them he at different times had punched in the jaw), he was irascible, cantankerous, and ornery. But behind the growl, and beneath the motley face nature had thrust upon him was an incisive, sensitive, and dedicated public servant.<sup>4</sup>

Time gives a picture of the Congressman when it describes his features and his dress as he appeared in Congress.

Millions remember him mostly from the televised session of Democratic Conventions. He was the hunched-one little hobgoblin who always seemed to be whispering parliamentary advice into the ear of Permanent Chairman Sam Rayburn. He had a splotch nose, squinty eyes and a mouth that always made it appear as though he had just eaten a peck of green persimmons. He wore black shoes, black socks, and a black tie. He was grumpy as all get-out and he seemed to take a perverse pride in being unpopular.<sup>5</sup>

The Saturday Evening Post was more caustic in its commentary as it attempted to classify Cannon as an ogre beyond all ogres.

He has the face of Grumpy, the Walt Disney dwarf, and a disposition to match. His nose is long and bulbous, his eyes small and shrewd, his mouth pinched, his cheeks and brow deeply furrowed. A slender man slightly below medium height and topped by a swatch of graying black hair, his lifelong working "Uniform" has been a black suit, black tie and white shirt. As he haunts the House corridors, his head held at a pensive angle, his hands thrust deep into his suit-coat pockets, and his face plunged into saturnine gloom, he could easily be mistaken for a frankly unscrupulous undertaker or a professional mourner.<sup>6</sup>

Cannon was aware of the remarks made about his personality and his looks. One of his Missouri colleagues reports a retort by Cannon when he was accused of being two-faced by an opponent. "Don't you think if I had two faces I'd use the other one instead of this one?"<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup>"Exit Clarence Cannon," Newsweek, LVIII, (May 25, 1964), p. 31-32.

<sup>5</sup>"The Guardian," Time, LXXXIII, (May 22, 1964), p. 22.

<sup>6</sup>Healy, op. cit., p. 38.

<sup>7</sup>Richard Bolling, House Out of Order, (New York: E. P. Dutton & Company), 1965, p. 90.

His appearance probably caused him less trouble than his methods of defending his ideas. Being accused of being irascible and a penny-pincher would seem to be a condemnation of a man, but in Cannon's job it was even more acute. He was constantly assaulted for his efforts to save the taxpayers' money, and what could not be blamed on tight-fistedness was blamed on age. Newsweek in the article, "The Missourian Who Hates to Spend," typifies the comments villifying what many taxpayers applauded.

Key man in the current Congressional economy wave is Representative Clarence Cannon, terrible-tempered Missouri Democrat who was first elected to the House in 1923, has been chairman of the powerful Appropriations Committee since 1941 (except for the GOP controlled 80th and 83rd Congresses) . . . . As a man who has dedicated his legislative life to cutting the Federal budget, dour, 78-year old Cannon is almost the perfect picture of a penny pincher . . . . Sternfaced and bulbous of nose, Cannon has been likened to a man who has just sniffed an overripe egg; he brings the same outlook to government efforts to spend money . . . . Despite his bantam size, he never hesitated to fight for economy even with his fists (in 1950, colleagues had to separate Cannon from then Senator Kenneth McKellin in a squabble over a money bill) . . . . Cannon usually has been forced to squirm in frustration while the House or Senate restored his budget cuts . . . . But this year, he may get his revenge.<sup>8</sup>

Fortune magazine also questioned Cannon's ability to keep pace with his Congressional responsibilities and with the special problems of maintaining the respect and control of the legislative problems.<sup>9</sup>

Keeping pace was not the real issue in the above criticisms or for other attacks on Cannon and his techniques. Even in later years he was functionally consistent, and he pursued the job as he felt that it should be performed. Fenno indicates that age was not a justifiable

---

<sup>8</sup>"The Missourian Who Hates to Spend," Newsweek, XLIX, (May 13, 1957), p. 34.

<sup>9</sup>"Has Congress Broken Down," Fortune, (February, 1952), p. 84.

reason for the criticism when he points to Cannon's ability to sustain the pace.

For all of his forty years in the House, however, Cannon had been a fearless and independent curmudgeon, and for most of these years he freely and frequently criticized the Senate for its appropriations behavior. Since Cannon was anything but senile in 1962, the "octogenarian" explanation begs the question.<sup>10</sup>

The criticisms seem to stem from the personality and position. Every chairman makes enemies in his job. The picking and choosing of individuals for committee positions and the assessment of bills and projects are bound to cause friction. But the job of the appropriations committee is exceptionally vulnerable to criticism and enemy making (especially to a man who is a conscientious objector to what he considered unnecessary spending). Each pet project that was rejected due to Cannon's cuts, each individual committee which saw its plans thwarted because of insufficient funds or justification looked for an excuse and a victim. The logical "fall guy" was the appropriations chairman, who was functioning as an executioner. That is not to say that Mr. Cannon attempted to endear himself to others or to make the axe any duller when it fell. Quite to the contrary, the axe fell when there was ample justification (as defined by the committee or its chairman), and in the case of an execution there was little recourse in appeal or satisfaction for the act. Cannon was a loner, he was independent, and he was powerful. He was determined to accomplish his goals, and he would defend his ideas and ideals.

---

<sup>10</sup>Richard F. Fenno, Jr., The Power of the Purse, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966), p. 637.

In fact, Cannon would physically defend his views if necessary, and on occasion it seemed necessary in the House. At the age of 54, he engaged Milton A. Romjue in a tussle in the House of Representatives. Mr. Romjue, also a Democrat from Missouri, received a split lip and was confined to his home, reportedly a result of influenza. Mr. Cannon, unmarked, denied any altercation.

In May of 1945, Representatives Taber and Cannon participated in a scuffle in Cannon's office. The 65 year old Taber claims that he held the 66 year old Cannon down. It should be noted that Cannon was unscathed while Taber rushed from the room with a badly split lip. Both accused the other of some nasty remarks.

Another altercation took place between the 72 year old Cannon and 63 year old Representative Phillips in 1951. All of the incidents made the New York Times, but the Fortune magazine describes Cannon's explanation of the 1951 incident. "I only act in self-defense in such matters."<sup>11</sup>

All of these problems, accusations, and personality conflicts would seem to deter a man from accomplishing much as a leader of the public, but Cannon's perserverance and accomplishments were above and beyond aspirations of most men. Perhaps his cantankerousness came from his ancestors, among whom was James Cannon, a Revolutionary war soldier and Kentucky Indian fighter.<sup>12</sup> Clarence's home was in the rough and ready small community of Elsberry, Missouri. Born to Rolfe and Ida Cannon on April 11, 1879, he spent his youth in a rural atmosphere.

---

<sup>11</sup>Fortune, op. cit., p. 84.

<sup>12</sup>Healy, op. cit., p. 134.

After completing his education in Elsberry, he then went to LaGrange Junior College. He received a B.A. and an M.A. from William Jewell College in 1903 and 1904. He studied law at the University of Missouri from 1904-1908 and taught history at Stephens College in Columbia.<sup>13</sup>

In 1906 he married Ida Dawson Whiggington, who, according to the Saturday Evening Post, was a wise "investment." "Mrs. Cannon's gracious charm is now considered one of the Congressman's most valuable political assets."<sup>14</sup>

In 1911, he became a confidential clerk to Champ Clark, Missouri's famous Speaker of the House. During 1916, he continued his historical studies by writing down precedents and actions in the House while serving as the House Parliamentarian.

Cannon's orderly mind had been fascinated by the rules ever since he discovered that House procedure differed from ordinary parliamentary law and that Congressmen were wasting at least a third of the House's time arguing in confusion over the rules. Cannon began to write down the gist of each point of procedure as he went along in a loose-leaf notebook he kept behind the Speaker's desk. This so impressed Speaker Gillette, who headed the House when the Republicans took over in 1919, that he reappointed Cannon and the latter became the first House parliamentarian to serve under both parties.<sup>15</sup>

While he was parliamentarian he had established such a reputation that he became the parliamentarian of the Democratic National Conventions. He compiled Cannon's Precedents, a twelve-volume history of House parliamentary tangles, and Cannon's Procedures described as a kind of Emily Post etiquette book for Congressmen.<sup>16</sup> Newsweek stated, "At 62

<sup>13</sup>Missouri Historical Review, op. cit., p. 140.

<sup>14</sup>Healy, op. cit., p. 134.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.

<sup>16</sup>Newsweek, "EXIT," op. cit., p. 32.

Representative Cannon is the nation's outstanding authority on parliamentary procedure."<sup>17</sup>

From a career as parliamentarian Mr. Cannon became an elected representative from Clark's ninth district, and he served longer than any other Missouri Senator or Representative in Congress. His main contribution was in the area of Appropriations, where he had served as a member of the committee since 1929. In 1941, Cannon was selected as the head of the Appropriations Committee by having his name drawn out of a hat. Representative Clifton A. Woodrum of Virginia was appointed member of the committee at the same time as Cannon, and they both had been elected and officially appointed at the 1923 session of Congress.<sup>18</sup>

From this period Mr. Cannon established his reputation as an economy-minded (except on farm issues) individual who wielded all the power he could muster as Appropriations chairman. The power was from two sources. " . . . he heads the most powerful committee in Congress and he is the most expert practitioner of legislative strategy in the House."<sup>19</sup>

Cannon not only had the power, he had the reputation for being capable of wielding that power if necessary. Besides having the power, Cannon put it to use. "No man in Washington is more feared than Cannon, for many people consider his power to be equal to, if not greater than, Speaker Rayburn."<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>"Fizzled Feud," Newsweek, XVIII, (September 22, 1941), p. 18.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>19</sup>Healy, op. cit., p. 38.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

Length of service is a criterion for office under the seniority system, but a man must still be effective to become powerful. As the appropriations chairman, Cannon used strategy to the utmost. He concentrated on developing control through parliamentary practice, and he performed those acts which would aid his philosophy of economy. An example of this manipulation shows how the Appropriations Chairman handled the Speaker of the House.

Rayburn was frequently at odds with the committee oligarchs, who rule their own committees with the assured arrogance of absolute monarchs.

With one of them, Clarence Cannon of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee late in the 1950's, he ran a collision course. Representative Vaughan Gary of Virginia, chairman of the subcommittee handling budgets on foreign aid, was critical but not hostile. One day Cannon simply replaced Gary, selecting in his stead Otto Passman of Louisiana, a vociferous opponent of foreign assistance programs.<sup>21</sup>

Another instance of Cannon's tactics was evident during the 1965 budget preparations. This instance shows Cannon's political independence under pressure conditions as well as the power invested in the man and the position.

In 1964, President Johnson was able to keep his fiscal year 1965 budget low by including a considerable number of budget requests in supplementals for the fiscal year 1964 -- to be presented to the Committee early in 1964. Chairman Cannon, perceiving that Texan Albert Thomas was likely to be lenient with Texan Lyndon Johnson's supplemental requests, abruptly abolished the subcommittee. A member of the Deficiencies Subcommittee agreed with Cannon's assessment of the situation. "We would probably have given them most of what they wanted," he said. "Under the circumstances Cannon was right. He's a very wise man and it was a wise move on his part."<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>Bolling, op. cit., p. 71.

<sup>22</sup>Fenno, op. cit., p. 241.

The power and the manipulation were evident but to what purpose? Business Week in 1954, commented that "Clarence Cannon, crusty Missourian, will be chairman of the Appropriations Committee, where the Democrats may harass the administration most effectively."<sup>23</sup> These predictions of harassment were from the Republican viewpoint, but they were intended to point out the methods and the goals of the economy and the position that Cannon would take against the administrative measures. Fenno takes some comments from the Hearings on the Budget for 1961 which describe Cannon's appropriation philosophy.

The greatest duty devolving upon the Congress, and one of the most difficult, is that of protecting the money of the tax-payers in the federal Treasury. There are today some people who want to get in the federal Treasury, want federal money, so many lobbyists, and unfortunately so many members of the Congress who in a determination to have federal funds for personal or local purposes, will use every possible effort, will resort to every device, to get money out of the Treasury put there by the tax-payers and put there under realizations of the responsibility of the Congress to protect the resources of the nation.<sup>24</sup>

Nation's Business added its report of Cannon's influence on the governmental spending. "Clarence Cannon of Missouri will lead assault on the budget . . . . He told the House that the budget was deceitful. His final report is likely to accuse budget-makers of padding in some places and of neglecting major items like defense, agriculture and public power."<sup>25</sup>

Cannon's colleagues knew that politics was seldom the issue at stake and no one could accuse him of overwhelming partisanship or

<sup>23</sup>Business Week, November 6, 1954, p. 27.

<sup>24</sup>Fenno, op. cit., p. 157.

<sup>25</sup>"These Fourteen Men Will Shape Your Future," Nation's Business XLII (March, 1955), p. 85.



dependence on others to maintain his policies. According to the Washington Post, Cannon refused to speak with President Kennedy on the telephone about an impasse that had developed between Cannon's committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee.<sup>26</sup> Bolling reports that "In fairness, Cannon was evenhanded in his attitude toward the leaders of his party. Democrat Cannon even refused to meet with Democrat Kennedy, the President, to discuss the foreign assistance bill."<sup>27</sup>

His independence regarding the party was noted by a committee member who described the pattern of cooperation and reaction with other party members.

There's not much rapport with the leadership. They respect Mr. Cannon, but they don't consider him a good Democrat. He's not a party man. He's not reliable. They don't feel they can trust him.<sup>28</sup>

Some Missouri people would have evidently argued with the above quote. At least they would have placed less value on his bending to political pressures. For instance, in an undated newspaper clipping from the Kansas City Democrat, the headlines read, "Missouri's candidate for President received a great ovation at the Springfield meeting."<sup>29</sup> Historically the mentioning of a Missourian for President would invariably mean that he's a Democrat, but the support for Presidency would seem to indicate Clarence Cannon had some popular support, outside of his own district. Nevertheless, it must be concluded that Mr. Cannon did not go out of his way to make himself popular with his fellow

<sup>26</sup>Washington Post, October 14, 1962, p. 24.

<sup>27</sup>Bolling, op. cit., p. 75.

<sup>28</sup>Fenno, op. cit., p. 429.

<sup>29</sup>Located in a folder along with his other clippings on miscellaneous items at the University of Missouri Western Manuscript Collection.

Congressmen, and his concern with what he considered sound economic policies, in spite of party politics, was another contributing factor to the unpopularity among the Democratic leaders. According to Cannon, economic consistency was the most important negative factor in the Democratic administrations. He stated in an article for the American Political Science Review that "Weak as the incentives toward party solidarity may be in comparison with organized pressures it is nevertheless self-evident that no party can safely sacrifice consistency in its legislative record."<sup>30</sup> Because he did strive to maintain a consistency in spending policies and because this consistency demanded a rigid economic spending formula, Cannon was bound to cause new leaders and new administrations great consternation, especially if they believed that a change was necessary.

The testimony of his colleagues shows the great desire for economy and the independence of his decisions. The position of chairman of the powerful appropriations committee is bound to cause feelings of prejudice and unrest, and of course Cannon's aggressiveness and decisiveness did not aid in the disposition of that job or the feelings involved. However, the constituents of his district and of the state of Missouri greatly appreciated the efforts that Cannon made in their behalf. A supporter of liberal farm policies and a tight hand on the dollar was the combination which led them to support Mr. Cannon.

Two undated newspaper clippings from the Chillicothe Constitution Tribune and the Ralls County Record suggest that it did not require

---

<sup>30</sup>"Congressional Responsibilities," Clarence Cannon, The American Political Review. (April, 1948), p. 309.

a great amount of money for Cannon to be reelected in his district.

"No slush fund here," and "Should be unanimous" were the respective titles in this paragraph.

It cost Clarence Cannon four cents to be renominated for Congress from the ninth district. His election should be unanimous. He is a great man and our people love him for the great work he has done.<sup>31</sup>

The organization behind Mr. Cannon heaped praise on his positions and on his accomplishments. One of the letters in the same folder of clippings was from the Committee to keep Cannon in Congress.

Because by reason of fact that the people of this district have kept him in Congress for twenty years or more he has been able to build himself into one of the most powerful and influential men in our lawmaking legislature institution. And he became chairman of the great appropriation committee of Congress.

This position of great influence has enabled him to do more for the benefit of farm producers and rural residents than any other man in the nation.

Farm income twenty billion dollars for 1946 compared to six billion in 1940. Three times as much money as six years ago and ten times as much as last year of the Hoover administration. Cannon was largely instrumental in bringing this increased farm income. All national and state farm organizations will endorse this statement.

Missouri produces about four percent of national farm income and this district produces about 1/6 of the state's total. This means nearly one percent of the nation's production or in 1946 an income of 160 million dollars for this district compared to less than fifty million in 1940, and about 1/10th that income in 1932.

Prosperity for the farmer means prosperity for all. Everybody from this district profits from its vastly increased farm income; business large and small . . . . With that much extra money coming to us every citizen shares in the prosperity. Apply it to our own country and see what it means to us. Cannon helped materially to bring this about. Let's keep him where he can be of such enormous benefit to us. After last war prices went up like a rocket and immediately came down like a stick.

---

<sup>31</sup>The Ralls County Record as quoted above is similar to the Chillicothe clipping except the Chillicothe paper points out that the four cents expenditure was for two postcards.

We can avoid that calamity this time by putting a floor under farm prices that will hold. Congress only does that and Cannon more than any other man in the United States can help to do this --from his powerful position as Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee can and will push this program. Farm prices, disposal of possible surpluses, find foreign market for farm products, protect us from again seeing ten cent corn and twenty-five cent wheat and three cent hogs.<sup>32</sup> [sic]

This example of "Cannon for Congress" material illustrates why some of the people of the ninth district supported Mr. Cannon.

An editorial in the Mexico Ledger sums up the attitudes of the Cannon supporters. The title, "The Blessings of a Cannon," gives an indication of the respect that the members of the rural areas held for Mr. Cannon.

Clarence Cannon, our Congressman, is one of the most powerful men in the world.

And one of the best.

His power comes from his chairmanship of the House Appropriations Committee.

It has been said that next to the President, himself, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee is the most powerful man in our government. Our country is properly proud that this great power is held in the capable hands of Clarence Cannon.

For Clarence Cannon is first an American and second a Congressman. Further, he has unmatched dedication, a towering knowledge of our government, the highest integrity, the deepest and broadest of human understanding. . . .

In August, we have an opportunity to renominate Mr. Cannon for Congress. And, in November, we will have the opportunity to reelect him which we can be sure, the Ninth Congressional will do.

Does he have opposition? Not really. One of the office seekers opposing Mr. Cannon, recently attempted to attract some attention by announcing: "I fight to free our children from life of increasing slavery. . . . We're going to win this one for our kids."

He sounds more like he's running against Mr. Krushev. . . .<sup>33</sup>

A long period of service ended in the passing of Mr. Cannon. He was characterized as honest, independent, dedicated, knowledgeable, and

<sup>32</sup>From the same folder as the newspaper previously cited.

<sup>33</sup>Mexico Ledger, "The Blessings of a Cannon," July 16, 1962.

controversial. He was acclaimed by his colleagues for his diligence and comprehensive understanding of appropriations problems.

His papers reveal material about the government and about American history, and also reveal the character of the man. Among those mixed papers was found a Bible verse which certainly explains the motivations if not the reason for Clarence Cannon's service: "Prove all things. Hold fast that which is good." First Thessalonians 5 seems to be a maxim which the Appropriations Chairman found valuable and productive.

### Speech Preparation

The main evidence used in describing Cannon's speech preparation was found in an old wooden file located in the University of Missouri library in its historical collection. Much of the material was impossible to identify as to its origin, but the unique way in which it was put together shows Cannon's technique for collecting and assembling materials. Among the materials were requests for information from the Library of Congress. For example, he had a note asking the Library staff to do research on British appropriations and their ramifications.

There were large numbers of quotations which had been clipped from typed sources, and one folder marked with pencil contained instructions to distribute the materials into speech folders. There were pamphlets on the freedom of speech and freedom of action; and there was the Age of Reason Magazine, which included an article on Thomas Paine and numerous clippings which were unidentified.

From these types of sources stuffed in folders, Cannon would type or would have typed this material on narrow strips of paper to be pasted on sheets of paper which were made up of old notebooks. There

were many loose strips of paper which he later pasted on envelopes to use in constructing his speeches. A look at the process of preparation from his campaign folders will help to show how and to what extent he prepared these materials. Several envelopes will be described to substantiate the above materials.

The first example of campaign speaking in the collection comes from a folder marked simply, "1920." Inside the folder was a notebook which contained a total of forty-five typewritten pages on the paper of the Journal Clerk. The beginning pages were composed of different introductions for several separate communities, where he was evidently scheduled to speak, and there was also a date listed for late October and November. The text of the speech is typed with many x's and corrections, which indicates that the material was reworked and marked out in order to construct the most desirable structure and meaning. The speech contained many generalizations which chastised Republicans for their administration, and praised the Democrats. It was a complete and well organized speech, replete with materials and arguments supporting Champ Clark for the 1920 campaign.

The campaign folder of 1922 contained a twenty-nine page speech, and gave additional clues to Cannon's development and knowledge as a speaker. He took an old 8½" x 11" book, and pasted the typed speech on to the pages of that book. There were several noteworthy items from this folder, which gave some clues about his method of speech preparation. First, we have both an outline and a manuscript of the speech. Secondly, he divided the speech into three sections: introduction, body, and conclusion. The labeling of these three areas indicates that he was

conscious of this tripartite division, and that he probably had some realization that there is a difference in the function of each division. Another noticeable item was an absence of quotations or any identifiable documentation of materials in the speech.

In the "1924" folder there was a note written which declared the address to be imperfect because, "Down from memory and is an inaccurate transcription of the speech." This note was written at the top of the speech and put into brackets. There was no additional information to indicate how he prepared, or why he had to transcribe this particular speech after he delivered it. The speech is a thirty-four page manuscript which is addressed to the farmer about his problems, and if he did transcribe it from memory he must have prepared extensively for that length of speech. The delayed transcribing of a thirty-four page speech would probably not occur from an impromptu occasion. At the end of the speech he again notes that it is poorly recorded.

The "1926" folder was unique in that it had copies of telegrams asking for information and statistics on various problems in Missouri. The speech was a forty-eight page manuscript which had several types of supporting materials, but none of these materials was documented.

The "1928" manuscript was dated and designated for use in Mexico, Missouri, on October 5, 1928. This manuscript was only four pages long, and the folder lacked clippings and written materials. The speech was composed of examples about famous women; and the thesis concentrated on providing the women with the right, privilege, and honor to vote.

The "1930" folder held a thirty page speech which was to be given at Flint Hill on October 5, 1930. This was the opening of the campaign and was the only speech referred to in the folder. There are several

introductions in the folder, which provides some evidence that he adjusted to particular audiences. The speech is again concerned with getting women involved with the public issues of the day, and he seems to concentrate on encouraging the women to become active, and to use the nineteenth amendment. No doubt he was encouraging them, at least indirectly, to vote for Clarence Cannon.

The "1932" material is arranged in an outline form. The following is a reproduction of what was within the folder.

Appreciation of support  
 Prevented from attending in last campaign by automobile accident  
 Endorsement of local candidates  
 Important election  
 Changes 1. Population 2. Food habits 3. Erosion (marked through) 4. War machinery 5. Transportation 6. New major industries 7. Foreign changes in government (marked out) 8. Debtor to creditor nation 9. Centralization of industry 10. Reapportionment of Congress  
 Depression  
 Causes of Depression 1. deflation by reserve board 2. tariff prevention export of farm products 3. lack of organization-- unable to deflate labor 4. surplus 5. unemployment  
 Roosevelt  
 Federal Deposit guarantee  
 Flexible tariff  
 Deflation of dollar  
 Agriculture Adjustment Act -- farm leaders -- crisis -- loan -- fifty-fifty parity  
 Need five congressmen  
 Soldiers compensation and bonus  
 Old age pension  
 Division not between parties but between old and new ideals<sup>34</sup>

In addition there is an article from the Hannibal Courier Post which reports roughly the same material that his topics, as shown above, cover. However, the report of the speech does not follow the same order as Cannon has in his folder. There also seems to be a greater concentration on the differences between the two political parties.

---

<sup>34</sup>The parentheses in the above reproduction are mine.



The "1934" speech was very close to the "1932" outline except for the commentary on the "New Deal." Cannon's speaking here indicates that he was a strong opponent of the New Deal, and he associates many of the acts with the former Republican administrators.

The 1936 campaign seems to show some slight changes in Cannon's methods of preparation. The "1936" folder contains several outlines and drafts of speeches, and also has extra clippings in the folder. There is a twenty-seven page manuscript with a one-page outline attached to the speech. Within the speech he strongly endorses the future Governor Stark; this represents the first time that he becomes overtly involved in state politics (at least in the folder material). "By their fruits" seems to be the main theme, which is also the title of a speech inserted in the Congressional Record given on March 2, 1931. The speech quotes Oliver Cromwell, "In the name of the Lord I beseech you brethren consider it possible that you may be mistaken." Pope Pius the 11th is quoted as saying, "The world is upside down, only the hand of God can come to the aid of humanity." This again shows his interest with historical matters, and demonstrates the use of the history of public speaking in his speeches.

From 1938 on, the materials become quite sketchy in the folders. For example, the "1938 folder" includes only a number of newspaper articles which tell that Cannon spoke in their town. Short newspaper articles from Louisiana, Monroe City, Center, Troy, and Mexico reveal his itinerary. The 1942 campaign material has the dates that he campaigned (October 24 to November 2), and the number of speeches given (18) in that campaign. The 1944 campaign must have been more strenuous because the folder lists sixty-five speeches and towns in thirty-four

days (October 3 to November 6). The file did not contain folders from 1944 until 1950.

In the 1950 folders, Cannon reverted to his previous techniques with a slightly different methodology. He had several white envelopes with the speeches outlined on them. There were three different outlines, but they were quite close to each other in content and organization. He not only changed the introductions, but he became adept in changing the outlines by rearranging the order and the main headings so that each delivered speech seemed different. Perhaps the speech and accuracy of communications caught up with Cannon, and therefore he felt that he must vary his speeches. Perhaps he also notices that his audience was more than farmers and farm related-merchants. The "1952" folder demonstrated how he changed his approach to a particular topic. He prepared a notebook, listed headings, and assembled typed strips under the headings. Most of these materials were different methods of saying the same things. From this material he could draw the most precise and descriptive phrase to use in his current speech.

The "1954" material consisted of an outline of a speech and a sheet of paper listing the things that he wanted to discuss.

The only other folder material available on his speeches was a 1958 folder, which contained a manuscript and an outline that did not seem to match the speech. This is the extent of the available materials on Cannon's speech preparation.

The purpose of describing the speech folders was to help reconstruct Cannon's method of speech preparation. With the speech materials and additional evidence, it is possible to show his methodology of preparation, and to see the value that Cannon puts on the art of public

speaking. The following synthesis was made on the basis of the materials in the folders.

The process which Cannon used seems to indicate his awareness of careful preparation. He would initially cut out articles, clippings, and quotations, and put them in folders. From these materials he would proceed to weed out and rewrite much of the information. He would type on 2" x 8½" strips of paper a statement about the subject. He would then make a notebook out of envelopes or old pieces of paper, and attach the strips under subject headings. (Quite often he used 11½" x 8½" Congressional envelopes). The headings were usually typed on pink or green paper to show a differentiation in subject headings and support material. By the time the preparation process had been concluded, almost all identity of the source had been removed and only the idea remained. Sometimes specific items were underlined with blue pencil, and occasionally a comment was penciled on the page. From these materials an outline and a manuscript were completed. There was no evidence as to which came first, but they both occur often enough together to infer that he used one to complete the other. There were additional materials which lead one to believe that he made references to former speeches on the topics on which he might speak. The bulk of his quoted material was from statements of speeches or speakers, and the reference to them was identifiable only through a knowledge of the individual or his works.

Cannon's supporting material seemed well researched, but he evidently felt that it was not necessary for him to reveal the source in his speeches or even in his preparations. Evidently he believed that the people came to hear his conclusions from experience as a Congressman, and he gave them his personal experiences. It was also evident that

besides the manuscript preparation, Cannon was conscious of the individual audiences. For example, earlier material in this chapter indicates that he spent time constructing particular introductions for particular audiences. Another example of audience analysis can be found in a card inserted in one of the miscellaneous folders.

"When you have a fight on, send out a number of speeches just before you start back home. When you meet people, they will say that I heard from you. If they don't get anything, they will say you fellows don't seem to be doing anything up there."

It should be noted that there were several bills from the Congressional printing office for the mass printing of speeches that had been sent in the mail. Sending speeches through the mail was a relatively cheap method of campaigning, especially when franking privileges were available to cover the expense.

Within many of the folders are newspapers from the Missouri communities where Cannon spoke on his campaigns. The dates of the papers were in advance of his scheduled speech, and indicates that Cannon was studying local happenings before his speaking engagements. From this material he could adapt to his particular audience.

A note card in a miscellaneous materials folder illustrates the value that Clarence Cannon placed on the effect of a speech.

The highest degree of care should be taken in selecting those people who will introduce the speaker. Pick people with like attitudes and opinions.

Make speeches, make speeches, make speeches, never less than one a day, and five or six if practicable. The effect of a speech of an able talker outweighs the many personal letters and much organizational work. On the contrary, one speech badly delivered, releasing an unpopular theory, or ineffectively staged, may lose to a poor audience or under discouraging conditions will do more harm than good. Have speeches set and carefully advertised and staged. Take more care in getting out your crowd and getting

it in a receptive frame of mind than in the preparation and delivery of the speech if possible. Of course, on automobile tours every speech to a small crowd gathered around informally can be delivered without notice and with good effect.

Another example of campaign advice is from a defensive viewpoint, and illustrates how an effective speech in the hands of an opponent could be negated.

The most dangerous man is the fellow who makes a thirty day campaign. Has his literature all ready and addressed and organizationally ready and speeches all ready and goes in a whirlwind campaign after too late to meet and answer him. Can make wild statements and get away. Too late to get the country aroused.

Easiest man is the one who starts too early and begins to make speeches, issues statements, makes commitments and issues platforms. Have a stenographer take down the speeches and mail you a couple of copies. Send one to him and ask him to verify and return it. It will scare him to death. He will not dare make unsupported statements and will be on the defensive all the time.

If he has something good, make a speech in Congress and send copies all through the district ahead of him. If he makes a mistake, make a speech denouncing that without referring to him and send it throughout the district.

Obviously Cannon was aware of the implications of the spoken word.

The above materials show that he found it necessary and desirable to speak, but more importantly that it was vital to speak well. He was also intimately aware of the concept of organization and preparation, and he was especially aware of the perceptiveness of his audiences. The attempt to gain the initiative and to eliminate the effect of his opponents' arguments before they were widely presented shows his respect for the power of the spoken word, and for the value of keeping his constituents informed. The refusal to credit his opponent with any new and good ideas also indicates that he was aware of the uses of the burden of proof; and by forcing his opponent to prove his point, Cannon used his position as presumption. In other words, his opponent must prove his point; and if it is good, he has to establish the fact that it was his idea and not

Cannon's. A final insight might be found in his ability to force his opponent to attempt to document all of his materials, and to intimidate him through constant checking while the materials in Cannon's speeches go relatively undocumented. Thus, the man in power was using his position to hold the inexperienced and naive in check while the incumbent Congressman was free to use all means of persuasion.

### Conclusion

Clarence Cannon was a dynamic man who carefully protected his interests and his position. He was conscientious in his work and in his methodology for maintaining control of his constituency and his committee. He was obviously conscious of his capabilities, and he used to his advantage many of the assets that he possessed. He was aggressive, analytical, and industrious in his endeavors. The evidence also indicates that Cannon was astutely aware of the power of public speaking both as a campaign tool and as a means of transferring information to his constituents. He intentionally made speeches in Congress on subjects that his adversary had initiated. Thus he eliminated potential issues and deprived his opponents of any conceivable advantages. His preparation, his rationale for action, and his conscious use of psychological campaigning demonstrate the aggressiveness, the industry, and the advance planning which are necessary to keep a politician in office.

The conclusions regarding his speech preparation were drawn from circumstantial materials from folders found in the Western Manuscripts Collection at the University of Missouri Library. Cannon's comments written on to the materials were invaluable in gaining insight into his preparation, and it also revealed many of his views on public

speaking. The fact that he was successful in reelection would indicate that his preparation techniques did not harm him, and his comments as to the effects of a bad speech would seem to assert that he felt that his public addresses were important in his career. If they were not (and this will be investigated later), then the extent of research, organization, and the general area of being prepared should not be among the first areas of suspicion when looking for the causes of inadequate response.

## CHAPTER THREE

### CANNON BEGINS WITH COOLIDGE: 1922-1928

The beginning Congressman has many things to learn in his new job. Ordinarily he must learn about the workings of Congress, and he needs to learn how to convert the interests of his constituency into national legislation. Usually a Congressman serves an apprenticeship on minor committees, and then, if he is re-elected, and if he does his job well, he is promoted to more important jobs.<sup>1</sup> Clarence Cannon had an advantage over most Congressmen, as he had viewed Congress when he was a confidential clerk to Champ Clark, and he was parliamentarian of the House under Democratic and Republican Speakers.

Even with this advantage Cannon chose to wait to deliver a major address. He may have been waiting for the right moment, the right topic, or perhaps he was trying to find a topic of local interest which would fit into national legislation. A look at the historical events will help illustrate the selections available to the new Congressman, and it will attempt to show why this beginning Congressman stuck with his constituents' problems.

---

<sup>1</sup>Richard F. Fenno, Jr., gives a detailed description of the roles played by new members of the appropriations committee in his article, "The Appropriations Committee As A Political System," New Perspectives on the House of Representatives, ED. Robert L. Peabody and Nelson W. Polsby (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963), pp. 79-108. See especially, pp. 95-98.



Cannon might have picked an economic topic in 1924, except for the fact that Coolidge prosperity was in full swing. A look at the advertisements of goods and services causes the present consumer to want the past prices with present salaries. For instance, Best and Company was selling "men's English Oxfords" for \$10.00 and coffee was selling for thirty-nine cents a pound. The American scene supported golf, and why not when one could buy a single club for \$2.50, or a complete set for \$9.95. Women's walking sticks were on special at B. Altman and Company. (It should be noted that the advertisement does not specify their use). Men's hats of the soft variety listed at \$3.50 for the winter months.

Magazines had an unusual price for the current observer, and an even more unusual method of advertising. In the May 23, 1924 New York Times, the Curtis company advertised an article concerning the current farm problems in The Country Gentleman magazine.

A silent man on most topics, the President talks with freedom about agriculture, defining his beliefs, his policies for relief of the nation's farmers. He understands farming as no other President in recent years had understood -- he is the first farm boy in 35 years to become President of the United States. Read David Lawrence's exclusive interview with Mr. Coolidge in the May 24, issue. (Five cents a copy, \$1 a year)

The above prices were right in line with the market. Many people were investing; and if they could have predicted the rise of the Bull Market, they would have purchased General Electric stock for  $220\frac{1}{2}$ , General Motors for 83, B. F. Goodrich for 21, Coca Cola for 66, Sinclair for 203, Sears for 83, Packard for 10, U.S. Rubber for 30, and Woolworth for  $318\frac{1}{2}$ . The dips and unbelievable rises would have been a good topic for a speech if the "great depression" had been anticipated by Cannon, but in 1924, prices and prosperity did not indicate the eventual crash.

"Violence" would have been a good topic for the year, and at least one other speaker used it as a step to oratorical fame. Clarence Darrow defended Leopold and Loeb in the Franks murder case. Frederick Lewis Allen describes Darrow as "a radical, a friend of the underdog, an agnostic, who had recently jumped into the limelight through his defense of Leopold and Loeb."<sup>2</sup> Within a year Darrow would engage another famous orator, William Jennings Bryan, in the famous Scopes trial; and while this might not be violence in the same sense, it certainly created a violent reaction. The topic of violence in religion was handled by the courts in those years, and Cannon couldn't, or at least didn't, find a speech topic in violence or religion.

The newspapers covered many popular activities in the sports world; in baseball, Rabbit Maranville won a game for the Pirates in the 14th inning; and racing, tennis, golf, fencing, boxing, football, basketball, polo, crew, pocket billiards, and rugby all received coverage in the New York Times. While many Missourians have been interested in sports, the province of sports rhetoric among politicians is occupied with professional sports anti-trust suits in 1924.

There were many political problems which Cannon might have picked as a subject for a major speech. On international topics, President Coolidge wrote a letter opposing the independence of the Phillipine Islands and said, "The Phillipine people are by no means equipped . . . for the heavy burden . . . of political independence."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup>Frederick Lewis Allen, Only Yesterday, (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 168. The brackets are mine.

<sup>3</sup>Irving and Nell Kull, An Encyclopedia of American History, (New York: Eagle Books, 1965), p. 366.

Cannon took exception to the remarks, and while later supporting the efforts for the nation's independence, did not speak on the issue in 1924.

There were other interesting political problems. The Teapot Dome investigation was a controversial topic, especially for an election year. And while the campaigning was highlighted by the furor, the National Election results were not indicative of the furor. Cannon's decision to leave the affair to older and wiser politicians appears to have been a wise one, because it did not affect his district.

Since it was an election year, the political conventions nominated their candidates. The Republicans nominated Calvin Coolidge for President, and the Democrats nominated John W. Davis of West Virginia and Charles W. Bryan as his running mate. There was a third power in the 1924 election which was significant enough to gain attention. Burl Noggle evaluates the abilities of the third party candidate.

Coolidge and Davis were the two leading contestants, but at least one minor party candidate was their equal, even their superior, in ability and achievement. The Republican Senator of Wisconsin received the presidential nomination on a Progressive Party ticket . . . .<sup>4</sup>

With all of these potential issues, Cannon had to pick something which would heighten his appeal with the people of his district and establish his competence as a member of Congress. The first term in office is an important one in establishing a reputation and image for the voters of a Representative's district. Therefore, Clarence Cannon selected an issue which would attract support from his constituents as well as demonstrate his position on a national topic. He selected the

---

<sup>4</sup>Taken from Burl Noggle, Teapot Dome, (New York: Norton Library, 1965), p. 165. He attributes the idea to Kenneth McKay, The Progressive Movement of 1924, (New York, 1947).

