

COPYRIGHT BY
RICHARD STEPHEN BROOKS
1957

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE SECTIONAL AND SENIORITY BASES OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE
CHAIRMANSHIPS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1889-1954

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
RICHARD STEPHEN BROOKS
Norman, Oklahoma
1956

THE SECTIONAL AND SENIORITY BASES OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE
CHAIRMANSHIPS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1889-1954

APPROVED BY

Arthur C. Brown
Joseph L. Flinn
J. H. Hask
H. L. Harrison
A. Christian

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Problems	
The Chairmen and the Committees	
The Sources	
The Historical Landmarks	
II. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.....	13
The Effect of Party Control of the House on the Distribution of Chairmen	
Congressional Apportionment and Sectional Distribution	
Republicans from Democratic Sections and Democrats from Republican Sections	
State Distribution	
The Chairmen of the Exclusive Committees	
Sectional Representation on the Various Committees	
Summary	
III. THE FAVORED STATES AND SECTIONS.....	47
Objectives and Methods	
Sectional Representation on the Committee Chairmanships	
Sectional Representation on the Exclusive Chairmanships	
Sectional Representation Under the Legislative Reorganization Act	
State Representation	
Summary	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Chapter	Page
IV. SENIORITY.....	82
The Origin of the Rule of Seniority The Overthrow of Cannon and the Legislative Reorganization Act Length of Service The Long Tenure Chairmen The "Failures" The Southern Chairmen The Eastern and Middle Western Republicans Committee Eminence Summary	
V. TENURE AS CHAIRMAN.....	123
Length of Service Reasons for Leaving the Chairmanship Involuntary Loss of Chairmanships Voluntary Loss of Chairmanship Summary	
VI. QUALIFICATIONS.....	136
Profession and Occupation Education Age Previous Public Service Summary	
VII. CONCLUSIONS.....	160
The Questions Does the South Really Dominate the Democratic Chairmanships? Do the East and Middle West Really Dominate the Republican Chairmanships? Are the Various Committees Dominated by Particular Sections?	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
Chapter	
VII. CONCLUSIONS (continued)	
Is Sectional Domination of the Chairmanships a Result of Seniority and Safe Districts?	
Is the Apprentice Period for Committee Chair- men too Long?	
Does Seniority Promote Unqualified Men to the Committee Chairmanships?	
Is Seniority the Cause of Party Irresponsibility? .	
APPENDIX.....	181
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	205

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of Chairmen of House Standing Committees, by Political Party and Geographic Section, Selected Periods, 1889-1954.....	19
2. Number of Chairmanships of House Standing Committees, by Political Party and Geographic Section, Selected Periods, 1889-1954.....	20
3. Number of Chairmen and Number of Chairmanships of House Standing Committees from Eastern States, by Political Party and by State, 1889-1954.....	26
4. Number of Chairmen and Number of Chairmanships of House Standing Committees from Middle Western States, by Political Party and by State, 1889-1954.....	27
5. Number of Chairmen and Number of Chairmanships of House Standing Committees from Southern States, by Political Party and by State, 1889-1954.....	28
6. Number of Chairmen and Number of Chairmanships of House Standing Committees from Western States, by Political Party and by State, 1889-1954.....	29
7. Number of Chairmen and Number of Chairmanships of House Standing Committees from Border States, by Political Party and by State, 1889-1954.....	30
8. Number of Chairmen and Number of Chairmanships of Exclusive Committees of the House, by Political Party and Geographic Section, 1889-1954.....	33
9. Number of Chairmen of House Standing Committees, by Geographic Section and Committee, 1889-1954.	40

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
10. Over and Underrepresentation on the Democratic Chairmanships, by Section, 1889-1954.....	52
11. Over and Underrepresentation on the Republican Chairmanships, by Section, 1889-1954.....	55
12. Over and Underrepresentation on the Committee Chairmanships, by Section, 1889-1954.....	57
13. Over and Underrepresentation on the Exclusive Chairmanships, by Section, 1889-1954.....	59
14. Over and Underrepresentation on the Committee Chairmanships, by Section, 1947-1954.....	64
15. Over and Underrepresentation on the Committee Chairmanships, by State, 1889-1954.....	69
16. Average Number of Years Served in Congress Prior to Becoming Chairman of a Standing Committee, by Political Party and Geographic Section, Selected Periods, 1889-1954.....	89
17. Average Number of Years Served in Congress by Chairmen of Standing Committees, by Political Party and Geographic Section, Selected Periods, 1889-1954.....	92
18. Percentage of Standing Committee Chairmen Serving 8 Years or Less in Congress, by Geographic Section, Selected Periods, 1889-1954.....	93
19. Distribution of Standing Committee Chairmanships by Number of Years Served in Congress Prior to Becoming Chairman, by Geographic Section, 1889-1954.....	95
20. Distribution of the Chairmanships of Exclusive Committees by Number of Years Served in Congress Prior to Becoming Chairman, by Geographic Section, 1889-1954.....	96

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
21.	Distribution of Chairmen of Standing Committees by Number of Years Served in Congress, by Geographic Section, 1889-1954.....	98
22.	Distribution of Chairmen of Exclusive Committees by Number of Years Served in Congress, by Geographic Section, 1889-1954.....	99
23.	Number of Chairmen Who Served 17 Years or More in Congress, by Political Party and Geographic Section, 1889-1954.....	101
24.	Number of Congressmen with Ten or More Terms of Service in the House of Representatives, 1931-1954.....	104
25.	Number and Percentage of Standing Committee Chairmen Serving 12 Years or Less and 13 Years or More in Congress by Geographic Section, 1889-1954.....	108
26.	Average Number of Years Served in Congress Prior to Becoming Chairman of Standing Committees, by Committee, 1889-1954.....	113
27.	Distribution of Chairmanships by Number of Terms Served as Chairman, by Geographic Section and Political Party, 1889-1954.....	125
28.	Reasons for Leaving the Chairmanship of House Standing Committees.....	129
29.	Sectional Distribution of House Committee Chairmen Defeated in Primaries and Elections...	130
30.	Distribution of Chairmen by Reason for Resigning from the House and Failing to Seek Renomination, 1889-1954.....	133
31.	Occupations and Professions of House Committee Chairmen, 1889-1954.....	138