McNary-Haugen Farm Relief Bill as his speech topic. It was a measure concerning price equities of farm products, and the results of the bill would have far-reaching effects on the farm community and on the organization of farm cooperatives.

Because this was a local concern, because it was a topic on which Cannon was prepared to speak, and because the local concern would be incorporated in national legislation, he selected this topic as his first major address. An impressive defense of local interest would help insure his return to Congress even against an incumbent President in prosperous times. This speech on the McNary-Haugen bill will be the subject of analysis throughout the remainder of the chapter.

### Logical Analysis

The purpose of Cannon's speech seems to emanate from his experience in a farm community and his already vast experience as a parliamentarian. Having served as parliamentarian under both Republican and Democratic House Speakers, he was aware of the methods of eliminating a bill before it can be presented adequately. In the beginning of his speech, he attempted to clarify the issue:

If the House agrees to a motion to strike out the enacting clause after the reading of the first section, there will be no opportunity to read the bill under the five-minute rule and, of course, no opportunity to offer amendments. That is a final disposition of the bill without opportunity for perfecting amendments of any kind.<sup>5</sup>

Cannon's initial purpose was to prevent the passing of the motion to strike the enacting clause. It was this parliamentary foresight which provided the introduction for this speech.

---

<sup>5</sup>Congressional Record, May 23, 1924, p. 9343. See Appendix A for complete text.

The topic was suited to him because of his knowledge of the needs of his Congressional district, and this debate afforded him the opportunity to speak in behalf of the farmer. The effects of farm prices were severely felt in a small farm community. Missouri, as a prime agriculture producer in 1924, and Elsberry, as a small community, made Cannon acutely aware of the price competition facing the farmer. A knowledge of what the bill would accomplish provided the rationale for his thesis statement.

The bill is merely designed to give the farmers an opportunity to organize and develop their own marketing machinery, a task accomplished by every other industry many years ago, but hitherto denied the farmer by conditions of environment and economic handicaps.<sup>6</sup>

He repeated the purpose of the bill, and was more specific about what the farmer would gain from a bill of this nature. The effort was primarily pointed to equating industry and farming.

It proposes to provide for the use of the farmer the same marketing advantages now utilized by the producers of manufactured goods. It proposes to relieve the domestic market of the surplus which depresses the price and sell it abroad under the jurisdiction of a centralized expert agency similar to that employed by steel, textile, and other industries. It creates for this purpose a Government agency to be known as the United States Agricultural Export Corporation.<sup>7</sup>

Realizing what the bill would produce, Cannon delivered the thesis statement of the speech. It was to pass the bill in order to give the farmer an opportunity to form the necessary protection that others have sought through legislation.

The only course open then is to bring agricultural prices to a par with the prices of other commodities to make the farm dollar worth as much as the industrial dollar, to apply to

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 9347.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 9345.

agriculture the same principles already applied to other industries, and that is what the McNary-Haugen Bill proposes to do.<sup>8</sup>

The recurring theme was to give the farmer equality through the passage of the McNary-Haugen Bill. The speech spent most of its content justifying this status of equality. The following section describes the methodology of the speaker as he justified the parallels between industry and farming.

Cannon's analysis of the problem seems to justify the action he asks for throughout the speech. The evidence that he presents seems to be valid, since he supported the mainpoints of his speech. For example, he used statistics compiled by the Congress, by the New York Federal Reserve Bank, by Standard Oil, U. S. Steel, and by several prominent railroads. He used tax sources, the Missouri Bankers' Association, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, and National Stock Yards, and several general figures from some smaller organizations. There was also a use of quotations from history, from Abraham Lincoln, from Secretary Wallace; from a letter from the B & O Railroad, from the metropolitan newspapers, and from his personal experience. It should be noted that the speaker used many pieces of evidence to establish a point and that he made an effort to mix the types and sources of evidence in order to support the conclusions from various viewpoints. For example, the point which Cannon established concerning the growth of the United States was illustrated with quotations which seem to cover and support the point that he was trying to prove. Following are some of the sources which he used to prove his point.

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

The year 1923, was incomparably the greatest year in industrial and financial growth and development since the discovery of America. Figures compiled by the New York Federal Bank indicate that during the year, 200 representative corporations manufacturing practically every commodity consumed by modern civilization, and profits of \$834,000,000 as the record year for volume of business and percentage of profits. The dividend of 300 percent aggregating \$318,423,295.38, declared by the Standard Oil group, the surplus of more than \$6,353,350, reported by the International Shoe Co.; the annual revenue of half a billion dollars flowing into the coffers of the United States Steel Corporation and its surplus of \$54,259,993.64 are typical of the unprecedented earnings of practically every great business in the country.<sup>9</sup>

His use of different types of evidence is shown when he described the recent success of the railroads.

The Pennsylvania Railroad drew a revenue for 1923 in excess of \$775,000,000, a new high-water mark, and the general passenger agent of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, in a circular letter to the members of this House, announced that the year 1923 was the most prosperous in the history of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.<sup>10</sup>

The same technique was used in showing that the farmer was in an extremely unequal situation. And the comparison was supported with similar proofs. There is a large volume of evidence that supported the points that Cannon was making. Therefore, his speech was not weak because of the amount of supporting material. The skill of analysis and synthesis is revealed in Cannon's method of relating the evidence to his arguments and formulating it into a logical sequence. The evidence was used to formulate a primarily deductive speech. Many of the major arguments were constructed on the hypothetical syllogism. For example, he initiated his speech by explaining the consequences of a parliamentary motion to strike out the enacting clause. The premises for the hypothetical syllogism were within the context of Cannon's explanation. But to

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 9344.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

make sure that the audience understood the effects, he put the major premise in the "if, then" structure when he said:

If the House agrees to a motion to strike out the enacting clause after the reading of the first section, there will be no opportunity to read the bill under the five-minute rule and, of course, no opportunity to offer any amendments.<sup>11</sup>

The speaker proceeded to give reasons why the debate should not be cut off, and in fact, he argued that the bill should be passed. His minor premise was that:

Elemental justice demands that agriculture receive the same opportunity which has been accorded every other interest in the country since the session began, and as a motion is offered to strike out the enacting clause and deny further consideration it should be decisively defeated and the farmer given at least an opportunity to present his case. [Applause]<sup>12</sup>

The conclusion was obvious, then, that the enactment clause should be left in the bill. The whole introduction of the speech was tied up in this hypothetical syllogism and smoothly led Cannon into the main text of the speech, which was designed to show the use and effectiveness of the McNary-Haugen Bill.

Another instance of the hypothetical syllogism demonstrated how the farmer could profit under the McNary-Haugen system.

If the price of the 404 articles advanced, the price of hogs would advance; if the price of the 404 commodities declined, the price of hogs would decline.

So the farmer could always be certain that the dollars which he received for his hogs would buy as much as they bought before the war. He could no longer be robbed, as under the present system, by having the manufacturer raise the price of the 404 necessities while the packer at the same time lowers the price of hogs.<sup>13</sup>

There are several ways of approaching what Cannon is saying; but probably

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 9343.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 9344.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 9346.



the plainest way is simply, that, if the farmer is no longer to be robbed then, Congress should pass legislation (the McNary-Haugen bill) which keeps prices correlative with manufactured items. The farmer should not be robbed, therefore, pass the McNary-Haugen bill. This syllogism not only was powerful as a logical method, but it had significant language implications and pathetic appeals which will be discussed later.

Cannon also used a disjunctive syllogism in this speech. He completed the syllogism by stating the alternatives; and after denying the desirability of one alternative, he established the second alternative as the only possible solution.

Either farm products must be raised to the level of non-agricultural goods or the price of the latter must be brought down to that of farm products. This is the great problem in the United States today. The latter course is not to be considered. It is neither practicable nor desirable. The only course open then is to bring agricultural prices to a par with the prices of other commodities -- to make the farm dollar worth as much as the industrial dollar, to apply to agriculture the same principles already applied to other industries, and that is what the McNary-Haugen bill proposes to do.<sup>14</sup>

By explaining the alternatives and illustrating the effect of both clauses, and then proceeding to use former arguments to justify his conclusion, Cannon is technically correct in his use of the disjunctive syllogism. The question which was not posed was, are these the only alternatives? Certainly they would be the desirable alternatives for the defender of the syllogism, but an opponent may see other possible solutions.

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 9345.

As an advocate, Cannon used these deductive methods carefully and accurately, and his conclusions must be judged valid until alternatives can be suggested.

He was also adept at the methods of induction. The speech was constructed in such a way that it was necessary to show that the United States was wealthy, that industry had received many aids from the government, and that the farmer had received neither wealth nor aid. Cannon illustrated all of the points inductively by giving an abundance of examples, by showing cause and effect, and by comparing the alternatives at issue.

Examples, statistics, testimony, and personal experience were previously discussed as evidence. The volume of materials gave credence to his position on the McNary-Haugen bill. The inductive cause-effect illustration further strengthened his position and can best be illustrated in Cannon's explanation of farm spending.

When we come to investigate this remarkable discrepancy between the buying power of the farm dollar and that of the industrial dollar we find it is directly due to methods and conditions of marketing.<sup>15</sup>

Cannon then proceeded to illustrate this cause-effect relationship by using specific instances of past farm spending and future plans for farm expenditures, and from these instances he drew his conclusion.

The comparison-contrast technique was illustrated in describing the wide differences between farming and business. In the structure of the speech, he built the entire first section on the success of America

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 9345.

and business. Then, very discreetly, he depicted how little the farmer really has financially. This comparison technique dominated the speech until he reached an explanation of the McNary-Haugen bill. Here is a description of the city, and country environment as viewed by Cannon.

While industry is enjoying an era of prosperity never dreamed of and labor is receiving the highest wage since the dawn of civilization, the farmers of America are in direct distress. Farm products are selling at less than the cost of production; taxes remain unpaid; credit is exhausted; farms are being abandoned; country banks are failing; foreclosures are common; and standards of living have declined to a minimum. While the roar of traffic and the hum of prosperity fill the cities, out in the country only a few miles away are ruin and privation.<sup>16</sup>

The differences were alarming for the farmer, and the rewards of the two different atmospheres were illustrated in the move away from country life. This section of the speech portrays the great division between the prosperous and the non-prosperous, and its intent was to show the vast financial distance between the two groups. Another illustration shows how Cannon viewed the double standards applied to the two areas.

We are told that the farmer's problem can not be solved by the enactment of laws; that we can not legislate prosperity. Apparently it is all right to legislate for the millionaire banker, the Wall Street capitalist, the industrial baron and the railroad manipulator, but when the farmer presumes to ask for a living wage the proposition is branded as economically unsound and socialistic and he is given fatherly advice and told he must help himself.<sup>17</sup>

The deductive and inductive methods used by Cannon were well constructed. He supported his reasoning with several types of proof, and he attempted to give sufficient examples in order to insure credibility of the argument. In this 1924 speech, he had arguments, evidence,

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 9344.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 9346.

and organization, and he correlated the materials to his arguments and to his main thesis statement.

### Emotional Analysis

The appeals that Cannon used to attempt to arouse the emotions of the audience show that he was aware of the audience that he was addressing. Even more importantly, the speech reveals that he selected appeals that might get a favorable reaction from his audience. The major appeal throughout the speech was "justice." The first question would obviously be, how do you know the theme was justice? And secondly, what audience was he addressing? The first question is relatively easy to answer. There are at least ten references to the theme of justice within the speech. The opening and closing of the speech are based on the concept of fair play, and the body of the speech contains a large number of advantages which industry had accumulated, and which had been denied to the farmer. The first historical example used portrayed the plight of the farmer, and it also compared justice of today and yesteryear.

One of the principal grievances charged against King John of England, during his regency for Richard, was that he refused to hear the common people. The wealthy and noble could always secure an audience, but the peasant, the farmer, and the laborer, the bone and sinew of medieval England, were denied and refused redress. If this motion to strike out the enacting clause is agreed to, the Sixty-eighth Congress subjects itself to the same criticism. The rich and powerful have never failed to receive a respectful hearing by this Congress.<sup>18</sup>

According to the speech text, Cannon received applause in the next paragraph when he argued that the enactment restriction would deny the

---

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 9343-44.

barest elements of justice. Other phrases throughout the speech show that the farmers' position in society was below the standards of the rest of the population. He also illustrated that the amount of work and effort of agriculture, compared to industry, was grossly disproportionate to the awards which the farmer received. Such statements as, "But the farmers' disadvantage does not end there. That is only the beginning;" and, "Under this double system of shortchanging, the farmer is rapidly being reduced to peonage," illustrates that Cannon was aiming at a more just alignment of profit for the farmer.<sup>19</sup>

This was not the only manner in which Mr. Cannon applied his appeal to justice. His quotation from Abraham Lincoln and a phrase from the preamble to the Constitution was an attempt to stir the feelings of patriotism, and to remind the audience that the United States would never knowingly propagate injustice. The final paragraph sums up the inequities that the farmer has received and this appeal also received applause from the audience.

The farmer deserves well at the hands of the Nation. He has produced unstintedly the most essential element of national wealth. He has fed to surfeit our armies in war and our citizens in peace. Suffering rankling inequalities, he has nevertheless generously and patriotically contributed his all with meager reward. We must not fail him in his hour of need. Let us pass this bill and restore to him and the rural America their rightful share of the Nation's prosperity. [Applause]<sup>20</sup>

Since the theme of justice is so prevalent, the question as to whom Cannon was addressing needs to be asked. The first response to the question, of course, is the Representatives. Cannon, as a relatively new

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 9345.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 9347.

member of the House, was supporting the bill and was urging the other members at least to give it an opportunity to be debated in full. This approach would be especially appealing to those Representatives who represented farm communities and states, similar to Cannon. His speech was also useful in demonstrating how well the new Representative from Missouri could defend his areas' interests. This type of debate speech was well suited to Cannon's abilities (as was noted earlier) and under most conditions seems to be logically sound and well supported. The appeals to justice and to the responsibilities of the protectors of the constitution seem to be well adapted to the law makers.

While the above description fits the audience in the chamber, it in no way precludes the possibility that the speech was delivered for someone other than the House of Representatives. In fact, many of the quotations seem to show an appeal far beyond the halls of the House. The appeals to patriotism and justice, the illustration of the farmer and the use of the constitution were appealing to the Missouri home-folk as well as to the lawmakers. Perhaps the use of Missouri examples was even more appealing to his constituents than it would to the House members. His supporting material builds the prestige of the farmer and his use of the Missouri Farmers Association is a good illustration of the point.

The two greatest livestock commission companies in the Central West, if not in America, are the Farmers' Commission Co., organized by the Missouri Farmers' Association, and Producers' Commission Co., organized by the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 9347.

and

The Missouri Farmers' Association organized in 1914, is today the largest dealer in poultry and eggs in the United States and handles a larger volume of business in the two commodities than either Armour or Swift.<sup>22</sup>

The appeal to the local audience is further demonstrated when Cannon extended his remarks by giving examples of how the McNary-Haugen bill would benefit the farmer. His examples were based on the Missouri farmer and he illustrated how the bill would benefit the Missourian.

During the year 1923, the State of Missouri produced 37,947,000 bushels of wheat, 196,000,000 bushels of corn and approximately 1,111,600,000 pounds of pork.

The table below shows the additional revenue which would have been derived from these products had the ratio price been in effect:

Missouri, 1923	
APPROXIMATE INCREASE IN WHEAT, CORN AND HOG VALUES IF RATIO PRICES HAD BEEN IN EFFECT	
Wheat - - - - -	-\$19,352,970
Corn - - - - -	31,497,600
Hogs - - - - -	<u>46,687,200</u>
Total - - - - -	-\$97,537,770

In other words, under the McNary-Haugen bill the State of Missouri would have received in one year from these three commodities alone approximately \$1,000,000,000 more than the prices actually paid the farmers who produced them.<sup>23</sup>

According to Cannon, the Missouri farmer should be quite concerned with the obvious loss of income. The reason then that Cannon supported the bill becomes clear, and very real when felt in the pocketbook, especially when according to Mr. Cannon, it was an unjustified and an unnecessary loss.

Finally, Mr. Cannon shows the tragedy of the situation, and he illustrates how the Missouri farmer is typical of the nation's struggling agriculture population.

---

<sup>22</sup>ibid., p. 9347.

<sup>23</sup>ibid., p. 9346.

And Missouri is no exception. The entire farming industry is affected by a devastating financial blight. According to a survey by the Department of Agriculture the average gross annual income per farm in the United States is \$712. This is not for each person but for each farm. It is the pitiful reward of those who work the longest hours, under the most adverse weather conditions, and at the most laborious profession known to man.<sup>24</sup>

While it is true that Cannon is addressing his constituency, which is almost totally a farm population, he is speaking for the farmer everywhere when he says:

While the roar of traffic and the hum of prosperity fill the cities, out in the country only a few miles away are ruin and privation.<sup>25</sup>

The young representative seems to be aware of certain emotional appeals and that these appeals covered a wide range of listeners. The appeal to justice fits both the immediate Congressional audience and the audience of farmers. The attempt to influence the Congressmen might enable Cannon to pass the bill. The appeal for the farmer would gain him support whether he won the debate or not.

### Ethical Analysis

Whether one analyzes the speaking of Clarence Cannon from the Aristotelian definition of "ethos" or from a modern viewpoint of "Personal Proof" the result is the same. This study will use the terms "competence, good character, and good will" to describe the occurrence of ethical appeal in Cannon's speaking. This section of the chapter will view his ethos through the text of his speech, and it will relate his

---

<sup>24</sup> ibid., pp. 9344-45.

<sup>25</sup> ibid., p. 9344.



ethos to the probable audiences.<sup>26</sup>

The major method of establishing competence was discussed throughout the logical analysis section. The young Congressman worked hard to establish a valid chain of reasoning, and he supported his arguments with a large supply of evidence. The evidence came from many sources, and the whole speech gives an impression of respectable argument. Whether the audience completely agreed with his conclusion is not important at this point. The important question is whether or not they had respect for the work and methodology. While there is no evidence available for this speech, it was this kind of speech which won him a reputation as a conscientious worker.

Fully armed in every debate and discussion he was a formidable ally when he was on your side of an issue; equally formidable if he were on the other.<sup>27</sup>

Another Representative from Missouri was more specific about Cannon's ability to be fully armed for debate.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps to me the greatest trait of this very distinguished American was that he was what I would regard as a Congressman's Congressman. He was a real student. He did his homework. He had strong views, but he backed them up through the work in which he engaged.<sup>28</sup>

These examples are demonstrations of the reputation that Cannon developed as a speaker. This particular speech illustrates how the young Missouri Representative achieved his reputation.

Representative Carl Vinson knew Cannon when Clarence was first brought to Washington, D. C. with Champ Clark. He was impressed with

---

<sup>26</sup>Kenneth G. Hance, David C. Ralph, and Milton J. Wiksell, Principles of Speaking, Second edition, (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1969), p. 80.

<sup>27</sup>Representative Joe D. Waggoner, Memorial Services, p. 100.

<sup>28</sup>Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Memorial Services, p. 21.

Cannon from the first time he met him, and was pleased when Cannon was elected to Congress. He found that Cannon was a very capable and respected Congressman. "He had already made his mark in the House even before becoming a Member, and he immediately attained a position of prominence and respect."

Cannon's use of local materials gave an impression of competence to his constituency as well as to his colleagues. His use of Missouri businesses not only kept him in touch with Missouri problems, it gave the voters an opportunity to check on the situation as Cannon explained it.

He also used his parliamentary knowledge to introduce the subject of his speech. Since he had been parliamentarian under both Republican and Democratic Speakers of the House, this acknowledged competence gave him an entry into a topic at which he was not yet an acknowledged expert. Perhaps this was an attempt to develop competence from one subject (parliamentary procedure) into another area (farm problems).

By using justice as a theme, and by illustrating that the farmer was being unfairly discriminated against, Cannon was building his appeal in the eyes of his district voter. This was an effort to establish good character. To illustrate that he was only asking for a fair deal, Cannon reviewed the legislation.

In fact, the farmer in urging this legislation is asking no favors and seeking no special consideration. The bill is not a measure proposing class legislation by depriving others of their rights as is so often and so unjustly charged, but proposes merely to restore to the farmer rights of which he has long been deprived by legislation already on the statute books.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup>Congressional Record, May 23, 1924, p. 9346.



It is difficult to believe that an audience of Representatives from the farm area, or that residents of a farm community, could find Cannon a man of ill will in this speech. The opponents of the McNary-Haugen bill would undoubtedly view the situation with a different perspective. However, the technique, and the attempt to force the opposition into an unfavorable light, must be admired.

While opponents may have discerned a degree of ill will when Cannon slipped a bit of sarcasm in the speech, his supporters would have probably approved of this tactic.

. . . the financial experts, in summing up in the metropolitan newspapers the situation on January 1, 1924, announced that Wall Street had enjoyed a great year and was "satisfied." Those conversant with what is required to gorge it can well understand what is meant when it is announced that Wall Street is "satisfied."<sup>30</sup>

The very nature of his procedure and product was an initial form of ethos building, when the whole of Cannon's career is put into perspective. The standards of evidence and reasoning were high in this speech, and these standards were respected by men such as Representatives Waggonner and Curtis. The appeals to patriotism and justice can be viewed as personal values of the new Representative, and these values helped establish the character of the speaker. The degree with which he maintained these standards will be closely watched throughout this paper.

There is one other factor which Cannon used to establish a favorable reputation as Congressman.

---

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 9344.



Even in the busy life he led, he always maintained an immaculate appearance in a well pressed suit. For a man who had reached the age of 85, he was truly a remarkable person.<sup>31</sup>

Evidently Cannon was aware of impressions and he attempted to eradicate any unnecessary complications of ethos by maintaining strict standards of research, preparation, and appearance.

### Conclusion

The young Clarence Cannon had an excellent grasp of the principles guiding the use of evidence and reasoning. He had sufficient and representative evidence and he used it in a variety of ways. His logical construction was accurate and imaginative, and the syllogisms are supported and valid as he used them. He used theme repetition to carry his point, and his comparison and contrast techniques were interesting and enlightening in describing the difference between the farmer and the city folk.

The emotional appeals by Mr. Cannon revealed a consciousness of his potential audience. He appealed to the victimized farmer by citing the Constitution, Abraham Lincoln, justice, and equality. He used the same appeals to convince the Congressmen that the bill was justified and necessary. The complications of working with the two audiences were vast, but the speech was appealing to both groups.

A measurement of this speech is difficult to assess. Was the speech a success? A correlation between this speech and his re-election is impossible, but the amount of interest that speeches of this nature created is described by Burl Noggle:

---

<sup>31</sup>Representative William J. Randall, Memorial Services, p. 31.

But John P. Gleason, while not denying the self-interest that business displayed in the 1920's, has found that debate and publicity on the McNary-Haugen plan among businessmen was "decidedly beneficial" to the American farmer. Although most businessmen opposed the plan, they did begin to realize that something must be done about the farm problem. The McNary-Haugen campaign "helped to prepare the business community for (New Deal form) legislation of the 1930's."<sup>32</sup>

At the very least Cannon established a viewpoint which his constituency and colleagues could evaluate for future use. At the most he created a showdown which the Saturday Evening Post described.

Being a farmer himself, and representing a wholly rural district, Cannon is an especially fast man with a billion when it comes to farm legislation. Cannon's canniness has pushed every type of aid to agriculture since 1924, when his parliamentary skill forced a vote on the pioneer McNary-Haugen farm-price-support bill -- a showdown neither major party wanted in that presidential-election year.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup>Burl Noggle, "The Twenties: A Historiographical Frontier," The Journal of American History, Vol. 53, (September, 1966), p. 308.

<sup>33</sup>P. F. Healy, "Nobody Loves Clarence," Saturday Evening Post, V. CCXXII, (March 25, 1950),

## CHAPTER FOUR

### CANNON AND HOOVER FACE THE DEPRESSION: 1928-1932

The years of the Hoover administration were years which saw Cannon spend his speaking time clarifying his views about government spending compared to government income. It was also a time which necessitated speeches to gain support from Missouri voters. Depression times were times which had to be spent placating the constituents, or at least a Congressman must appear to be making an effort to satisfy their needs. It was necessary to keep the district populations informed about Congressional affairs so that the depression could be explained and perhaps settled in some manner. Certainly with a Republican still in the White House (even though he was a new one) a stalwart Democrat looking for issues should not be at a loss for a subject which justifies his stand and points out the inadequacies of the Republican administration.

Cannon, however, did not choose the route of partisan politics and opponent castigation. Rather, he continued to build on his former farm policies (such as the McNary Haugen Bill) and spending, and he also established several Missouri projects as necessary and desirable.

By March 30, 1932, the economic situation required a forty million bushel of wheat distribution throughout the organizational machinery of the Red Cross. In July, an additional forty-five million bushels of wheat and 240,000,000 pounds of cotton were added for further distribution by the Red Cross. Grain and cotton prices dropped steadily, and,



the farmer suffered because of the many price letdowns. Cannon had illustrated the problem as early as July 28, 1931, when he issued a statement through the Democratic National Committee.<sup>1</sup> He showed wheat at 23¢, corn at 30¢, and cotton at 6-7¢, with prices still tumbling. A look at the average yearly prices of wheat, corn, and cotton demonstrates the market problem.

	1925	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933
Wheat	1.437	1.036	.671	.391	.382	.744 dollars/bushel
Corn	.701	.799	.518	.321	.316	.520 dollars/bushel
Cotton	19.61	16.78	9.46	5.66	6.52	10.17 cents/pound <sup>2</sup>

While farmers in the Middle West were given a moratorium on taxes in some counties of Kansas, there was no moratorium on drought or on the plague of grasshoppers reported in Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota.<sup>3</sup>

The depth of depression was reached in that 1932 period. Besides the farm problems, the Stock Exchange prices dropped from a 1929 high total index of 26.02 to a 1932 low of 6.93.<sup>4</sup> Unemployment reached fifteen million by the end of the year, with the national income cut from \$81 billion to \$42 billion. On July 1, 1929, Secretary Mellon predicted a tax cut for the year (because of a surplus of \$185 million and a \$300 million surplus estimated by 1931), but the depression soon made it impossible for his prediction to be realized.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>New York Times, July 28, 1931, "Blames High Tariff for Farmer's Ills."

<sup>2</sup>The Statistical History of the United States from Colonial Times to the Present, (Stanford, Connecticut: Fairfield Publishers, 1965, pp. 296-297, 301.

<sup>3</sup>Irving S. & Nell M. Kull, An Encyclopedia of American History, pp. 381-82.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 657.

<sup>5</sup>N. Y. T. headlines on July 1, 1929.

Foreign policy was often forgotten during this period for several reasons: (1) domestic policies caused sufficient aggravation and unsettled problems; (2) Stimson and Hoover did not view cause and solutions in the same manner; (3) and the lack of cooperation eventually between the President and the Secretary of State led to a stalemate. Richard W. Leopold verified that these types of problems existed between Stimson and Hoover.

He (Stimson) was readier to support diplomacy with armed forces and to maintain peace through consultative treaties. He believed that economic sanctions could restrain an aggressor, while Hoover feared they would precipitate hostilities. The President was cautious, circumspect, and keenly alive to domestic pressures; the Secretary was bold, forthright, and deeply concerned with foreign problems . . . . For two years they worked in harmony and then drifted steadily apart.<sup>6</sup>

The depression was a good reason for stressing domestic problems because the domestic problems were immediate to the people, and the solution of those problems necessitated the attention and action by Congressmen. The small businessman and the rural population were dependent on the action that Congress would take regarding prices and stabilization. The voters were anxious to know what their Congressmen had in mind as a solution. There is little wonder then, that on March 30, 1932, Cannon gave a speech designed to bring revenue into the government.

Just eight days later Franklin Delano Roosevelt broadcast his "forgotten man" speech, which would keynote his preconvention campaign. Cannon was appealing to the same kind of individual with the same, though more limited, objective in mind; reelection to Congress.

The amendment presented by Cannon was designed to force the big businesses to pay a larger share of the taxes and it was also designed to

---

<sup>6</sup>Richard W. Leopold, The Growth of American Foreign Policy, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), p. 410.

11

5.4.

— — —

— 4 —

71.

11

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 84

24.

100

—

1

15

21

10

10

2

• • • • •

prevent the large corporations from eliminating the small, independent businesses. The development of the solution, the attempt to equalize competition, and the increase of government income are the major points of the speech. The logical techniques used in this speech differ significantly from the speech previously examined and the change in the techniques will be closely followed.

### Logical Analysis

The first argument that Cannon advanced was designed to show that the weight of evidence was favorable to the amendment. While the arguments appeared to be documented it was really an appeal to prestige. The effort to include so many important personages seems to attempt to preclude a substantive examination of the issues. Who could refuse the amendment or deny the support by the Speaker of the House, the majority leader, and the acting chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and still vote logically? The inference was that because of the powerful support, the amendment must make sense.

All three distinguished Members of the House with their long experience in matters of tax legislation and with an intimate knowledge of the principles of taxation, heartily indorsed [sic] the proposal presented in this amendment when it was under consideration in 1929.<sup>7</sup>

The evidence, then, was based on the prestige of his colleagues, and this was perhaps one of the most significant mistakes in his public speaking career.

There are several possible explanations regarding Cannon's action. He could have been attempting to force Garner into a public statement; he

---

<sup>7</sup>Congressional Record, March 30, 1932, p. 7124. See Appendix B for complete text.

could have used Garner's 1929 support as evidence of the value of the proposition; or, he could have failed to check with the leaders regarding their present disposition toward the matter. The last of these possibilities seems to be the most likely because Cannon does not pursue a logical course of discussion that would reveal Garner's inconsistencies, nor does he push Garner for a supported explanation of the change in position. Also, he drops all discussion about the leaders' attitudes toward the bill, and frantically attempts to substitute documented materials in place of prestige. Finally, there is no further reference to Garner or the other leaders as evidence for the strength of the proposition. The analysis of the evidence and reasoning will demonstrate the shift in Cannon's approach after Garner's intercession. Therefore, Cannon evidently failed to check his sources in order to find out whether the Speaker of the House was still supporting an amendment which attempted to force the corporations to pay their share of taxes rather than avoid taxation by consolidating their returns.

The tax system that Cannon was discussing allowed large corporations to discount their taxation by taking losses on the subsidiary companies. The discounting on subsidiary companies not only avoided a large amount of taxation, it facilitated the crushing of small independent businesses which were forced to pay normal taxes. At the end of Cannon's allotted speaking time, Garner felt compelled to explain his present position on the matter. The essence of the statement was rather condemning.

"MR. GARNER. I refer to the committee amendment, of course. I think you will make a mistake if you adopt the Cannon amendment."<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>ibid., p. 7127.

Speaker Garner had an explanation for his change in position. He explained that while money was being lost, as Cannon illustrated, through consolidated returns, and that while he had fought a hard battle to eliminate the consolidated and affiliated returns, the former position had two major flaws. First, the financial situation would not yield much. Second, after the first year the bookkeepers could readjust to eliminate much of the effect of the amendment.

The effect of Mr. Garner's statement was catastrophic to Cannon's speech. It ruined most of the logical basis for accepting his position. The fact that Cannon had relied on the prestige of the most important members of the House is easily illustrated. There were practically no other sources in the speech. There was one illustration from the Bible, but the rest of the speech was supported by illustrating how DuPont Company and a few other companies had escaped taxation by allowing subsidiaries to take losses which alleviated the parent corporations' tax problems. It is true that Cannon portrayed the step-by-step procedures which the companies used to evade the taxes; it is also true that he portrayed the companies' methods of eliminating competition. He did not, however, give a source for any of the information. Notice how he described the working order of the organization without stating how he had accumulated the information or how he had verified the accurateness of the information.

The result is that the chain stores not only escape taxation but they use the law to drive out competition. Whenever a chain store is established in a new location, or whenever competition becomes troublesome, the chain store deliberately lowers prices, and runs at a loss until the home store across the street is driven to the wall and either closes or sells out. The loss in this branch of the chain is credited in the tax returns against profits made in other branches and the chain escapes taxation while it crushes the home merchant. Then when competition is eliminated the chain restores prices to a profitable basis and recoups its losses and is prepared

to open up a new location or strangle any independent merchant who tries to enter the field.<sup>9</sup>

Later Cannon did verify that the government was losing millions of dollars by having the loophole in the law. He stated that the "Federal Trade Commission after exhaustive hearings" confirmed that the government was losing millions of dollars unnecessarily, but this is the closest that he came to supporting his material.

The conclusion of the speech shows the effect of the unanticipated switch by Garner as Cannon shifted ground. Forced into abandoning his amendment, he tried to salvage his arguments by switching to a recommendation to increase the rate requested in the committee amendment.

But may I at the same time suggest an increase in the amount to be contributed by these corporations over that proposed by the committee? Do you realize that consolidated corporations taking advantage of this law, constituting only two per cent of all the corporations making tax returns to the Federal Government, received fifty per cent of the entire corporation income of the United States? Going further, do you realize that five per cent of the corporations of the country making tax returns, and entitled to additional exemptions under this law, received ninety per cent of the total gross income paid to all the corporations of the United States? It seems incredible, but it is shown by the records of the Treasury Department.<sup>10</sup>

He packed as many sources and statistics in these few minutes as he had in the rest of the entire speech. He used four statistical examples and the United States Treasury as a source. The closing of the speech provide several possible explanations of Cannon's reaction to Garner's statement. He may have had more materials and more sources to

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 7125.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 7127.

call on, if necessary; but it appears that he assumed that the group had enough information from previous debates. From this conclusion he must have counted heavily on the weight of the prestigious members of the House to carry his arguments. Or perhaps he was caught unaware of the ability of the companies to adapt to the tax structure. The materials in the conclusion would indicate that he recognized that he had made a tactical error in relying on the prestige, and he was attempting to recover support by supplying the missing arguments.

Do you realize that consolidated corporations taking advantage of this law, constituting only two per cent of all the corporations making tax returns to the Federal Government, receive fifty per cent of the entire corporation income of the United States? Going still further, do you realize that five per cent of the corporations of the country making tax returns, and entitled additional exemptions under this law, received ninety per cent of the total gross income paid to all the corporations of the United States? It seems incredible, but it is shown by the records of the Treasury Department.<sup>11</sup>

The allotted speaking time was used up, and his colleagues took advantage of his misplay by seizing the opportunity to question him. Meanwhile, Cannon struggled to exit somewhat gracefully from the scene by withdrawing the amendment while asking for an adjustment to the present law.

From the standpoint of argument and evidence, this was an extremely weak speech by Cannon's previous standard. His inability to support his arguments or, more importantly, to anticipate the change in support resulted in the destruction of the support of his speech. By removing the assumption that the bill was supported by the leaders of the House, the speech was devoid of prestige and substantive support; and contained

---

<sup>11</sup> ibid.



only an informative description of the way companies used their subsidiaries. Even this was without substantial documentation.

### Emotional Analysis

"Mr. Chairman, I trust the committee will approach this proposition with an open mind." The above statement is particularly deceiving when it is analyzed with the information that the speaker thought he had.<sup>12</sup> Cannon immediately introduced an amendment which he thought was supported by the Speaker of the House, the majority leader of the House, and the acting chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. Cannon attempted to increase the prestige factor, listing the qualifications of these men in tax matters. This would have been a valuable and interesting technique under normal circumstances. However, the opening statement regarding "an open mind" allows little room for Cannon to maneuver when the House leaders repudiate their support for his amendment. If the committee follow his advice, then Cannon's amendment must be rejected on the basis of support and prestige.

In addition to prestige Cannon relied on the familiar appeal to justice. He also headed the argument with an appeal to a better-balanced budget.

This amendment not only offers a means of assisting in balancing the Budget by greatly decreasing the exemptions of our largest corporations but it also prevents the Government from becoming a party to unfair competition through which the corporation with many branches destroys competition and eliminates the

---

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 7124.

smaller and independent corporation engaged in the same business. This section of the law gives the chain corporation an unfair advantage over the individual corporation; and it is only American fair play to repeal it and put the smaller corporation and the independent corporation on a plane of equal advantage so far as the law is concerned.<sup>13</sup>

There were several appeals to American fair play, and there was also an emphasis on phrases such as "unfair competition" and "unfair advantage." All of these accentuated the necessity for change, and they anticipated arguments in favor of the original amendment by forcing the defender to be supporting an unAmerican, unfair proposition.

Cannon was not content with using Americanism and justice. He referred to a Bible story to illustrate the extent of the problem. "The law which this amendment proposes to strike out penalizes David and assists Goliath." This particular appeal merely highlighted the difference between the two groups, and while the appeal to the ultimate authority was not a threat in this case, at least it was a reminder of final justice.

Cannon used two other types of emotional appeals in this speech. One was an effort to use the first premise (that they are robbing the government) to prove that large businesses are intentionally hurting the small businesses. He described the methodology used by the chain stores.

The result is that the chain stores not only escape taxation, but they use the law to drive out competition. Whenever a chain store is established in a new location, or when competition becomes troublesome, the chain deliberately lowers prices and runs at a loss until the home store across the street is driven to the wall and either closes or sells out.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 7124-25.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 7125.

Therefore, the big businesses were committing two acts which deserve correction, and the whole attack was fraught with moral overtones. While Cannon did not accuse the businesses of violating the law, he did accuse them of using their strength and position to eliminate the "David's" from the competitive market. His inference was that the companies may or may not be violating the law, but they are taking an unfair advantage of the lesser companies.

Cannon's final statement in his address was an effort to justify his resolution. Any emotional impact that he may have built from prestige was lost, but the intent of this section of the speech would be hard to misconstrue. He was obviously trying to leave his audience with an emotional justification for the amendment.

Now, if we are driven to the extreme of taxing the chewing gum of the children, surely we ought to permit the greatest money-making corporations to pay their just and lawful share of the taxes.<sup>15</sup>

The final futile attempt to justify the taxing of these corporations suffered from lack of support of the Chairman. Regardless of the imagination of the critics, it would be difficult to imagine Cannon recreating a favorable mood in the audience. While the logic of the speech may have been relatively untouched by counter-arguments, the mood and the prestige were entirely eliminated by the shift of position by the Speaker of the House. Regardless of the effect of the speech up to the point of interruption, the shift of support was extremely damaging to his amendment and to the later suggestion that the tax percentage be increased.

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 7127.