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table	Page
32. Sectional Distribution of Lawyers.....	140
33. Educational Attainment of House Committee Chairmen.....	148
34. Median Age of House Committee Chairmen at the Time of Their First Election to Congress, 1889-1954.....	150
35. Sectional Distribution of Chairmen by Age Elected to Congress.....	152
36. Percentage Distribution of Chairmen at the Time of Their Election to Congress.....	153
37. Average Age of Chairmen at the Time of Promotion to the Chairmanship for Selected Committees....	155
38. Previous Public Service of House Committee Chairmen.....	156

THE SECTIONAL AND SENIORITY BASES OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE
CHAIRMANSHIPS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1889-1954

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problems

This study is limited in scope to the investigation of two problems relating to the standing committee chairmanships of the United States House of Representatives. The first is the problem of sectionalism and the regional basis of the committee chairmanships. Secondly, the rule of seniority and the selection of committee chairmen is considered. Thus, this study is not a comprehensive survey of the House committee chairmen. Perhaps the greatest omission is the question of the role played by chairmen as leaders in the legislative process. No attempt has been made to describe the nature or extent of the influence of chairmen in shaping legislative policy.

For the study of the regional aspects of the committee chairmanships, the states have been grouped into five geo-

graphic sections -- East, Middle West, South, West, and Border. The East includes New England, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The Middle West includes the seven states of Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio. The Border states consist of Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri. The South consists of the eleven secession states and Oklahoma. The remaining fifteen states are included in the West.

A frequently commented-upon phenomenon of American politics is the domination of the committee chairmanships of Congress by particular geographic sections. Most often mentioned is Southern domination of the Democratic chairmanships, but it is also quite apparent that the Republican chairmanships are not evenly distributed throughout the nation. During the past sixty-six years, the South has supplied almost one half of the Democratic standing committee chairmen of the House of Representatives, and the East and Middle West have supplied almost four-fifths of the Republican chairmen.

It is generally agreed that sectional domination of chairmanships is a result of two things: the existence of what is popularly known as a one-party system in large areas of the United States and the rule of seniority. The one-party system, because of the lack of opposition in general elections, enables the congressmen from those areas in which it exists to establish amazing records of long and continuous

service. And from this it follows that the rule of seniority, which awards the chairmanship of a committee to the member with the longest continuous service, automatically gives the lion's share of the chairmanships to these areas.

This explanation of the causal relation between seniority, one-party politics, and the sectional domination of the committee chairmanships, though fairly accurate, is believed to be somewhat over-simplified. A basic objective of the present study is to provide a method for the evaluation of regional representation on the House committee chairmanships and to determine, if possible, the extent and cause of sectional domination.

Seniority has many aspects. This rule governs the assignment of offices in the House Office Building, the seating arrangements at official dinners and in the committee room, the assignment of members to committees, and the selection of committee chairmen. A comprehensive investigation of the institution of seniority would cover all of these. The present study, however, is concerned only with the rule as it applies to the selection of chairmen. The method used is a statistical analysis of length of service in the House, and data have been collected on chairmen only. A definitive study of seniority would collect data on all committee members, especially the senior minority members of the various committees.

In addition to the problem mentioned above (the relation of seniority to sectional representation on the committee chairmanships), an attempt will be made to determine the effect of two historical events -- the famous "revolution" of 1910-11 and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946-- upon the development of the rule of seniority. Some attention will also be devoted to the origin of seniority as the prevailing principle governing the selection of chairmen.

The matter of tenure as chairman, that is, the length of time chairmen hold office, may be considered as the reverse side of promotion by seniority. Once elected to office a chairman may not be removed without his consent. In regard to this problem an attempt has been made to answer a series of questions: How long do chairmen remain at the head of their committees? Is there a rapid turnover or do vacancies occur infrequently? Why do chairmen give up their positions? Do they hold office until deprived of it by death or defeat or do they frequently retire voluntarily? How many chairmen leave the House to run for the Senate? How many are defeated in primaries or elections?

A frequent criticism of the seniority system is that it sometimes elevates to the chairmanship a man unqualified for the job. This question has been approached by an examination of the background of the chairmen in terms of formal education, profession and occupation, age, and public

service. No attempt has been made to evaluate their abilities in terms of the more subjective, and perhaps more important, criteria such as general ability as a floor leader and in presiding over a committee, the degree of expertness acquired in the subject matter over which a committee has jurisdiction, or the consistency of their support of party policy.

The Chairmen and the Committees

In the sixty-six-year period since the convening of the 51st Congress in 1889, 696 Congressmen have served as chairmen of the seventy-seven standing committees of the United States House of Representatives. Testimonials to the importance of this group of men are more than abundant. With a degree of exaggeration Woodrow Wilson called the government of the United States "a government by the chairmen of the standing committees of Congress."¹ Robert Luce has said that "the chairmen of the standing committees of an American lawmaking body are more responsible than any other group for the character of its product."² An almost endless list of similar quotations could be compiled. This calls attention to the interesting possibility that the influence of chairmen in formulating legislative policy has

¹ Woodrow Wilson, Congressional Government (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1885), 102.

² Robert Luce, Legislative Procedure (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1922), 122.

been over-emphasized. Nevertheless, a glance at a list of the standing committee chairmen will reveal that it includes a sizeable portion of the members of the House who have had a hand in determining the course of legislation.