Ethical Analysis

There is little doubt that this speech did little to advance the image that Clarence Cannon had worked toward since his entry into the House. The technique of associating the prestige of the House officers to provide strength for the measure eventuated not only a loss of support, but a reverse of position on the bill. Cannon's effort to salvage his position on the issue, and his attempt to justify his withdrawing of the amendment reveals the damage to his position.

Mr. Chairman, for 20 years I have cooperated at every opportunity with the gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House, and this occasion shall not be an exception to the rule. I am glad to have this unexpected opportunity to express my high regard for him. I have followed him always gladly and always with profit, not only because I am an organization Democrat, but because of my deep personal affection. I shall withdraw my amendment.<sup>16</sup>

This particular speech would lend support to Aristotle's hypothesis that "we might almost affirm that his character (ethos) is the most potent of all the means to persuasion."<sup>17</sup> In this speech, Cannon's secondary prestige was at least temporarily damaged. In other words, his dependence on the support of the House leaders was categorically denied. Regardless of the reason behind the move, Garner erased Cannon's entire supporting argument; and in addition, he asked that the Cannon amendment be rejected. This probably eliminated any influence that Cannon may have personally developed because the Congressmen would have to reject Garner's recommendation over Cannon's. At this time in his career it is doubtful that Cannon would have carried sufficient prestige to fight the Speaker

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 7127.

<sup>17</sup>Aristotle, The Rhetoric of Aristotle, translated by Lane Cooper, (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc., 1960), p. 9.

of the House. Since Garner made one statement, and Cannon withdrew his amendment as a result, it appears that greater ethos won the battle.

There is another reason that Aristotle's hypothesis seems supported in this speech. The arguments, though poorly supported, were never really attacked by Garner. In fact, several Congressmen asked questions which tended to support Cannon's general thesis. However, once the Garner statement was made, the intent of the speech was voided, and the arguments were never considered. While Cannon's later use of evidence and reasoning may have helped maintain his image as a responsible speaker with a justifiable position, it was not directed toward winning support for a specific purpose. Thus, ethos, or the lack of it in this case, was the major factor in this speech.

The decision to retreat and change tactics allowed Cannon to salvage a few pieces. At least at this point he did not launch an attack which might irreparably damage his prestige. He evidently estimated that his chances of victory were minimal, or that the risk was not justified at the time. Perhaps he felt that the temporary loss of prestige was comparatively more advantageous than a direct split with the Speaker of the House.

### Conclusion

The conclusion regarding this speech and speaking situation would have to be that Mr. Cannon avoided a very uncomfortable situation. The standard of evidence which he had developed in previous speaking situations was partially abandoned in this speech, and he substituted prestige of others for the evidence. By failing to check with Speaker Garner to find out about his current position on the bill, Cannon made

a dangerous assumption which should have been a lesson in politics and in public speaking. The attempted use of emotional language and the use of examples do not overcome the weak basis of argument which Cannon used in this instance. His prestige, not yet as great as the Speakers', was temporarily reduced; and he chose not to force a clash of personalities or positions at this time.

The effect of the speech on Cannon's career was minimal. His eventual political success, and his public speaking effectiveness seem to indicate that this speech did not affect Cannon's prestige adversely. The next chapter, however, will illustrate that Clarence Cannon learned a lesson on evidence and ethos.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### ROOSEVELT AND RELIEF

What were you doing in January, 1939? Were you eating lunch at the Hotel Taft in New York for sixty-five cents? Were you buying a pair of Nunn Bush Shoes for \$6.95? Was your wife buying a corset at Macy's January Sale? After all, for \$5.98 to \$10.89, you could be among the best dressed in New York. Macy's advertisements had a footnote which said, "We sell only for cash. Resulting economics including efficiency and volume save we estimate six percent. We endeavor to have the prices of our merchandise reflect this saving, subject to limitations over which we have no control." The Macy's advertisement indicates that cash was an important business element contrasted to the credit money which we use today.

Other economic factors were shown in the pages of the New York Times. For instance, General Electric had a 1938 high of 48 points and a low of  $27\frac{1}{2}$ . Although there was a January average price of  $41\frac{1}{2}$ , recovery was slow and uncertain. Most of the stocks were from five to ten points below the 1938 high. Business had a long way to go to recover losses and confidence.

There were several other events in the news that had an effect on the speech the Clarence Cannon made on January 12, 1939. Mr. Cannon took a stand against the proposition that "The Existing Methods of Administering Relief Funds be Changed." By taking that stand, he was supporting Roosevelt's theory of recovery. The proposition seems simple

enough; but the economics of the time, as well as the daily events, caused a deeper interest and a greater significance than just spending relief money. Why should there be any change? (Basically, the change was to be a cut in appropriations). Was Congress tired of giving away money? Was the country now economically sound? Was unemployment significantly decreased; enough to remove a large proportion of the aid? The answer, by Cannon, to all these questions is "no". There were other things that were instrumental in the decision to propose this measure.

The new headlines of January 10, 11, and 12 reveal a major foreign policy decision which caused economic concern in this country. "Chamberlain Off Today on Rome Trip," "Kennedy, Bullitt Spur Arming Drive," "Our Air Supremacy is Held Endangered," "Rebels Say Troops Are in Montblanc," and "Britain Protests Franco Violations."

On January 5, President Roosevelt had submitted his budget message to Congress. National Defense had taken \$1, 319, 558,000; and January 12, in a special message, he recommended an additional \$535,000,000 to be spent in the next two years. The money was channeled into preparations for defense in the anticipation of an armed conflict. A majority of Americans expressed approval of Chamberlain's Munich agreement in 1938. But by January of 1939, American officials were doubtful of Hitler's good intentions. In his annual message on January 5, Roosevelt called for American unity in the face of foreign threats to free institutions, and for a heavy increase in American armaments. The suspicions were well founded. Even though Germany announced her World's Fair pavilion as the Freedom Pavilion, designed to celebrate Germany yesterday and tomorrow, the Hitler army would be in Czechoslovakia by March.

The United States was also bothered by the Japanese aggression.



Secretary Hull was taking enough action to make the headlines with "An Air Munitions Ban Shows Hull's Concern Over Japanese Actions." Hitler, Mussolini, and Japanese military were more than men, power, or aggressors. They were economic factors as well.

Business was also causing Roosevelt concern. His legislative actions, if not challenged by the Supreme Court, were ignored by the worker and the manager. Such news as the "N.L.R.B. Loses Fight to Enforce Order," "President Assigns Hopkins to Reconcile Labor Group, Study Wagner Act Changes," and "Deadlock in Court on TVA is Rumored," seem to indicate that business was resisting Roosevelt or New Deal methods of recovery.

The House Republicans were attacking the spending policies of the Administration, but they were not strong enough to control the House. They had sufficient power with some Democratic support to push financial issues into heated debate and public attention, and thus they proposed an economic topic for debate. As expected, the conservative side of the House was not willing to give away money, and as long as the Republicans did not make the issues a party matter, they could get support from the dissident Democrats.

Money was needed everywhere. Economically the country was still comparatively unsound, and \$150,000,000 out of the relief budget of \$875,000,000 could damage the recovery process. Representative Cannon contended that a significant amount of damage would be done to the economy. In a vigorous protest, he demonstrated not only that the damage would be to the people who were unemployed, but that the multiplier effect would hurt our whole economy. Thus, the whole business cycle would be affected.

Without the war, his arguments might have carried more weight. The "New Deal" would certainly have been affected to a greater extent. But who realized on January 12, 1939, that Hitler would start his Blitzkrieg in two months? The debate centered on the advisability of spending funds for relief, which would provide money for the people who were seriously affected by unemployment and personal adverse conditions.

### Logical Analysis

The purpose of this speech was to reject the debate proposal that the relief appropriation should be reduced by 125 million dollars. Cannon was intent on showing that there was no justification for the proposal. A quick look at the divisions of the speech will show how he defended the entire relief appropriation.

The final statement in the introduction demonstrates the result of the budget committees' action. "But just at this critical period the committee brings in a proposal to dismiss from employment more than a million workmen today earning their daily bread in productive employment."<sup>1</sup> From this statement, Cannon propelled his attack upon the committee.

The entire body of the speech was a confirmation of the purpose statement. Representative Cannon attempted to demonstrate that the plan of the proposition was injurious to the nation. He contended that the proposed measure specifically eliminated work for 1,151,300 men. He used the buying power of these men to show the multiplier effect on our economy.

---

<sup>1</sup>Congressional Record, January 12, 1939, p. 249. See Appendix C for complete text.

The P.W.A. estimates each family to average  $3\frac{1}{2}$  persons. That is a conservative estimate, as the traditional military ratio is five to a family. But even at the minimum estimate, the number of dependents affected by this reduction would aggregate 4,026,550 persons. At the Army ratio it will affect 5,726,500 people. But it goes further than that. The business created and supported by the needs of this vast number of people, their trade with merchants, artisans, and professional men, gives employment to numerous other workers, who without this business, will also be thrown out of employment. So, on a conservative estimate, the proposition of the committee here is to take away the subsistence of from six to eight million people. It is not necessary to draw on the imagination to understand what that would mean to the people themselves or to the business interests of the country.<sup>2</sup>

According to Cannon, if either of the estimates were actuated it would cause a significant effect on the economy. The theoretical discussion illustrated that the proposed cut in relief should cause harm to millions of people. While Cannon did not provide evidence that his theoretical projection would actually come about, the potential harm was evident in his statistics concerning the base effect plus the multiplier effect.

After showing the harm of the committee's proposal, Cannon demonstrated in his second argument that there was no evidence to support the budget cut.

The committee gives no tenable reason for its ruthless recommendation except a desire to save money. In fact there is no reason. Every witness called by the committee demonstrated the need for increased rather than decreased employment. Every item of the evidence submitted to the committee supported the President's recommendation of \$875,000,000. You can read the hearings through from the first page to the last, and there is not one line, or a single statement that justifies a decrease of a dollar in the appropriation or a reduction of a job in the employment program. The proposal to reduce the amount is unwarranted, so at variance with the evidence, so unjustified by the statistics submitted in the hearings, that it is impossible to escape the conclusion that

---

<sup>2</sup>ibid.

the committee met with the preconceived determination to cut the amount recommended by the budget. No matter what amount had been recommended, the committee would have cut it. If the request had been for \$500,000,000 the committee would have cut it. If the estimate had been for \$200,000,000 they would have cut it. Apparently it is a purely arbitrary cut unsupported by any fact or formula. And certainly it is not supported by the American people.<sup>3</sup>

This second argument was very general and rather weak in direct evidence. The technique was designed to show that there were no reasons given for the reduction of the funds. The material was well placed, questioned the committee's motives, and served as a transition into the more powerful argument, public opinion.

The third argument was by far the best-supported. The argument was designed to be a reminder to the Congressmen that they were representatives of the public demand. Although he never explicitly stated the effect on Congress, the public power argument was a powerful reminder of the existence of home voters.

For example, Cannon reported a viewpoint held by several economists who wrote to President Roosevelt in order to show support outside of Congress for maintaining the relief funds.

Dear President Roosevelt: We, the undersigned economists, are addressing ourselves to you in order to express our opinions on a national problem of greatest importance which falls within our sphere of professional competence.

Newspaper reports, which have not been denied, indicate that the Works Progress Administration is planning to cut its rolls by a third during the next two or three months. This action, we understand, is contemplated in order to stretch the present relief appropriation and to lay the ground for a greatly reduced deficiency appropriation next spring. Such a policy would involve throwing some million breadwinners and their families into destitution during the severe winter months. It would involve a reduction of

---

<sup>3</sup>ibid.

more than \$50,000,000 per month in direct wage payments in addition to some \$30,000,000 in wage expenditures. Such a cut in consumer purchasing power would, we believe, constitute a severe threat to the continuance of the present economic recovery, and might even cause a serious set-back in business activity.

The rapid upsurge in business during the last six months has been a source of encouragement to those who believe that the severity of swings in business activity need not be accepted fatalistically but can be successfully counteracted by wise social action. Thanks to the vigorous action taken last spring by the Federal Government under your leadership, the recession of 1937 was arrested; and the curve of business and employment turned upward. The expanding of the spending program was the chief governmental instrument used in fighting the recession and stimulating the recovery. Furthermore, during these six months the major channel for the disbursement of new purchasing power has been the Works Progress Administration, and we believe that the Works Progress Administration should continue to perform this function until private industry clearly demonstrates its capacity to absorb all those released from the relief rolls.

We conclude, Mr. President, that the curtailment of the Works Progress Administration at the present time would be particularly ill-timed from an economic as well as a humanitarian viewpoint, and we strongly<sup>4</sup> urge that the contemplated policy of curtailment be abandoned.

Cannon did not depend solely on the letter as evidence; he also used two other techniques to support the letter. He borrowed the prestige of the economists when he described their positions.

Of the sixty-nine signers of the statement, thirteen are members of the faculty of Harvard, seven are from Yale, seven from Columbia, six from Northwestern, six from Brooklyn College, five from Mount Holyoke, and four from Tufts. Among the other institutions represented are Brown, Williams, Amherst, Stanford, University of Wisconsin, University of Illinois, University of Chicago,<sup>5</sup> Cornell, New York University, University of Minnesota, and Princeton.

Finally, he compared the experts that he was using with the committee's experts.

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

On the other hand, there is not an economist from any college or university in the United States who has endorsed this unwarranted, unscientific, and arbitrary reduction of the amount recommended by the President.<sup>6</sup>

The proof of the point was not dependent merely on the statement of the economists. Cannon also used the testimony of ministers, teachers, businessmen, veterans, and mayors. The essence of their letters indicated an interest in the country rather than personal gain. The variance of sources also illustrated a breadth of opinion. The use of eight documented examples of public disapproval illustrated how important Cannon valued this third point.

The three arguments that Cannon used could be classified as theoretical, emotional, and practical, in that sequence. At the same time he demonstrated a potential harm in the proposal; incompetency in the committee; and, finally, mass approval of the relief budget. This structure reveals a conscious effort at arranging materials for a maximum of understanding and effect.

The conclusion was abrupt and directed as a rebuttal for past and future Congressional debate. The only value in citing any part of the conclusion is to reveal one inconsistency in Cannon's speaking for future reference. Note the arguments and precedents for an unbalanced budget in this conclusion.

And in their argument on balancing the budget they go back and quote a message of the President of the United States, delivered when the public debt was \$21,000,000,000, the most specious argument made in this debate. Why not go back to 1916, when the debt was \$1,000,000,000? It would have been just as consistent.

Between the time when the debt was \$1,000,000,000 in 1916,

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

and the time when the debt was \$21,000,000,000, this country went through a trying ordeal, and the gentleman does not question that debt. Since the time the President of the United States wrote that message the country has gone through another great trial, a depression that brought disaster to more people than the war, and no one will say that the money was not well spent if it saves the American people.<sup>7</sup>

No other speech in this research revealed Cannon justifying an unbalanced budget.

The introduction and conclusion of this speech are abrupt and of little importance to the body of the address. They are interesting adjuncts of history but that is the extent of their value. The main thesis of the speech was well supported with repetition, internal summary, and numerous sources of information. Logically Cannon appears to have supported his attack in this speech.

#### Emotional Analysis

The use of emotional material is easily identified in three parts of the speech. The first part of the introduction was designed to compare the position of the budget cut advocates with the French retreat. An historical analogy illustrated what the American people did not want to do.

Mr. Cannon of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on the eve of America's entry into the world war, insuring victory for the Allies, a panic seized a large part of the French people and three entire army corps left the front-line trenches and retreated on Paris. Today in America's war against the depression, with victory already in sight, there are those who would sound retreat. Already within reach of their goal our comrades falter. They are unwilling to keep men moving up into the front-line jobs. There is general agreement that the campaign for employment is succeeding. All authorities report a general upturn in business on every front.

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 250.

But just at this critical period the committee brings in a proposal to dismiss from employment more than a million workmen today earn their daily bread in productive employment.<sup>8</sup>

This obvious appeal to pride identified his opponents as cowards, who were afraid to stand up and fight when the going was rough. It was this type of attack which brings Cannon's aggressiveness to the front.

Another emotional appeal occurred in the body of the speech and the plea attempted to demonstrate the effect of cutting the productivity of the breadwinners. To deprive the families of the means of living was a strike at self-preservation. The description of the potential deprivation is worth noting.

That is the sole issue presented by this resolution. But it is a more important question than may appear at first blush. These 1,151,300 men are breadwinners. They are heads of families. When you deprive them of work, you deprive their dependent families of support.<sup>9</sup>

Cannon also made use of the type of emotional arousal when he described what the teachers saw as they performed their duties.

Mr. Chairman, this is the recommendation of the teachers of the land who come in daily contact with the child problem, who know family conditions, who see children coming to school sometimes without breakfast, and sometimes without shoes. They know that if this reduction is made there will be a good many more without breakfast and without needed clothing and medical care.<sup>10</sup>

He made one more significant emotional appeal to his audience in the closing of the speech. He referred to the pomposity of the Congressman or his lack of real understanding of the effects of passing the bill. At any rate the pointed remark was intended to create dissonance between

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 249.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.



the voting Congressman and the starving families.

But the Congressman, in his superior wisdom, comes in, and he sees that the child has on its plate both bread and potatoes. "Oh," he says, "you have too much," and the Congressman, by his vote on this resolution, reaches over and takes the potatoes off the plate. It is hard on the child, perhaps, but it helps balance the budget. Now, this is not melodrama. It is the inevitable result in homes all over the Nation of an affirmative vote on the pending resolution.<sup>11</sup>

The appeals which Cannon used would indicate that he was in close contact with his constituency. His arguments were designed to protect people who were struggling to maintain a living under adverse conditions, and much of his farm district would have suffered from the cut by the Congress. The fact that Cannon was defending these people would not go unnoticed at election time.

### Ethical Analysis

Clarence Cannon was pitting his reputation against the members of the Budget committee regarding the amount of appropriations given to W.P.A. Mr. Woodrum had yielded thirty minutes to Mr. Cannon to enable him to address the House on the question, and he spent little time building his prestige or his competence on the matter. He accepted himself as an authority and expected everyone else to accept him. Former incidents (two fights and innumerable quarrels) gave him the reputation as a gruff, aggressive, and indomitable individual. In this instance, he carried the gruff manner over into his speaking, and this particular speech illustrated a dynamic, concerned Congressman. The following section will analyze a few of the techniques that he used with his

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 250.



audience.

In this speech it was suggested that his audience was not the Congress, but rather, his constituents. The speech is concerned with the breadwinners; the heads of families. Cannon contends that if these poor people were let out of work, then the whole economy would suffer. In other words, according to this speech, the jobless working men were the core of the economy and Cannon was on their side.

Another technique of developing his personal proof was through the evidence that he used. By taking these quotations and letters as representative of his stand, Mr. Cannon was saying that business, farming, labor, teachers, mayors, churchmen, economists, and veterans have all agreed that the relief budget should not be cut. He was equating his feelings with the statements of these groups and concluding that "we the people are right." He reinforces his personal identification with these groups when he sarcastically speaks about the "Congressman, (who) in his superior wisdom, comes in, and sees that the child has on its plate both bread and potatoes. 'Oh,' he says, 'you have too much,' and the Congressman, by his vote on this resolution, reaches over and takes the potatoes off the plate."<sup>12</sup> Cannon was attempting to divorce himself from the Congress, or at least from the Congressmen who would stoop to such ignominious behavior. He did not want to take anything away from the people, especially something which would cause harm to individuals.

The last use of personal proof was in his statement that the proposal had no merit, material grounds, or any justification. Cannon was

---

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

saying that if the reduction in relief foods had justification, then he, along with the people that he had quoted in the speech, would vote for the measure. However, his evidence had indicated that the bill had no merit. Therefore, as a rational man, he could see no reason to vote for it. Therefore, he implicitly says that those who are irrational will support the measure.

His conclusion was a method of identification. He justified the deficit spending because it saved the American people, and that was good enough for Clarence Cannon.

The speech then was designed to separate Cannon from those representatives who would vote against the people. It can be classified as an appeal for popular support and understanding.

### Conclusion

The purpose of Cannon's maneuvering seemed to be directed toward the people of the nation (or at least Missouri), rather than toward the Congress. The only mention he made of Congress was sarcastic and designed to show his position relative to the committee. The total stand was a firm rebuttal of the committees' decision. The materials of experience were well used, and the language occasionally carried connotations that were designed to create empathy with his home audience. Terms such as "breadwinner," "comrades," "dependents;" and phrases such as "without shoes," and "it saved the American people," and the stealing potatoes argument were methods of creating a favorable image. The image depicts a conscientious Congressman against a committee which is merciless and incompetent.

This particular speech represents a completeness that has not been evident in earlier works. It was the first speech studied which

demonstrated a skill in using all three modes of proof. He made effective use of arrangement, and he built his speech logically with common knowledge and personal proof as his evidence. His experience and concern for the safety of the American people gave him excellent appeal as a protector in time of need. The display of independence from Congress demonstrated to the voters that Representative Cannon was doing things for the best interests of his constituency and America as a whole, regardless of his colleagues. This independence was characteristic of Mr. Cannon's career as a member of the appropriations committee, and this speech displays some of the beginnings of that independence on monetary matters.

## CHAPTER SIX

### THE TWO MISSOURIANS

In time of national crises, the hardships are sometimes forgotten because of the concentration on the problems of the country, and in time of national joy the hardships are suppressed because of the concentration on having a good time. Both crisis and national joy were evident in the year 1945. The loss of American soldiers created a national grief that was surpassed only by the intense sorrow felt when President Roosevelt passed away. This beloved leader had carried the hope and confidence of a nation caught by the war. The funeral, the memories, the concern can be most accurately recreated by the country's response to our recent tragedies.

The apprehension about the new President by the nation was surpassed only by Harry S. Truman's apprehension about Harry S. Truman. As he said, "The overwhelming fact that faced me was hard to grasp. I had been afraid for many weeks that something might happen to this great leader, but now that the worst had happened I was unprepared for it."<sup>1</sup>

His explanation of the shock and the disbelief was communicated to his mother and sister in a personal letter.

---

<sup>1</sup>Harry S. Truman, Year of Decisions: Memoirs by Harry S. Truman, (New York: Signet Book, 1965), p. 15.

It was the only time in my life, I think, that I ever felt as if I'd had a real shock. I had hurried to the White House to see the President, and when I arrived, I found I was the President. No one in the history of our country ever had it happen to him just that way.<sup>2</sup>

His apprehension did not prevent him from pursuing a course of action. He set about the task with a fury and determination that can at least be admired. The mistakes were overlooked because of the effort, and the problems did not mount to a significant degree before victory came to the nation. The travesty of atomic weapons, the length of war and war weariness, the labor problems, and the loss of their great leader were all overshadowed by the success of ending the war. The joy of V. E. Day and eventually of V. J. Day was greeted with wild enthusiasm and delirium on the part the American people. One of the strongest memories of childhood was the night of V. J. Day. The honking of horns, the celebration by buying a milkshake, the spilling of that milkshake without scolding, the shouting of families and friends whose fathers and sons would be returning burned an image in a five year-old mind.<sup>3</sup>

In the cities the crowds were enormous, enthusiastic, and at the time unconcerned with the future. Eric Goldman shows the activity of America at the announcement of victory.

Across America the traditional signs of victory flared and shrieked. In Los Angeles, yelling paraders commandeered trolley cars, played leapfrog in the middle of Hollywood Boulevard, hung Hirohito from scores of lampposts. Salt Lake City, thousands snakedanced in a pouring rain and a St. Louis crowd, suddenly hushing its whistles and tossing aside the confetti . . . .

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 57

<sup>3</sup>This author's personal experience took place in Moberly, Missouri, which was a small rural town like Cannon's Elsberry.

New York City, hardly unaccustomed to furor, amazed itself. With the first flash of V. J., up went the windows and down came the torn telephone books, the hats, bottles, bolts of silk, books, wastebaskets, and shoes, more than five thousand tons of jubilant shoes, more than five thousand tons of jubilant litter. Whole families made their way to Times Square until two million people were milling about, breaking into snatches of the conga, hugging and kissing anybody in sight, greeting each twinkle of V-J news on the Times electric sign with a cheer that roared from the East River to the Hudson.<sup>4</sup>

The ending of the war eliminated some problems, but it created others. The joy of the war's end could temporarily hide the problems, but peace brought forth financial complications that ordinarily would be hidden. Clarence Cannon was not oblivious to the problems that would face a nation turning from war. His speech on November 27, 1945, revealed a perceptiveness about the financial future of the United States. His concern with balancing the budget, providing employment, curtailing unnecessary expenditures, and providing for a national awareness was portrayed in a speech in the House. The end of the war did not mean that the U. S. could continue spending at previous rates, and Representative Cannon applied his insight to the future national problems in this Appropriations speech.

### Logical Analysis

"No nation can be indefinitely maintained today on a deficit budget."  
 "In the end disaster must overtake any nation which fails to pay its way."  
 These statements are interesting on their own merit, but as a major assumption and thesis of Cannon's speech they deserve careful analysis. Chairman Cannon was obviously in favor of a balanced budget, and he

---

<sup>4</sup>Eric F. Goldman, The Crucial Decade, (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), p. 34.



cited historical precedents as a means of establishing that all countries which failed to pay met with disaster. He extended the challenge to the listener when he said, "In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries every administration that came to power or fell from power in the major European nations either rose or was wrecked upon its fiscal policies."<sup>5</sup>

This was a general statement which Mr. Cannon did not document or elaborate upon, but this statement was evidently used to jump to the conclusion that all countries which failed to balance their budgets deteriorated as a result. Cannon did nothing else to establish this premise, but (in the introduction and conclusion of the speech) he did use the premise as a threat to the U.S. future. He spent most of his time on the premise that "no nation can be indefinitely maintained on a deficit budget."<sup>6</sup> It would be hard to prove that a nation had survived in the same form without paying its own way since all government structures prior to the eighteenth century have fallen. The second premise, then, is where the crux of the speech develops; and the question is still debated today. Can a government survive without a balanced budget? Mr. Cannon obviously takes the "No!" position, and this was a reversal from the last speech analyzed. There was no doubt about the position that he was taking in this speech. However, he was more concerned with the timing of the demise than with the theory or argument as to whether it would take place. He assured the audience that under the present philosophy of spending, deterioration would take place. The question was, when would the deterioration cause the fall

---

<sup>5</sup>Congressional Record, November 27, 1945, p. 11041. see Appendix D.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

of the United States? Cannon's speech was designed to consider the 1945 financial situation as a threat to U. S. stability.

After the above assumptions are clarified, it is easier to locate the thesis statement of the speech. His thesis statement was, "Unless we can maintain this Nation on a sound financial basis there is disaster ahead of us and for the world."<sup>7</sup> This is easily transferred to the hypothetical syllogism structure by showing that if this nation does not maintain a sound financial condition, then there is disaster ahead. The previous assumptions lend support to this construction by showing that all governments without financial solvency have fallen: therefore, the U. S. would be no different. He then proceeded to show why the U. S. was in such a critical period.

It was critical before we entered the war, before we dreamed that a war was possible. It is critical because a decade before the opening of the war we had developed a spending psychology and entered upon a period of unrestrained and uninhibited expenditure. We bought what we wanted. Too often we bought what we saw whether we were certain we wanted it or not. We did not stop to count the cost or to consider the source from which the money came to pay for it. The result was a spending spree such as the world had never seen before.<sup>8</sup>

From this general description of American habits, Cannon gave specific examples of the effects of U. S. spending.

For the fiscal year 1933, the agricultural appropriation bill totaled \$175,000,000, to be exact \$175,671,665. That was a large sum . . . . In 1940, the agricultural appropriation bill was \$1,194,498,633. In seven years the bill had jumped seven hundred per cent.<sup>9</sup>

He also compared Interior, State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Department expenditures, noting the drastic changes in their total composition.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 11042.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 11042.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

Cannon noted that the statistics were for peace time expenditures, and he used this information to prove that the American people and government were spending exorbitantly. His concern was with the attitudes toward spending.

The alarming feature of the situation is not that in this short period of six or eight years appropriations and expenditures mushroomed, and pyramided, and skyrocketed. The alarming feature is that today-under vastly different circumstances, and steadily shrinking revenues with huge [sic] burdens of new responsibilities- there seems to be a general impression that we can continue the free and untrammelled spending of prewar days.<sup>10</sup>

The conditions showing an alleged need for a change in spending philosophy were illustrated by Cannon when he reviewed the present obligations and duties of the American nation in the next few years. He was concerned with problems of interest, shrinking revenues, taxation, military maintenance, international (U. N.) obligations, veterans' expenditures, and rehabilitation. All of these examples were used to demonstrate the growing distance between the tax dollars and the expended dollars.

The alarming thing is that notwithstanding we have all these new expenses and fixed charges to meet now that the war is over, and with the decline in income, there is a general expectation not only that we will continue to spend at the old rate of expenditures. The people at home are demanding it. I have been alarmed at the letters I have received from my congressional district. From one town in my congressional district they wrote that they wanted to build a post office, an airport, a new sewer system, and a hospital and they expect the Federal Government to pay for a large part of it just as in the old W. P. A. days.<sup>11</sup>

With the future painted so bleakly, Mr. Cannon's original "If" clause appears to have little chance of being implemented. In fact, the rise of spending seems to be the order of the day. However, the

---

<sup>10</sup> ibid.

<sup>11</sup> ibid., p. 11044.

speech later offered an alternative to the present course when Cannon recommended that the Congress not vote such large and, as he described them, "unnecessary" expenditures. He illustrated a manner of dealing with the pressures put on by the "spend-mad people."

I explained that there were no funds available from which such expenditures could be met and that they would not be available until after Congress voted them. Then I said, "As much as I regret to have to disappoint you, I must vote against the appropriations of any money for such purposes. The country is too deep in debt and we must begin cutting it down. Under the circumstances I feel I would have to vote against the appropriation for money to start another W.P.A."

They were all business. They talked it over for a minute and then said, "You are right about it. We do not want you to vote that money. Of course, if everybody else is going to get it then we want ours; but if nobody is going to get it that suits us . . . ." And they went away satisfied. But let me tell you that the conservative businessman-the intelligent, average, solid citizen of your district-is going to stand back of you if you stand against the reduction of taxes, against increased expenditures, and against appropriations for another W.P.A.<sup>12</sup>

Cannon then pleaded that the Congressmen change their philosophy of spending to one of a balanced budget. He did not repeat the conclusion of the hypothetical syllogism, but he did review the spending policies of the past.

After the debacle on Wall Street in which so many men went to ruin in 1929, a philanthropic organization investigated the suicides and found that the great majority of those suicides which followed the crash were not due to the loss of property, but due to the fact their families could not understand their changed financial status and continued, or attempted to continue to spend at the old rate at which they had spent in the days before the crash.

We have a crash in this country. We have burned up men and money in the crucible of war to an extent beyond all computation. Like those Wall Street families we must readjust ourselves to a changed financial status; we cannot spend after the crash at the rate at which we spent before the crash, and we must make the

---

<sup>12</sup>ibid., p. 11045.

people at home understand that, and when they do understand they will support your policies of retrenchment and amortization here on the floor.<sup>13</sup>

It appears then, that his solution was to look for the time when the budget could be balanced, which, according to his analysis, would put the U.S. back into a safe-spending philosophy. And Cannon urged that the legislators begin looking that direction.

But the first line of defense in any nation is a balanced budget. For the next several years that must be our first consideration.<sup>14</sup>

In checking the hypothetical premises, it was found that Cannon did not demonstrate that the U.S. specifically could not live with an unbalanced budget. He didn't even really show the merits of a balanced budget for this country. He used this premise as a given assumption in the speech, and additionally he made an effort to correlate the present U.S. economic condition with the seventeenth and eighteenth century countries who had been unsuccessful in maintaining their governments. He inferred that because these countries were destroyed due to economic imbalance that the U.S. would be destroyed in a like manner, but this was never specifically stated. The foreign countries' financial problems were not described, nor were the causes delineated. Under close examination the hypothesis, at the very least, should be challenged for clarification and/or documentation. However, if the assumption that these countries were representative of the U.S. financial situation and secondly, that the unbalanced budget was unwise or dangerous, then the overall structure of Cannon's speech appears to be valid. Thus,

<sup>13</sup>ibid., p. 11046.

<sup>14</sup>ibid., p. 11047.

the conclusion that the U. S. should reduce the appropriations figures to match the national income is a logical conclusion.

All of the evidence in this speech evolved in one way or another from Cannon's personal experience and from the knowledge gained from his Appropriations work. The materials on appropriations came from his committee; the letters and visits from his constituents were personal; and the historical examples in the beginning and end of the speech were undocumented accounts of historical responsibility in spending. It could not be disputed that the governments changed significantly, but he does not offer evidence that the cause of change was due to fiscal irresponsibility, he merely asserts it.

Why these pieces of evidence remained unchallenged is impossible to say. Perhaps the ethos of the Appropriations Chairmanship carried the material through, and this possibility will be examined in the ethical analysis. Perhaps the lines between budget balances and non-balances were clearly drawn and Cannon was merely showing the direction in which he intended to guide the Committee on Appropriations. Even if the Congressman did not want to challenge the evidence, why didn't they charge Cannon with inconsistency? The last speech examined clearly advocated maintaining relief funds at the expense of a more unbalanced budget.

While there is no clear explanation for the reversal, the change is a solid commitment. Clarence Cannon spends the rest of his legislative career attempting to keep the national income and expenditures as close as possible. These premises, which go unchallenged, become the basis of Cannon's appropriation philosophy.

Emotional Analysis

The strongest emotional appeal in this speech was to self-preservation. Cannon used this technique in both his introduction and in his conclusion of November 27, 1945 speech. His appeal was delivered as an ultimatum: unless the U.S. mends her economic ways, she will be self-destructive. He further threatened the listeners by showing precedents from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The conclusion was an indirect appeal to preservation through patriotism and duty. His argument was that the present representatives had the advantage of numbers, age, sophistication, diverse religions and parties, and diverse nationalities over the first national representatives, but the present problems were equally important in their scope and consequences. "They established the government. It is up to us to maintain it."<sup>15</sup>

The previous statement intimates, as does the original thesis, that the U.S. had a serious problem if it failed to balance the budget, but the statement goes farther in that it recalls the duty of the Congressman and accents the importance of the question being discussed.

The threat of disaster was also shown in the paragraph, which compared, inferentially, the U.S. of 1945 with that of 1929. Cannon offered a way out of the problem, and he also illustrated the effects of his solution. He also demonstrated how the Congressmen could get support from their constituents. This whole plea was designed as a preventive measure for what he described as the inevitable situation.

---

<sup>15</sup>ibid., p.11047.

We face today a situation comparable only to that which faced American statesmen in the foundation of the Republic, and for that reason I would like to go back to those constituent assemblies which established the Government . . . . The first interest of the American people is the safety of our Government. With that in view we are thinking of military conscription; of strengthening the Army and maintaining the Navy; of consolidating the various branches of the service. The dominant concern today is safety. But the first line of defense in any nation is a balanced budget. For the next several years that must be our first consideration.<sup>16</sup>

Another attempt at emotional appeal can be illustrated through the language of the speech. For instance the unilateral statements gave the speech a definite sense of purpose. "There is no more vital concern in national economy than the National Budget. No nation can be indefinitely maintained today on a deficit budget."<sup>17</sup> Phrases combining words such as astronomic proportions, extraordinary and unprecedented, mushroomed, pyramided, skyrocketed, the alarming features, vastly (three times) untrammelled spending, halcyon days, colossal debt, debate on Wall Street gave a feeling of strength and importance to the problem.

These statements were reinforced with maxims regarding spending. "We can no longer spend for any indispensable objective, however desirable and however advantageous the purpose of the expenditure." "There is absolutely no other source from which the Federal Government can obtain money to pay for all these local expenditures we are asked to vote on this floor." The reason for the allness statements and the descriptive language might be to try to inform the Congress and the people that the future U.S. spending policies were going to be directed toward a more balanced budget, if Clarence Cannon had his way. It is a statement of

<sup>16</sup>ibid., p. 11046-11047.

<sup>17</sup>ibid., p. 11041.



policy allegedly given in the best interest of the American people.

The final observation should be made in terms of the use of pronouns. Mr. Cannon addressed the entire speech to the House members. His emphasis was on showing the Congressmen what their fiscal guideline should be in the upcoming appropriations. It also established a philosophy for voting against appropriation requests in the next session of Congress. This attempt to build a resistant philosophy could act as a deterrent to Congressional and private group requests, and it also gave Cannon a statement to fall back on when he didn't want to approve an appropriation request. By referring to this speech, he may have been able to head off some arguments on his spending philosophy. His attempt to illustrate the potential downfall of our government would seem to be important enough to use language which would impress upon his audience the consequences of overspending. Cannon's use of language connotes activity and denotes through it an absoluteness. As a result, the reader is involved in a decisive action.

### Ethical Analysis

Mr. Ludlow. I asked the gentleman to yield to me in order that I might make an observation. The gentleman from Missouri is making an economic speech which I believe the entire nation will applaud. He has here today charted the legislative course of the direction we in Congress must take if we are to save our country from financial disaster. He has said many things, in my opinion, which ought to be said for the good of the country; and I know of nobody who could have said the things more effectively or more impressively than the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He has performed a great public service this afternoon.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 11045.

This short interruption by Representative Ludlow helps clarify the purpose of Cannon's November 27, 1945, address. It was an economic speech, and it did chart a relative course against the trend of American expenditures. The speech is obviously a policy statement of the Cannon Committee; and as a policy statement, it reveals a broad philosophy of expenditures with few specifics. The evidence of the entire address is dependent on the ethos of the committee and its chairman.

The effectiveness of ethical appeal is demonstrated in two ways in this speech; the lack of material documentation, and the praise of his colleagues.

While Cannon confirmed using history as a method of proof in this speech, the examples of history were less specific and poorly coordinated than in his other speeches. There was no documentation for his statements, and the use of statistics and testimony were general and underdeveloped. In other words, almost all of the proof comes from the personal storehouse of information of Chairman Cannon. The materials which he used in the speech, outside of the historical examples, were materials from the Committee on Appropriations. The tracing of the history of expenditures, the description of the division of funds, the lack of balanced budget, the types of expenditures, and the future of expenditures unless checked, were all claims made by Cannon based on his personal observations. Because there was no source given in the speech, the listener must either believe or reject the plea on the basis of his own knowledge, or his belief in Cannon.