Many of the chairmen in this study are well known to students of American history. From their ranks have come a large number of Cabinet members, Senators, Judges, Governors, and Speakers of the House. One became President of the United States and two became Vice President. Many famous legislative acts bear the names of House committee chairmen. In a group of seven committees one finds such names as Gilbert N. Haugen, Asbury F. Lever, Andrew J. Volstead, John J. Esch, James R. Mann, William P. Hepburn, Fred A. Hartley, Richard P. "Silver Dick" Bland, Robert Ramspeck, and Carter Glass. The names of the chairmen of the ways and means committee read like chapter titles in a history of the tariff. Some of the chairmen of this committee were Willis G. Hawley, Joseph W. Fordney, Oscar W. Underwood, Sereno E. Payne, Nelson Dingley, William L. Wilson, and William McKinley.

Not all of the chairmen of standing committees have left their mark on the legislative history of the United States. For each of the great legislative leaders in this study there is one who is saved from oblivion by a half dozen lines in the Biographical Directory of the American

Congress. And the seventy-seven committees, like the chairmen, run the gamut of the scale of significance. They range in importance from the powerful and influential committees on ways and means, rules, and appropriations to the insignificant committees on mileage, expenditures on public buildings, ventilation and acoustics, and disposition of useless executive papers.

This study is limited in scope to the chairmen of standing committees. It does not include the chairmen of select committees, subcommittees, or conference committees. In regard to the chairmen of joint standing committees, however, some have been included and others excluded. Four joint committees, library, printing, enrolled bills, and disposition of executive papers, have been considered as regular standing committees; the chairmen of the other joint committees have been omitted. Justification for this procedure is based on the method of selecting chairmen and committee members. The chairmen and members of the four committees mentioned above have always been chosen in the same manner as the regular standing committees. The other joint standing committees have usually been set up by statute, with the chairmanship and membership defined by the statutes which created them.

The Sources

The student of the national House of Representatives is indeed fortunate in the great quantity of literature on this subject produced by numerous scholars of political science. The amount of material on House committee chairmen alone is quite extensive. In fact, three of the chairmen in this study have been prolific writers. De Alva Stanwood Alexander, chairman of the rivers and harbors committee in the 61st Congress and for fourteen years a Congressman from New York, has written several books including a History and Procedure of the House of Representatives (1916). Robert Luce, who served twenty years in the House and ten years as a committee chairman, has produced no less than five volumes on the subject of legislation.³ Clarence Cannon, now serving his sixth term as chairman of the appropriations committee and his seventeenth consecutive term in the House, has compiled several volumes of Precedents of the House of Representatives (1935-1941).

Two books written more than half a century ago remain outstanding as studies of the national legislature. Woodrow Wilson's classic study, Congressional Government (1885), was perhaps the first to focus attention on the committee system and the power and influence of committee

³ These are Legislative Procedure (1922), Legislative Assemblies (1924), Congress, An Explanation (1926), Legislative Principles (1930), and Legislative Problems (1935).

chairmen in the legislative process. Lauros G. McConachie's Congressional Committees (1898) is a thorough analysis of the development of the committee system from the beginning of Congress to 1895. Some of the chapters in this book contain a considerable amount of information on committee chairmen during the first century of Congress. A few of the recent writers in the field of legislation who have been especially helpful for the present study are James M. Burns,⁴ Roland A. Young,⁵ Floyd M. Riddick,⁶ Robert Heller,⁷ George B. Galloway,⁸ Ernest S. Griffith,⁹ Bertram M. Gross,¹⁰ and Stephen K. Bailey.¹¹

The basic source materials for this study have been the Congressional Directory, the Congressional Record, and

⁴ Congress on Trial (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949).

⁵ This is Congress (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1943).

⁶ The United States Congress: Organization and Procedure (Washington: National Capitol Publishers, 1949).

⁷ Strengthening the Congress (National Planning Association, 1945).

⁸ The Legislative Process in Congress (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1953).

⁹ Congress: Its Contemporary Role (New York: New York University Press, 1951).

¹⁰ The Legislative Struggle: A Study in Group Combat (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1953).

¹¹ Congress at Work (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1952).

the Biographical Directory of the American Congress.¹² Of these the first was far the most important. If necessary all of the statistical data could be obtained from the Congressional Directory, but the Record has been used as a check on the accuracy of the data and the Biographical Directory has been used for convenience. Hinds' Precedents and Cannon's Precedents have also been used extensively, especially in regard to the development of the seniority rule.¹³

The Historical Landmarks

The history of the House of Representatives since 1889 falls naturally into three periods. The first begins with the election of Thomas B. Reed to the speakership and the adoption of the "Reed rules" in 1889 and 1890 and ends with the general revision of the House rules in 1910 and 1911, often referred to as the "revolution of 1910-11" or the "overthrow of Czar Cannon." The second begins with this date and ends with the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which completely reorganized the

12

James L. Harrison (compiler), Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950).

13

Asher C. Hinds, Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States (5 vols.; Washington: Government Printing Office, 1907); Clarence Cannon, Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States (6 vols.; Washington, Government Printing Office, 1935-1941). These have been published as a single set of eleven volumes, with the first five comprising Hinds' Precedents and volumes 6-11 comprising Cannon's Precedents.

committee system of the House. The third period covers the years from 1947 to the present.

Previous to 1911 standing committee chairmen were appointed by the Speaker. Since 1911 the rules have provided for the election of chairmen of the House. In actual practice, however, chairmen have been chosen by the committee on committees and approved by the party caucus. The effect of this change in the rules upon the operation of the seniority rule is difficult to evaluate. This event is usually assumed to mark the beginning of seniority in the House, and it is undoubtedly true that it has had a great effect upon the actual application of the rule. From one viewpoint, however, its effects are scarcely perceptible. It resulted in very little change in the length of time required to become a committee chairman. When the Speaker appointed the chairmen it took almost as many years to climb the ladder of seniority as it has since that time.

The effect of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 upon the office of committee chairman cannot be overemphasized. By reducing the number of standing committees from forty-eight to nineteen, this act eliminated the minor committees. The corollary of this is that the minor chairmanships were also abolished. The effect of this has been to limit the chairmanships to congressmen with exceedingly long tenures, thereby greatly enhancing the importance of

the seniority principle. Paradoxically enough the congressional reformers who pushed through the reorganization of 1946 were, in general, critical of the "senility rule," but retention of the latter was part of the price paid for the passage of the act.

CHAPTER II

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

The Effect of Party Control of the House on the Distribution of Chairmen

The five geographic sections have a distinctly partisan¹ flavor. Decidely Republican are the East, Middle West, and West, while the Border states are strongly Democratic and the South almost unanimously Democratic. Consequently, party control of the House of Representatives has a very definite influence on the geographic distribution of the committee chairmanships. When the Democrats organize the House, the great majority of the chairmen will come from the Southern and Border states; when the Republicans control, these two sections receive very few chairmanships. In order to obtain a balanced picture of the distribution of committee chairmen, it is essential to select a period in which party control of the House is fairly evenly divided between the two major political parties. That is to say, the variable of party control can be eliminated by choosing

¹ For the sectional classification of the states see pp. 1-2 above.

a period in which the House was controlled by the Republican and Democratic parties for an almost equal number of years.

Party strength in the various sections can be measured by a party's ability to win congressional elections. On the basis of this criterion the Middle West is the "most Republican" section, for in the twenty-five elections from 1896 to 1944 the Republicans won 70 per cent of the contests² for the House of Representatives in this section. Using the same criterion the East is 66 per cent Republican and the West 63 per cent. In the Border states Democrats won 67 per cent of the elections; the South is 95 per cent Democratic.

Party domination of the chairmanships of the various sections reflects the election results. Of the chairmen from the Middle West, 73 per cent have been Republicans. Measured by this same criterion the East is 74 per cent Republican and the West 69 per cent. The Border is 66 per cent Democratic and the South 96 per cent. (Table 1)

Since 1889 party control of the House of Representatives has been almost evenly divided between the Republican and Democratic parties. During this period the House was controlled by the Republicans for a total of thirty-four years and by the Democrats for thirty-two years. Consequently

²Cortez A. M. Ewing, Congressional Elections, 1896-1944 (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1947). The sectional classification of states used in the present study is identical to the classification used in this study of congressional elections.

the 696 standing committee chairmen who served during this period are also closely divided between the two major parties, 372 (or 53 per cent) coming from the Republican party and the remaining 324 (or 47 per cent) from the Democratic party. Thus the distribution of chairmen from 1889 to 1954 is not greatly influenced by the sectional aspects of our political parties.

From 1889 to 1910 the House was dominated by the Republican party. During this period in which committee chairmen were appointed by the Speaker, the Republicans controlled the House for eighteen years and furnished 214 (or 74 per cent) of the 290 chairmen. The Democrats organized the House on but two occasions -- the 52nd Congress in 1891 and 53rd Congress in 1893 -- and furnished only seventy six chairmen. It is not in the least surprising to find that the East and Middle West, the two "most Republican" sections, dominated the chairmanships. Of the 290 chairmen who served during this period, 107 came from the Middle West and 105 from the East. (Table 1) Together these two sections supplied 73 per cent of the chairmen. Their share for the entire period was only 57 per cent. The South and the Border, the two Democratic sections, provided 19 per cent of the chairmen. For the entire period these two sections provided 32 per cent of the chairmen.

In the thirty-six-year period from the overthrow of

"Czar Cannon" in 1911 to the reorganization of Congress in 1946, the Democratic party was the dominant party. This period opened with eight years of Democratic control of the House and ended with this party in a majority for sixteen consecutive years. The Republicans provided the officers and chairmen for twelve years. During this period 583 congressmen, including nine who are also counted in the earlier period, served as chairmen of standing committees. Of these, 241 were Democrats and 142 Republicans. The South and Border furnished 42 per cent of the chairmen who served during this period compared to 19 per cent for the earlier period and 32 per cent for the entire period.

Since 1947 party control of the House has been evenly divided, and each section's percentage of the chairmen is very close to its percentage for the entire period when party control was also evenly divided. During this period the Republicans have controlled the House for four years and have had twenty-seven chairmen; the Democrats have also controlled for four years and have had twenty-six chairmen. The East has furnished 26 per cent of the chairmen who have served since 1947 -- 3 per cent less than its share for the sixty-six-year period. The figures for the other sections are as follows: Middle West, 32 per cent of the chairmen since 1947 and 28 per cent for the entire period; South, 25 per cent and 24 per cent; West, 9 per cent and 11 per cent;

Border, 8 per cent in both instances.

Congressional Apportionment and Sectional Distribution

To a very great extent, during periods of equal party control, the distribution of standing committee chairmen reflects congressional apportionment. That is to say, each section's share of the chairmen since 1889 is almost the same as its share of the congressmen. The East, for example, has furnished 29 per cent of the 696 chairmen and has had 28 per cent of the representation in Congress. The figures for the other sections are: Middle West, 28 per cent of the chairmen and 25 per cent of the congressmen; South, 24 per cent and 26 per cent; West, 11 per cent and 12 per cent; Border, 8 per cent and 9 per cent.

From these figures it is apparent that the East and Middle West, the two most predominantly Republican sections, are slightly over-represented while the West and the two Democratic sections are a little under-represented. This discrepancy can perhaps be explained by the fact that the Republicans controlled the House thirty-four years compared to thirty-two years for the Democrats.