There were a number of interruptions during this speech. His colleagues asked a series of questions which he answered politely and directly, and without referring to any documents. He then returned to

his subject. There were several compliments paid to Cannon during the speech. In addition to Ludlow, Representatives Woodruff and Dondero complimented Cannon on the quality and direction of his statement.

In addition, Dondero supported the speech by revealing the reactions of his constituents.

Mr. Dondero. I want to commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the courageous statement he has made before the House today. I am no different than any other Member of this body. I am receiving telegrams, letters, and petitions urging me to vote very large sums for nearly every conceivable kind of activity, including Federal aid to schools. We have a duty to perform on this floor and that is to preserve a sound economic structure in this country. If we do not do that, what is there left for the hope of the world so far as maintaining world peace is concerned.<sup>19</sup>

The lack of documentation in this speech can be attributed to two things. First, Cannon had ascended to a much higher political power. While he may not have gained the complete respect of his colleagues because he had not controlled the position long enough, he had gained enough prestige and self-confidence to allow the speech to be based on his authority and opinion. Secondly, the speech was on a broad policy on which arguments had been established in the House for a long time. A similar debate about a balanced budget is still taking place, especially in light of the recent Republican resurgence.

Regardless of the reason for Cannon's lack of documentation, it is evident that he did not feel compelled to supply a source for his information. His use of the pronoun "I" and the use of his prestige as chairman of the Appropriations Committee demonstrates a greater confidence in himself than he has shown in other speeches. The praise from his

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 11045.

colleagues shows a significant status improvement in the House. Cannon's reliance on reputation and position causes speculation about his awareness of increased ethos and will be covered in the conclusion of this study.

### Conclusion

This speech was a policy statement which set forth the intended direction of U.S. expenditures for almost two decades. In fact, this type of fiscal argument won Cannon a great amount of attention, if not fame. As Representative Glenard P. Lipscomb of California said in his eulogy:

Clarence Cannon will always be remembered for the enviable record he compiled as a guardian of the public funds, a reputation he richly deserved.

He was untiring in his efforts to hold the spending of the taxpayers' money to the most essential purposes. His vigilance in guarding against excessive budget requests is legendary.<sup>20</sup>

The speech was not based on documented evidence, but depended on Cannon's personal experience. As a result, the speech was primarily dependent on Cannon's ethos and his ability to provide the answers to the questions asked of him. There was a moderate use of emotional materials, as compared to other speeches. His use of descriptive language and his use of the personal pronoun were indicative of the emotional material, as well as a barometer of his self-confidence and increased status. While this speech may not be judged a successful debate speech, an emotional oration, or an "immediate action appeal," it certainly outlined the policy of the Appropriations Committee for the next twenty years. This was one of the first of his yearly lectures on spending.

---

<sup>20</sup>Memorial Services, p. 181.

According to Representative Randall:

Usually in May or June, when appropriation bills were being considered, he would deliver his annual antispending lectures. These sermons on spending never failed to impress his colleagues because they knew he was telling the truth.<sup>21</sup>

Representative James A. Haley, of Florida describes the function of Cannon's ethos on the subject of spending.

Because of his intimate knowledge of the workings of our Federal Government and our legislative procedure, he probably saved the taxpayers of the nation billions of dollars during his lifetime. His prestige was so great when it came to fiscal matters that few people questioned his judgment on such issues.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 29.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 113.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### CANNON AND EISENHOWER

President Eisenhower called the personal story of his first administration, *Mandate for Change*. The historian is entitled to ask, "What change, except in men?" There was little change in domestic affairs, apart from sniping T.V.A. and other New Deal institutions; all basic New Deal measures were continued and even enlarged upon. The economic developments that we have just described began before 1952, and were largely independent of government. In foreign affairs there was the same cold war challenge, which President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles attempted to meet. No positive initiative in foreign affairs can be credited to the Eisenhower-Dulles team; Russia, China, and Egypt called the tunes to which they responded as best as they could. Nevertheless, they led their country through the most critical period of the cold war and the intensified atomic race without an international disaster, which might easily have been touched off in a moment of impatience or carelessness.

Perhaps the observations of Morison could be contested; most certainly through a different criteria for success and perhaps by individuals caught up in the events of the administration. Although he was not a part of the administration, most of Representative Cannon's work was involved with the day-to-day work of appropriations; and his connection to the administration was vital. The important monetary issues of the day led him to speak on many topics which affected his committee and the operation of the government. For example, his speech regarding the Department of Defense Appropriation Bill for 1957, given May 10, 1956,

---

<sup>1</sup>Samuel Eliot Morison, The Oxford History of the American People, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 1106.

was an analysis of the United States' position of defense against the Soviet Union. There was a great concern for the safety of the United States as an aggressive Russia continued to develop weapons, conquer countries, and threaten the United States. The concern permeated every facet of the U.S. production complex. That particular speech was not unique because the same arguments, threats, and fears are heard today. Cannon was not the first to use them, and Defense Secretary Laird will probably not be the last to argue in this manner.

In 1957, following the President's budget message, Cannon launched an attack on spending which covered every alleged violation of Republican or Democratic pledges. His concern with record budgeting and his indictment of this Republican administration was full of documentation and noted a number of alleged inconsistencies in the President's message, but that could be expected every year that there was a Republican administration.

In 1958, Mr. Cannon again concerned himself with the defense budget, and his speech was a scathing attack on the United States defense productions. His use of letters from President Truman and President Eisenhower were designed to show non-partisanship and concern for the insufficient protection provided by our system of production of defense materials and to show the need for a more concentrated effort for efficiency and foresight. One of the major goals of this debate was to change the structure of the administration of the armed forces. This Armed Forces Bill brought all of the armed forces under one administrative system. This was an important change, and Cannon's evidence showed support from most of the Congressional and Administration leaders outside of the military complex.

While any of these speeches could be justified as good representations of Mr. Cannon's speaking during the administration of President Eisenhower, and while all of them could demonstrate his techniques and his effectiveness, one other speech, because of its uniqueness, stands out as worthy of analysis. The defense of the actions of the Appropriations Committee was a demonstration of his argumentative techniques, and it also reveals how carefully he could prepare a speech.

This particular speech demands little historical acumen. It is based on a procedural matter which has reference only to the Committee on Appropriations and its chairman. Regardless of Eisenhower's accomplishments or his lack of them (however one interprets Morison's quotation), this speech could have been given under any President and still retain its integrity.

### Logical Analysis

In the introduction of the speech Cannon admits that the role of the speech is to be a matter of personal defense.

So what I have to say this morning is purely defensive. I never strike except in self-defense. And this is certainly no exception to the rule.<sup>2</sup>

From this opening, the logical analysis of Cannon's speech concerning the ". . . various strictures . . . pronounced on the Committee on Appropriations, on its personnel, on its procedure, its ethics and its moral turpitude" is oriented toward overwhelming his opposition with

---

<sup>2</sup>U.S. Congressional Record, July 20, 1955, p. 11057. See Appendix E for complete text.



materials. In fact, the title of this section could easily have been "more and better evidence by Clarence Cannon." The speech is constructed as a narrative which denies the accusations of the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Smith. Mr. Cannon's purpose seems to be to explain the past and present procedures of his committee. The speech is a defense of the operation and the responsible actions of his committee and does not call for any action by the audience. It is a speech to set the record straight.

The types and extent of evidence of this speech far outweigh any previous speaking efforts in the House by Cannon. Audience challenge, literature, House Rules, personal experience, history, and authority are scattered throughout the speech. The following analysis will be primarily concerned with how Cannon used these types of evidence in this speech.

The use of audience challenge (for lack of a better term) was used twice by Mr. Cannon. He asserted a broad statement and then challenged the audience to dispute any part of it. The challenge was even more pointed because it would almost take a personal insult to challenge the speaker.

And so far, as I am concerned I have never at any time, either on the floor or off the floor, expressed any sentiment except the warmest fellowship for the committee, and admiration for the manner in which they perform duties devolving upon them.

I pause here to afford anyone present an opportunity to suggest any possible correction of that sweeping statement.<sup>3</sup>

The second use of the challenge method added another burden to any individual who might want to debate Cannon personally. He worded the

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

challenge so that an opponent must attack both the chairman and the committee if he disagreed with Cannon's conclusion.

. . . never has anyone, either official or private, whatever their station in life, whether lobbyist on a salary several times that paid the members of the committee or whether patriots from remote sections of the country paying their own expenses to Washington and back home, been denied an opportunity to appeal before the committee and present their cause for or against any measure or fund under consideration by the committee. Again I pause to permit anyone to offer evidence in refutation of this rather broad but accurate statement.<sup>4</sup>

Obviously, the shift of burden and the implications of that burden would deter most opponents from replying, and Cannon seems aware of this. He waited for an answer to the challenge; and when no answer was given, he used the silence as evidence of the accuracy of his statements.

The use of literature appeared in the introduction as Cannon attempts to turn Smith's evidence against him. It was quite a statement of self-minimization in light of Smith's tactics.

It is to be noted that both the Constitution and the Bible are cited in the interesting dissertation delivered in this connection. It was quite a sermon, with text and exhortation. I wear no jeweled phylacteries. I am not privileged to express gratitude that I am not as other men. But if I might be permitted to add Shakespeare to the other two reference volumes, I would call to mind the admonition of Antonio to Bassanio. And if permitted also to cite Holy Writ, would recall that "The wicked flee when no man pursueth."<sup>5</sup>

After the introduction, Cannon reviewed the charges that Representative Smith had leveled so that he might disprove the accusations. The four violations alleged by Smith were denied, and the denial was supported with examples in every case. The charges concerned the committee and Cannon's operations as chairman of the appropriations.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 11058.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 11057.

. . . first, that the Committee on Appropriations is violating, and has been violating for many years, the rules of the House. Second, that in contravention of the law of the House, the Committee on Appropriations has been holding closed hearings. Third, that the Committee on Appropriations has refused to hear Members and citizens who desired to appear before the committee in behalf of, or in opposition to, pending bills and appropriations. Fourth, that the Committee on Appropriations is continually reaching out for power and deliberately encroaches on the jurisdiction of the legislative committees of the House.<sup>6</sup>

To take care of the first charge, Cannon cited the bill which gave the Committee on Appropriations the right to perform in their present manner. To be specific, he referred to the Reorganization Act of 1946, paragraph g, section twenty-five, of rule XI in House procedure. This use of House precedent strengthened his position and gave him justification for chastizing Representative Smith.

To refute the second charge, Mr. Cannon used his personal experience during World War II. He illustrated that the committee knew information which could be dangerous in the hands of the uninitiated. This explanation showed the wisdom of the Reorganization Act and served as evidence for his past actions. He tacked a rhetorical question on the end of the paragraph in order to gain support from his audience.

During World War II, by some remarkable accident, we broke the Japanese naval code and for two weeks the United States Navy knew in advance every move the Japanese Navy proposed to take . . . . I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are those who will talk. A reporter found we had broken the code and telegraphed his paper. And thirty minutes after the next edition hit the streets in Chicago, the Japanese changed their code. My friends, do you not think we should have been allowed to hold closed hearings on that question?<sup>7</sup>

After getting an affirmative reply on a question of this nature, Cannon did not let the evidence stand alone. He introduced an even more

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 11058.

important personal experience which should have clinched the right of the committee to hold closed hearings.

There are three members of the Committee on Appropriations present here on the floor this afternoon who knew two years in advance we were working on the atomic bomb, including the gentleman from New York (Mr. Taber), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Mahon). We went secretly in the night to Oak Ridge. We sweated two years on that nerve-wracking proposition. Do you think we ought to have had open hearings on it?<sup>8</sup>

His unstated conclusion was that obviously it was more advantageous to allow the Committee to have closed hearings when necessary.

To deal with the third argument, Cannon used the audience challenge method, as was already noted. He supported the argument with more than that, however, as he went to the use of history and authority to support his position. The historical material denied that the Committee had violated the intent of the rule. He quoted John Quincy Adams, and he asserted that his committee protected the citizens' rights so that he could demonstrate that the intent of the law had never been violated.

John Quincy Adams settled that question for all time to come when he maintained against widespread and strenuous opposition the right of petition, the right of any citizen of the United States to present his views or to appear before a committee. The Committee on Appropriations has at all times and from the beginning sedulously protected and maintained that right.<sup>9</sup>

The final argument which Cannon referred to was also a matter of legal prerogative. He illustrated that the function of the Committee was to present the material to the Congress and not to pass it. As a matter of course, the Appropriations Committee did not plead for legislative power, according to Mr. Cannon.

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 11058.

All that the Committee on Appropriations does in bringing in these budget estimates in a bill, is to give you an opportunity to consider, debate, modify, and vote. We do not ask you to approve them. We merely ask you to consider them and then vote them down. We give the House an opportunity to function -- to carry out its duties under the Constitution. That is what you are here for, that is what your constituents sent you here to do.<sup>10</sup>

The conclusion of the speech was loaded with parliamentary authorities whom Mr. Cannon used to support the legal position of the Appropriations Committee on this matter. He used two instances of House precedents; for authorities he cited the "great Parliamentarian, Asher C. Hinds, who knew more about the procedure of the House than any man who ever lived," Senator Norris, of Nebraska, and Mr. Sherley, of Kentucky. He used quoted materials from these sources in order to support the function of the Appropriations and the Rules Committees.

Cannon offered several types of evidence in this rebuttal against Smith. He denied every charge brought against him, and he used at least one type of evidence and generally two in his defense. He allowed the audience the opportunity to challenge his points, and he used the rhetorical question in order to eliminate any further attacks by the members of his audience. He gave them an opportunity to disagree with his statements, but he was careful to shift the burden of rebuttal to his antagonists, if they chose to reply. This technique shows how really confident Cannon was about his position. The conclusion of the chapter will reveal whether Cannon was effective in this instance.

---

<sup>10</sup>ibid., p. 11059.

Emotional Analysis

All this talk, all this circumlocution, all this tempest in a teapot here, all the parliamentary peccadillos, are beside the point. The people at home want action. They want us to vote on the questions before the country today.<sup>11</sup>

This final appeal to the Congress produced the only significant appeal to the emotions in this speech. This short peroration was an effort at showing the insignificance of the whole debate. The purpose of the speech was oriented toward proving a point by amassing evidence, and not by emotionally arousing his audience. Since the speech was oriented towards refutation it avoided emotional material. He did, however, open the speech with some delightful sarcasm which might be emotional because of the stir it would probably cause in the House. "Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations is again advertised by its loving friends -- and we are deeply appreciative." He then proceeded to allude to justice and fair play with a lingering bit of sarcasm as he lectured the House on the impropriety of Mr. Smith's action.

It is always customary to give a Member of the House notice in advance when he or his committee is to be made the subject of criticism. But in this instance there was no notice of any kind, and I was denied the opportunity of being present, and knew nothing of it until appraised by others and until I saw it in the Record this morning. Consequently, this is the first opportunity I have had to acquiesce with my distinguished friend from Virginia in his high praise and richly-merited ecomium of the Committee on rules.<sup>12</sup>

The remainder of the speech, as shown in the logical analysis, was refutation with the extended and varied use of evidence. If Mr. Cannon created an emotional or charged mood within his audience, it did

---

<sup>11</sup>ibid., p. 11059.

<sup>12</sup>ibid., p. 11057.

not seem to come from colorful language, direct motivational appeals, or picturesque images in this speech. It must be attributed to the weight of his evidence and the arrangement of his arguments.

### Ethical Analysis

Cannon's effort to establish himself as an authority on the function and use of his committee is very evident in this speech. The use of his position, his knowledge, and his authority on parliamentary or House precedent is also easily observable. The self-righteousness of his position in this debate was made quite clear when he described the attacks on his committees while, "The gentleman from New York (Mr. Taler) and I were at the time conferring with the Bureau of the Budget . . . ." At the least he was showing his devotion to his job rather than spending his time talking about relatively trifling matters.

Cannon continued the advantageous use of his position when he described the warmth he felt toward the Rules Committee and when he argued that no one had been prevented from testifying before the Appropriations Committee. These statements were followed with the opportunity for the audience to contradict any part of his statement. Because there were no questions or contradictions this use of the audience appears, at least, to support Cannon in his personal image building.

Another instance of using his position and knowledge was his reference to his vast experience.

I must say positively, Mr. Speaker, that in all my experience -- and I have served at some time on every subcommittee and consideration of every departmental appropriation bill under the jurisdiction of the committee -- . . . .<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 11088.

The weight of personal and national responsibility upon his committee was brought to bear when Mr. Cannon talked about the committee's knowledge on atomic weapons during the Second World War. His description of the knowledge of the burdens and concerns of the committee can be construed as an attempt to increase respect for the committee and the head of that committee.

When Cannon described the procedures that his committee went through to insure the fair and legal disposition of the bills, he was illustrating the integrity of the committee. By describing the meticulous care taken by the Appropriation Committee, he further justified the past approach taken on the money bills sent to the House for action.

In order to meet this situation, four years ago I had the staff go over all the bills we had passed at the previous session and tabulate the items subject to points of order. When we had classified them according to jurisdictions, we sent a list to each legislative committee. Many of them, of course, were unimportant; they had been carried in the bill for many years, but they were outside our jurisdiction. Of all the committees of the House who received them, only three gave them any attention.<sup>14</sup>

There are two other important items in building his ethical appeal in this speech. One was the evidence used throughout the speech. It appears that Cannon was attempting to overwhelm his audience with his many types of evidence. His use of present and past members of the House (Dirksen of Illinois, and Sherley of Kentucky), his use of parliamentary authority (on which no one could doubt Cannon's credentials), and his use of committee experiences left very little to be challenged. His reputation as parliamentarian, his scholarly history of House precedents, and his position as Appropriation Committee Chairman, coupled with this vast

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 11058.



amount of material and audience challenges, created an enormous obstacle to his opponents.

The second significant factor which aided his ethical appeal occurred after his speech. Mr. Smith of Virginia gave a short reply to Mr. Cannon.

Mr. Speaker, I feel sufficiently chastized. There is a certain number of innings to a ball game. The Committee on Appropriations had its inning on Thursday and batted around quite a few balls. I had a feeble inning yesterday. Now the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has had his inning and normally, under the rules of the game, I would be entitled to another inning. But I forfeit my right to the final inning.

The only reason I took the floor was to say that we have all had our innings. A good time has been had by all. I am not mad with anybody and I hope nobody is mad with me. I just want to close the war. Let us forget about this little incident. Everybody has had his say. I still love Clarence Cannon, as I always have. I have the highest regard and respect and affection for every member of the great Committee on Appropriations. They are doing a stupendous job and a man-killing job. I love them all.

Let us get down to business and forget about this incident.<sup>15</sup>

However you classify this reply, it cannot be doubted that Cannon "won the ball game." Mr. Smith's reply was not a rebuttal but an effort to eliminate the controversy, and Cannon could not have helped feeling that the actions of his committee were vindicated. Smith's apology supported Cannon's materials and his veracity. The support led to a building of ethical appeal by depicting consistent and conscientious action. The dismissing of the subject may have been the easiest, or perhaps the only, thing that his accuser could have done at this point.

### Conclusion

From a debate criterion this speech has to be considered an unqualified success. Cannon organized his evidence and arguments so solidly

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 11059.

that he was not challenged by any member of the House. He used audience challenge, literature, House precedents, personal experience, history, and authority throughout the speech. His refutation of the specific points as charged was the main point of his talk, and he pursued it with a direct and forceful style.

The use of emotional material was extremely limited in this speech, because it was unnecessary. The logical materials and ethical materials served as refutation much better than the emotional materials could. His use of personal experience established proof and support for his arguments, and the apology by Smith gave external support for the speech.

It was not a showy or flashy speech, but its methodology and purpose were clear and concise. It is obvious that Cannon was pursuing the arguments with one thing in mind; sufficient proof. Cannon won the ball game.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### CANNON STALLS KENNEDY

The history of 1962 is the history of conflicts between men. The materials which surround the Kennedy administration seem to be predominantly concentrated on the personalities of government rather than on the institution itself. Perhaps this is always true, but the Kennedys especially attracted headlines. President Kennedy, a dynamic and forceful speaker, has been portrayed by many of his contemporaries as being conscious of the attraction that he possessed. Theodore Sorenson noted in his biography of Kennedy that the President felt the pressure from Congress concerning his strength as an administrator. He explained the reaction by quoting the President from a personal conversation.

Some of them aren't as important as they were under Eisenhower, especially in the Senate. A lot of the spotlight has shifted down here now and they get damn little credit for their part. Every time I ask them for more power -- over aid for trade of taxes -- they think I'm invading their prerogatives.<sup>1</sup>

The tragic assassination of President Kennedy forced a great deal of speculation as to what he could have accomplished in his administration. He definitely believed in pushing his own legislative programs, which caused an even greater conflict with the Congress. "No major legislative measure was ever presented to the Congress by his Cabinet or passed by

---

<sup>1</sup>Theodore C. Sorenson, Kennedy, (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), p. 346.

the Congress for his signature without his prior approval.<sup>2</sup>

Other personalities appeared in the headlines with a flurry that brought hero welcomes to John H. Glenn Jr., who became the first American to complete an orbit of the earth (February 20); M. Scott Carpenter, the second American astronaut in space completed a three-orbit flight (May 24); and Walter N. Schirra Jr., who completed six orbits around the earth (October 3).<sup>3</sup>

The success of the space program, the youth movement in government, and the continued high rise of expenditures did cause several of the Congressmen to react as Mr. Kennedy indicated they would. One particular Congressman gained headlines by restricting government expenditures and simply not appropriating money. For some time, the Senate Appropriations Chairman Carl Hayden and Clarence Cannon had been involved with the problems of monetary matters. Cannon assiduously protected the Representatives' right to initiate the Appropriations process. He felt strongly about the Senator's encroaching upon the rights of the House in anything concerning monies. In his speech in the House on October 13, 1962, he explained the reason for these rights of the House.

We had a little controversy with the Senate some time ago in changing the obsolete, antiquated machinery in order to discourage the habit of the Senate of adding unwarranted sums to House appropriations bills.

The other body sought to take away a prerogative lodged in the House by the Founding Fathers who wisely provided that the strongest hold on the purse-strings of the Nation should be in the hands of the House of Representatives because it is closest to the people, and has to come before the people every two years.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Kull, pp. 500, 502, 503.

<sup>4</sup>U.S. Congressional Record, October, 1962, p. 23485. See Appendix F for complete text.

The Atlantic Monthly characterized the power and the effect which Cannon could bring to bear when challenged by the leadership of the country

Without appropriations, no government can function. And the man who can withhold appropriations or reduces the amount available or hold them up until the last moment can harass an administration every day of the year. Cannon's tactics were as formidable as Smith's. When Kennedy was assassinated in November, 1963, the bulk of the appropriations bills for the fiscal year that had begun the previous July 1, were still unenacted.<sup>5</sup>

In 1962, before Cannon gave his speech, the feud was just gaining heat. As Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. stated.

For an edifying four months in 1962 a feud between Representative Clarence Cannon (eighty-three years old) and Senator Carl Hayden (eighty-four years old) each of whom angrily declined to go to the office of the other, held up House-Senate agreement on appropriation bills and left a number of government agencies without money to meet their payrolls.<sup>6</sup>

The enormity of the problem was not based solely on personalities or spending, or on any one factor. A combination of factors caused eruption which was depicted by Cannon's October 13, 1962 speech. The later explanations about that speech illustrate a variety of viewpoints. Daniel M. Berman shows how the Washington Post viewed the interaction.

Baronial tendencies were certainly manifested by House Appropriations Committee Chairman Clarence Cannon (D. Mo) in 1962 when he refused to speak on the telephone with the President of the United States. Mr. Kennedy had called about an impasse that had developed between Cannon's committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup>The Atlantic Monthly, "Report on Washington," Volume 216, No. 3, p. 8.

<sup>6</sup>Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., A Thousand Days, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965), p. 709.

<sup>7</sup>Daniel M. Berman, In Congress Assembled (New York: Macmillan Co., 1964, p. 121. Berman took the note from Washington Post, October 14, 1962, p. 24.

Representative Bolling (Mo.), although seldom favorable in his comments to Cannon gives a slightly different interpretation of the incident and of Cannon's speech.

On October 13, 1962, the last day of the Eighty-Seventh Congress, Cannon rose on the floor and excoriated McCormack and Albert and the Democratic whip, Representative Hale Boggs of Louisiana. In fairness, Cannon was evenhanded in his attitude toward the leaders of his party. Democrat Cannon even refused to meet with Democrat Kennedy, the President, to discuss the foreign-assistance bill.<sup>8</sup>

Other writers picked up Cannon's comments either to illustrate the conflict or to show Americans about spending problems within Congress. For example, the U.S. News and World Report carried excerpts of the speech in order to show what was happening in the first "100-billion Congress."<sup>9</sup>

The enormity of the task of spending 100 billion dollars would seem miniscule in comparison to the problems of appropriating the funds for the expenditure. Every Congressman and Senator pushing his own project would cause undue stress on the committee decisions. Cannon's conservative approach to spending was seriously damaged by these enormous expenditures. In order to dramatize the mammoth problems involved in expenditures and in the process of decision making, he took the opportunity to speak on these problems at the closing of Congress.

#### Logical Analysis

Mr. Cannon delivered this speech at the close of an extremely long session of Congress. As he said in his remarks on one of the Senate

---

<sup>8</sup>Bolling, House Out of Order, p. 75.

<sup>9</sup>U.S. News & World Report, October 29, 1962, p. 47.

amendments attached to the Appropriations Committee bill:

Mr. Speaker, the summer has waxed and waned; the birds have nested and flown; the leaves are falling in the autumn breeze, but Congress still stays on.<sup>10</sup>

This Congress was extremely difficult to work with, and Cannon at eighty-three years of age was disgusted by the activities of the leadership of the House. The leaders failed to support the work of the House on several occasions. In fact, Cannon demonstrated two ways that the leadership harmed or delayed the House procedures.

Daily we were importuned by the Speaker to yield to the Senate, to surrender the prerogatives of the House, to agree on any terms.

The Committee on Appropriations, under heavy criticism, maintained its position but it was in spite of the leadership of the House when it should have been supporting us.<sup>11</sup>

In questioning the attitude and tactics of the leadership, Cannon attacked the moral integrity of several of the leaders. To demonstrate their method of operation he cited an example of the leadership in action. These accusations and personal experiences were the primary means of support in this speech by Cannon.

The majority leader of the House came to me last night, after the roll call and said, "If you will agree to let this half billion dollar bill go through" -- the one he said we did not need -- "We will turn and support you and give you this motion."<sup>12</sup>

The methodology was different in this speech from that of the previous efforts analyzed. For example, he spoke in generalities rather than specifics; he did not bother to use sources; and he did not seem to care for accuracy in this speech.

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 23485.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 23486.

The only quotation used was from Thomas Jefferson in which he illustrated that the bill had no justification or reason for adoption. This philosophical statement by Jefferson (not documented) was the philosophy that Cannon relied upon in his speech; "A just consideration for the opinion of mankind requires that we give reason for our action." Mr. Cannon gave reasons for his actions, and he was extremely critical of the action taken by his colleagues. The entire speech was designed to show that the unnecessary expenditures were leading the Congress to adopt the first 100 billion dollar budget. Obviously upset and bitter about the rejection of the committee recommendations for a lower budget, Cannon wasted little time trying to persuade Congress to change its behavior through a demonstrated rational argument. He depended on their loyalty to the system and the historical precedents.

The materials which he used to persuade were based on the past and present. His comparison and contrast technique of the expenditures since Mr. Tabor (N.Y.) entered Congress were general, but they created an effective example on differences between the times. These changes (three billion to 115 billion dollars; 536,000 employees to 2,514,000 people in government; 22 billion to 302 billion in public debt), were not documented, nor did they particularly need to be. The statement that there was a large difference was known by the members of the House and the accuracy of the figures was relatively unimportant in creating the atmosphere and making the point.

Mr. Tabor and Mr. Cannon had been members of the Appropriations Committee for a long time. Although there were occasional ruptures in the friendship (a fist fight or two), there was an intimate understanding of the workings of their committee.



The close working relationship of Clarence Cannon and John Tabor, whose service on the Committee (at the close of the 87th Congress) totaled seventy years, and who exchanged the position of Committee Chairman and ranking minority member for twenty years, highlighted and strengthened the reciprocity of roles existing in the group. Despite their radically different personalities and voting records, the two men concurred that "We have a lot in common. We stand shoulder to shoulder. We usually agree and we are both on the conservative side: when it comes to the business of the committee." "Many times," said Cannon, "the two of us could sit right here at this table and go over the whole schedule -- authorizations and all. If we saw something that ought to come out, we'd take it out; if we saw something that ought to go in, we'd put it in." Mr. Cannon confides in Mr. Tabor and Mr. Tabor confides in nobody else.<sup>13</sup>

Mr. Cannon and Mr. Tabor had watched the budget grow bigger as they grew older. Their experience and their work were being seriously challenged and rechanneled by those groups outside the committee structure.

Cannon did not let the monetary comparison stand on statistical differences alone. He pointed out that the American public was being taxed at war time rates without a war. But what he found even more appalling was the lack of reason for change in the program.

An instance is the item we just passed. Although Congressional expenditures are already larger than ever before we have just added a program which will cost a fabulous sum before it is completed for a project rejected by every authority we consulted.<sup>14</sup>

This statement correlated closely with his Jefferson quotation regarding the need for sufficient reasons for action. He pursued the point by repetition and by amplifying the statement of the chairman on the bill under Congressional inspection.

The chairman of the committee who reported it says it is not necessary. He says it will in no way discommode the Government if you fail to pass it this year. So we are adhering to the refusal

---

<sup>13</sup>Fenno, p. 202.

<sup>14</sup>U.S. Congressional Record, p. 23485.

to permit it to go to conference. We adhering to the refusal to permit you to add further to the taxes of your already overburdened taxpayers. As you did in the vote just taken.<sup>15</sup>

The remainder of the speech was directed toward the Florida lobbyists and individual Congressmen who were attempting to push the bill through. The primary technique used by Cannon was relating his personal observations on the devaluation of the dollar. These personal experiences appeared to be primarily used as a basis for the emotional pleas in the speech. To show the unworthiness of the bill and the leadership, he recalled the lack of purpose in the bill and in the Congressional delay.

At the end of these long months, the longest peacetime session Congress has had -- and with no visible reason -- I honor the high office they hold but I cannot endorse the quality of leadership.

I have sat under ten Speakers -- but I have never seen such biased and inept leadership.<sup>16</sup>

The evidence, as positive proof for changing opinion, was not impressive in this speech. Mr. Cannon's materials were a matter of his experience and knowledge (which were not insignificant), and of the audience's general knowledge of governmental expenditures. Many of the items of personal experience were from earlier speeches. For instance, the theme for this speech was taken from his plea for a more sensible criterion for spending which was noted in his November 27, 1945 speech. The policy toward holding the spending down did not change in this speech, but his efforts and methodology were different. The explanation for the effectiveness of this speech has to be found in an area other than logical analysis.

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 23486.

Emotional Analysis

Cannon used emotional materials in this speech to attempt to carry the arguments presented. No other speech studied has had the direct appeal to the emotions that this speech reveals. One could derive the conclusion that Cannon was angry and was merely striking out, but a careful analysis revealed a pattern in his emotional material. There were three primary techniques which Cannon used to illustrate his feelings: sarcasm, direct comparison of materials, and personal appeal to the people.

The sarcasm was scattered throughout the speech. There were seven different instances where Cannon "blistered" the Congressmen for their spending attitudes. His method is best illustrated when he appealed to a false pride that Congressmen should have in their spending ability.

Gentlemen, when you go home you can attract special attention by saying, "I have just come from a \$100 billion Congress." You are the first man ever to go back to your congressional district from a \$100 billion Congress in all its history.<sup>17</sup>

He carried the illustration almost to the point of absurdity by offering a method of advertising their stand on the expenditures for the coming year. His caustic comment isolated each Congressman according to his past actions.

I know you high-cost-of-living gentlemen will be disappointed that you will not have an opportunity to add it to the bill you have just voted through. The name of every Congressman who voted it is right here in the yea-and-nay vote. Why not send it back home to be posted in every voting poll in your district.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 23484.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid.

Another use of sarcasm was directed to the Representative from Florida. Cannon illustrated how he felt about the actions of these men who in his opinion, were manipulating monetary matters to their advantage.

Mr. Speaker, who is leading this raid upon the public Treasury today? The gentlemen from Florida -- fine fellows, of course -- I love every one of them. The great Sunshine State of Florida is taking population from every State of the Union. New York here lost a Congressman. They put him down in Florida. And they have tax laws down there that pull New York money down there too. They are attracting population from all over. The reason they readjusted your districts this year is that Florida is such an enticing State. Yet they are so poverty stricken that they must come up to Washington and run over the Committee on Appropriations which has no interest whatever except to discharge the duties and serve the purpose for which appointed.<sup>19</sup>

This sarcasm and anger can be explained as a matter of frustration. He was disturbed by the amount of the expenditures being recommended, as well as by the methodology by which the changes were brought about. He added direct attack to his emotional tactics when he accused the Floridians of piracy.

They are as redoubtable a gang of pirates as ever sailed the Spanish Main, and my State and your State are paying the bill in onerous taxes. Millions of dollars were plundered by Captain Kidd and Blue Beard, but the amount of money Kidd and Blue Beard took pales into insignificance compared to the money these highwaymen have taken from the U.S. Treasury this morning.<sup>20</sup>

Cannon did not resort solely to group attacks in his speech. He attacked Congressman Hale Boggs (Louisiana) and Carl Albert (Oklahoma) for their poor leadership. The description of Boggs would be humorous under any other situation.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 23484-85.

Last night my good friend Hale Boggs, after vigorously campaigning for Florida, brushed the Parliamentary aside. He stood there like an avenging angel. I have never seen anything like it before.

When the A's in the alphabet were called Mr. Albert voted against the committee, the unanimous report of the committee, and then at the last minute after he had given the signal to the House, and everybody had voted, he changed his vote so that it would look a little better.<sup>21</sup>

Cannon continued the attack against the House leadership when he reviewed his experience and gave his personal opinion of this Congress. This was a rather damning commentary on his own party during the Kennedy administration.

At the end of these long months, the longest peacetime session Congress has had -- and with no visible reason -- I honor the high office they hold but I cannot endorse the quality of leadership.

I have sat under ten Speakers -- but I have never seen such biased and inept leadership.<sup>22</sup>

This was not kind criticism and revealed the intensity and seriousness with which Mr. Cannon viewed the situation. The major magazines and newspapers picked up the quotation, and U.S. News & World Report commented on Cannon's remarks about the leadership and on the expenditures that the government was making for that budget.

It all adds up to more than 100 billion in appropriations at a time when, in Mr. Cannon's words, "the Government is already spending the largest amount ever spent in one peacetime year in the history of any nation on earth."<sup>23</sup>

Cannon did not allow these attack to disconcert him so much that he could not make a plea for the common man. His concern with the people was illustrated when he complained about the taxation that the people were suffering. But he was even more pointed when he talked of the

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 23486.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> "The First 100-Billion Congress!" U.S. News & World Report, October 29, 1962, p. 47.

personal experience he had with people who were caught in the economic pinch.

A woman wrote me yesterday that she took a dozen eggs to market and got twenty-four cents for them, and it was not enough to pay for postage stamps to write to each of her children. Yet you raised the postage the other day. "Oh, the people are not paying enough. Sure, vote to make them pay more postage and more taxes."<sup>24</sup>

The efforts to dramatize the dollar-value change were not missed by Cannon in his example of family problems. This appeal to self-preservation was an attempt to make Congress aware of how hard Cannon thought it was to live with the new measures. It was also a way to show the audience outside of Congress that Cannon was still sympathetic and in tune with the "people" of the United States. His practical use of the worth of the dollar was especially appealing to this wider audience.

In 1926 when a housewife took a dollar downtown to the grocery store, she got \$1.07 worth of groceries for that dollar. National all over the world were scrambling for that dollar. They wanted hard cash. But now they are not so keen about it. Today it is worth only 44 cents.<sup>25</sup>

To reveal the effects of the measure that Congress was about to pass can be an extremely effective appeal. To add extra hardships for the American, when he was trying to get a basic education and a decent meal, would seem to arouse the listeners. Cannon compounded the already emotional content when he added children to these other two variables.

Many a man who must earn his living by the sweat of his brow is having a hard time buying school shoes for his children. He is having a hard time filling the plates on the breakfast table. But when we send the tax collector around, he has to ante up. Here today you are telling that man to let his children wear their shoes a little longer after they are already worn out. You are telling the parents of some of those children to send them to school without an

---

<sup>24</sup>Congressional Record, op. cit., p. 23484.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

an egg for breakfast or without a slice of bacon so that they will have enough to pay the taxes you voted on them this morning for the golden Sunshine State of prosperous Florida.<sup>26</sup>

There were other appeals to the people in this speech. Cannon was deeply concerned that the Congressman no longer felt responsible for the people in his district and in his county. He was appealing for better leadership and better contact with the people when he argued that Congress should have been recessed a long time ago so that the Congressman could be in closer touch with his constituents.

Congress ought to go home. Congressmen ought to stay in touch with the people and find out what they need, what they are talking about, what their sentiments are. If Members had kept in touch with the voters we would not have had the vote we had here just now.<sup>27</sup>

This direct appeal was a combination of voter awareness and lecturing of Congressional responsibility. It illustrated the frustration that Mr. Cannon must have felt at this time.

The long Congress, the age factor, the feeling that unfair tactics had been used, and the poor leadership may have been the cause for this emotional outburst. This type of outburst was not evident in any of his other speeches. The material seems to be well placed and it gave vent to Cannon's feelings. And it further illustrates his position as a representative of the people. The speech revealed his displeasure with the methodology used to attempt to override his committee. His speech was designed to exonerate the House Committee on Appropriations for the increased spending; and it was an effort to show his constituency, and

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p. 23485.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

perhaps the whole nation, that Clarence Cannon is still fighting to preserve the integrity of his office and to protect the people from piracy and poor leadership. These appeals are manifested through his use of sarcasm, comparison and contrast of materials, and appeal to the people. The basis for these appeals was evident when he said, "The Committee on Appropriations, under heavy criticism, maintained its position but it was in spite of the leadership of the House when it should have been supporting us."<sup>28</sup>

### Ethical Analysis

This speech was oriented toward two audiences (Congress and constituents), because of the tremendous expenditures over and above the Appropriations Committee recommendations. While oriented toward both audiences, his direct attack on Congress, on Florida, and on the House leadership would do little to enhance his image with the Congress. However, it would establish in the voters a respect for the efforts that Cannon was making in their behalf. His appeal to the voters illustrated the control that he felt the voter could and probably should have over his Congressman.