Furthermore, there is also a marked tendency for the sectional distribution of Republican and Democratic chairmen to follow the same rule. In Table 1 it can be seen that the South has supplied almost one half of the Democratic chairmen and the East approximately 40 per cent of the

Republican chairmen. It is also true that these two sections have had a similar share of the Democratic and Republican congressmen. The same is true for the other sections. However, to compare number of chairmen to representation in Congress is a little misleading for all chairmen do not hold office for an equal period of time. Obviously the same value should not be assigned to Robert L. Doughton who presided over a standing committee for twenty-four years and a chairman who held office for only a few months. The problem of over-representation and under-representation will be discussed in the following chapter, and the criterion used will be "years held chairmanship" and "years represented in Congress" rather than number of chairmen and number of congressman.

Some congressmen have held the chairmanship of more than one standing committee. Since 1889, 102 persons have served as chairman of two committees and seventeen have held the chairmanship of three committees. In other words, the 696 chairmen have held 832 chairmanships. By comparing Tables 1 and 2 it can be seen that the sectional distribution of the two groups is quite similar. Hence, the observations made in regard to the chairmen apply very largely to the chairmanships also.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF CHAIRMEN OF HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEES, BY POLITICAL PARTY
AND GEOGRAPHIC SECTION, SELECTED PERIODS, 1889-1954*

Geographic Section	Number of Chairmen											
	1889-1910			1911-1946			1947-1954			1889-1954		
	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic
East	105	92	13	90	52	38	14	9	5	202	150	52
Middle West	107	87	20	83	51	32	17	13	4	197	144	53
South	36	4	32	124	2	122	13	0	13	164	6	158
West	23	23	0	51	27	24	5	4	1	77	53	24
Border	19	8	11	35	10	25	4	1	3	56	19	37
United States	290	214	76	383	142	241	53	27	26	696	372	324

*Source: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory. Nine Republicans who served in the period 1911-1946 also served in the period 1889-1910, and nineteen Democrats and two Republicans who served in the period 1947-1954 also served in the period 1911-1946. These chairmen appear in the data for each period, but are counted only once in the total for 1889-1954.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF CHAIRMANSHIPS OF HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEES, BY POLITICAL PARTY
AND GEOGRAPHIC SECTION, SELECTED PERIODS, 1889-1954*

Geographic Sections	Number of Chairmanships											
	1889-1910			1911-1946			1947-1954			1889-1954		
	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic
East	124	109	15	111	66	45	14	9	5	248	184	64
Middle West	123	101	22	101	63	38	17	13	4	240	177	63
South	38	4	34	136	2	134	13	0	13	182	6	176
West	27	27	0	62	33	29	5	4	1	94	64	30
Border	23	12	11	43	12	31	4	1	3	68	25	43
United States	335	253	82	453	176	277	53	27	26	832	456	376

*Source: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory. Nine Democratic chairmanships began in the period 1911-1946 and continued into the period 1947-1954. These chairmanships appear in the data for each period, but are counted only once in the total for 1889-1954.

Republicans from Democratic Sections and
Democrats from Republican Sections

Democratic strength is more widely spread throughout the nation than Republican strength. The Republican party is almost nonexistent in the South, but Democratic strength is apparent in all sections. This feature of American parties has its effect on the distribution of chairmen. For, like party strength, the Democratic chairmen are more widely distributed. Although a majority of the Democratic chairmen have come from the Southern and Border States, no less than 129 (or 40 per cent) have come from the East, Middle West, and West. But only twenty-five Republican chairmen have come from the two Democratic sections.

Outside of the South and Border and a few Western states such as New Mexico, Arizona, and Nevada, Democratic congressmen come primarily from pockets of Democratic strength usually found in large industrial cities. Democratic chairmen, of course, come from the same places. Metropolitan New York City has furnished thirty-two Democratic chairman, and eighteen have come from other large urban centers of one-half million population or more. Besides New York City the leading producers are Chicago, Los Angeles, Buffalo, and Detroit. Cleveland, Boston, Milwaukee, Pittsburgh, and the St. Paul-Minneapolis area have each produced at least one Democratic chairman. In addition to these, nineteen Democratic

chairmen have come from cities ranging in population from 100,000 to 500,000. A few of the cities in this group are Indianapolis, Rochester, Denver, Columbus, Toledo, Dayton, Providence, and Omaha. Conspicuously absent from the list of urban producers of Democratic chairmen is Philadelphia. Nine Democratic chairmen have come from the state of Pennsylvania, but none from Philadelphia.

On the other hand, sixty Democrats from Republican sections came from districts which might be classified as "rural," that is, from districts which did not contain a city of at least 100,000 population.³ And almost all of these can be accounted for by three upsurges in Democratic popularity which cut deeply into traditionally Republican territory -- or, to put it differently, by three losses of popular respect by the Republican party. In the late 1880's and the early 1890's, profiting from agrarian discontent, the Democrats elected many congressmen from traditionally Republican districts. For Example, in the Democratic landslide of 1890, New Hampshire awarded its two House seats to Democrats, and three out of four congressmen from Connecticut were Democrats. All of the Middle Western states sent more Democrats to the House than Republicans; Indiana sent

3

This definition of "rural" is indeed quite generous. Actually, seven Democrats in this group represented cities ranging in population from 66,000 to 96,000, and a few came from districts which bordered on large cities. Here, however, all districts which do not contain a city of at least 100,000 population are considered as rural.

only two Republican representatives to Congress. Sixteen of the rural Democratic chairmen from the East and Middle West entered Congress in the years from 1887 to 1891 and served as chairmen in the 52nd and 53rd Congresses. Twenty-three entered Congress in the years from 1907 to 1913--an era of insurgency in the Republican party and the New Freedom of Woodrow Wilson. Fourteen entered Congress during the New Deal period.

In a discussion of rural Democrats from Republican sections Indiana deserves special mention. In the past sixty-six years this state has produced twelve Democratic chairmen, just three less than the number of Republicans. Only one of these came from a large city. This is truly a tribute to the vitality of the two-party system in the state. Although the Democrats are ordinarily in the minority, this state is unusually responsive to shifts in the political tides and on occasion has sent a full slate of Democrats to the House. In 1890 and 1892, this state sent eleven Democrats to Congress and only two Republicans. In 1894, Indiana elected thirteen Republicans representatives. In 1912 this state sent thirteen Democrats to the House. By 1918, the entire delegation was again composed of Republicans. In 1932, Indiana sent a full slate of Democrats to Congress. This tendency toward violent shifts has greatly benefited the minority party as far as the chairmanships are concerned.

Many of the nineteen Republican chairmen from the Border states can be accounted for by a situation similar to that which exists in Indiana. The minority party is strong enough to occasionally elect a majority of the congressmen. There are few safe districts in the Border states, and this makes possible violent shifts in party fortunes.⁴ And the minority party benefits from this situation. But four of the Border Republicans came from safe districts in the south eastern part of Kentucky.

The six Southern Republicans came from Republican pockets in Tennessee, Virginia, North Carolina, and Oklahoma. The mountain constituencies of eastern Tennessee and western North Carolina and Virginia account for five, and the district in northern Oklahoma which lies next to the Kansas border accounts for one.

State Distribution

Although forty-six states are represented in the list of standing committee chairmen, the great majority of the chairmen are concentrated in a relatively few of the more populous states. The fifteen states with the greatest number of chairmen (which are also the states with the greatest population) have supplied 66 per cent of the total.

4

Cortez A. M. Ewing, Congressional Elections, 1896-1944 (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1947), p. 87. In the Border states, "slight alterations in the popular vote" often results in "pronounced shifts in the party complexions of the Congressional delegations."

The six states of New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, and Indiana account for 40 per cent. The three leading states, New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, account for 183 (or 26 per cent) of the 696 chairmen. On the other hand, the twenty states at the bottom of the list have produced fewer chairmen than the state of New York and account for only 10 per cent of the total number of chairmen. In general, these states are the smallest in regard to population, but combined they have a population 50 per cent greater than New York. None of these states have had more than seven chairmen. Six have had only three; Arizona, Wyoming, and North Dakota have had but one each; Delaware and Nevada have had none. The figures on the state distribution of committee chairmen are given in Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

The state distribution of committee chairmen, like the sectional distribution, reflects congressional apportionment. New York, the leading state in number of chairmen with 73 has also had the largest number of congressmen since 1889. Pennsylvania with 59 chairmen, Illinois with 51, and Ohio with 39 rank second, third, and fourth in number of chairmen -- the same rank they hold in regard to congressional apportionment. Michigan, which is fifth in number of chairmen with 32, ranks eighth in number of congressmen. Indiana, sixth in number of chairmen with 27, ranks tenth

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF CHAIRMEN AND NUMBER OF CHAIRMANSIPS OF HOUSE
STANDING COMMITTEES FROM EASTERN STATES, BY
POLITICAL PARTY AND BY STATE, 1889-1954*

State	Number of Chairmen			Number of Chairmanships		
	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic
New York	73	41	32	88	49	39
Pennsylvania	59	50	9	72	61	11
New Jersey	19	13	6	22	13	9
Massachusetts	22	20	2	29	27	2
Connecticut	7	6	1	7	6	1
Rhode Island	3	2	1	3	2	1
Maine	10	9	1	14	13	1
New Hampshire	3	3	0	4	4	0
Vermont	6	6	0	9	9	0
Total	202	150	52	248	184	64

*Source: Compiled from data in various issues of
Congressional Directory.

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF CHAIRMEN AND NUMBER OF CHAIRMANSIPS OF HOUSE
STANDING COMMITTEES FROM MIDDLE WESTERN STATES, BY
POLITICAL PARTY AND BY STATE, 1889-1954*

State	Number of Chairmen			Number of Chairmanships		
	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic
Minnesota	12	11	1	18	17	1
Iowa	19	18	1	27	26	1
Wisconsin	17	12	5	20	15	5
Illinois	51	37	14	60	44	16
Michigan	32	28	4	36	30	6
Indiana	27	15	12	33	19	14
Ohio	39	23	16	46	26	20
Total	197	144	53	240	177	63

*Source: Compiled from data in various issues of
Congressional Directory.

TABLE 5

NUMBER OF CHAIRMEN AND NUMBER OF CHAIRMANSIPS OF HOUSE
STANDING COMMITTEES FROM SOUTHERN STATES, BY
POLITICAL PARTY AND BY STATE, 1889-1954*

State	Number of Chairmen			Number of Chairmanships		
	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic
Florida	5	0	5	6	0	6
Georgia	15	0	15	17	0	17
Mississippi	12	0	12	18	0	18
Alabama	20	0	20	21	0	21
South Carolina	13	0	13	14	0	14
Louisiana	13	0	13	14	0	14
Arkansas	5	0	5	5	0	5
Texas	25	0	25	25	0	25
Oklahoma	7	1	6	7	1	6
Tennessee	15	2	13	17	2	15
North Carolina	20	2	18	23	2	21
Virginia	14	1	13	15	1	14
Total	164	6	158	182	6	176

*Source: Compiled from data in various issues of
Congressional Directory.

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF CHAIRMEN AND NUMBER OF CHAIRMANSIPS OF HOUSE
STANDING COMMITTEES FROM WESTERN STATES, BY
POLITICAL PARTY AND BY STATE, 1889-1954*

State	Number of Chairmen			Number of Chairmanships		
	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic
North Dakota	1	1	0	1	1	0
South Dakota	6	6	0	8	8	0
Nebraska	9	6	3	10	7	3
Kansas	16	16	0	19	19	0
Montana	5	2	3	5	2	3
Idaho	3	2	1	5	3	2
Utah	3	2	1	5	3	2
Wyoming	1	1	0	2	2	0
Colorado	3	1	2	4	1	3
New Mexico	3	0	3	3	0	3
Arizona	1	0	1	3	0	3
Nevada	0	0	0	0	0	0
California	17	10	7	19	11	8
Oregon	5	5	0	6	6	0
Washington	4	1	3	4	1	3
Total	77	53	24	94	64	30

*Source: Compiled from data in various issues of
Congressional Directory.