I am convinced, we would not have had votes like we had here this morning if we had been back home, rubbing shoulders with our constituents, if we had had an opportunity to see the hard conditions under which they live.<sup>29</sup>

The image of a protector was also shown when he talked about the difference between the function of committees and the responsibilities of individuals. The people were overlooked, according to Cannon.

---

<sup>28</sup>ibid.

<sup>29</sup>ibid.



The appeals to the people in this instance certainly do not appear to be designed to tie the Congressional leaders to Cannon. The excommunication of specific individuals was not patterned to win their favor, and Cannon did not appear to be eager to do their bidding. The use of emotional appeals directly related to the people seems to indicate that Cannon was willing and eager to divorce himself from the actions of Congress. His bitterness and his appeal to the people were illustrative of his independence and of his relationship to his constituency. The image that he portrayed was one of a concerned Congressman trying to perform the task which his job required. If Congress passed the amendment, then they would obviously be duped by the shyster Floridians who were attempting to overturn the efforts of an honest and hard-working committee. The length of service of Cannon and Tabor would lend credence to the belief that they were dedicated public servants attempting to perform according to the standards of their committee. Undoubtedly, Cannon and Tabor were upset by the tactics employed by the opposition, and the reply by Cannon gave support for his theory of government. His theory of a relatively conservative monetary policy, and his belief that he owed a certain obligation to his district voters was clearly supported in this speech. His independence was certainly characterized by his attack on the established leaders of the Congress.

### Conclusion

Clarence Cannon was unhappy about the actions of the Congress concerning expenditures over and above those recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. If that seems to be an understatement, then the proof would have to come from the emotional and the ethical analysis. The

logical viewpoint played a very slight role in this particular speech. The proofs were primarily emotional and they were used as a method of attacking specific leaders and state organizations rather than as a method of constructing a policy. His efforts at removing himself from the actions of Congress show the complete disassociation that he desired from these actions taken by Congress. His reference to the leadership of Congress (excluding himself), his desire to have Congress go home so that it can learn how to vote, his faith in the voter, and his effort to maintain a respectable standard are all evidence of his intense dissatisfaction in the new expenditures. His use of women, children, hunger, voter responsibility, and fiscal responsibility, are techniques used to dramatize a distasteful occurrence. The effort at demonstrating his disassociation from Congress illustrates how adamantly he is against the measures which will increase the expenditures.

This speech is definitely different than other speeches analyzed in that it is primarily a speech that depends on emotional appeals. It is also different because it is an attempt, not to advocate a policy or to attack policy as much as to accept a sort of inevitability and divorce himself from it. In the classical sense it might be classified as an epideictic speech; its ends are blame and its occasion is the death of a policy.

## CHAPTER NINE

### CONCLUSIONS ABOUT CLARENCE CANNON

The final chapter of this study will be devoted to drawing three types of conclusions. First, the questions asked in the first chapter, regarding Cannon's function as an appropriator of the national budget, will be answered. Second, the categories used for analysis (logical, emotional, and ethical) will be summarized and evaluated. Third, some conclusions regarding the effectiveness of his speaking will be drawn. After these conclusions, the study will analyze the objectives of this research, as described in Chapter One. It will use the earlier set of conclusions to evaluate the entire study.

#### Cannon as an Appropriator

To serve a total of forty-two years in Congress could be one measure of effectiveness, or to rule the Appropriations Committee for almost twenty years could be another. But length of service doesn't necessarily indicate contribution or speech effectiveness. To be effective as Head of the Appropriations Committee can be described in many ways, but to control the expenditures, and to withhold monies over all opposition reveals a certain independence of power. Cannon had this power, and he used it according to his beliefs. As early as 1950, a Saturday Evening Post article noted Cannon's effectiveness and its causes. (The) . . . "extraordinary effectiveness is due to two factors: he heads the most powerful

committee in Congress, and he is the most expert practitioner of legislative strategy in the House."<sup>1</sup>

The early training under Champ Clark and the service as House parliamentarian gave him a tremendous advantage over less prepared opponents. According to Representative Otto E. Passman, of Louisiana, Cannon may have had an advantage over all of his opponents, because his skill was unsurpassed.<sup>2</sup>

His writings on parliamentary procedure, and his use of those precedents in Congress were noted by his successor, Representative George H. Mahon, of Texas, the present Appropriations Committee Chairman.

Whereas no set of resolutions, however fragmentary of design should be concluded without noting that Mr. Cannon, a man of eminent and varied public services and accomplishments, was an internationally known parliamentarian and universally regarded as the greatest authority on the parliamentary rules, precedents and practices of the House of Representatives . . . .<sup>3</sup>

Part of the reason behind his success was his astute parliamentary knowledge and his ability to use it in committee and on the floor of the House.

Other valuable assets were his ability to predict defeat (and thus dissolve the committee to avoid the defeat), and his ability to avoid political pressure by refusing to respond to the President. These incidents were described in Chapter Two. These examples demonstrate Cannon's ability to maneuver within the prerogatives of his office.

Even more important than his ability to use the rules to his advan-

<sup>1</sup>P. F. Healy, "Nobody Loves Clarence," Saturday Evening Post, V. CCXXII, (March 25, 1950), p. 38.

<sup>2</sup>Memorial Services, p. 60.

<sup>3</sup>ibid., p. 230-231.

tage was another factor which allowed him to maintain this power. This factor was the respect which his colleagues had for the chairman. His associates had respect for his knowledge, his devotion, and his integrity. In fact almost every Representative or Senator who delivered a memorial address on Cannon commented on these three characteristics.

Representative Leonor Kretzer Sullivan, of Missouri, spoke of Cannon's knowledge: "As chairman of the Committee of Appropriations, he knew everything -- almost everything -- about every program of Government in which taxpayers' funds were spent."<sup>4</sup> Representative W.R. Hull, also of Missouri, commented that Cannon had no weekends or vacations. He further illustrated the devotion of Cannon. "Clarence Cannon was the personification of the serious, studious, and dedicated public servant."<sup>5</sup> Senator Gordon Allot, of Colorado, described the total characteristics of Cannon's service in the House.

It would be impossible for anyone to sit at a conference table with a man like Clarence Cannon and not be impressed over and over again, not only with the seriousness and acuity of his mind but also with the great integrity and sense of fairness and reasonableness which characterized his every action.<sup>6</sup>

Cannon, then, was a hard worker with a knowledge of parliamentary procedure and a knowledge of the Appropriation materials and processes. The biography chapter indicated that his party affiliation was independent of his national feeling. The reason for this independence was best expressed by Representative Melvin R. Laird, of Wisconsin.

Also, as the years have passed, I have found myself almost forgetting that Clarence Cannon was of a different political party,

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 26.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 223.

because it became more and more evident that he was first, last, and always an American -- a man who always put the good of his country above all else, including himself.<sup>7</sup>

This opinion was shared by many of Laird's colleagues, and the evidence showed that regardless of party pressure Cannon maintained the philosophy that his job was to save the country as much expense as possible. His later speeches especially demonstrated his preoccupation with a sound fiscal policy. His annual non-spending lectures, his complaint about the billion dollar budget, and his intense controversies with the Senate over their free-spending policies give credence to the following statement by Representative Edward P. Boland, of Massachusetts.

His untiring efforts undoubtedly contributed much toward keeping our national finances on a sound basis. While more than one trillion dollars has been appropriated by Congress for Government operations during his term as chairman of this committee, Clarence Cannon may be given much credit for cuts running into billions of dollars which have been made in executive budget requests. Thus his powerful and forceful influence has acted as a deterrent to wasteful Government spending which only adds to our budgetary deficits and to our large public debt.<sup>8</sup>

It is accurate to say that Cannon was respected for his knowledge, his ability, his accomplishments, and his integrity as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. His colleagues, while not always agreeing, were impressed with his devotion to his job and his ability to get the bills passed with as much savings as he did.

Finally, Representative Edward R. Finnegan of Illinois, described the time when Cannon arrived at his budget philosophy. According to Finnegan, Cannon did not develop his philosophy solidly until the 1944-45 sessions of Congress. This helps explain why the speech of January 12,

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 74.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 41.

1939 (Chapter Five), and the speech of November 27, 1945 differ significantly in their approach to spending.

It was in the last months of World War II that Mr. Cannon's attitude and philosophy about his role in life emerged and manifested itself. It was to become the overriding motivating principle of his approach to the responsibilities of the Appropriations Committee.<sup>9</sup>

Thus, his philosophy of tight-fistedness, his honesty, his integrity, and his devotion to his job won him the respect of his colleagues. Many of these traits or characteristics are manifested in his speaking.

#### Cannon's Use of the Modes of Proof

This study has focused on the logical, emotional, and ethical modes of proof employed by Clarence Cannon over his entire speaking career in the House. The study has demonstrated that the logical elements of Cannon's speaking were generally sound. He used evidence in varying degrees, according to the need that he saw for it, or the relative sophistication of his audience. The speeches examined have revealed that in his early speaking he used specific and documented materials, and that as he became more of an authority, he used less documentation and less quoted material. There was one speech, given on March 30, 1932 (Chapter Four), which may have been a miscalculation by Cannon. He used a main source (Speaker Garner) to support most of his speech, and Garner removed that support during the debate. Cannon attempted to recover the loss of prestige by literally throwing examples and statistics into the last few minutes of his debate. However, he was unable to carry the measure and quickly bowed out of the debate. Other than this one speech, Cannon's

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 173.

materials were generally acceptable, and he gained the reputation of being a knowledgeable speaker, especially on Appropriations material.

As Cannon gained tenure and prestige in the House, he relied less and less on the documented materials and more and more on his own recognizance and on his personal experiences. Cannon as a fledgling Congressman and Cannon as an experienced Appropriations expert illustrated a wide diversity of methodology in both logical and ethical materials. There is a level of correlation between Cannon's tenure as a Congressman and his use of logical and ethical materials. The correlation works inversely with the logical material and directly with the ethical materials. In other words, as Cannon grew older, his use of evidence, his use of reasoning, and the documentation of his premises declined, while his use of personal experience and reputation increased (excepting the Garner example in Chapter Four).

The use of emotional materials seems to be based on Cannon's analysis of each audience situation. There does not appear to be a discernible pattern in the speeches studied. He used emotional material frequently in all the speeches, and the material was directed toward both the immediate and the secondary audience. He used home town examples, illustrations of suffering, and materials designed to arouse specific emotions for the audiences in Missouri when he was talking to the secondary audience. These appeals to the voters won him many devoted supporters in his district and his use of sarcasm, witticisms, and anger were generally reserved for his fellow Congressman. From this study, it can be concluded that Cannon had a grasp of his audience situations. This conclusion will be further substantiated in the following section on his effectiveness as a speaker.



### Cannon's Effectiveness

Was Clarence Cannon an effective speaker? One measurement could be his continuous tenure as a Representative from Missouri and his service as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. But these measurements do not necessarily show that the effect was caused by his speaking. However, there is evidence that the man was an effective speaker as well as an effective administrator.

The Congressional Record reveals one aspect of Cannon's effectiveness in the House. His repartee to Congressman McLaughlin, of Nebraska, was greatly appreciated by his audience. This example of quickness and wit was demonstrated early in his Congressional career on April 15, 1926.

Mr. Cannon. No. The most important piece of legislation which those most interested had a right to expect this Congress to consider -- legislation involving some adequate solution of the most vital and most pressing problem before the American people today -- is either to be stifled in the committee or reported out for enactment.

Mr. McLaughlin of Nebraska. Let me say to the gentleman that the Committee on Agriculture is in session this morning, and we hope to report out a bill some time next week.

Mr. Cannon. The gentleman from Nebraska recognizes the legislation to which I refer, although I have said nothing about agriculture. (Laughter) He concedes it to be the most important problem before the country to-day. [Applause]<sup>10</sup>

In an article entitled, "Insane Bickering," Time discussed another type of response which illustrated support for his effectiveness. This example took place at the latter part of his career.

The Eisenhower plan got still another big boost, this one from Missouri's bulb-nosed Democratic Congressman Clarence Cannon,

---

<sup>10</sup>U.S. Congressional Record, April 15, 1926, p. 7531. See Appendix A for complete text.

seventy-nine, chairman of the potent House Appropriations Committee, and a man who considers himself every bit as much a military expert as Carl Vinson. Rising on the House floor, Cannon delivered an old-fashioned stem-winder. "Who is better qualified," demanded Democrat Cannon, "in training, experience, and capacity than General Eisenhower when it comes to military affairs involving the safety of the people and the survival of our form of government, he is a general, and I take off my hat to him with heart-felt alacrity. It is high time we put an end to this insane bickering between the services, and eliminate billions of wastage and begin to develop sufficient military strength to keep us out of war."<sup>11</sup>

In addition to these specific examples, his colleagues commented on the reasons for his effectiveness. The most consistent remarks pertained to his debating technique. For instance, Representative Harold C. Ostertag, of New York, commented, " . . . we will miss the chairman's hard-hitting, effective, and colorful role in the debates on this floor. He spiced his arguments with sharp comments, amusing anecdotes and ear-catching expressions."<sup>12</sup> Representative W.J. Bryan Dorn, of South Carolina said that "His speeches on the floor were masterpieces."<sup>13</sup>

Not all critics were impressed with Cannon's speaking. For instance Representative Roland V. Libonati, of Illinois, had praise for Cannon's written ability, but he wasn't as pleased with his oral presentation.

Clarence Cannon was an artist of the written word -- his speeches on the floor are gems of rhetorical language, symbolized by the writings of Walter Pater.

In his presentment of a speech his gruffness of voice and hurried style would confound the listener, but upon reading the context in the Record, the eloquence of his logic and the thorough application of research in its preparation and fullness of discussion edified his colleagues.

<sup>11</sup>Time., May 19, 1958, p. 14.

<sup>12</sup>Memorial Services, p. 87.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 134.

There was no stronger debater in the House, nor one more engulfed in work. Mr. Cannon was a vigorous and worthy opponent, and meticulous in money matters affecting the Appropriations Committee's expenses of operation.<sup>14</sup>

Finally, Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, with whom Cannon had a fight over the lack of House leadership in 1962 (Chapter Eight), described Cannon's presentation as superb, even when given instantaneously.

The House has long appreciated Mr. Cannon's oratory. He had a style and manner of speech second to none ever displayed in the well of this House. He had a faultless ear for the right word, and elegant wit, devastating and unarguable logic. Even in impromptu speech his rhetoric and grammar were as flawless as his style was unique.<sup>15</sup>

Other people reacted to Cannon's speaking favorably and wrote to him regarding their reactions to his various addresses. For example, a speech called "More and Higher Taxes," delivered on October 13, 1962, received over forty letters from all over the country. The following letters, reacting to the speech, were in a miscellaneous file at the University of Missouri Western Manuscripts Collection. Mr. Clyde W. Vickey, Assistant Manager of Metropolitan Life Insurance Company in San Diego, expressed his thoughts concerning the speech.

The October 29, 1962 issue of the U.S. News & World Report reported in detail the speech you made in the House the day Congress adjourned. If we had more men with your courage and convictions, perhaps the U.S. would not have the tremendous national debt which we have. I wish I could personally thank you for making the speech. You expressed my thoughts and sentiments better than I possibly could have, had I the opportunity to do so before the House. I learned with pleasure that you were again reelected, although I am a conservative Republican, I certainly would have voted for you, if I had the opportunity to do so. Thanks again and keep up the good work.

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 80.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 39.

Mrs. Arthur Beddoe of 747 Nassau Street, Princeton, New Jersey, wrote to Cannon on January 4, 1963, and asked him to travel "from one end of the country to the other dispelling his message."

From the former illustrations and testimonies, it is evident that Cannon was respected for his ability to form and communicate a particular message. His ability to adapt to the debate situation has been especially noted, and there has been some support to show that the people believed in Cannon and in what he stood for.

A more specific analysis of Cannon's effectiveness in the audience was secured from the interviews with Mr. H. Greene Simpson, Mr. W.O. Mackie, and Mr. Harvey Young. These gentlemen praised Cannon's ability to create a mood of sympathy and understanding. All three men also agreed that one of Cannon's hidden assets was his charming wife, who acted as his memory, his secretary, and his chauffeur. This extra assistance was appreciated by Mr. Cannon and his constituents.

Mr. Simpson, who was Chairman of the Democratic Party in District I and IX, and also an Honorary Colonel on the staff of governors Blair and Hearn, ascribed Cannon's effectiveness to his relationship with his audience. He said, "Clarence Cannon was attractive to his audience; and he had a great ability to estimate the mood and needs of the audience."<sup>16</sup>

Mr. Mackie, a former State Senator from Kirksville, stated that while Cannon's voice (weak and raspy) prevented him from being a great orator, his excellent use of organization, history, and his ability

---

<sup>16</sup>Personal Interview on December 30, 1968, in Kirksville, Missouri.

to relate materials to his audience made him an effective speaker and Congressman.<sup>17</sup>

Mr. Young, a Democratic Chairman for Adair County, a member of the School Board, and President of the First National Bank of Kirksville, characterized Cannon's speaking as effective because he was courteous, well-liked, and well organized in his presentations. His delivery was described as animated by swinging an arm and a clenched fist. Mr. Young also said that his word was iron law; "he told you whether he could do something or whether he could not do it."<sup>18</sup>

After reviewing his method of speaking, and turning to secondary and primary sources for proof of his effectiveness, it is appropriate to remember what Cannon said about the value of public speaking. He counseled his fellow Congressmen to be aware of well-organized speeches and campaigns by their opponents. He made the statement that preparation and short, to-the-point speeches were the key to effectiveness with audiences. And more importantly, he followed his own advice. His speeches were well organized, documented according to the needs of the audience, and generally well received. Cannon was an effective speaker according to the effects produced, according to his fellow Congressmen, according to his constituents, and according to his own standards.

### Evaluation

Now that conclusions about Cannon have been drawn, the objectives of this research will be evaluated according to the criteria listed by Albert J. Croft.

---

<sup>17</sup>Personal Interview on December 31, 1968, in Kirksville, Missouri.

<sup>18</sup>Personal Interview on December 30, 1968, in Kirksville, Missouri.

One goal was "to report and interpret the manner in which a speaker's social values have been related to the social values of his audience in the course of his rhetorical adaptation . . . ." This study has indicated that Cannon adjusted to his audience in several ways. He used evidence and logic according to the demands placed on him by his audience. When speaking to Congress he was debate-oriented, with sharp and witty comments. When he was speaking to his constituents he was audience-oriented and he used hometown examples, personal experiences, and emotional materials. The popularity, the praise, and the support of the chairman indicate that he was in touch with the social and intellectual values of his times. And even more importantly, he was able to keep in touch with his audiences throughout his long Congressional career. The comments on his ability as a speaker occur early and late in his career as has been illustrated in this study.

The second objective was "to evaluate particular speeches and speakers by estimating the appropriateness and evaluating the uniqueness of the idea-adaptation in them . . . ." The appropriateness of the ideas was centered on the philosophy behind United States spending. There has been testimony in this study to indicate that Cannon was respected for the performance as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. However, Congressmen, and even certain constituents, wanted particular projects consummated which Cannon blocked for one reason or another. After establishing himself as the leader of appropriations, Cannon took a conservative look at the budgetary process. He complained about those Congressmen who voted against higher taxes, but for increased appropriations. While efforts to keep the income and spending equal were frustrated, there is no doubt that he saved our country large amounts of money.

The uniqueness of his ideas rests in his position as chairman of the Appropriations Committee. He was the spokesman and defender of the policies of that committee. He used logical, emotional, and ethical appeals to attempt to secure the appropriations recommended, and many of his colleagues appreciated his efforts. He adapted the ideas to satisfy his committee, Congress, and his voting population.

The third objective was to "re-examine, re-evaluate, and if possible, to modify contemporary rhetorical theory through the examination of the adaptive processes in speeches . . . ."

While this study does not modify rhetorical theory, it may support and clarify existing theory. Since Aristotle indicated the possibility that ethos may be the most important factor in persuasion, there has been a great deal of effort expended by rhetoricians in attempting to establish those elements which make up ethos. Anderson and Clevenger reviewed the research in 1963, and since 1966, in Speech Monographs alone, eleven studies working on the theory of ethos have been published. The study on Cannon illustrates a speaker using ethos, at least one element of it. Whether Cannon withheld evidence because he knew that his reputation would carry the speech cannot be documented, but there are some interesting uses of evidence and ethos which indicate some support for the belief that he was conscious of his use of these two elements of rhetoric.

The above points illustrate the growth and change of Cannon's speaking. His early speaking was characterized by specific documentation and parliamentary acumen. These characteristics provided him with a reputation for honesty, dedication, and knowledge of his subject. Testimony by his Congressional colleagues clearly supported his right

to that reputation. As Cannon gained experience in Congress he relied heavily on the materials of appropriation matters, and when he assumed the leadership of the Appropriations Committee he relied more frequently on his personal experiences and his position.

Because of the favorable personal reputation that his colleagues awarded him, because of his long tenure in Congress, because of his position on the powerful Appropriations Committee, because of his careful documentation in his early speaking, and because he could support his speeches with documents and experience, if necessary, Clarence Cannon's speaking supports the theory that ethos may be the most important factor in persuasive speaking.

This thesis has demonstrated that Cannon used logical materials in his early speaking, pathetic materials in those speeches which were directed to audiences with which this type of material would be beneficial, and ethos when he developed a sufficient reputation to make it a valuable mode of proof. Furthermore, the thesis provided evidence that Cannon carefully prepared his campaign speeches by collecting materials, writing outlines and manuscripts, and rewriting those manuscripts. Finally, the thesis provided testimony that Cannon felt that speaking was important and his colleagues provided testimony that he did an effective job of speaking.

While this thesis cannot prove that Cannon was an effective Congressman because of his speaking, it can assert that speaking was an integral part of his success and that his use of the modes of proof are distinctly observable in his development as a Congressman. He established a favorable reputation through his intelligence, his ability to analyze, and his speaking; and he maintained his reputation through the same attributes.



Therefore, this research establishes that Clarence Andrew Cannon, a Congressman from Missouri from 1923 to 1964, was an effective speaker due to his ability to understand, motivate, and secure the support of his audience.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BOOKS

- Allen, Frederick Lewis. Only Yesterday. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Since Yesterday. New York: Bantam Books, 1961.
- Bailey, Stephen K. The New Congress. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966.
- Berman, Daniel M. In Congress Assembled. New York: Macmillan Company, 1964.
- Bolling, Richard. House Out of Order. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1965.
- Clark, Joseph S. Congress: The Sapless Branch. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- Divine, Robert A. The Reluctant Belligerent. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965.
- Fenno, Richard F., Jr. The Power of the Purse. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966.
- Galloway, George B. The Legislative Process in Congress. New York: Crowell Co., 1953.
- Hofstadter, Richard, ed. Great Issues in American History. Vol. 2. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.
- Kull, Irving S., Nell M. Kull, and Stanley H. Friedelbaum. An Encyclopedia of American History. New York: Eagle Books, 1965.
- Jackson, William Rufus. Missouri Democracy, A History of the Party and Its Representative Members-Past and Present. 3 vols. Chicago: S. J. Clarke Pub. Co., Inc., 1935.
- Memorial Services: Clarence Andrew Cannon. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.
- Morison, Samuel Eliot. The Oxford History of The American People. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Peabody, Robert L. and Nelson W. Polsby, eds. New Perspectives on the House of Representatives. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963.

Pressman, Jeffery L. House vs. Senate: Conflict in the Appropriations Process. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.

Robinson, James A. The House Rules Committee. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1963.

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. The Coming of the New Deal. Sentry Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965.

Truman, Harry S. Memoirs. 2 vols. New York: Signet Books, 1965.

U.S. President. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register. National Archives and Records Service, 1953- . Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1956.

\_\_\_\_\_. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register. National Archives and Records Service, 1963-1964. Lyndon B. Johnson, 1965.

#### ARTICLES IN JOURNALS OR MAGAZINES

"Above Inhibition." Time, May 17, 1963, pp. 28-9.

Cannon, Clarence. "Address, January 21, 1952; excerpts." Congressional Digest, XXXI (April, 1952), 119+.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Address March 26, 1957." Congressional Digest, XXXVI (May, 1957), 150+.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Cannon on Committee's Power and Justification." Congressional Record, XCV (October 3, 1949), 13970.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Congressional Responsibilities." American Political Science Review, 42 (April, 1948), 307-16.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Report by Chairman Clarence Cannon." Congressional Record, XCVI (July 24, 1950), 11054.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Protest on the Floor of the House Against Reduction in the Appropriation for Relief." Congressional Digest, XVIII (February, 1939), 62-4.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Speech in the House, May 11, 1938, Replying to Some of the Arguments Against the Lending and Spending Bills." Congressional Digest, XVII (June, 1938), 174-5.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Speech on Public Debt Limit Question; excerpts." Congressional Digest, XXXII (October, 1953), 245.

Cannon, Ida Maud. "How Can We Vitalize the Relationship of Our Public and Private Social Work?" National Conference Social Work (1929), 506-13.

Cannon, Ida Maud. "Relation of Hospital Social Service to Child Health Work." National Conference Social Work (1921), 179-82.

"Cannon to Mahon, Cato." National Review, June 2, 1964, p. 439.

Congressional Record, 1923-1964.

"Exit Clarence Cannon." Newsweek, May 25, 1964, pp. 31-2.

"First 100 Billion Congress." U.S. News & World Report, October 29, 1962, pp. 47-8.

"Fizzled Feud." Newsweek, September 22, 1941, p. 18.

"Gloom of Night." Reporter, April 18, 1957, p. 5.

"Guardian." Time, May 22, 1964, p. 22.

"Has Congress Broken Down?" Fortune, February, 1952, pp. 81-4, 220.

Healy, P. F. "Nobody Loves Clarence." Saturday Evening Post, March 25, 1950, pp. 38-9+.

"I Love This House." Time, February 2, 1959, pp. 11-4.

Hazlitt, H. "Irresponsible Spending." Newsweek, July 18, 1955, p. 75.

MacMahon, Arthur W. "Congressional Oversight of the Administration: The Power of the Purse." Political Science Quarterly, (September, 1943), 401-7.

Marx, Fritz Morstein. "The Bureau of the Budget: Its Evolution and Present Role." American Political Science Review, 111(October, 1945), 877-8.

"Missourian Who Hates To Spend." Newsweek, May 13, 1957, p. 34.

"More Missile Submarines Asked to Combat Soviet ICBM Threat." Aviation Weekly, February 24, 1958, p. 28.

"Revenge." Time, July 25, 1955, p. 10.

"These Fourteen Men Will Shape Your Future." Nations Business, March, 1955, p. 85.

ARTICLES IN NEWSPAPERS

New York Times. "Announces House Appropriations Committee Will Expedite Funds Bills." December 27, 1944.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Arthur Krock on Democratic Convention Rules He Prepared." July 24, 1940.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Asks for Proposals on Recovery of War Appropriations, House." September 6, 1945.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Books on House Precedents Published." May 14, 1936.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Called to Confer with President Truman on Proposed Aid to Greece." March 8 & 10, 1947.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Charges Meat Packers with Organizing Detroit Strike." August 18, 1935.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Comment on Compromise Transition Tax Bill." October 30, 1945.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Assails Bill, House." October 31, 1945.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Conference with Roosevelt on Lend-Lease Fund Bill." September 23, 1941.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Defends Roosevelt's Relief Appropriation Request, House Debate." January 13-14, 1939.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Denies Rumor of Intoxication." March 20, 1933.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Doubts Large Cut Possible in Federal Spending." October 9, 1943.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Backs Treasury Tax Program, House Committee Hearing." October 17, 1943.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Editor on Praise of Representative Blanton." May 1, 1934.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Elected Appropriations Committee Chairman." September 18, 1941.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Foresees Food Shortage, House." March 17, 1943.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Hurt in Accident." April 10, 1934.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Insists Republicans Dictated Final Relief Appropriations Terms, House Debate." February 3, 1939.

\_\_\_\_\_. "On Chicago Tribune Dispatch on AEF Plans, House." December 5, 1941.

\_\_\_\_\_. "On Effect of Tariff on Farmers." July 28, 1931.

New York Times. "On Fulmer Farm Parity Loan Bill." May 14, 1941.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Comments on Signing of Fulmer Bill." May 27, 1941.

\_\_\_\_\_. "On House Committee Plans to Recapture Federal Funds Authorized for War Spending No Longer Needed." August 17, 1945.

\_\_\_\_\_. "One Need to Watch Federal Spending." March 13, 1944.

\_\_\_\_\_. "On President Truman's Budget Message." January 22, 1946.

\_\_\_\_\_. "On Procedure Necessary for Changing Democratic Convention Two-third's Rule." June 24, 1932.

\_\_\_\_\_. "On Roosevelt Navy Appropriation Request." April 8, 1943.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Predicts Reintroduction of Appropriations Bill with Rider on Uses Despite Truman Veto." December 24, 1945.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Radio Speech Defending Farm Bill." April 9, 1939.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Reported Fist Fight with Representative Romjue." March 17, 1933.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Representatives Cannon and Taber in Fist Fight Over Congressional Expense Account." May 5, 1945.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Representative Cannon Says Budget Should Be Cut to Point Where No New Taxes Are Needed." January 17, 1949.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Representative Knutson Cites Alleged Defense of Large Federal Appropriations." August 12, 1946.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Roosevelt in Annual Message to Congress Abandons Hope for Balanced '39 Budget." January 4, 1938.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Says President Hoover Understates Unemployment Crisis; Attacks Secretary Doak's Figures." August 10, 1931.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Scores RFC Fund Use for Food Subsidies." May 9, 1943.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Sees German Army Collapse by September & Surrender by Christmas, House." June 18, 1944.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Urges Speed on Lend-Lease Fund Bill, House." October 9, 1941.

\_\_\_\_\_. "U.S. Funds Tied Up by House Leader." February 19, 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Warns 1941 Congressional Appropriations Will Exceed National Debt Limit, House." May 9, 1940.

MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS

The Truman Library, Independence, Missouri.

University of Missouri, Western Manuscripts Collections.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Mackie, W. O., former Missouri State Senator, private interview held in Kirksville, Missouri, December 31, 1968.

Simpson, H. Greene, former Party Chairman Districts I & IX, private interview held in Kirksville, Missouri, December 30, 1968.

Young, Harvey, Democratic Chairman for Adair County, private interview held in Kirksville, Missouri, December 30, 1968.





## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it becomes apparent that the first test on this bill may come on a motion to strike out the enacting clause.<sup>1</sup> It is rumored that the motion will be offered in the committee immediately after the conclusion of general debate. Of course an affirmative vote on the motion to strike out the enacting clause kills the bill on the spot. It would shut out all opportunity for substitution; it would shut out all opportunity for amendment, and if approved by the House it would summarily and arbitrarily dispose of the whole question for this session. As a matter of fact, it would preclude any possibility of farm legislation during the Sixty-eighth Congress, as the short session ends on March 4 and barely affords time for the disposition of the supply bills.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. With pleasure.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have forgotten whether a motion to strike out the enacting clause can be made at any stage.

Mr. CANNON. It may be offered at any time after the reading of the first section and before the reading of the last section.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I did not recall.

Mr. CANNON. Let us consider the significance of a vote in favor of the motion to strike out the enacting clause. It not only indicates opposition to this bill as written, not only opposition to any bill which might be substituted for the McNary-Haugen bill, and to any form of legislation which might be evolved through amendment of the pending bill, but it signifies objection to giving the subject any consideration whatever.

Mr. ASWELL. Well, now, the gentleman has no right to make an assertion of that kind.

Mr. CANNON. I am simply explaining the effect of an affirmative vote on the motion, a matter of common parliamentary procedure.

If the House agrees to a motion to strike out the enacting clause after the reading of the first section, there will be no opportunity to read the bill under the five-minute rule and, of course, no opportunity to offer amendments. That is a final disposition of the bill without opportunity for perfecting amendments of any kind.

One of the principal grievances charged against King John of England, during his regency for Richard, was that he refused to hear the common people. The wealthy and noble could always secure an audience, but the peasant, the farmer, and the laborer, the bone and sinew of medieval England, were denied and refused redress. If this motion to strike out the enacting clause is agreed to, the Sixty-eighth Congress subjects itself to the same criticism. The rich and the powerful have never

---

<sup>1</sup>U.S., Congressional Record, 68th Congress, 1st Session, 1924, LXV, Part 9, 9343.

failed to receive a respectful hearing by this Congress. They have brought into this House every character of legislation in their own behalf, from the Mellon plan to the immigration bill, and have been accorded every consideration. Their bills have been debated at length, and every opportunity has been afforded for full consideration, but when the farmer, bankrupted by unfair discrimination and petitioning for relief from conditions the existence of which are universally conceded, comes in at the eleventh hour with a plea for restitution it is proposed that we throw the bill in his face and close the doors and go home.

Elemental justice demands that agriculture receive the same opportunity which has been accorded every other interest in the country since the session began, and if a motion is offered to strike out the enacting clause and deny further consideration it should be decisively defeated and the farmer given at least an opportunity to present his case. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the United States as a whole has enjoyed a decade of unexampled prosperity. Production, movement of freight, corporate earnings, employment of labor, wages, bank clearings, and all visible criteria of national wealth and prosperity have in the last 10 years increased to totals and established records unequalled by any nation in any period of the world's history.

The year 1923 was incomparably the greatest year in industrial and financial growth and development since the discovery of America. Figures compiled by the New York Federal Reserve Bank indicate that during the year 200 representative corporations, manufacturing practically every commodity consumed by modern civilization, made profits of \$834,000,000, as compared with profits of \$634,000,000 made in 1919, previously the record year for volume of business and percentage of profits. The dividend of 300 per cent, aggregating \$318,423,295.38, declared by the Standard Oil group; the surplus of more than \$6,353,350 reported by the International Shoe Co.; the annual revenue of half a billion dollars flowing into the coffers of the United States Steel Corporation and its surplus of \$54,259,993.64 are typical of the unprecedented earnings of practically every great business in the country.

Railroad profits were larger for 1923 than for any previous year. The freight traffic for the year was the heaviest ever recorded. For 23 successive weeks railroad-car loadings exceeded 1,000,000 cars weekly, and railroad earnings and dividends were in proportion. After paying taxes, interest, and "all other ascertainable charges" and expending vast sums in equipment and improvements, railroads reported incomes ranging from \$11.45 to \$26.80 a share on heavily watered capitalizations.

The Pennsylvania Railroad drew a revenue for 1923 in excess of \$775,000,000, a new high-water mark, and the general passenger agent of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, in a circular letter to the Members of this House, announced that the year 1923 was the most prosperous in the history of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

The remarkable prosperity of the country as a whole was also accurately reflected in the records of Federal income and profit taxes for 1923, which showed an increase of 21 per cent over those returned for 1922. During the year bank deposits and bank clearings, governed, of course, by business conditions in the great industrial and financial centers, surpassed all former records. Savings bank deposits increased \$1,140,000,000. Savings averaged in excess of \$30,000,000 a day for the entire year of 1923. And the increase continues. A nationwide

---

survey by the Federal Reserve Board shows that savings deposits on April 1, 1924, totaled more than \$7,000,000,000, an increase of over \$53,000,000 above the figures for the preceding month and \$560,000,000 over the amount on deposit a year ago.

Our national wealth when last estimated by the Department of Labor amounted to \$320,803,862,000, an increase of 72.2 per cent over that of the previous census—so marked an increase that the wealth of the United States to-day is practically equal to the total wealth of all Europe. The combined wealth of the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Italy, and Russia in 1914, when these nations were in the high tide of their greatest prosperity, totaled but \$289,000,000,000, as compared with the present wealth of the United States of more than \$320,000,000,000.

As an appropriate summary of business conditions for the year 1923, the financial experts, in summing up in the metropolitan newspapers the situation on January 1, 1924, announced that Wall Street had enjoyed a great year and was "satisfied." Those conversant with Wall Street's voracious appetite and with what is required to gorge it can well understand what is meant when it is announced that Wall Street is "satisfied."

But in the midst of the unparalleled prosperity prevailing to-day in the cities and the great industrial centers, while business is declaring enormous dividends, while railroads are carrying the largest and most profitable traffic since the locomotive was invented, and labor is receiving the highest wage for the shortest hours since man was ordained to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow, in the face of this remarkable affluence the farmers of the country, comprising its most important single industry both in numbers engaged and in service rendered, are receiving such meager returns from their investments and such inadequate wages for their labor as to bring agriculture and the agricultural districts to the brink of a business precipice.

While corporate dividends and wage schedules have been mounting steadily the farmer has been deflated \$32,000,000 in three years—\$18,000,000 in land values and \$14,000,000 in crop values—and this is a conservative estimate. Statistics reported by the Secretary of Agriculture show that crops and livestock at the close of 1923 were worth about \$7,000,000,000 less than in 1919. Although there was an increase of more than a million head of cattle, hogs, horses, and sheep between January 1, 1914, and January 1, 1923, and all other classes of property in the United States increased in value from 1912 to 1923, the value of livestock decreased from \$6,238,389,00 to \$5,807,104,000.

While industry is enjoying an era of prosperity never dreamed of and labor is receiving the highest wage since the dawn of civilization, the farmers of America are in direst distress. Farm products are selling at less than the cost of production; taxes remain unpaid; credit is exhausted; farms are being abandoned; country banks are failing; foreclosures are common; and standards of living have declined to a minimum. While the roar of traffic and the hum of prosperity fill the cities, out in the country only a few miles away are ruin and privation. In 15 wheat-growing States 108,000 farmers have lost their farms by legal process or bankruptcy since 1920. More than 122,000 have surrendered their property without legal proceedings, and nearly 375,000 retain possession of their farms only through the leniency of creditors. Secretary Wallace officially reports that practically one out of every five farmers is bankrupt if his loans were called, and practically all are in desperate financial straits.