TABLE 7

NUMBER OF CHAIRMEN AND NUMBER OF CHAIRMANSIPS OF HOUSE
STANDING COMMITTEES FROM BORDER STATES, BY
POLITICAL PARTY AND BY STATE, 1889-1954*

State	Number of Chairmen			Number of Chairmanships		
	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic
Missouri	22	6	16	26	8	18
Kentucky	14	4	10	15	4	11
West Virginia	10	5	5	13	7	6
Maryland	10	4	6	14	6	8
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	56	19	37	68	25	43

*Source: Compiled from data in various issues of
Congressional Directory.

in congressional apportionment. Texas with 25 chairmen, and Massachusetts and Missouri with 22 each rank seventh, eighth, and ninth in number of chairmen, very close to their rank in regard to number of congressmen. The next six states and the number of chairmen from each are: Alabama, 20; North Carolina, 20; New Jersey, 19; Iowa, 19; Wisconsin, 17; and California, 17. All of these are within a few notches of their congressional apportionment rank.

The Republican chairmen are concentrated in a small number of states. Fourteen states account for 81 per cent of the Republican chairmen, and the six states of Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Massachusetts have had more Republican chairmen than the other forty-two states combined. The twenty-four states at the bottom of the scale have had but eighteen Republican chairmen; twelve states have had none.

Like the Republicans, the great majority of the Democratic chairmen have come from a handful of states. Fourteen states have provided 71 per cent of the Democratic chairmen, and the four states of New York, Texas, Alabama, and North Carolina have had more chairmen than the thirty-two states at the bottom of the list. Nine states have not held a Democratic chairmanship. It is interesting to note that New York -- though predominantly a Republican state -- has had more Democratic chairmen than any state in the Union,

and that Ohio has had more than Georgia. In fact, both Ohio and Illinois have had more Democratic chairmen than eight of the twelve Southern states.

This surprising feature of the Democratic chairmanships is a result of the tendency of the distribution of chairmen to follow congressional apportionment. New York has had more Democratic chairmen than Texas, the leading Southern state, because New York has had more Democratic congressmen. Ohio has sent more Democrats to Congress than Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, South Carolina, Oklahoma, or Florida. Of the twelve Southern states, only Georgia and Texas have elected more Democratic congressmen than Illinois. The "solid South" is such a prominent feature of the American political scene that it is sometimes forgotten that there are districts in Brooklyn, Cleveland, and Chicago almost as safely Democratic as any in Mississippi or Georgia.

The Chairmen of the Exclusive Committees

Prior to the 80th Congress eleven committees of the House were recognized as "exclusive." That is, these committees were considered to be of sufficient importance that membership on any one of them precluded membership on other committee.⁵ Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of

⁵ Clarence Cannon, Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1935-41), VIII, 12.

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF CHAIRMEN AND NUMBER OF CHAIRMANSIPS OF
EXCLUSIVE COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE, BY POLITICAL
PARTY AND GEOGRAPHIC SECTION, 1889-1954*

Geographic Section	Number of Chairmen			Number of Chairmanships		
	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic	Total	Repub- lican	Demo- cratic
East	50	39	11	51	40	11
Middle West	47	39	8	50	41	9
South	55	0	55	56	0	56
West	20	15	5	20	15	5
Border	12	1	11	12	1	11
United States	184	94	90	189	97	92

*Source: Compiled from data in various issues of
Congressional Directory.

1946 and the one-committee-assignment rule, all of the nineteen standing committees of the House are exclusive committees. But the rules permit the members of four committees to hold one other committee assignment, and for this study these four committees will not be considered as exclusive. Altogether there have been eighteen exclusive committees. Table 8 shows the sectional distribution of the chairmen of the exclusive committees; and in Table 9, which gives an alphabetical list of the seventy-seven standing committees, the eighteen exclusive committees are marked by an asterisk.

With one important exception, the sectional distribution of the exclusive chairmen is quite similar to the distribution of the whole group. The West has had an identical share in both instances. The East, Middle West, and Border have each had a share of the exclusive chairmen which is 2 per cent smaller than their share of the total number of chairmen. The South, however, has fared quite well in regard to the chairmanships of the more important committees. This section has supplied 30 per cent of the exclusive chairmen compared to only 24 per cent of the total number. Only 20 per cent of the chairmen of the 59 "non exclusive" committees have been Southerners. This point, which will be developed more fully in later chapters, is the key to the understanding of sectional domination of the standing committee chairmanships of the House of Representatives.

Party domination of the various sections is more pronounced when measured in terms of the exclusive chairmanships. Very few Democrats from the East, Middle West or Border climb to the top of the more important committees, and Republicans from the South and Border are almost totally absent from the list of exclusive chairmen. Measured by this criterion the South is 100 per cent Democratic. Only one Border Republican has held an exclusive chairmanship. The Middle West is 87 per cent Republican, the East 80 per cent, and the West 75 per cent.

Sectional Representation on the Various Committees

In general it can be said that sectional representation on the chairmanships of the various committees has been equitable. Each of the geographic sections has held at least one chairmanship on a fairly large number of committees, and only a handful of committees have been dominated by particular sections. The three largest sections (the East, South, and Middle West) are represented on practically all of the committees. Of the seventy-seven committees, only five have not had an Eastern chairman. The Middle West is represented on seventy-one committees and the South on sixty-five. The ninety-four Western chairmanships are distributed among forty-five committees; and the Border -- even though this section has had fewer chairmanships than the total number of committees -- is represented on forty

different committees. The sectional distribution of the chairmen of the seventy-seven committees is given in Table 9.

Moreover, each section is widely represented on the important committees. Although the South is the only section which has held at least one chairmanship on all of the exclusive committees, the East is represented on all but two and the Middle West on all but three. The West has held the chairmanships of ten exclusive committees, and the Border is represented on nine.