---

The natural consequence is a decline in the value of farms, averaging something like 50 per cent, and carrying with it a drop in bank credits secured by depreciated lands and crops that has thrown country banks into the hands of receivers and all but choked the avenues of rural credit. From 1918 to 1923, 1,448 banks suspended payments with total liabilities of more than half a billion dollars, the great majority of them located in rural districts and practically all dependent on agricultural patronage. The previous record for bank failures was made in 1893 when 326 banks closed; but in 1921 the record was again broken and 358 banks failed; in 1922 the number rose to 397; in 1923, to 274; and all previous records for bank disasters were broken during the period between July 1, 1923, and May 7, 1924, the last statistics available, when 511 banks went down carrying with them the little remaining credit assets of as many rural communities.

In the State of Missouri, comprising some of the richest farming lands in the world, cultivated by some of the most industrious and intelligent farmers to be found in the Union, a survey made by the Missouri Bankers' Association and reported at its convention held at St. Louis, May 1, 1924, disclosed a larger number of failures in the farming sections of the State in the preceding three years than in the whole period of more than 100 years since Missouri was admitted into the Union in 1821.

And Missouri is no exception. The entire farming industry is affected by a devastating financial blight. According to a survey by the Department of Agriculture the average gross annual income per farm in the United States is \$712. This is not for each person but for each farm. Nor is this profit. It is gross receipts. Out of it must be paid the taxes, cost of operations, up-keep, interest on loans, and wages of farm labor. What is left of the \$712 when these charges are taken out is the pay received by the farmer. It is the pitiful reward of those who work the longest hours, under the most adverse weather conditions, and at the most laborious profession known to man. It is the remuneration received not only for his own labor but for that of his wife and children, and it is the return not only on his labor but on his investments in land, stock, and equipment.

But the farmer's disadvantage does not end there. That is only the beginning. When he takes his few hard-won dollars to the market place he discovers they will buy only 50 cents' worth of the manufactured commodities required by his family. While the price of his products has been deflated to pre-war levels, the price of industry's products have not only refused to take a corresponding drop but have advanced even beyond war-time prices. As a result his dollar which before the war was worth 100 cents in the city markets has to-day only a fraction of its former purchasing power.

The following comparisons of the purchasing power of a bushel of wheat in 1913 and 1923 illustrate the gravity and extent of this discrimination against the farmer:

|                                  | Cost,<br>1913 | Cost,<br>1923 | Wheat needed—  |                |
|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|
|                                  |               |               |                |                |
|                                  |               |               | 1913           | 1923           |
|                                  |               |               | <i>Bushels</i> | <i>Bushels</i> |
| Plow . . . . .                   | \$9.50        | \$27.00       | 11.7           | 29.2           |
| Double wagon . . . . .           | 61.21         | 132.20        | 66.8           | 143.3          |
| Single harness . . . . .         | 11.00         | 26.00         | 13.7           | 28.3           |
| 100 pounds barbed wire . . . . . | 2.25          | 5.00          | 3              | 5.6            |
| Suit of clothes . . . . .        | 16.75         | 28.50         | 21             | 31             |
| Two bottom plows . . . . .       | 64.00         | 125.00        | 80             | 140            |
| Double harness . . . . .         | 32.00         | 73.50         | 40             | 80             |
| Pair of shoes . . . . .          | 4.75          | 11.00         | 6              | 12             |
| Thresher operators . . . . .     | 6.25          | 14.75         | 8              | 16             |
| Harvest labor . . . . .          | 2.00          | 6.00          | 3              | 6.5            |

Farm price of wheat per bushel:

1913. . . . . \$0.799

1923. . . . . .923

The same discrimination is shown in the purchasing power of hogs, a staple farm product, the returns from which largely fix the price of corn and other farm feeds:

|  | Cost,<br>1913 | Cost,<br>1923 | Pork needed—  |               | Increase       |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
|  |               |               |               |               |                |
|  |               |               | 1913          | 1923          |                |
| <hr/>  |               |               |               |               |                |
|  |               |               | <i>Pounds</i> | <i>Pounds</i> | <i>percent</i> |
| Walking plow, 14-inch, general purpose . . . . . | \$11.75       | \$21.25       | 157           | 332           | 111            |
| Gang plow, 14-inch . . . . .                     | 53.25         | 99.00         | 744           | 1,549         | 108            |
| Disk harrow, 7-foot, 16-inch . . . . .           | 23.00         | 47.50         | 321           | 743           | 131            |
| Corn-planter, 2-row. . . . .                     | 31.75         | 64.50         | 443           | 1,009         | 123            |
| Grain drill, 22-7. . . . .                       | 106.00        | 190.00        | 1,481         | 2,973         | 101            |
| Double wagon . . . . .                           | 61.21         | 132.20        |               | 855           | 2,059          |
| Ton of hard coal . . . . .                       | 8.59          | 19.17         |               | 120           | 300            |

Farm price, hogs, per 100 pounds: 1913, \$7.16; 1923, \$6.39.

A corn cultivator which could have been bought for 500 pounds of live cattle in 1913 to-day requires 1,400 pounds of cattle in the same market. In other words, when the city man comes out in the country his dollar buys \$1.30 worth of farm products, but when the farmer takes the same dollar back to the city it is worth only 50 cents in manufactured commodities. When we come to investigate this remarkable discrepancy between the buying power of the farm dollar and that of the industrial dollar we find it is directly due to methods and conditions of marketing. Manufactured products are fed into the market only as there is a demand for them and protected by a heavy tariff. Any surplus is kept off the domestic market and sold abroad. On the other hand, agricultural products are thrown on the open market as soon as produced, regardless of the demand, and, of course, greatly in excess of market requirements. The market is glutted, dealers are overstocked, and the oversupply inevitably beats down the price to a level far below the cost of production.

This is notably true of the wheat crop. We produce about 750,000,000 bushels of wheat every year, 600,000,000 bushels of which are consumed in the United States, leaving approximately 150,000,000 bushels to be exported to foreign countries. When exported it is passed through the Liverpool market, where it is sold in competition with the surplus of every other wheat-producing country in the world, and must therefore be sold at the world price. The world price thereupon becomes the American price, because exporters will pay shipping costs abroad only when they can no longer sell for a higher price at home, and in this way the price received for our surpluses fixes the price of our entire crop.

The same conditions apply to hogs, and the 2,000,000,000 pounds of pork and pork products which we must annually export to Europe lowers the price of pork at home to the world price prevailing in foreign markets.

Not so with the products of America's industrial plants. Protected from outside competition by high tariff walls, they are fed into the home market in carefully measured quantities sufficient to supply the demand only, and at prices to which the tariff has been added to make a handsome profit. The surplus is dumped abroad in competition with foreign goods and, of course, at world prices, but cannot affect the domestic price, as it does not reach the domestic market and is shipped abroad as soon as produced. As a result of these two widely differing methods of marketing, manufactured goods are sold in a protected domestic market at the American price and agricultural products are sold both at home and abroad in an open market at the world price.

Industry sells in the American market and buys in the world market. It sells its products at a high price and buys its necessities at a low price. Agriculture sells in the world market and buys in the American market. It sells its products cheap and buys its necessities dear.

Under this double system of short changing, the farmer is rapidly being reduced to a condition of peonage. The situation is becoming intolerable. The farmer, the most willing and indispensable producer in America, is entitled to a share of the wealth he produces. He is entitled to participate in the abounding prosperity which every other class in the country is enjoying. Either farm products must be raised to the level of nonagricultural goods or the price of the latter be brought down to that of farm products. This is the great problem in the United States to-day. The latter course is not to be considered. It is neither

---





practicable nor desirable. The only course open then is to bring agricultural prices to a par with the prices of other commodities—to make the farm dollar worth as much as the industrial dollar, to apply to agriculture the same principles already applied to other industries, and that is what the McNary-Haugen bill proposes to do.

It proposes to provide for the use of the farmer the same marketing advantages now utilized by the producers of manufactured goods. It proposes to relieve the domestic market of the surplus which depresses the price and sell it abroad under the jurisdiction of a centralized export agency similar to that employed by steel, textile, and other industries. It creates for this purpose a Government agency to be known as the United States Agricultural Export Corporation. This corporation would have the power to go into the markets and buy agricultural products which were selling for less than their pre-war value and pay a price for them which would place them on a parity with the general average of all other commodities. Such a price is termed the "ratio price."

In determining this "ratio price" the wholesale prices of 404 staples, including every variety of commodity from machinery and clothing to fuels and building materials, for the 10 years beginning with 1905 and ending with 1914, inclusive, as compiled by the Department of Labor, is taken as a basis.

This decade has been selected as a period which represents fairly normal conditions throughout the United States. If prices prevailing during that period can be said to be unfair to either farm or factory, they probably favor the latter, for no one can claim that the farmer was unduly prosperous during those years. Few farmers made more than a living, and those who did made it through the inevitable increase in the price of land rather than through farming operations. Conditions may be considered as nearest to normal during those years, and the whole purpose of the bill is to restore to agricultural products the purchasing power they possessed during that period.

It would be the function of the corporation to maintain the price of any particular farm product at the same relation to the average price of that product during 1905-1914 that the average price of the 404 commodities at the time bears to the average price of the 404 commodities during the period from 1905 to 1914.

If, for example, the average price of hogs during the 1905-1914 period was approximately \$7 per hundred pounds and the present price of hogs was \$7, and the average price of the 404 commodities was about 60 per cent higher than the average price of the 404 commodities during the 1905-1914 period, the ratio price of hogs would be 60 per cent higher than \$7, or approximately \$11.20.

Under the provisions of the bill the farmer would receive \$11.20 instead of \$7 per hundred pounds for his hogs. If the price of the 404 articles advanced the price of hogs would advance; if the price of the 404 commodities declined the price of hogs would decline.

So the farmer would always be certain that the dollars which he received for his hogs would buy as much as they bought before the war. He could no longer be robbed, as under the present system, by having the manufacturer raise the price of the 404 necessities while the packer at the same time lowered the price of hogs.

During the year 1923 the State of Missouri produced 37,947,000 bushels of wheat, 196,000,000 bushels of corn, and approximately

---

1,111,600,000 pounds of pork.

The table below shows the additional revenue which would have been derived from these products had the ration price been in effect:

Missouri, 1923

APPROXIMATE INCREASE IN WHEAT, CORN, AND HOG VALUES IF RATION PRICES  
HAD BEEN IN EFFECT

|                 |                   |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Wheat . . . . . | .\$19,352,970     |
| Corn. . . . .   | 31,497,600        |
| Hogs. . . . .   | 46,687,200        |
| Total . . . . . | <u>97,537,770</u> |

In other words, under the McNary-Haugen bill the State of Missouri would have received in one year from these three commodities alone approximately \$1,000,000,000 more than the prices actually paid the farmers who produced them.

It is a stock objection that the bill is a price-fixing proposition, but it is apparent at once that while the influence of world factors would be removed the effect of domestic influences would still obtain, and under the pressure of local supply and demand would fluctuate with the price of the 404 commodities. When these declined farm products would automatically decline with them and when they advanced in price farm products would automatically advance with them. The price of farm products would no more be fixed than that of the 404 commodities, and certainly no system could be more equitable.

The surplus bought to relieve the domestic market would, of course, be sold abroad, and the corporation would lose on all such transactions the difference between the American price at which it had been bought and the world price at which it must be sold.

To provide for this deficit the corporation would estimate in advance its probable losses on these sales and the season's operating expenses, and would collect from the producer at the time of marketing a small per cent of the ratio price to be used in meeting such charges and to be known as an equalization fee. A receipt would be given the producer at the time it was collected and after the season's operations were completed any part of the fund remaining on hand would be distributed back to the producer in the same proportions in which it was collected.

For illustration, let us assume that wheat is selling at \$1.07 a bushel, as was the case in November, 1923. But the corporation finds that the ratio price is \$1.58 a bushel, and establishes an equalization fee of 12 cents per bushel. The farmer receives \$1.46 in cash and a receipt for 12 cents, a total of \$1.58, the ration price. Losses on surplus sold abroad and operating expenses would amount to about 9 cents per bushel, and at the end of the season the farmer presents his receipt and receives 3 cents per bushel, which, added to the \$1.46 already received, gives him \$1.49 a bushel for his wheat, or a margin of 42 cents over the price he would have received had the law not been in operation.

Had this bill been in force in 1923 the price would have, in fact,

averaged \$1.58 a bushel instead of \$1.07. Twelve cents per bushel would have supplied an ample equalization fee, and the farmer would have received \$1.46 in cash and a receipt for the twelve-cent equalization fee. Our crop amounted to approximately 750,000,000 bushels, and 600,000,000 bushels were required for home consumption, leaving 150,000,000 bushels to be bought by the corporation for export. At the world price of \$1.07 per bushel, the American farmer would have received \$802,500,000 for his entire crop. But under the provisions of the McNary-Haugen bill he would have received for the 600,000,000 bushels sold at home \$876,000,000 in cash and equalization receipts at the rate of 12 cents per bushel, amounting to \$72,000,000. For the 150,000,000 bushels exported by the corporation and sold at \$1.07, the world price, he would have received \$160,500,000. The 150,000,000 bushels bought at the domestic price of \$1.58 a bushel and sold at the world price of \$1.07 per bushel would entail a loss of \$76,500,000, and the operating expenses bring the total equalization charge up to \$81,500,000. Subtracting this from the equalization fund of \$90,000,000 collected on the entire crop of 750,000,000 bushels leaves \$8,500,000 to be returned at the end of the year when the equalization receipts are presented for payment, and this added to the \$876,000,000 received in the home market and the \$160,500,000 received in the world market makes a total of \$1,045,000,000 received for the year's crop under the McNary-Haugen bill, instead of the \$802,500,000 actually received under the present system, which the gentlemen opposed to this bill desire to perpetuate.

The same procedure would apply to other agricultural commodities provided for in the bill. The ratio price of hogs, for example, would be maintained in the same manner. Recently hogs on the St. Louis market sold for \$6.70 per hundred pounds, the lowest price recorded for hogs at the National Stock Yards since March 8, 1912. Upon a pre-war purchasing power basis the price would have been \$10.85 per hundred pounds, the ratio price, which on a car weighing 16,000 pounds would have made a difference of \$664 to the farmer who produced them.

It is to be noted that in these transactions no part of the expense of administering the law and enforcing the ratio price is to be charged against the United States Treasury. The adjustment is without cost to the taxpayer. The farmer, who receives the profit, pays the bill in full.

In fact, the farmer in urging this legislation is asking no favors and seeking no special consideration. The bill is not a measure proposing class legislation by depriving others of their rights as is so often and so unjustly charged, but proposes merely to restore to the farmer rights of which he has long been deprived by legislation already on the statute books. Through the enactment of legislation granting special favors to other groups a system of protection has been built up under which practically every other industry and every other class of labor has been protected against the competition of European products and cheap foreign labor, while the farmer has been left on the outside in a position similar to that of one of the early settlers against whom the door of the fort had been closed during an Indian attack.

There are three great factors in the business world: Capital, which owns the money, the factories, the mines, the transportation systems, and which runs Wall Street and handles the markets; labor, which operates all this vast mechanism owned by capital; and, third, agriculture, which provides the food supply to sustain both capital and labor,

---

and is the most important of the three, for without it the world would starve in 90 days.

The first of these great agencies has already asked and obtained the right to combine for export trade, tariff protection, and other legislative favors and has for many years enjoyed many times the advantage which this bill now proposes to give to agriculture. The Webb-Pomerene bill and the Edge bill permitting combination for export trade, the Esch-Cummins act, and especially the Fordney-McCumber bill are as patently paternalistic and fix prices more certainly and more drastically than the most hostile interpretation of the McNary-Haugen bill could possibly effect them. The McNary-Haugen bill does not create precedent. It merely follows precedent. Industry is to-day charging prices and drawing revenues which would be impossible if these laws were wiped off the statute books.

We are told that the farmer's problem can not be solved by the enactment of laws; that we can not legislate prosperity. Apparently it is all right to legislate for the millionaire banker, the Wall Street capitalist, the industrial baron, and the railroad manipulator, but when the farmer presumes to ask for a living wage the proposition is branded as economically unsound and socialistic and he is given fatherly advice and told he must help himself.

Labor, the second of the three great agencies, has likewise received special consideration at the hands of Congress. Under the immigration laws, the eight-hour laws, the Adamson bill, and the Howell-Barkley bill, if passed, labor enjoys the same protection from the pauper labor of Europe, the coolie labor of the East, and the peon labor of the South asked by the farmer in this bill. Under this protection labor is to-day maintaining double the wage-scale which would be either practicable or possible without favoring legislation.

The farmer believes in the right to organize, in the theory of collective bargaining and the doctrine of the living wage, and has cooperated with labor in the passage of laws which make them possible. And it is significant that organized labor favors the McNary-Haugen bill and is advocating its enactment. The workingman realizes that the decay of agriculture not only restricts his food supply and destroys a vast market for the products of his labor but drives into the city and into shop and factory armies of farm workers to compete for work and depress wages, and he is willing to concede to others what he asks for himself and to pay the men who produce the food he eats a living wage for it.

As a matter of fact, the cost of living would not be appreciably affected by the passage of the bill, as the difference in price would be taken up by the reduction in the cost of distribution. Bread sold in May, 1917, when wheat was bringing \$3.45 a bushel, at the same price charged for it in September, 1923, when wheat was 92 cents, and there was little difference in the price of packer's bacon whether hogs sold for \$11 per hundred pounds or for \$7 per hundred or any price between the two.

Capital should be as generous as labor. Both are receiving an American price for their products while agriculture is receiving a world price. Both are enjoying protection while agriculture is competing with the starvation standards of the peasant and peon of war-stricken, poverty-cursed Europe and Asia. If American industry is unwilling to meet the competition of foreign industry, and American labor is unwilling to

---

compete with foreign labor, how can they ask the American farmer to do what they themselves refuse to do?

Even in the McNary-Haugen bill agriculture is not asking the permanent legislative status so long enjoyed by industry and labor. The McNary-Haugen bill is an emergency measure only. It expires in five years; and the representatives of the farm organizations now in Washington give definite and emphatic assurance that when the date of its expiration arrives no continuance will be asked or expected.

The bill is merely designed to give the farmers an opportunity to organize and develop their own marketing machinery, a task accomplished by every other industry many years ago, but hitherto denied the farmer by conditions of environment and economic handicaps.

The development of farm organization is necessarily a slow and difficult process. There are six and a half million farmers, widely isolated and of vastly varying interests; and the welding of a representative majority of this vast constituency into a compact, effective distributing agency is an undertaking of the first magnitude.

But it is neither impossible nor impracticable. Already coordination is proceeding at a phenomenal rate in every branch of the industry. Cooperative associations are already to be found in the smallest villages, and national cooperative movements are now represented in every State of the Union.

From 4,000 to 5,000 organizations of producers are shipping livestock in a cooperative way, and the number is rapidly increasing. Thousands of cooperative elevators are owned by farmer organizations in the agricultural States, and central depots and plants are being established in every important city. The largest enterprise in my own town, both in volume of business and in capital invested, is the Farmer's Cooperative Elevator Co., owned and operated by the farmers of the community.

Surveys by the Department of Agriculture show 2,690 grain-marketing associations in the United States, and 753 associations for the handling of fruit and vegetables, and innumerable cooperative creameries and similar farm agencies.

Some of them manage vast enterprises and transact an annual business aggregating millions of dollars. The Montana Wheat Growers' Association handled 6,000,000 bushels of grain in 1923, in addition to other business, and its sales for 1924 already approximate 5,000,000 bushels.

The two greatest livestock commission companies in the Central West, if not in America, are the Farmers' Commission Co., organized by the Missouri Farmers' Association, and the Producers' Commission Co., organized by the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation. They handled 14,000 cars of livestock in 1923 and transacted a third of all the business passing through the great cattle-marketing centers of the State.

The Missouri Farmers' Association, organized in 1914, is to-day the largest dealer in poultry and eggs in the United States and handles a larger volume of business in those two commodities than either Armour or Swift. Three hundred thousand dollars were paid back to its members in patronage dividends last year from two of its four livestock commission companies. It has organized 377 livestock shipping associations and financed nearly 400 grain elevators and produce exchanges, and 9 central storage plants in Missouri in the last decade. It has saved hundreds of thousands of dollars for its members in commissions and profits and is controlled exclusively by dirt farmers who own and

---

operate their own farms and who in the last seven years have contributed more than \$5,000,000 in basic capital to finance its operations.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, engaged in similar enterprises, is perfecting township and county organizations in all the States and has materially improved production and marketing throughout the country.

With practical, successful, growing, cooperative organizations like these developing in all sections of the country, of their own initiative and on their own capital, it is evident that under the impetus of this bill a national cooperative organization would be formed which would be ready to take over the work of the Agricultural Export Corporation the instant it was relinquished.

In fact, leading representatives of the farm organizations announce that in event of the passage of the bill a conference of farm leaders will be convened at once and a statement issued notifying the farmers of America that they must immediately begin to perfect their own marketing machinery preparatory to taking over the business of the export corporation and continuing the benefits conferred by the McNary-Haugen bill at the expiration of the five-year period for which it is to be created.

Abraham Lincoln said:

The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but can not do at all, or can not so well do, for themselves in their separate and individual capacities.

He could not better or more accurately have expressed the theory of this bill had he been thinking of it at the time.

The farmers of America with all their handicaps can not do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities what every other class and industry in the land have long ago accomplished to their own profit and to the farmer's disadvantage.

This bill places agriculture on the same footing. It will make it possible for the farmers to help themselves, for them to enjoy the same opportunities and advantages already accorded labor and industry, and under the interpretation of Abraham Lincoln it is therefore a legitimate object of government.

It is a measure which will contribute not only to the needs and necessities of the farmer but to the prosperity and welfare of the Nation. The times demand a race of freemen in rural America and our form of government rests primarily on a powerful farming class—men prosperous and intelligent, fearless and independent. The safety of the Nation and the perpetuity of democracy demand that the farmer receive his just share of the economic profits and the opportunities and comforts of life, and there can be no substantial and lasting prosperity if he is denied them.

There is an ancient document, now seldom quoted and too often forgotten, which opens with this preamble:

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America.

---

Mr. Chairman, there is not a single purpose among the many enumerated in this greatest of all constitutional enactments which would not be conserved and effectuated by the provisions of this measure to remancipate and revivify American agriculture.

The farmer deserves well at the hands of the Nation.. He has produced unstintedly the most essential element of national wealth. He has fed to surfeit our armies in war and our citizens in peace. Suffering rankling inequalities, he has nevertheless generously and patriotically contributed his all with meager reward. We must not fail him in his hour of need. Let us pass this bill and restore to him and to rural America their rightful share of the Nation's prosperity. [Applause.]

---



## APPENDIX B

The clerk read as follows:

(a) Privilege to file consolidated returns: An affiliated group of corporations shall, subject to the provisions of this section, have the privilege of making a consolidated return for the taxable year in lieu of separate returns.<sup>1</sup> The making of a consolidated return shall be upon the condition that all the corporations which have been members of the affiliated group at any time during the taxable year for which the return is made consent to all the regulations under subsection (b) prescribed prior to the making of such return; and the making of a consolidated return shall be considered as such consent. In the case of a corporation which is a member of the affiliated group for a fractional part of the year the consolidated return shall include the income of such corporation for such part of the year as it is a member of the affiliated group.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, unless the committee desires to modify its amendment.

Mr. CRISP. I have an amendment at the desk dealing with this section (c). I will ask unanimous consent that we may go to that section, where the amendment can now be offered.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman ask unanimous consent that his amendment may be read for information?

Mr. CRISP. Yes. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment be read for information.

The clerk read as follows:

Page 109, line 22, strike out the period and the word "only," and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "except that there shall be added to the rate of tax prescribed by section 13 (a) a rate of 12 per cent and only."

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to consider paragraph (c) out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. CANNON. Reserving the right to object, it does not prohibit consolidated returns but simply changes the rate.

Mr. CRISP. If the gentleman will give me a chance, I will explain to the House the amendment, and the House can adopt it or reject it.

---

<sup>1</sup>U.S., Congressional Record, 72d Congress, 1st Session, 1932, LXXV, Part 7, 7124.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is this amendment being read just now for information or for the purpose of debate?

Mr. CANNON. For information.

Mr. CRISP. To please the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], I ask that it be read before we reach that section for the information of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. I move to strike out the paragraph just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the clerk will report.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: Beginning on line 20, page 108, strike out subsection (a), ending in line 9, on page 109.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I trust the committee will approach this proposition with an open mind. It is a proposal of peculiar merit in that it not only brings into the Treasury an amount which has been estimated by reliable authorities to be as high as \$50,000 but its approval will be attended with other highly desirable advantages. May I say by way of preface that it is an amendment which has been indorsed by the Speaker of the House; it is an amendment which has been indorsed by the majority leader of the House; and it is an amendment which has been indorsed by the present acting chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. All three of these distinguished Members of the House, with their long experience in matters of tax legislation and with an intimate knowledge of the principle of taxation, heartily indorsed the proposal presented in this amendment when it was under consideration in 1929. And while I am not advised as to the attitude of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], the leader on the other side of the aisle, I earnestly invite his sympathetic consideration of this amendment.

It involves the increase of millions of dollars in taxes paid by the most highly organized and most profitable corporations in the world today.

This amendment not only offers a means of assisting in balancing the Budget by greatly decreasing the exemptions of our largest corporations but it also prevents the Government from becoming a party to unfair competition through which the corporation with many branches destroys competition and eliminates the smaller and independent corporations engaged in the same business. This section of the law gives the chain corporation an unfair advantage over the individual corporation; and it is only American fair play to repeal it and put the smaller corporation and the independent corporation on a plane of equal advantage so far as the law is concerned.

The law which this amendment proposes to strike out penalizes David and assists Goliath. It is one of the most effective weapons in the hands of the chain store and other federated corporations and is doing more to drive the independent merchant and the individual corporation out of business than any other law on the statute books to-day.

There are two classes of these corporations. The first class includes corporations with all their branches engaged in the same business, as the chain grocery, the chain drug store, the chain dry-goods or clothing store, the chain newspaper, and similar chain businesses.

The other, and perhaps the more important of the two, are the

holding companies and mother corporations whose subsidiaries are engaged in a variety of businesses and activities, as the Standard Oil Co., the United States Steel Co., the Munson Steamship Co., the Pittsburgh Coal Co., practically all the public utilities doing interstate business, and many others with which you are all familiar.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. And those large enterprises invariably use one of their subsidiaries to crush competition, and then make up its losses by these consolidated returns?

Mr. CANNON. That is one of the many advantages available to these giant corporations under this law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am satisfied that the entire membership will want to follow the gentleman if he has an amendment here that will prevent the chain stores and similar organizations from escaping taxation. Will the gentleman indicate whether this amendment is offered to subsection (a), or (c), or to the pending amendment of the chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. CRISP? We do not propose that any branch of any chain store shall escape taxes.

Mr. CANNON. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Washington. The amendment proposes to strike out subsection (a) with notice, of course, that if agreed to, I shall then move to strike out the remaining paragraphs of the section.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is it not a fact that you are striking at the proviso of making consolidated returns and in doing so you are striking at the heart of this great loss which runs into millions to the Treasury of the United States every year?

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. By closing up this loophole in the law and compelling the chain corporation to pay the same taxes paid by individual corporations we are not only repealing a law used as a weapon by the trusts against their smaller competitors, but we are bringing into the United States Treasury every year millions of dollars of additional revenue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am inclined to think that by paying careful attention to this we will obviate the necessity for the repayment of taxes which always makes a charge against the Treasury.

Mr. CANNON. I was just coming to that. Many of the claims by the great corporations for the repayment of taxes are filed under this section of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the gentleman please explain to us step by step how they get out of paying taxes. As I understand it, in all of these subsidiaries, the entire stock is owned by a parent corporation. The parent corporation can not return dividends to its stockholders until the subsidiary companies in turn have declared their dividends to the stockholding parent corporation. Where are they escaping?

Mr. CANNON. I shall be glad to explain, as my friend from New York

[Mr. CLARKE] suggests, step by step, just how this provision in the present law is used to increase the exemptions of the chain corporations and how it is utilized to stamp out competition.

Let us take, for example, the Du Pont Co. It has innumerable subsidiaries rendering various services and producing a variety of commodities. One turns out explosives, another leather, another paint, another chemicals, another cellophane, and so on; all of them tied into the parent corporation. Inasmuch as the same corporation is both the buyer and the seller, both the producer and the consumer of these products, it would be merely a matter of bookkeeping to show losses in practically any of the subsidiaries for the year. Under the provisions of the law we are seeking to repeal by this amendment, the central office is allowed to charge off such paper losses against the profits of other subsidiaries, and may reduce the amount of its taxes by enormous sums. Such a corporation as General Motors by taking advantage of this loophole could show such losses in its lumber subsidiaries or its accessories as to increase its exemptions in every return it makes. The great oil companies and the coal companies, into whose exchequers you propose to legislate vast subsidies in the form of tariffs elsewhere in this bill, escape taxation every year through transportation subsidiaries, pipe line and railroad, and many other affiliated corporations to which their bookkeeping departments charge heavy paper losses in order to increase the exemptions of the parent corporation. Practically all the power utilities of the country share these exemptions.

And the chain stores are particularly favored beneficiaries of this pernicious law. Here is the way they take advantage of it. The parent corporation, the mother organization, has branches in perhaps every State of the Union. These individual branches do not make tax returns. Under this law the central organization makes a consolidated return for all the branches, and may work in a long list of exemptions. But the independent store, with which the chain stores are competing, is required to make its own return. It has no way of bookkeeping phantom losses from which to draw exemptions. It must pay its taxes in full.

The result is that the chain stores not only escape taxation but they use the law to drive out competition. Whenever a chain store is established in a new location, or when competition becomes troublesome, the chain deliberately lowers prices and runs at a loss until the home store across the street is driven to the wall and either closes or sells out. The loss in this branch of the chain is credited in the tax returns against profits made in other branches and the chain escapes taxation while it crushes the home merchant. Then when competition is eliminated the chain restores prices to a profitable bases and recoups its losses and is prepared to open up a new location or strangle any independent merchant who tries to enter the field.

The law is a favorite device of the utilities. An electric company or telephone branch or transportation company pays little attention to the cost of installing new services. A railroad company can run a bus line at a loss, a streetcar company can operate a line of taxicabs, or a power company can preempt a new community at a loss. Through the benevolent provisions of this law they charge these losses against their profits elsewhere and reduce their taxes while destroying competition and monopolizing the market.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the gentleman yield?

---

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the gentleman say the same thing could not happen if it was one big corporation?

Mr. CANNON. It not only could not happen, it does not happen in the manner permitted by this law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Here is another beneficent use the chains make of this convenient law. They use it to freeze out the small stockholders. They find that some particular branch or some particular plant is especially profitable. By increasing the cost of materials, services, and other items of production furnished by affiliated subsidiaries and decreasing the price paid for its product by consuming subsidiaries it begins to show losses instead of profits. Dividends cease. The stock drops. And the small stockholder is forced to sell. Then income is increased while they freeze out the minority stockholders of some other branch. All the while the manipulators on the inside are not only shearing the lambs, but they are doing it at the expense of the Treasury by using these paper losses to exempt them from paying taxes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. CANNON. With pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. They can do exactly that same thing under one big corporation. They can take their losses from those little stores on one return just as easily as they can do it in the consolidated return.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is it not true that they find it more convenient to operate through these smaller subsidiaries, without the responsibilities that attach thereto, so that they are getting all of the cream without having any of the liabilities? Is not that true?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is eminently correct. The law permits a practice by which the Government not only loses the taxes but is put in the position of deliberately conniving with the trusts to drive out competition. It is deliberately arming the branch stores against their competitors.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Are not all of those practices illegal under the Clayton law, and does not the Federal Trade Commission take jurisdiction over those practices? I think the gentleman will find it does.

Mr. BRIGGS. Has not the Federal Trade Commission been engaged for about three years in trying to find out the facts in connection with the Power Trust, and as yet has been unable to gather, from all the voluminous evidence that has been presented to it, the facts in connection therewith? And did not the Federal Trade Commission issue a statement not long ago with reference to this very thing and state they found the Government had lost several million dollars through the subsidiaries being utilized by the parent organization for the payment of taxes, which taxes never found their way into the Treasury of the United States, but which operated only to the benefit of the holding company, which

---

contributed nothing?

Mr. CANNON. Only week before last the United States Federal Trade Commission, after exhaustive hearings, reported that the Government was losing millions of dollars of revenue every year through this very device. They went further. They reported that parent corporations were frequently refusing to return to subsidiaries the amount of the exemptions which the subsidiaries were entitled to receive.

The holding company or central corporation would collect the full amount of the taxes from each of the subsidiaries. Then it would make a consolidated return under this law and increase its exemptions until a large part of the taxes were charged off. But instead of returning to the subsidiaries the excess taxes collected, it retained the full amount and thus mulcted the stockholders of the subsidiary of large amounts at every taxpaying period. The law lends itself to every species of crooked corporation finance, and the House should adopt this amendment, close the back door to such practices, and at the same time collect the full amount of taxes due.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is it not true that after the distribution of dividends among the stockholders of the holding company they then assess those dividends against the users of power throughout the United States, which results in increasing the power rates to everybody in the United States?

Mr. CANNON. Exactly. It is one of the principal devices by which the Power Trust adds to already swollen revenues exacted from the people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think the gentleman will find another instance in the United Cigar Co. Inside the United Cigar Co. is a holding company for the 99-year leases on its stores. Under this arrangement a loss is taken in one place and deducted from profits in another place, always, of course, at the expense of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. CANNON. The exemptions claimed by the United Cigar Co. is an instance of the manner in which the provisions of the law may be invoked.

Like all other chain stores and chain corporations, they are in a position to enlist the services of the Government in crushing competition and at the same time save taxes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. The deductions for losses apply just as much to one big corporation as they do to a subsidiary corporation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. I would like to answer the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object. The gentleman has had 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted. It has been a moot question as to whether it is advisable, in the interest of the taxpayers, to permit these affiliated and consolidated returns.

The argument of my friend from Missouri could be met by saying that a big corporation could place subsidiaries or agencies around at different places and accomplish the same thing in respect of unfair competition. I want to say that the Speaker of the House is very much in favor of the committee recommendation and, gentlemen, this useful purpose will be

---

served.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I can not yield right now. I decline to yield. The Speaker can correct me if I am wrong, or if I misstate his position.

This amendment will serve this useful purpose. Under the committee amendment corporations can make individual returns and pay  $13\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. If they desire to make consolidated and affiliated returns, they have that privilege, but must pay  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent extra tax for the privilege.

Now, the recommendation will serve this purpose. The committee can get returns from the Treasury Department for the future years after this is passed, and they can study those returns and see how many avail themselves of the privilege and whether or not further legislation is required.

The House is divided on this proposition, and this is a compromise. If you do away entirely with affiliated and consolidated returns, you are liable to junk a lot of short-line railroads. They can not pass their taxes on, because their rates are set by the public-utilities commissions, and if they can not deduct loss on their short-lines they will junk them; and, on the other hand, if they avail themselves of this privilege they must pay the Government  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent extra tax on their net income for the purpose of doing so. Now, is not this wise? I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], who has been very much interested in this matter, is favorable to this compromise. If I am in error, I would like for the gentleman to correct me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman has referred to the attitude of the Speaker at present on the question of consolidated returns. Now, we seem to have one amendment here, and then another amendment to the middle of the paragraph, offered by the gentleman from Georgia, in line 22, page 109, and the debate, it seems to me, has been running quite a bit ahead of that place in the bill.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman from Missouri offered an amendment to strike that out, which he has a perfect right to do, and the amendment was in order before the place in the bill where my amendment was in order, and, therefore, I had to take the floor now to argue my amendment and to try to convince the committee that they should not adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, which does away with affiliated and consolidated returns.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The question I wanted to ask is this: The gentleman speaks of the Speaker's attitude at present. Is the gentleman familiar with the present Speaker's attitude in earlier Congresses when he was on the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. CRISP. I will say that the Speaker, like all wise men, never hesitates to change his opinion when he thinks he ought to. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I agree with that,

Mr. CRISP. And the Speaker of the House, knowing the temper of the House, knowing how it is divided, thinks this is a wise compromise and will enable the Government, later, to see whether or not these affiliated and consolidated returns work an injury to the Government, and if so, the provision can be amended later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What I think the gentleman might well

do is to pass this amendment over until the membership can read this debate in the RECORD and ascertain just what the trouble is.

Mr. CRISP. That is the gentleman's opinion. My opinion is that this bill must be expedited and the House will be asked to vote upon the matter.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this particular provision of the bill is one I have had a good deal to do with in the past, and in view of the fact that it would appear, probably, that I have changed my position in the matter, it would perhaps not be out of order if I make a suggestion concerning it.

I made what I thought was as good a fight as I ever made in my life when I undertook to abolish consolidated and affiliated returns, and succeeded in doing this over the protests of the Ways and Means Committee. I feel now that there is probably no defense for consolidated and affiliated returns, but the suggestion has been made, and it seems to me a very wise one, that we test out in the next year or so the question of whether I am correct or those who believe in consolidated and affiliated returns are correct, and the way to test this out is to penalize corporations for making consolidated returns.

You are now proposing to penalize them  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. If it is advantageous to them to file such returns they will pay the penalty. If there is no advantage in consolidated and affiliated returns, they will submit separate returns.

There is one other situation that may, perhaps, be taken into consideration. The amendment that the House put on in a former Congress, as I recall, by a majority of 71 votes, did not become a part of the law. On a record vote in the Senate, the Senate voted more than two to one against it. The result was that in conference the matter was lost. Now, I imagine when this goes over to the Senate, if those gentlemen are of the same opinion now that they were then they will accept the amendment, or there will be some considerable scrimmage in conference.

I imagine no one can defend the proposition that you must give a multiplicity of corporations an advantage over an individual corporation and at the same time say that that advantage should not be equalized, or a test made to see what benefits they get out of it.

Remember, gentlemen, this amendment will yield \$14,000,000.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Eighteen million dollars.

Mr. GARNER. I think the gentleman is mistaken, but, of course, the estimate is before us. I understand 1 per cent would yield \$9,000,000 and  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent would yield \$14,500,000; but in any event, it will yield a large sum of money.

If you abolish consolidated and affiliated returns, no one knows just how much money the Government would gain by it. We have all guessed at it. I staked my reputation at one time on the floor of this House as a predictor as to what revenue would be derived from it when I said it would yield \$50,000,000; but that was in 1928, gentlemen, and the returns from corporations now are about one-half what they were then. So if my prediction were true then, the limit at this time would probably be \$25,000,000 for the first year, and it would gradually drift off during the years. The reason for this must be apparent to anyone when he thinks of it. Consolidated and affiliated returns the first year could hardly be adjusted. After that wash sales and readjustments in their bookkeeping would naturally reduce the advantage from consolidated and affiliated

---



returns.

I hope that this amendment will be adopted, because, as I have said, it will test out in the next year or two whether or not the opposition to consolidated and affiliated returns is correct.

Mr. CRISP. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman refers to "this" amendment. Does he mean the Cannon amendment or the committee amendment?

Mr. GARNER. I refer to the committee amendment, of course, I think you will make a mistake if you adopt the Cannon amendment. I think this is a wise compromise and that the committee amendment should be adopted.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, for 20 years I have cooperated at every opportunity with the gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House, and this occasion shall not be an exception to the rule. I am glad to have this unexpected opportunity to express my high regard for him. I have followed him always gladly and always with profit, not only because I am an organizational Democrat but because of my deep personal affection for him. I shall withdraw my amendment. But may I at the same time suggest an increase in the amount to be contributed by these corporations over that proposed by the committee? The amount here involved is too large to be disregarded. Do you realize that consolidated corporations taking advantage of this law, constituting only 2 per cent of all the corporations making tax returns to the Federal Government, receive 50 per cent of the entire corporation income of the United States? Going still further, do you realize that 5 per cent of the corporations of the country making tax returns, and entitled to additional exemptions under this law, receive 90 per cent of the total gross income paid to all the corporations of the United States? It seems incredible, but it is shown by the records of the Treasury Department.

Now, if we were driven to the extreme of taxing the chewing gum of the children, surely we ought to permit the greatest money-making corporations in the country pay their just and lawful share of the taxes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Assuredly.

Mr. SCHAFER. If the gentleman's amendment is defeated, the publishers of the great chain newspapers will get the advantage?

Mr. CANNON. It applies to chain newspapers as well as to other chain businesses. The amendment will have a most salutary effect on both taxes and business.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will it not apply to the Hearst newspapers and give them about \$1,000,000 annually?

Mr. CANNON. It makes no distinction as to any corporation making consolidated returns.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

## APPENDIX C

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on the eve of America's entry into the world war, insuring victory for the Allies, a panic seized a large part of the French people and three entire army corps left the front-line trenches and retreated on Paris.<sup>1</sup> Today in America's war against the depression, with victory already in sight, there are those who would sound a retreat. Already within reach of the goal our comrades falter. They are unwilling to go the last mile. They are unwilling to keep men moving up into the front-line jobs. There is general agreement that the campaign for employment is succeeding. All authorities report a general upturn in business on every front. But just at this critical period the committee brings in a proposal to dismiss from employment more than a million workmen today earning their daily bread in productive employment.

In order to see the situation a little more clearly, let us clear away some of the underbrush about this proposition. The resolution contains a number of minor provisions.

There is practically no difference of opinion on either side of the aisle on any of these items. I think there is general concurrence on the part of the committee and the House on both sides of the aisle in the entire resolution with the exception of the amount of the appropriation. The appropriation of \$875,000,000 recommended by the Budget will keep 3,081,300 men at work. The appropriation of \$725,000,000 recommended by the committee will employ only 1,930,000. In other words, the committee proposes to throw out of employment, in the dead of winter, 1,151,300 men.

So, Mr. Chairman, the whole question before the House this afternoon is the hiring or firing of these 1,151,300 men. This is the sole issue presented by this resolution. But it is a more important question than may appear at first blush. These 1,151,300 men are breadwinners. They are heads of families. When you deprive them of work you deprive their dependent families of support.

The P.W.A. estimates each family to average  $3\frac{1}{2}$  persons. That is a conservative estimate, as the traditional military ratio is five to a family. But even at the minimum estimate, the number of dependents affected by this reduction would aggregate 4,026,550 persons. At the Army ratio it will affect 5,726,500 people. But it goes further than that. The business created and supported by the needs of this vast number of people, their trade with merchants, artisans, and professional men, gives employment to numerous other workers who, without this business, will also be thrown out of employment. So, on a conservative estimate, the proposition of the committee here is to take away the

---

<sup>1</sup>U.S., Congressional Record, 76th Congress, 1st Session, 1939, LXXXIV, Part 1, 248.

sustenance of from six to eight million people. It is not necessary to draw on the imagination to understand what that would mean to the people themselves or to the business interests of the country.

The committee gives no tenable reason for its ruthless recommendation except a desire to save money. In fact there is no reason. Every witness called by the committee demonstrated the need for increased rather than decreased employment. Every item of evidence submitted to the committee supported the President's recommendation of \$875,000,000. You can read the hearings through from the first page to the last and there is not one line or a single statement that justifies a decrease of a dollar in the appropriations or the reduction of a job in the employment program. The proposal to reduce the amount is so unwarranted, so at variance with the evidence, so unjustified by the statistics submitted in the hearings, that it is impossible to escape the conclusion that the committee met with the preconceived determination to cut the amount recommended by the Budget. No matter what amount had been recommended, the committee would have cut it. If the request had been for \$500,000,000 the committee would have cut it. If the estimate had been for \$200,000,000 they would have cut it. Apparently it is a purely arbitrary cut unsupported by any fact or formula. And certainly it is not supported by the American people.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. My time is very limited. I hope the gentleman will excuse me.

We have had the recommendation of the committee. Now, let us examine the recommendation of the country at large.

Let us take up the recommendation of organized agriculture on this subject. Let us consult the wishes of organized labor on this proposed reduction. Let us consider the recommendation of the organized veterans of the United States, the opinion of the clergy, of recognized economists, businessmen, and the Conference of Mayors of the United States.

With astonishing unanimity each of these great groups, in direct and intimate touch with business, labor, and relief in every section of the country, is asking a continuation of the W.P.A. program and a continuation or increase in W.P.A. activity.

The American Farm Bureau Federation in its annual meeting at New Orleans, which adjourned just a week or two ago, adopted this resolution:

To the President of the United States and the Members of the Seventy-sixth Congress:

Pursuant to resolutions adopted by the House of voting delegates at the twentieth annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation herewith calls to the attention of the President of the United States and the Members of the Seventy-sixth Congress the following matters, which are considered by the organization to be of outstanding importance to the Nation:

We recommend: \* \* \*

(b) That the Federal Government continue to provide employment for those who cannot secure employment in private industry.

\* \* \* \* \*

We are convinced that the Federal Government must continue to supply the bulk of the relief funds, for the burden is beyond

---

the present capacity of the local political divisions to handle; and we recognize the continued necessity that the Government provide capital investment funds until such time as private funds are again attracted into productive enterprise.

There is the statement of a great national agricultural organization speaking for the farmers of the country. Organized labor takes the same view.

Out of a number of official statements I will read one or two representative declarations:

Any reduction in the proposed allotment of funds for W.P.A. would seriously handicap the functioning of W.P.A. and would probably mean an even greater number of dismissals of both project and administrative employees.

W.P.A. has provided relief to the people of our industry as well as to millions in other industries during a period of extreme want and necessity. We urge an appropriation for at least \$1,000,000,000.

And I must take time to read just one more which I am certain will be of particular interest to the Members of the House. The several Congressmen who have expressed themselves on this question here this afternoon do not have a single child in school. But here is an opinion from the organized teachers of the Nation speaking from first-hand knowledge on this subject of such vital concern to the children under their care:

JANUARY 11, 1938

PA 218 21 NL

CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Washington, D.C.:

American Federation of Teachers, numbering 30,000 affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, urges full appropriation for W.P.A. as recommended by the President.

Mr. Chairman, this is the recommendation of the teachers of the land who come in daily contact with the child problem, who know family conditions, who see children coming to school sometimes without breakfast, and sometimes without shoes. They know that if this reduction is made there will be a good many more without breakfast and without needed clothing and medical care.

The churchmen of the Nation, whose relation to the problem is even more intimate than that of the teachers, have exhibited even a greater interest.

Upon the desk of every Member of Congress are letters from the clergy of the Nation, including practically every denomination and creed. No one is in a position to speak with more knowledge and more authority on this question affecting both the material and the spiritual welfare of the people and the Nation. And they uniformly endorse an increase rather than a reduction in the amount provided in this bill. In this connection I must also include in the RECORD the opinion of the accredited economists of the Nation, as follows:

---

DEAR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT: We, the undersigned economists, are addressing ourselves to you in order to express our opinions on a national problem of greatest importance which falls within our sphere of professional competence.

Newspaper reports, which have not been denied, indicate that the Works Progress Administration is planning to cut its rolls by a third during the next 2 or 3 months. This action, we understand, is contemplated in order to stretch the present relied appropriation and to lay the ground for a greatly reduced deficiency appropriation next spring. Such a policy would involve throwing some million breadwinners and their families into destitution during the severe winter months. It would involve a reduction of more than \$50,000,000 per month in direct wage payments in addition to some \$30,000,000 in related expenditures. Such a cut in consumer purchasing power would, we believe, constitute a severe threat to the continuance of the present economic recovery, and might even cause a serious set-back in business activity.

The rapid upsurge in business during the last 6 months has been a source of encouragement to those who believe that the severity of swings in business activity need not be accepted fatalistically but can be successfully counteracted by wise social action. Thanks to the vigorous action taken last spring by the Federal Government under your leadership, the recession of 1937 was arrested; and the curve of business and employment turned upward. The expansion of the spending program was the chief governmental weapon used in fighting the recession and stimulating the recovery. Furthermore during these 6 months the major channel for the disbursement of new purchasing power has been the Works Progress Administration, and we believe that the Works Progress Administration should continue to perform this function until private industry clearly demonstrates its capacity to absorb all those released from relief rolls.

We conclude, Mr. President, that the curtailment of the Works Progress Administration at the present time would be particularly ill-timed from an economic as well as from a humanitarian viewpoint, and we strongly urge that the contemplated policy of curtailment be abandoned.

Of the 69 signers of the statement, 13 are members of the faculty of Harvard, 7 are from Yale, 7 are from Columbia, 6 from Northwestern, 6 from Brooklyn College, 5 from Mount Holyoke, and 4 from Tufts. Among the other institutions represented are Brown, Williams, Amherst, Stanford, University of Wisconsin, University of Illinois, University of Chicago, Cornell, New York University, University of Minnesota, and Princeton.

On the other hand, there is not an economist from any college or university in the United States who has endorsed this unwarranted, unscientific, and arbitrary reduction in the amount recommended by the President.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. Did the gentleman have some evidence before his committee that all of those persons certified as being eligible for W.P.A. were not on the W.P.A. at the present time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman calls attention

---

to the fact that even with the present employment there are still over 500,000 who have been certified to W.P.A. but for whom W.P.A. is unable to provide work of any kind. They are eligible, they have been on the waiting list for months, but even with the current appropriation they cannot be provided for. And in addition there are twice as many eligible awaiting certification.

The statement was made on the floor here a few minutes ago that P.W.A. would provide a million and a half jobs. Of course, the P.W.A. program was taken into consideration when these figures were tabulated. Furthermore, it should not be overlooked that we made these estimates on the assumption that the present acceleration in business and industry would continue. If such a reduction as is here proposed, or any other untoward condition, interferes with recovery, it will require more than a billion dollars to carry the program through to June 30 instead of \$875,000,000.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I wish I could yield to the gentleman, but I have only a minute or two remaining.

Mr. Chairman, the businessmen of the country are also opposed to this reduction. Out of the \$875,000,000 recommended in the Budget, \$750,000,000 is paid out in wages which flow directly into the channels of trade. If you withdraw from the retail business of the country that enormous amount, it affects the retail merchant, it affects the jobber, the wholesaler, the factory—it shakes the entire fabric of American commerce and business. Take a plebiscite of your home-town merchants and get their recommendation of the wisdom of the Nation's investment in W.P.A.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is no one more entitled to pass on this question or better qualified to understand it than the ex-service men and their organizations. Here is a communication which speaks for itself:

#### VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

January 11, 1939.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANNON: I am enclosing a copy of the detailed objectives of the V.F.W. and call your particular attention to the points checked with red pencil.

MILLARD W. RICE

Legislative Representative

Point 3:

7. Retention of W.P.A. with liberalized eligibility for entry, reentry, and retention of veterans who need such employment.

The organized veterans of the Nation not only endorse the present provisions for W.P.A. but they favor their liberalization.

But, Mr. Chairman, the most significant recommendations on this entire question come from the mayors of the United States, representing every city in the United States of over 50,000 population. They express the opinion that disaster will follow any reduction in this appropriation. And who is better qualified to pass on the questions involved in W.P.A.? Is it not rather singular that there is not a single chief executive in any city in any State in the Union who believes that this appropriation ought to be reduced?

Mr. Chairman, if the proposed reduction had any merit, if it was

---

based on any material grounds, if it is justified from any reasonable point of view, surely they could find at least one mayor in the entire United States who could support their contention. Organized agriculture, organized labor, organized veterans, organized business and businessmen, churchmen, economists, the mayors of every large city in the land are of one accord in support of the full amount asked by the Budget. But the Congressman, in his superior wisdom, comes in, and he sees that the child has on its plate both bread and potatoes. "Oh," he says, "you have too much," and the Congressman, by his vote on this resolution, reaches over and takes the potatoes off the plate. It is hard on the child, perhaps, but it helps balance the Budget. Now, that is not melodrama. It is the inevitable result in homes all over the Nation of an affirmative vote on the pending resolution.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am sorry.

And in their argument on balancing the Budget they go back and quote a message of the President of the United States, delivered when the public debt was \$21,000,000,000, the most specious argument made in this debate. Why not go back to 1916, when the debt was \$1,000,000,000? It would have been just as consistent.

Mr. Chairman, between the time when the debt was \$1,000,000,000 in 1916 and the time when the debt was \$21,000,000,000, this country went through a trying ordeal, and the gentleman does not question that debt. Since the time the President of the United States wrote that message the country has gone through another great trial, a depression that brought disaster to more people than the war, and no one will say that the money was not well spent if it saved the American people.

---

#### APPENDIX D

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R.4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies on certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the bill continue through the day and that at the close of the debate today the first paragraph of the bill be read, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York Mr. TABER and myself.<sup>1</sup>

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, a great many Members of the House have indicated to me that they feel that this bill should have 2 days' general debate. As the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations knows, it required more time in committee to consider this bill than any appropriations bill that has been considered by the Appropriations Committee in the last several years. There are many Members of the House who desire to be heard in general debate on this bill.

I have no particular objection to the limitation of debate to today if we can be assured that no other business is to interfere. I understand there is a conference report on the lands-grant freight-rate bill pending which might be taken up at any time and which might take some of the time that we would otherwise have for general debate. I would like for the gentleman to couple with his request, if he sees proper to do so, a request that general debate shall continue for at least 4 hours.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I shall say to the gentleman that I have conferred with the Speaker and no other business will be taken up. The entire time will be devoted to this bill. I will couple with my request that at least 4 hours be devoted to general debate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not understand that that request implies that if there is an opportunity to have more debate than 4 hours today, and there is a demand for it, that we should not have it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Our intention is to run as long as anybody wants to talk. We want the Members to talk themselves out, and anybody who wants time can have it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it may be that under the proposition made by the gentleman from Missouri we would have to run very late this evening. Of course, there are very important projects that have been eliminated from this bill in which a great

---

<sup>1</sup>U.S., Congressional Record, 79th Congress, 1st Session, 1945, XCI, Part 8, 11041.



many Members are interested, and I particularly hope that the gentleman will withdraw his request to read the first paragraph of the bill today because there are many Members who are not members of the Committee on Appropriations who desire time on this measure.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, no requests have been made and we shall deny no requests that are made.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then do I understand the gentleman to say that as long as a gentleman is making a request for time, that he will be recognized, and he will be yielded to?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unless there is interruption from other source than the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know if it is the intention of the chairman to go on with the bill tomorrow in the event that we conclude general debate today?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We expect to read the bill tomorrow.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, it is not proposed to take up any amendments today; that we will merely read the first paragraph, which may be subject to amendment, and then take up any amendments tomorrow?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. TARVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the gentleman's statement about "unless there is interruption from some other source than the committee." I am wondering if we could have the assurance from the Speaker that no other business will be taken up this afternoon except this.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Speaker has given us assurance that there will be no intervention. It is a little out of order, and rather bad taste, to insist on the Speaker's making terms.

Mr. TARVER. Then I think the gentleman might withdraw his reservation about "unless there is interruption from some other source than the committee."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We will continue all night if necessary unless somebody outside the committee objects.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do this for the purpose of asking if it is the purpose, when we start to read the bill tomorrow, to go on reading it and come to a conclusion and vote on the bill immediately thereafter?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is our expectation, Mr. Speaker, to devote today to general debate, to begin reading the bill for amendment tomorrow, and to continue through the remainder of the week until the bill is disposed of.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, not to inquire about this bill, where does that leave the conference report on the so-called Boren bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma Mr. BOREN to call up the conference report after this bill is disposed of.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It will not be called up until after this bill is disposed of?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the Chair state the request of the gentleman from Missouri so that the

Members may understand it?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that general debate be continued throughout the day, not less than 4 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from New York, and that the first paragraph of the bill be read today. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4805, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we submit today the first deficiency bill for the fiscal year 1946, and the last appropriation bill for the calendar year.

But, Mr. Chairman, before we take up the bill in detail may I earnestly invite the serious and considered attention of the House to a general phase of the fiscal program, particularly in point at this time. There is no more vital consideration in national economy than the National Budget. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries every administration that came to power or fell from power in the major European nations either rose or was wrecked upon its fiscal policies. No nation can be indefinitely maintained today on a deficit budget. In the end disaster must overtake any nation which fails to pay its way.

Mr. Chairman, we have reached this year, this month, this hour, a turn in the long road. It is a road that leads from the beginning of our Government down to today and stretches way ahead of us into the far distant future. Upon the nature of the turn we make today depends to a very large degree the destination to which that road leads the Nation, not only next year, but for 100 years to come, and not only for the American people but for the world. Unless we can maintain this Nation on a sound financial basis there is disaster ahead for us and for the world.

The situation is critical not because we are in a stage of transition from one historic era to another, not because we are entering upon a period of extraordinary scientific and industrial development. It was critical before the war, before we dreamed that a war was possible. It is critical because a decade before the opening of the war we had developed a spending psychology, had entered upon a period of unrestrained and uninhibited expenditure. We bought what we wanted. Too often we bought what we saw whether we were certain we wanted it or not. We did not stop to count the cost or to consider the source from which the money came to pay for it. The result was a spending spree such as the world had never seen before.

Let us take a few concrete instances. For example, let us check the astounding growth of the agricultural appropriation bill. For the fiscal year 1933 the agricultural appropriation bill totaled \$175,000,000, to be exact, \$175,671,665. That was a large sum.

Under the chairmanship of Congressman James W. Wadsworth, of New York, the father of our distinguished colleague, James W. Wadsworth, Jr.,

---

the agricultural appropriation bill carried a total of \$3,232,995. But coming back to modern history. In 1940 the agricultural appropriation bill was \$1,194,498,633. In 7 years the bill had jumped 700 percent.

Let us check the Interior Department appropriation bill. In 1933 it was \$45,533,672.33. At the beginning of the war it had reached \$188,-325,923. Likewise, the State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor bill for the fiscal year of 1933 was \$112,291,970.89. In 1941 the combined bills representing the same departments aggregated \$1,130,431,691.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. With reference to the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments appropriation bill, the gentleman must remember that included was an appropriation for aviation, which was badly needed for the prosecution of the war.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But the expenditure was a purely peacetime expenditure. It was in time of peace, and at that time no one dreamed a war was ahead of us. If you had taken a vote on the floor you could not have gotten one vote for war. There was not a man here who believed that we were going into war or would ever go to war. In time of peace, with no prospect of war we ran expenditures from \$112,000,000 up to \$1,130,-000,000; more than a billion dollars' increase in 8 years.

Now, these bills were typical of practically all Government expenditures. In those seven or eight run-away years we increased the supply bills, the annual appropriations by leaps and bounds. There is no parallel in the annals of any nation. Remember, these are not war expenditures. There is nothing here for war or preparation for war. All the figures cited are peacetime expenditures for the annual housekeeping expenditures of the Nation.

It might be added, however, that the civil functions bill, reported out by the Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations, but which carries only civil appropriations, increased from \$106,578,489 in 1933 to \$305,188,514 in 1940.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Did that first bill include the Department of Labor, to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; State, Commerce, Justice, and Labor. The four Departments were provided for in one bill at that time.

Mr. RABAUT. If it refers to State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor it probably has taken in Social Security now, has it not? I mean the bill to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; it includes the departments originally provided for in the four-department bill.

Mr. RABAUT. That was because the subject became so large it had to be broken up and handled by two committees of the House, Justice and Commerce in one, and Labor and Social Security in the other.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The increase was so rapid and so precipitous it became necessary to divide the bill into two bills. But these figures cover the departments handled in the original bill.

Mr. RABAUT. We had social-security legislation that took care of the people. That was the cause for the enormous increase.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is what I am calling attention to—the extraordinary increase of all Federal expenditures in such an

---

incredibly short space of time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman mentioned the increase for the Department of Agriculture. I wish to call his attention to the fact that a large portion of the billion dollars that was appropriated went to pay the farmers to produce less food.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That was only one item in the bill and the bill was only one of the many passed by the Congress. Regardless of the purpose for which expended, all expenditures of the Government climbed to astronomic proportions in a little more than half a decade.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. But I want to ask the gentleman if it would not be fair, because all this money that the gentleman is talking about comes through the Appropriations Committee, to state that the Appropriations Committee has been forced to take action because of earlier action taken in the legislative committees of the Congress authorizing expenditures, the Committee on Appropriations being finally asked to appropriate the money. That is the cause of the high figure. We must also remember that we had an economy in this Nation of \$38,000,000,000 which has risen to a point where the taxes of the Nation a year or so ago were above what the whole economy of the Nation was when we came into power. So in justice to the situation the two things should be mentioned at the same time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has put his finger on the crux of the matter. Expenditures necessarily originate in the legislative committees, which bring in bills authorizing expenditures and then demand that the Appropriations Committee supply the funds. The Appropriations Committee frequently declines to appropriate the amount authorized or in some instances to appropriate anything at all. But in the end all must accept their share of the responsibility. The legislative committees are responsible, the Committee on Appropriations is responsible, and the House itself is responsible for this extraordinary and unprecedented, but perhaps not unwarranted increase in the annual expenses of the Government.

I say "perhaps not unwarranted" because under conditions extant at the time many, if not all of them, might have been fully warranted.

The alarming feature of the situation is not that in this short period of 6 or 8 years appropriations and expenditures mushroomed, and pyramided, and skyrocketed. The alarming feature is that today—under vastly different circumstances, and steadily shrinking revenues, with huge burdens of new responsibilities—there seems to be a general impression that we can continue the free and untrammelled spending of prewar days.

Conditions have vastly changed since those halcyon days in which we spent \$1,000,000,000 it was all right, there was more where that came from.

But today we find ourselves in a vastly different situation. We have not balanced the budget for 15 years. For 15 years we have been running this Government on IOU's, not merely in time of war, but in time of peace. We owe today, when we have finally settled all of our bills, approximately \$300,000,000,000. Such a debt has never burdened any nation in human history. Under the pressure of that colossal debt we cannot continue to spend money at the rate at which we spent before the war. We

---

can no longer spend for any indispensable objective, however desirable and however advantageous the purpose of the expenditure.

Today we have fixed charges that we did not have before the war, fixed charges which must be paid before we can spend a dollar for current expenses.

For instance, the interest on the national debt is already between five and six billion dollars annually. That one item alone is larger than the entire expenditures of the Federal Government for all purposes prior to 1934. We have to take that out of our revenues before we start to spend.

Not only that, but the national debt has to be refunded. It is all in short-term issues, comparatively speaking, and the loans, the certificates of indebtedness, have to be renewed. We are paying now the lowest rate of interest ever paid on Government money—about 2 percent.

When business starts again and investors need capital and the banks begin to make loans, and we continue to refund this money, we are going to have to pay more than 2 percent. If we refunded the public debt at the same rate of interest that we paid after the last war, our interest charges today would be twelve billion dollars instead of five. Then where would we stand with \$12,000,000,000 interest charges to start with? It is my belief that while we may not always be able to refund at 2 percent, we will not have to go as far as we did before, but there is no guaranty of that.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. The gentleman stated that we have not balanced the Budget for 15 years. I remember that the gentleman along with me opposed passing the tax-reduction bill while our Budget was in such bad condition. I believe the gentleman knows that we are not going to balance the Budget for years to come as long as pressure groups can come in here and shove through tax-cutting bills regardless of our responsibility to the Nation. We are not going to balance the Budget under those circumstances.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the astounding feature of the situation which confronts us today. We are being importuned by all sorts of pressure groups, insisting upon increased expenditures and then, on the other side, we are being urged by pressure groups, just as insistent, demanding reduction in taxes. And, mirabile dictu, we have Members of Congress who vote with both crowds. We have Members of Congress who vote for the highest appropriations and vote for the lowest taxes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. There was made recently a computation of appropriations or requests for appropriations and they aggregated \$39,000,000,000. There are eight valley authorities requests in there. In addition, we have this health program that has been sent to us by the President which will cost billions of dollars. There is also the full-employment bill that will run into the hundreds of millions of dollars if not billions of dollars. As the gentleman from Missouri said, there is pressure. Of course, the taxpayer is seeking relief from wartime taxation, which is only natural, but what the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has reference to is all the pressure groups asking for anything and everything, going on the theory that every dollar they give me out of the Federal Treasury is

---

that much gravy. They refuse to stop and consider the fact that every dollar spent must be raised by taxation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is absolutely no other source from which the Federal Government can obtain money to pay for all these local expenditures we are asked to vote on this floor. All of it must come direct from the pockets of the taxpayers of the Nation—all the Nation. I am very glad to hear the very influential gentleman take that position. I trust he will join this committee in trying to hold down expenditures and, incidentally, will join with the little group of 33 who voted on the last revenue bill against reducing wartime taxes while the taxpayers are still drawing wartime incomes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the interest on the public debt is only the first of the fixed charges, accumulated during the war, which the Government must pay before it can begin paying on current expenses. But before I take up the rest of them, in their order, may I call attention to the fact that we are still running the Government on borrowed money and these extra appropriations for which we are being asked, and on which we will vote tomorrow, would be deficit expenditures. We are still borrowing money. We are now busily engaged in trying to put over the eighth bond drive—the Victory loan. We are trying to sell \$11,000,000,000 worth of bonds and having a harder time selling them than we have had on any of the preceding seven campaigns to sell bonds.

But there are men in the House who already want to start spending on that \$11,000,000,000 before we borrow it. They come in here for appropriations and they want to appropriate money we do not have and have not yet been able to borrow for things we can get along without.

We must face the fact that from this time on we will have steadily shrinking revenues. That is inevitable. Already the national income is falling. For the current year it reached \$46,400,000,000, the largest amount in the history of any nation. The most optimistic estimate for the coming year is ten billion below that figure. But the people who want to spend money, both in this House and out of this House, pay no attention to the fact. They want to increase expenditures while income is declining.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the gentleman think that the best time to pay taxes is when the people have money to pay them?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Beyond a shadow of a doubt. The basic law of scientific taxation is that the burden should be in proportion to ability to pay. Those who have the money to pay should pay, and they should pay when they have the money to pay. That is why I joined with the gentleman in opposing the reduction of taxes in the last tax-reduction bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe that the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman now addressing the House were practically the only two Members of the House who argued against that tax-reduction bill because of the serious effect it might have upon our national income; am I not correct in that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am always glad to find myself in agreement with the gentleman from Minnesota.

---

Mr. Chairman, another fixed charge we have never paid before is the maintenance of a military establishment. For the first time in American history we must maintain a large military establishment in time of peace. We are maintaining today a large standing army and the largest navy that the world has ever seen.

And fully as important as the Army and the Navy, we must spend a vast sum of money in research. Everybody realizes that the last war was won on research. It was radar, the proximity fuse, our antisubmarine devices, the atomic bomb, and innumerable other scientific developments which protected our continent and crushed the enemy. All testimony before the committee was to the effect that but for these developments we would still be fighting on all fronts. The next war—if mankind should ever again be cursed with another war—will be purely a war between scientists. So that a heavy fixed charge, which we have never carried before, must be incurred every year in research to keep ourselves abreast of the time to see that no other nation develops some secret weapon which would destroy us overnight.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman speaks of the next war. Is it the gentleman's idea that we must continue to have an arms race and a naval race over the world, and never devote our attention to disarmament and to obtaining peace throughout the human family?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; I have an abiding faith that we will never have another war, but the only way to guard against another war is to trust in God and keep our powder dry. These fixed charges are to keep our powder dry.

Mr. WHITE. When the gentleman says, "Keep our powder dry" he means the biggest navy and the biggest army, and an armament race with all the nations of the world. They will all keep their powder dry, and they will all have tremendous armies and tremendous navies. Is that what the gentleman means?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We must always have a shotgun behind the door.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Another fixed charge, incurred as an aftermath of the war is the expense of vastly enlarged international obligations. The world has shrunk so rapidly that every nation in the world is just across the street from us, just over the fence. We have assumed, beginning with the San Francisco Charter, international obligations, including financial obligations, military obligations, diplomatic obligations, and all of them involving increased expense which must be paid before we start giving away money. They are expenses we have never paid before, and we must pay them before we start distributing money for the things some of our friends here on the floor want spent back home in their congressional districts.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. Has the gentleman any idea how much the United Nations Organization will cost the United States in its first year?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The negotiations now under way have not yet reached the stage where we can crystallize either the program or the cost of the program, but we do know that it will be substantial.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. If I understood the gentleman's question correctly, it was how much has the United Nations Organization cost up to this time.

Mr. CLASON. No; it was not. I said during the next year.

Mr. STEFAN. I can tell the gentleman approximately what it has cost up to this time, but I cannot answer as to next year.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Another charge, and this is the greatest debt of honor America owes today, an obligation which must come first, whatever the cost, is our obligation to the veterans. We must pay the allotments, the expense of education, the hospitalization; we must pay for all of these things we have promised and guaranteed the men who saved the Nation in its time of need, in the GI bill, in legislation already passed, and in other legislation which will be passed in the future. And, however much we pay, it will only be a part of what we owe them.

It was testified before the committee that the peak of hospitalization of veterans of the war will not be reached until 1975. We are today paying pensions for every war the United States has fought except the Revolutionary War.

We are still paying pensions for the War of 1812, for the Mexican War, the Indian War, and the Civil War, and we will be paying pensions on this war for 100 years to come. From this time on we must set aside at the beginning, before we pay anything else, billions of dollars to redeem our obligations to the veterans. That is a fixed charge that cannot be avoided and one which no one desires to avoid. And its cost will run into the billions.

Then we must pay—now or eventually—the cost of rehabilitation. It is a part of the cost of the war, and it is a matter of particular interest at this time because a great many people are saying that the money they are asking us to spend ought to be spent in order to make work for the unemployed. We have no unemployment in this country. Neither in the cities nor on the farms are they able to secure the labor they need. They are advertising in the papers for people to work in the factories and they are advertising for people to work on the farms—and getting no applications.

This situation will continue. We need today every manufactured product that is consumed by a civilized people. Our shelves are bare; our warehouses are vacant; our pipelines are empty. We need in this country 15,000,000 automobiles. We need 5,500,000 radios. We need everything that men consume. We have the money to pay for them. You cannot go downtown today in Washington and buy a shirt. They are not down there. We need men in factories all over the country to produce these goods. Just as soon as we can get those factories going, we will employ all of the labor in the country. And that situation will continue until we reach the saturation point in supplies. There is a difference of opinion among economists as to when that point will be reached, but nobody estimates that it will be reached in less than 2 years. Some say 5 years. But at the end of that time, when we reach the saturation point in the production of goods for daily consumption, then the test will come. That is when unemployment will develop if at all—not for the next 2 years and perhaps not for the next 5 years, but when it comes, as inevitably it must come—and as it has come after every war—we must be prepared to meet it. How will you meet it? It will require huge expenditures. We must have money. But if we go out to every Member's congressional district and

---



build everything his constituents want there, and spend all the money that they would like for us to spend there, with this huge unpaid debt still hanging over us, how will we be in a position to finance rehaibitation when the time comes—as come it must.

The alarming thing is that notwithstanding we have all these new expenses and fixed charges to meet now that the war is over, and with the decline in income there is a general expectation not only that we will continue to spend at the old rate of expenditure, but that we will actually increase expenditures. The people at home are demanding it. I have been alarmed at the letters I have received from my congressional district. From one town in my congressional district they wrote that they wanted to build a post office, an airport, a new sewer system, and a hospital; and they expect the Federal Government to pay for a large part of it just as in the old WPA days. All sorts of commercial clubs and organizations are writing. Not only the people back home expect the Government to pay but the Congressmen expect to continue appropriations at prewar figures. Here in Congress bills are being introduced to authorize heavier expenditures than before the war. I read a bill just yesterday which has been introduced in another body. It is a general health bill. It provides for huge expenditures, never made before. Its aims are very desirable, of course. It provides for these vast appropriations but makes no provisions whatever for any funds to pay the expense except to take them out of the general revenues of the Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that the policy of the National Government now is to take care of all flood-control projects, without any hope of recoupment from the localities or cities?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not know what the policy is, but I do know we have not got the money to do it. In view of the fact that the gentleman mentions flood-control, let me say we had before our committee yesterday a Member who talked about a project for flood control in his district. He told us that for 50 years that water had been causing them damage. As a matter of fact, it had been causing damage ever since the river had been there. Now, if we could not finance before the war, how can we finance it now, after the war?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We have been led to believe in California, where we have a great many of these multipurpose dams, sometimes as many as five or six purposes, that the only chargeable cost against the consumers of electricity or water will be the costs that are properly allocated to hydroelectric power and irrigation. Is that not the fixed policy of this Government?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I cannot say what the fixed policy is, but regardless of whether it is as the gentleman indicates, we do not have the money with which to do it.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. I first wish to commend the gentleman for his fearless speech this morning, regardless of partisanship. Recently, in my own district, in making a speech or two along the same line, and the result it might have upon people as far as bonds held by the people are concerned, I found that I received more applause along that line, from Democrats as well as Republicans. The whole country is thinking along

---

the same line, I beleive. But what surprised me was this: I saw in the Washington Post of Sunday a United Press story stating that investigation had disclosed and that the administration would soon submit a budget for it, that our deficit for this year would be somewhere around forty or fifty billion dollars. When we passed the tax bill, it was said the deficit would probably be \$30,000,000,000 this year. I took occasion to say on the floor that it was a very illogical bill, with a deficit of \$30,000,000,000 facing us this year, that we should reduce taxes. I want to ask the gentleman what is the likelihood as to what our deficit will be for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The prospect now, as nearly as we can figure it, is that the budget for the coming year will be, roughly, between fifty and sixty billion dollars. Our income will be less than it was last year, and last year it was only \$46,400,000,000.

But I am glad the gentleman mentioned his constituents. You know, we grow worried when we receive a telegram or a letter from back home demanding appropriations, But these demands are not as serious as they sometimes seem. When I was home the last time delegates from various parts of my district visited me. All of you had about the same experience. They said they had completed plans for construction and needed Federal contributions, and wanted to know when they could get the money.

I explained there were no funds available from which such expenditures could be met, and that they would not be available until Congress voted them. The I said, "As much as I regret I have to disappoint you, I must vote against the appropriation of any money for such purposes. This country is too deep in debt and we must begin cutting it down." Under the circumstances, I feel I would have to vote against the appropriation of money to start another WPA.

They were all businessmen. They talked it over for a minute and then said, "You are right about it. We do not want you to vote that money. Of course, if everybody else is going to get it, then we want ours; but if nobody is going to get it that suits us. We would rather pay off the debt and keep the finances of this country intact than to spend the money when we ought to be paying our debts." And they went away satisfied. But let me tell you that the conservative businessman—the inteeligent, average, solid citizen of your district—is going to stand back of you if you stand against reduction of taxes, against increased expenditures, and against appropriations for another WPA.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I asked the gentleman to yield to me in order that I might make an observation. The gentleman from Missouri is making an economic speech which I believe the entire Nation will applaud. He has here today charted the legislative course of the direction we in Congress must take if we are to save our country from financial disaster. He has said many things, in my opinion, which ought to be said for the good of the country; and I know of nobody who could have said them more effectively or more impressively than the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He has performed a great public service in his speech this afternoon.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to say that I am simply following the lead of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana who has always believed in a sane status of expenditure. I have always been glad to follow his lead, and when I did I always found I was in a sound and safe

---

position.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Missouri for the very splendid statement he made just preceding the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana. I should like to ask him if I understood him correctly when a few minutes ago he stated that our deficit next year would be between fifty and sixty billions of dollars?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That, of course, is purely a matter of estimate. No one can say what it will be. I have heard it stated as low as \$40,000,000,000, although that was an exception to the rule. The average is about \$50,000,000,000 and some go from fifty to fifty-five or fifty-six billions. That, of course, is only an estimate, but in any event we will have a huge deficit.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman tell me whether or not those figures have been arrived at with due consideration to the amounts of money we will secure from the disposal of surplus war stocks?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The disposal of surplus war stocks, of course, is a matter which will extend over a number of years and no one can make an accurate estimate as to what it will amount to in any particular year. It will be so distributed so that the amount will not be very large in any particular year; and for that reason it will not be very appreciable in its effect on the national budget.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I believe the gentleman will agree that the amounts we receive will be very much greater in the immediate future than in the distant future.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If we repeat the experience we had in the last war, the largest amount will be received in the first year.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GILLESPIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. GILLESPIE. I believe the gentleman mistated himself. He said the deficit would be fifty to sixty billion dollars.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The budget will be fifty to sixty billion dollars. I thank the gentleman. That was a slip of the tongue.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the courageous statement he has made before the House today. I am no different than any other Member of this body. I am receiving telegrams, letters, and petitions urging me to vote very large sums for nearly every kind of activity, including Federal aid to schools. We have a duty to perform on this floor and that is to preserve a sound economic structure in this country. If we do not do that, what is there left for the hope of the world so far as maintaining world peace is concerned?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Finance, of course, is the cornerstone upon which everything must be based.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I refer to the committee report, page 3, and the title, "Temporary housing for veterans."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman permit me to take up the bill in detail a little bit later?

## FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL, 1946

Carries appropriations totaling \$1,131,552,312.48

Reduction under Budget estimates, \$576,142,136.

Ninety-eight percent of the amount in the bill is traceable to the 12 items in the first tabulation on page 2 of the report.

As will be seen, the outstanding item in the list is the one of \$928,000,000 for national service life insurance. That item alone accounts for 82 percent of the amount carried by the bill.

There is a statement respecting each of the items in the report.

The Employees' Compensation Commission item is for complying with the law regarding the compensation of civilians engaged in Government work who were captured and held prisoners by the Japanese.

For grants to States for unemployemny compensation administration, there is a statement in the middle of page 8 of the report. The amount in the bill will increase the total for this year to \$57,042,000. This pertains to USES, which is involved in the pending rescission bill. That is a question which the conferees will have to work out, including the proposition of bringing into line with this proposition the funds available to the War Manpower Commission for the operation of employment offices. The item under consideration deals strictly with unemployment compensation expenses, but the law fixes an over-all ceiling on appropriations for the two.

Advance planning for public works: Appropriated heretofore \$17,500,000. We provide an additional \$12,500,000. We speak of this matter on pages 8 and 9 of the report. We were asked to provide an additional \$107,500,000, of which \$57,500,000 was by way of contractual authority.

You will note that we are providing that works readied for construction with this advance planning money are not to be financed by Federal lending agencies. The law says that the Congress shall not be in any way committed to appropriate funds to undertake any projects, pans for which were financed from advance planning funds.

It has been announced that the RFC will make loans or cooperate with private lenders for almost any type of construction work. In other words, we advance the money for the planning and the RFC, whose resources the Government owns, will finance or back the financing of construction, which is an indirect way of doing that which Congress has said in the Jaw it would not do. Let us give private capital a chance. Let us make a real effort to regain complete control of the right to appropriate.

The Federal-aid highway item is in response to law. Reference on page 9 of report.

That is true, also, of the item below pertaining to forest roads and trails.

## FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM, \$14,000,000

This money is for the period ending December 31, 1946. Item discussed on page 13 of the report. The estimate and bill provide for an additional amount of approximately \$4,250,000 to be raised by charging 50 cents a day, wherever practicable, for the number of days a man works. The estimated total availability for 1946 calendar year is \$19,564,000, which Secretary Anderson believes will be adequate. This year the availability is about \$32,000,000.

---

As domestic workers return to the farms, as it is hoped they will, the need for bringing in alien labor will diminish. What the situation will be during the next planting and harvesting seasons no one can foretell. This is an insurance appropriation.

As the program nears its end, there arises for consideration the disposition of camps, other facilities, and equipment which have been purchased for use in the housing of agricultural labor. It has been recommended to the committee that authority should be granted to dispose of such property to local public agencies or to nonprofit associations of farmers for continued use in the housing of agricultural labor. We are recommending such authority.

The census item is for enabling the Census Bureau to supply statistics for which there is an urgent demand on account of the switch-over from war to peace. It is a very economical program and should be of genuine value to business and industry in getting squared away for the new economy era. The program is detailed on page 356 of Part I of the hearings.

The reclamation items are explained rather fully in the report, commencing on page 15. The projects are listed on pages 211-212 of Part II of the hearings. If you wish any further word about them, we can hear later from the gentleman from Oklahoma Mr. JOHNSON.

There are many other items in the bill and we have screened them very carefully and very few have escaped without some pruning.

We have omitted from the bill funds under the four heads you will see listed in the lower table on page 2 of the report. They have been omitted without prejudice. All, in our judgment, need to be further studied, and that study can be made and, I am sure, will be made by the regular subcommittees.

The item of temporary housing for veterans could be a boomerang, if approved. I am not so sure that it is not more in the interest of becoming dispossessed of useless temporary housing, owing to its location, than to provide shelter for veterans in areas where a paucity of housing prevails.

The need of colleges for temporary housing for former servicemen has been considerably met by making available trailer-housing which has become idle. This is still going on. That matter is not involved here.

This proposition deals with providing for community shortages. It contemplates sawing up nonportable houses into sections or panels, crating them, and shipping them to new areas where a demand for housing for veterans exists.

Twenty-five thousand units are involved. To dismember, ship, and reerect costs \$2,500 per unit average. To dismember and prepare for shipment costs \$600 per unit average. The estimate contemplates that 20,000 units will be taken by communities which will pay all costs save the \$600 and that 5,000 units will be supplied on requisition to communities, unable to pay, for which the Government will be charged the whole cost.

If the housing has any worth, there is a question as to why communities should not bear the whole expense. If the housing, when erected, would be crude and uninviting, it is questionable whether or not the Government should be sponsoring that kind of shelter. Other than a small amount to smooth over sites from which housing would be removed, no appropriation is necessary if communities really want and will pay for this type of shelter.

---

In any event, the Independent Offices Subcommittee begins hearings on the 28th of this month on the 1947 Budget, and the Deficiency Subcommittee feels that that subcommittee should go into the matter at greater length and in greater detail.

#### VETERANS' HOSPITALS AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES, \$158,320,000

The estimate contemplates, first, additional amounts for construction previously appropriated for; second, additional establishments; and, third, extensions to existing accommodations.

We all recognize that additional permanent accommodations will have to be provided way and beyond what is contemplated by this estimate, which looks to adding 29,445 beds. Present number, 85,094; future objectives, 1955, 171,000; 1965, 249,400; 1975, 298,400.

This is a very important matter. It is felt that the Congress should have some voice in the location of hospitals and in the priority for such locations. It is felt that the Congress should make a study of existing facilities built during the war for the Army and Navy with the idea of later use by the Veterans' Administration, and see what the plan is with respect to such facilities. In other words, that there should be an examination of the Veterans' Administration pattern for future facilities, and that we should not go ahead with expanding programs without some knowledge of the program as a whole to the extent that it can be reasonably projected.

We have passed the item over, therefore, for the fuller consideration of the Independent Offices Subcommittee.

It was represented to the committee that the Veterans' Administration would like some expression of the Congress as to the utilization of war-built facilities, permanently or temporarily. We have included in the bill a paragraph reading as follows:

The administration of Veterans' Affairs, subject to the approval of the Federal Board of Hospitalization, is authorized to utilize such Army and Navy hospitals, temporary or otherwise, not required by the Army or Navy, as such Administrator and the Federal Board of Hospitalization may deem safe and suitable for the hospitalization or domiciliary care of veterans.

#### RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS, \$128,475,000

We have omitted the entire estimate. There are a number of projects which the Deficiency Subcommittee feels should be reexamined by the regular subcommittee having jurisdiction. That may mean a delay of possibly 75 days, because the War Department subcommittee may begin its hearings on the 1947 bill on the 7th of January. This bill will not be a law before the latter part of December. The other bill should be a law before the end of February.

We could have selected out for inclusion in this bill a large number of items, but it was considered to be to the best interests of all who are interested in the projects to have them all go over.

The projects which we feel should be further studied are the multipurpose dam projects. These are always costly installations and it is felt that the need for the multipurpose features should be well established

---

and is sufficient or will be sufficient to warrant the costs of dams of that character. Also, whether or not provision is being made for power when simply provision for future power installations would suffice. There is much money involved in this matter and we owe it to the House and to the people to do this sort of work just as economically as possible.

Mr. Chairman, we have grown so inured to the habit of spending that it is difficult to free ourselves from it. It is difficult for the people to get out of the habit and still more difficult for the Congress to get out of the habit.

After the debacle on Wall Street in which so many men went to ruin in 1929, a philanthropic organization investigated the suicides and found that the great majority of those suicides which followed the crash were not due to the loss of property, but due to the fact that their families could not understand their changed financial status and continued, or attempted to continue, to spend at the old rate at which they had spent in the days before the crash.

We have a crash in this country. We have burned up men and money in the crucible of war to an extent beyond all computation. Like those Wall Street families we must readjust ourselves to a changed financial status; we cannot spend after the crash at the rate at which we spent before the crash, and we must make the people at home understand that, and when they do understand they will support your policies of retrenchment and amortization here on the floor.

We face today a situation comparable only to that which faced American statesmen in the foundation of the Republic, and for that reason I would like to go back to those constituent assemblies which established the Government.

You men who sit here as Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress are the legislative descendant of great men in the Assembly who promulgated the Declaration of Independence and that which evolved the Constitution were men who sat about where we sit today. Perhaps in some ways we have the advantage of them. In the first place, of course, we have a much larger number here in the House. We have 435 Members. Only 56 men signed the Declaration of Independence and 39 signed the Constitution. We are a good deal older than they were then. Those who signed the Declaration of Independence were an average of 43 years old. The men who signed the Constitution averaged 44 years. The average age of the membership in this House is a little over 56 years. We have 10 or 12 years the advantage of them in age and experience.

We are more cosmopolitan. They were sort of a provincial set, those fellows. They came from a little string of settlements along the Atlantic coast. We represent here today every section of the heart of the North American continent.

With the exception of Charles Carroll of Carrollton they all belonged to one church. They all worshipped alike. We belong to divers religious faiths. They all belonged to the same political party. They were Federalists. We represent both major political parties and perhaps some others.

They were largely men of one nationality. Practically all were English. We have here on this floor descendants of every nation in Europe. In other words, my colleagues, we today have every advantage of them. We are older, we are more experienced and we are in a position to take a broader view. We have a richer background. But we face a problem second only in its serious import and implications to that which they faced when

---

they founded this Government. They established the Government. It is up to us to maintain it.

I do not have to ask my colleagues, in passing on the appropriation bills which will come before the House in the next year, to take into consideration as they took into consideration at that time the welfare of the whole people, the welfare of the whole Nation, and the integrity of the Treasury of the United States. Now this is the first criterion. This war is not won until we pay for it. The first interest of the American people is the safety of the Government. With that in view we are thinking of military conscription; of strengthening the Army and maintaining the Navy; of consolidating the various branches of the service. The dominant concern today is safety. But the first line of defense in any nation is a balanced budget. For the next several years that must be our first consideration.



## APPENDIX E

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment, and pending that I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].<sup>1</sup>

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations is again advised by its loving friends—and we are deeply appreciative.

In the House yesterday, I am told, various strictures were pronounced on the Committee on Appropriations, on its personnel, on its procedure, its ethics, and its moral turpitude.

Now, fortunately or unfortunately, I was not on the floor. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and I were at the time conferring with the Bureau of the Budget in my office across the corridor.

It is always customary to give a Member of the House notice in advance when he or his committee is to be made the subject of criticism. But in this instance there was no notice of any kind, and I was denied the opportunity of being present, and knew nothing of it until appraised by others and until I saw it in the RECORD this morning. Consequently, this is the first opportunity I have had to acquiesce with my distinguished friend from Virginia in his high praise and richly-merited encomium of the Committee on Rules.

It must have been a very edifying proceeding, Mr. Speaker. Judging from the RECORD, they seem to have thrown at the Committee on Appropriations everything in the arsenal, including the Constitution, the Bible, and the kitchen sink.

So what I have to say this morning is purely defensive. I never strike except in self-defense. And this is certainly no exception to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, in the beginning, may I disabuse the mind of any Member of the House who may perchance entertain any such unwarranted illusions that there is on the part of any of the members of the Committee on Appropriations, so far as I am aware, any feeling of any kind whatever against the Committee on Rules, or any member of the Committee on Rules. And so far as I am concerned, I have never at any time, either on the floor or off the floor, expressed any sentiment except the warmest fellowship for the committee, and admiration for the manner in which they perform the onerous duties devolving upon them.

I pause here to afford anyone present an opportunity to suggest any possible correction to that sweeping statement.

It is to be noted that both the Constitution and the Bible are cited in the interesting dissertation delivered in this connection. It was quite a sermon, with text and exhortation. I wear no jeweled phylacteries. I am not privileged to express gratitude that I am not as other men. But

---

<sup>1</sup>U.S., Congressional Record, 84th Congress, 1st Session, 1955, CI, Part 9, 11057.

if I might be permitted to add Shakespeare to the other two reference volumes, I would call to mind the admonition of Antonio to Bassanio. And if permitted also to cite Holy Writ, would recall that "The wicked flee when no man pursueth."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman knows the rules. He must proceed in order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I hope no technicalities will be thrown in the way of a free discussion of this matter which has been initiated by others, and to which we have had no opportunity to reply.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may speak out of order, if he desires.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask what was that request?

The SPEAKER. The request was that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed out of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is very gracious.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. So, Mr. Speaker, it was a matter of some surprise to find in this morning's RECORD grave and gratuitous charges against the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, with whom it has been my privilege to serve here in the House for many years, speaking apparently for his committee, and without advance notice to any member of the committee he criticized, charged, first, that the Committee on Appropriations is violating, and has been violating for many years, the rules of the House. Second, that in contravention of the law of the House, the Committee on Appropriations has been holding closed hearings. Third, that the Committee on Appropriations has refused to hear Members and citizens who desired to appear before the committee in behalf of, or in opposition to, pending bills and appropriations. Fourth, that the Committee on Appropriations is continually reaching out for power and deliberately encroaches on the jurisdiction of the legislative committees of the House.

These are serious charges, Mr. Speaker. They are grave indictments and are not to be lightly brought. And they are entitled to a painstaking and considered reply.

Incidentally, we are charged with harboring pique because the Committee on Rules failed to grant a rule requested the other day waiving points of order on the supplementary appropriations bill. That rather ridiculous charge falls when it is recalled that the Committee on Appropriations asked identically the same rule on the first bill of the session, the Independent Offices appropriation bill. That request was refused. If there had been any pique or resentment because of denial of a rule it would have been in order on that occasion. The denial of rules waiving points of order on routine appropriation bills is too inconsequential to give rise to even passing interest.

---

But the charge that the Committee on Appropriations chronically and consistently violates the rules of the House is quite another matter.

The gentleman from Virginia would have us believe that the rules prohibit closed hearings and that this inhibition applies to and is disregarded by the Committee on Appropriations.

Now, I have the greatest respect for the recollection of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I have always found him accurate. It is a matter of regret to find this is an exception to an otherwise flawless record.

Under the law of the House, as adopted in conformity with the Reorganization Act of 1946, the committee has the right to hold executive sessions when so authorized by a vote of the committee; and it will be recalled that immediately following the enactment of the Reorganization Act of 1946, and the incorporation of this provision as paragraph (g) of section 25 of rule XI in House procedure, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who was at that time a member of the Committee on Appropriations, moved that it be the policy and practice of the committee henceforth to hold closed sessions at all hearings before the committee and its subcommittees. The motion was unanimously adopted and is a part of the archives of the committee.

This is a matter, Mr. Speaker, which is entitled to plain speaking here on the floor. The Committee on Appropriations is ready to give its reasons—to explain in detail why it holds closed sessions. In the first place, we do not have the room to hold open sessions. If you relax the rule for one you must relax it for all, and we do not have space or seats for spectators. We hardly have the room at times for representatives of the departments, not to mention casual or curious visitors. Anyone who has had an opportunity to observe the proceedings in another body in recent years knows that there is a vast retinue of people who attend these sessions because they have no place else to go. It is unfortunate that lack of facilities prevents our offering competitive field-day attractions.

But the gentleman from Virginia says we deny Members, citizens, and other interested applicants opportunity to appear before our subcommittees in behalf or in opposition to measure and appropriations under consideration. Nothing could be further from the fact. I must say positively, Mr. Speaker, that in all my experience—and I have served at some time on every subcommittee and in consideration of every departmental appropriation bill under the jurisdiction of the committee—never has anyone, either official or private, whatever their station in life, whether lobbyist on a salary several times that paid the members of the committee or whether patriots from remote sections of the country paying their own expenses to Washington and back home, been denied an opportunity to appear before the committee and present their cause for or against any measure or fund under consideration by the committee. Again I pause to permit anyone to offer evidence in refutation of this rather broad but accurate statement.

John Quincy Adams settled that question for all time to come when he maintained against widespread and strenuous opposition the right of petition, the right of any citizen of the United States to present his views or to appear before a committee. The Committee on Appropriations has at all times and from the beginning sedulously protected and maintained that right.

---

There are other reasons, Mr. Speaker, why we have not held open hearings. Not only is it physically impossible to accommodate spectators, but there are other considerations which will appeal to those who understand as eminently convincing reasons. In providing money for every activity of the Government the committee necessarily handles many explosive problems and some highly confidential information.

During World War II, by some remarkable accident, we broke the Japanese naval code and for 2 weeks the United States Navy knew in advance every move the Japanese Navy proposed to take; where their capital ships would be, where they would take on supplies, where they would receive ammunition and fuel. During those 2 weeks we secured such an advantage over the Japanese Navy that they were never able to recover or overcome it. Then what happened? I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are those who will talk. A reporter found we had broken the code and telegraphed his paper. And 30 minutes after the next edition hit the streets in Chicago, the Japanese changed their code. My friends, do you not think we should have been allowed to hold closed hearings on that question?

There are three members of the Committee on Appropriations present here on the floor this afternoon who knew 2 years in advance we were working on the atomic bomb, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. We went secretly in the night to Oak Ridge. We sweated for 2 years on that nerve-racking proposition. Do you think we ought to have had open hearings on it? If that had been the case, Germany would have beaten us to the punch. We could never have ended the war when we did. It is ridiculous to say that the Committee on Appropriations denies the House or anyone else any information we can give with safety to the country and to national defense. All testimony before the committee is transcribed by competent reporters and published in printed hearings which are available to anyone who asks for them. Copies of all of them go regularly by sealed diplomatic pouch to Stalingrad, and the other chancelleries of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

But the charge is made that we encroach upon the jurisdiction of other committees. The chairman of the Committee on Rules tells the House he himself enlists the chairmen of other committees and secures their collaboration in protesting against the Committee on Appropriations taking over their jurisdictions. My friends, the committee has too much jurisdiction now to suit the members of the Committee on Appropriations. We have far more business than we want. We certainly have no desire to encroach upon the prerogatives or the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House. God forbid.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. SPEAKER, I yield an additional 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, let us take as example, the bill before the House last Thursday, the supplementary appropriation bill.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules, in criticizing the Committee on Appropriations, named three committees which he claimed had been arbitrarily deprived of their rightful jurisdiction by paragraphs included in the bill as reported to the House. He cited the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on House Administration, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Let us take up first the agricultural provision in the bill.

---

Here was a provision for extension of loans by the Farmers' Home Administration to part-time farmers. Two weeks before this bill was prepared the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and asked him if they wanted the Committee on Appropriations to take it up; and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] was told to go ahead and hold the hearings and include the appropriation, which he did. They had the facts in advance; they were consulted, they were asked, and they acquiesced. We did not want it. But that was the only practical way to get the farmers their loans.

So far as the Committee on House Administration was concerned, we had indicated repeatedly that we did not want to take over their work. We had refused to accept sections which they asked us to process and include in this bill.

Likewise the Committee on Appropriations included the item requested by the President relating to veterans reluctantly. The item was a request by the President for \$300,000 to investigate pensions to veterans to see if they were paid enough, if they were paid too much, or if they were paid too little; it was a part of the White House appropriation, and there was no other way to get it before the House.

In fact, most of the appropriations carried in the bill were parts of the administrative program of the President of the United States. They came down to us at the last minute and there was no other way to get the program over except for the committee to include them in that bill.

I do not have to call the attention of the House to the fact that owing to the vast coverage, and to the intricacy of the problems involved, every appropriation bill must necessarily carry some legislation.

In order to meet this situation, 4 years ago I had the staff go over all the bills we had passed at the previous session and tabulate the items subject to points of order. When we had classified them according to jurisdictions, we sent a list to each legislative committee. Many of them, of course, were unimportant; they had been carried in the bill for many years, but they were outside our jurisdiction. Of all the committees of the House who received them, only three gave them any attention.

But, Mr. Speaker, what is the practical effect?

The Committee on Rules by its failure to act makes it possible to deny the House an opportunity to debate these questions, many of them vital to the welfare of the country, to deny the House an opportunity to amend these propositions or to vote on them. All that the Committee on Appropriations does in bringing in these budget estimates in a bill, is to give you an opportunity to consider, debate, modify, and vote. We do not ask you to approve them. We merely ask you to consider them and then vote them up, or vote them down. We give the House an opportunity to function—to carry out its duties under the Constitution. That is what you are here for, that is what your constituents sent you here to do.

The fact that the Committee on Appropriations puts an item in a bill does not mean that the House has to agree to it. We leave that to you. All we do is to give you an opportunity to exercise your prerogative, representing the people of your congressional districts. And the people of your congressional districts are entitled to have you pass on them, the Committee on Rules to the contrary notwithstanding.

Let us look at this in a practical way. The committees of the

---

House—the Committee on Banking and Currency or the Committee on Appropriations—spend weeks and months holding hearings, taking testimony, studying and investigating the many phases involved by competent staffs. Volumes of hearings are printed and great care is taken in sifting the issues, and finally a bill is drawn which represents the best judgment of men versed in the subject with which they deal. Thereupon the Committee on Rules—no member of which has heard a word of testimony or read a page of the hearings or consulted any authority, meet and throw the whole product of the committee into the ashcan—as the housing bill for example. I have no personal feeling about the matter but is it common horsesense?

Now the Committee on rules has certain functions within its province.

We were told on the floor yesterday that the Committee on Rules gives Members an opportunity to hide out, an opportunity to pass the buck if voting on a bill might embarrass them—if it would endanger their reelection. But on the Democratic side it goes still deeper than that.

What is the function of the Committee on Rules? We have traveled far afield in the interpretation and adaptation of the functions of the Committee on Rules. Let us get back to the fundamentals. There have been two great revisions of the rules of the House in modern times, the first one in 1880 and the last one in 1911. If you will read the debates on those two great revisions with relation to the duties of the Committee on Rules you will find that committee was not intended to retard legislation. Wherever there was a conflict as to priority the Committee on Rules was designed to resolve the conflict. They were to make possible the consideration of a bill which otherwise could not be considered. They were never authorized, it was never intended, that they should deny the House the right to pass upon any proposition reported by other committees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, may I quote from the great Parliamentarian, Asher C. Hinds, who knew more about the procedure of the House than any man who ever lived. Asher Hinds excelled in parliamentary knowledge anyone who has ever served the United States Congress since 1789.

Here is what he said:

The Committee on Rules officiates as to the consideration of bills only when, for some reason, the ordinary method prescribed by the rules for the order of business is not satisfactory or produces delay.

The purpose of the rules was to put the matter before the House and put it before the House now.

Hinds further said:

The number of bills in relation to which it officiates by reporting special orders is relatively few.

It never occurred to him that the time would ever come when the Committee on Rules would arrogate to itself the authority to pass on every bill reported out by a committee of the House. And to deny it consideration as it has denied the House the right and opportunity to

---

consider the housing bill or items objected to in the supplementary appropriation bill.

The absurdity of the situation is further emphasized by the fact that the greater number of the items will be put back in the bill by the Senate.

Members here have protested, with tongue in cheek, that the stripping of the supplementary bill contravenes the right of the House to initiate appropriation bills. That issue is not before us. The Committee on Appropriations by reporting out the bill initiated the appropriations whether the Committee on Rules makes it possible to vote on them or not. And the Senate which has always had the right to amend House appropriation bills has the right to amend this bill and will exercise that right. So what has been gained by the failure of the Committee on Rules to make it possible for the House to pass on the bill the Committee on Appropriations has reported? It is technically gone to seed.

In 1911, when the question of rules was before the House, Mr. Norris, of Nebraska, one of the notable men of his time, said:

One of the greatest prerogatives of the Members of this body is to be permitted to vote upon propositions material to our people and propositions material to the control of our own body.

Sherley, of Kentucky, one of the ablest men who ever served in this body, said:

The American people are a practical people and as a practical people they will judge the House—not by the intricacies of parliamentary law but by the results that follow.

All this talk, all this circumlocution, all this tempest in a teapot here, all the parliamentary peccadillos, are beside the point. The people at home want action. They want us to vote on the questions before the country today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What was the purpose in making points of order against the bill when it was under consideration?

Mr. CANNON. For the reasons just given but especially to show the devious processes by which the Dixon-Yates proponents seek to cloud the issue. If the Dixon-Yates paragraph had not been in the supplementary appropriation bill there would have been no difficulty about securing a rule.

The action on the supplementary bill was designed to focus attention on efforts to avoid the Dixon-Yates item coming to a record vote in the House.

And do not underrate the possibilities of the Dixon-Yates contract still being enforced. The ranking member of the committee said when the bill was reported that there was every confidence that Memphis would not build its plant and if it did not, the Dixon-Yates contract would still be in effect.

Creeping monopoly, as exemplified by the Dixon-Yates contract, is the issue at stake in the supplementary bill and in the refusal of the Committee on Rules to vote a rule.

---

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia Mr. SMITH, 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York Mr. TABER, and then move the previous question.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia Mr. SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I feel sufficiently chastised. There is a certain number of innings to a ball game. The Committee on Appropriations had its inning on Thursday and batted around quite a few balls. I had a feeble inning yesterday. Then the Committee on Appropriations had a little bit of an inning again yesterday. Now the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has had his inning and normally, under the rules of the game, I would be entitled to another inning. But I forfeit my right to the final inning. I am just here taking the floor to say this, that notwithstanding everything that has been said about this matter, two questions still remain. Who scuttled the supplementary appropriation bill? The Committee on Rules did not do it. The other question is this. They do not hold any public hearings in the Committee on Appropriations. And I invite your attention again to rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The only reason I took the floor was to say that we have all had our innings. A good time has been had by all. I am not mad with anybody and I hope nobody is mad with me. Let us forget about this little incident. I just want to close the war. Everybody has had his say. I still love CLARENCE CANNON, as I always have. I have the highest regard and respect and affection for every member of the great Committee on Appropriations. They are doing a stupendous job and a man-killing job. I love them all.

Let us get down to business and forget about this incident.

---



## APPENDIX F

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.<sup>1</sup>  
The clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concur therein.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, objection has been made to sending to conference a supplementary appropriation bill carrying more than one-half billion dollars in needless appropriations. If there is any question as to its need, the chairman of the subcommittee which reported the bill advises that there is nothing in the bill of immediate emergency. Such items as may in the future require consideration can very well go over to the next Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as Thomas Jefferson said in an immortal document: "A just consideration for the opinion of mankind requires that we give reason for our action."

So, I give you here today the reason why this action is taken.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], one of the great men of the House of Representatives, is leaving his congressional service with the end of this session. If I had my way I would keep him here because I think he is needed. But he has more than earned the right to a vacation. He is entitled to the last and best years of his life for himself, for his family, his friends, and his books, and in order to catch up with his long neglected fishing.

At a dinner tendered him as a tribute to his distinguished service and as a token of the warm affection in which he is universally held, statistics were quoted of the national situation at the beginning and close of his service, as follows:

The year Mr. TABER came here the total annual public expenditure was \$3 billion. The first year that he was here Congress spent \$3 billion. We are spending this year \$115 billion, the largest amount ever spent in a peacetime year in the history of the American Congress.

Gentlemen, when you go home you can attract special attention by saying, "I have just come from a \$100 billion Congress." You are the first man ever to go back to your congressional district from a \$100 billion Congress in all its history.

When Mr. TABER came here the number of employees of the Federal Government was 536,000. Today it is 2,514,000.

When he came here the public debt was \$22 billion. Today it is \$302 billion. It is now past the high water mark. It is the largest debt in the history of the United States. It is the largest debt ever

---

<sup>1</sup>U.S., Congressional Record, 87th Congress, 2d Session, 1962, CVIII, Part 17, 23485.

owed by any nation in any country in the history of the world. And we are still busily adding to it as fast as we can and every year spending more than we take in.

That is why the purchasing power of the dollar is down to less than half. That is why the cost of living for every family of the United States is up. That is why our gold is dwindling at Fort Knox. We are spending at the rate of \$115 billion a year—far above our revenues.

We are still taxing the people at wartime rates. In the past we have repealed war taxes levied to keep the troops in the field as soon as peace was declared. But not this time. We are today levying every tax dollar we can draw out of the American people. We are still exacting the same taxes we levied to keep our armies fighting in Europe. And with all that extra revenue we are spending more than we take in.

An instance is the item we just passed. Although congressional expenditures are already larger than ever before we have just added a program which will cost a fabulous sum before it is completed for a project rejected by every authority we consulted.

This must be added to the public debt already of recordbreaking proportions. From your vote it is evident that all you gentlemen favor increasing the public debt. When you go home tell your people you voted today to increase the public debt; that you believe the public debt is too small, that you believe we ought to owe more money; that you believe that the purchasing power of the dollar should be depreciated; that the American people are living too cheaply; that the cost of living ought to be higher, so you vote to raise it.

That is what you voted for just now.

The supplemental bill which we are objecting will add more than half a billion dollars to the national debt. I know you high-cost-of-living gentlemen will be disappointed that you will not have an opportunity to add it to the bill you have just voted through. The name of every Congressman who voted for it is right here in this yea-and-nay vote. Why not send it back home to be posted in every voting poll in your district?

The chairman of the committee who reported it says it is not necessary. He says it will in no way discommode the Government if you fail to pass it this year. So we are adhering to the refusal to permit you to add further to the taxes of your already overburdened taxpayers. As you did in the vote just taken.

Surely, gentlemen, we ought to be satisfied with a debt of \$302 billion. Why insist on owing more money? Why add to it? That is what you voted to do just now. And will you tell us what your people and your district get out of it? Nothing but more taxes.

There is many a taxpayer out on a small farm, a small businessman in the local town, a workingman here who has a hard time paying even a few dollars of taxes. But when the Internal Revenue men bring it to Washington we spend it all; we spend it as you have spent it today. We send it down to Florida. Florida received everything, every project she asked except this one item. She received more proportionately than most any State in the Union. She received 10 projects. This was a particularly bad item. But it is fine for the promoters. In one case down there they bought land for 5 cents an acre and got the Government to build some public works and sold it for \$5,000 an acre.

Florida could not get this item in the bill when we wrote the bill

But legislation suffers.

Congress ought to go home. Congressmen ought to stay in touch with the people and find out what they need, what they are talking about, what their sentiments are. If Members had kept in touch with the voters we would not have had the vote we had here just now. And, Mr. Speaker, we have not had any outstanding generalship in the House this session.

We had a little controversy with the Senate some time ago in changing the obsolete, antiquated machinery in order to discourage the habit of the Senate of adding unwarranted sums to House appropriation bills.

The other body sought to take away a prerogative lodged in the House by the Founding Fathers who wisely provided that the strongest hold on the pursestrings of the Nation should be in the hands of the House of Representatives because it is closest to the people, and has to come before the people every 2 years.

It has been the prerogative of the House since 1789. In that battle we did not have the support of the leadership. Daily we were importuned by the Speaker to yield to the Senate, to surrender the prerogatives of the House, to agree on any terms.

The Committee on Appropriations, under heavy criticism, maintained its position but it was in spite of the leadership of the House when it should have been supporting us.

The leadership is supposed under ordinary circumstances to collaborate with the committees. After a committee has studied a bill, held hearings, processed a bill, and has spent months bringing in a report—other things being equal—the committees are entitled to the support of the leadership of the House. Last night my good friend HALE BOGGS, after vigorously campaigning for Florida, brushed the Parliamentary aside. He stood there like an avenging angel. I have never seen anything like it before. You could not get to the Speaker even if he had been willing to see you. My good friend from Oklahoma, CARL ALBERT, assiduously opposed every effort for economy by the committee in trying to maintain the bill it had unanimously reported.

The other day there was an insulting speech made in the Senate in which they charged Members of the House with moral obloquy and delinquencies because they used their frank as every Congressman from Washington's administration has done.

When the A's in the alphabet were called Mr. ALBERT voted against the committee, the unanimous report of the committee, and then at the last minute, after he had given the signal to the House, and everybody had voted, he changed his vote so that it would look a little better.

The majority leader of the House came to me last night, after the rollcall started and said, "If you will agree to let this half billion dollar bill go through"—the one they said we did not need—"we will turn and support you and give you this motion."

In other words, gentlemen, justice is for sale. No thought of principle. No thought of the obligation of office. It is a question of the highest bidder.

At the end of these long months, the longest peacetime session Congress has had—and with no visible reason—I honor the high office they hold but I cannot endorse the quality of leadership.

I have sat under 10 Speakers—but I have never seen such biased and inept leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a summary tabulation on the

---

in the subcommittee. They could not get it in the bill when it was reported by the subcommittee to the full committee. They could not get it in the bill when the full committee reported it to the House. They could not get it in the bill when the House conferees took it up with the Senate conferees. So they come in here today and buttonhole every man on the floor. "What is the U.S. Treasury between friends?"

Remember these boys are asking for something for themselves. The committee has not personal interest. The only thing the committee has to gain by this is ill will and unpopularity for being a "wet blanket." But surely somebody has to protect the taxpayers' money. The committee does not seem to have any friends here today. The taxpayers' do not seem to have any friends here today. Everybody is the friend of these ingratiating gentlemen from Florida.

A woman wrote me yesterday that she took a dozen eggs to market and got 24 cents for them, and it was not enough to pay for postage stamps to write to each of her children. Yet you raised postage the other day. "Oh, the people are not paying enough. Sure, vote to make them pay more postage and more taxes."

Mr. Speaker, who is leading this raid on the public Treasury today? The gentlemen from Florida—fine fellows, of course—I love every one of them. The great Sunshine State of Florida is taking population from every State of the Union. New York up here lost a Congressman. They have put him down in Florida. And they have tax laws down there that pull New York money down there too. They are attracting population from all over. The reason they readjusted your districts this year is that Florida is such an enticing State. Yet they are so poverty stricken that they must come up to Washington and run over the Committee on Appropriations which has no interest whatever except to discharge the duties and serve the purpose for which appointed.

They are as redoubtable a gang of pirates as ever sailed the Spanish Main, and my State and your State are paying the bill in onerous taxes. Millions of dollars were plundered by Captain Kidd and Blue Beard, but the amount of money Kidd and Blue Beard took pales into insignificance compared to the money these highwaymen have taken from the U.S. Treasury here this morning. You cannot give them enough. No matter how much you give them, they want more. They come in here after being denied by an impartial committee and try their case here on the floor. Nobody except Florida insisted on trying their case on the floor. Why have a committee if you are going to support these rebels against legitimate authority like other Caribbean freebooters in Central and South American principalities?

Today, gentlemen, you have voted to increase the annual expenditures of the Nation although the Government is already spending the largest amount ever spent in one peacetime year in the history of any nation on earth.

You have today added to the number of Government employees when they are falling over each other in every department. Competent men tell us that if they had only one-third the number of employees in the Pentagon, they could do better work. That is true of every department of the Government. You have today voted to increase the national debt already so large that it staggers the imagination. I was in Germany after the war. At one time the German mark was an unassailable standard of value throughout Europe. Then Germany followed this primrose path until

---

eventually the depositor had to carry his money to the bank in a basket. When he got to the bank, the bank did not count the money. It just distributed the bills by demonination and weighed it.

In 1936 when a housewife took a dollar downtown to the grocery store, she got \$1.07 worth of groceries for that dollar. Nations all over the world were scrambling for that dollar. They wanted hard cash. But now they are not so keen about it. Today it is only worth 44 cents.

Many a man who must earn his living by the sweat of his brow is having a hard time buying school shoes for his children. He is having a hard time filling the plates on the breakfast table. But when we send the tax collector around, he has to ante up. Here today you are telling that man to let his children wear their shoes a little longer after they are already worn out. You are telling the parents of some of those children to send them to school without an egg for breakfast or without a slice of bacon so they will have enough to pay the taxes you voted on them this morning for the golden Sunshine State of prosperous Florida.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the motion is agreed to. There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 19, line 5, insert: "After September 30, 1962, the position of Commissioner of Reclamation shall have an annual rate of compensation as provided for positions listed in section 2205(a) of title 5, United States Code, so long as held by the present incumbent."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 13 and concur therein.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 13 was inserted by the conferees after having been passed in the Senate version of the bill. In part it represents a policy that I cannot go along with. It provides for increase of salary for the Commissioner of Reclamation from \$19,000 to \$20,000 a year. I am opposed to the inclusion in appropriation bills of increases in salary. I think that ought to be taken care of by the appropriate legislative committee.

If we do not this idea of these civil servants running around to somebody who has an appropriation bill up, if we do not begin to stop that practice and stop the way we are doing business I can see no hope for the people of the United States. We heard what the chairman of the committee said in his statement as to the financial condition of the Government. That is the thing that worries me very much, and I do not believe we can continue long in the direction things are going at the present time. For my own part I am opposed to this motion and I hope it will be voted down.

---

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 29, line 7, strike out "1962" and insert "1963".

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 and concur therein.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the summer has waxed and waned; the birds have nested and flown; the leaves are falling in the autumn breeze, but Congress still stays on.

We should have been home long ago. There are more new districts in the United States this year than in any previous election. In some districts the change has been comparatively small. They have added one county or they have taken away one county. But there are more districts this time in the United States in which there is readjustment, in which there are new constituents, than in any previous election.

We should have had an opportunity to go home. These constituents want to see their new Congressman, they want to hear him; and I am certain the new Congressman wants to see his new constituents. But we have been kept here longer than at any time before, except in time of war. Do not ask me why. I do not know.

Someone is ready to comment that the last bill here this morning is an appropriation bill. It must be the Appropriations Committee. Why did you not hurry up?

I remind you that early in the session we reminded the leadership that we would not process appropriation bills until we had authorization. Happily, under the American Constitution, you cannot appropriate a dollar that is not authorized by law. The legislative committees hold the whip hand. The delay on the pending bill is due to the fact that we do not have authorizations. That has been true of most of our bills. We have been here from January to October, but the last authorization bill came in last night.

Before the change in the Constitution, we went home every other year on the 4th of March. Every bill had been passed, everything was done that needed to be done. There was never a year in which we failed to complete the legislative program in ample time to adjourn by March 4. Why did we not go home in March of this year, or at least in July, according to law? I am convinced, we would not have had votes like we had here this morning if we had been back home, rubbing shoulders with our constituents, if we had had an opportunity to see the hard conditions under which they live.

Back here in Washington we are in these lovely air-conditioned offices. We do not have to be bothered by constituents running in on us.

---

bill and the usual list of additional surveys and the studies agreed to in conference:

---