But a few committees have shown a definite preference for chairmen from particular sections. The most notable example is Western domination of the irrigation and reclamation committee. The West has supplied eleven chairmen for this committee and from 1889 to 1946, when it was abolished, controlled the chairmanship for forty-three years. All of the Republican chairmen and four of the seven Democrats were Westerners.

No other committee has been so completely monopolized by a single geographic section, but the tendency is apparent in several instances. The South has had more than its share of several committees, including such important ones as agriculture, judiciary, naval affairs, and ways and means. The East has controlled the labor committee for a longer period than all other sections combined. This section is also well represented on the chairmanships of banking and currency,

civil service, and immigration and naturalization. The Middle West has held the chairmanship of the appropriations committee for thirty-one years. The Border states have controlled the chairmanship of the District of Columbia committee for twenty-seven years.

It is true that all sections receive at least a few chairmanships when either party organizes the House (the South during Republican control is almost an exception to this rule); nevertheless, party control of the House is definitely a limiting factor on the length of time any section may hold the chairmanship of a single committee. Because of this a better picture can be obtained of those committees with a distinctly sectional flavor by comparing the number of years the Democrats held the chairmanship to the number of years the South and the Border held the chairmanship, and by making the same comparison in regard to Republican control and the three Republican sections. Below is a list of ten committees with the length of time the chairmanship was controlled by the Democratic party, the South, and the Border.

Number of years chairmanship was held by:

	Democrats	South	Border
District of Columbia	32	7	27
Mines and Mining	28	2	22
Agriculture	32	28	4
Judiciary	32	28	0
Naval Affairs	28	26	0
Flood Control	20	20	0
Territories	28	28	0
Ways and Means	32	28	2
Rivers and Harbors	28	28	0
Public Lands	32	26	0

The following list of ten committees shows the number of years the chairmanship was held by the Republican party, the West, the Middle West and the West.

Number of Years chairmanship was held by:

	Republicans	East	Mid West	West
Immigration and Naturalization	28	25	7	12
Labor	30	36	9	2
Banking and Currency	34	30	6	2
Civil Service	28	30	0	0
Flood Control	12	0	12	0
Military Affairs	30	4	24	6
Railways and Canals	26	6	24	0
Appropriations	34	11	31	5
Public Lands	34	0	14	26
Irrigation and Reclamation	28	0	2	43

No committee has been dominated by one section to the same extent that irrigation and reclamation has been dominated by the West, but it is interesting to note that the East has controlled the chairmanship of labor and civil service for a longer period than the Republican party. During the thirty-two years of its existence the flood control committee was controlled by the Democrats for twenty years and by the Republicans for twelve years. All of the Democratic chairmen were Southerners and all of the Republicans were from the Middle Western states.

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF CHAIRMEN OF HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEES, BY
GEOGRAPHIC SECTION AND COMMITTEE, 1889-1954^a

Committee	Total	East	Mid West	South	West	Border
Accounts	15	6	3	2	0	4
*Agriculture	12	1	1	6	3	1
Alcoholic Liquor Traffic	10	4	4	1	1	0
*Appropriations	16	2	7	3	2	2
*Armed Services	3	1	0	1	0	1
*Banking and Currency	14	7	2	3	1	1
Census	13	4	4	2	0	3
Civil Service	8	4	0	3	0	1
Coinage, Weights, and Measures	11	3	5	1	1	1
Claims	14	5	3	4	1	1
Disposition of Executive Papers	7	1	1	1	2	2
District of Columbia	16	3	5	2	0	6
Education	16	6	4	5	0	1
*Education and Labor	4	2	1	1	0	0
Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress	15	5	3	3	2	2
Elections No. 1	21	4	6	9	1	1
Elections No. 2	11	5	4	1	1	0
Elections No. 3	16	4	4	7	1	0

TABLE 9--Continued

Committee	Total	East	Mid West	South	West	Border
Enrolled Bills	18	4	9	2	0	3
Expenditures in the Dept. of Agriculture	10	4	3	2	1	0
Expenditures in the Dept. of Commerce	8	3	5	0	0	0
Expenditures in the Dept. of Commerce and Labor	3	2	1	0	0	0
Expenditures in the Dept. of Labor	5	5	0	0	0	0
Expenditures in the Dept. of Justice	18	5	2	3	5	3
Expenditures in the Executive Depts. ^b	6	1	2	1	1	1
Expenditures in the Interior Dept.	12	2	4	3	3	0
Expenditures in the Navy Dept.	13	5	5	2	0	1
Expenditures in the Post Office Dept.	12	3	2	3	3	1
Expenditures in the State Dept.	10	4	2	2	0	2
Expenditures in the Treasury Dept.	12	4	6	0	2	0
Expenditures in the War Department	12	6	3	0	1	2
Expenditures on Public Buildings	15	3	5	3	2	2
Flood Control	6	0	3	3	0	0
*Foreign Affairs	16	6	3	4	0	3

TABLE 9--Continued

Committee	Total	East	Mid West	South	West	Border
House Administration	3	1	1	1	0	0
Immigration and Naturalization	9	3	3	1	1	1
Indian Affairs	13	2	1	4	6	0
Industrial Arts and Expositions	9	4	3	1	0	1
Irrigation and Reclamation	14	0	1	2	11	0
Insular Affairs	12	2	5	4	0	1
*Interstate and Foreign Commerce	14	4	4	5	1	0
Invalid Pensions	13	4	7	0	2	0
*Judiciary	14	4	6	4	0	0
Labor	14	6	3	0	1	4
Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi R.	7	1	2	2	1	1
Library	13	8	3	1	0	1
Manufactures	7	4	3	0	0	0
Memorials	9	2	1	2	4	0
*Merchant Marine and Fisheries	13	6	4	2	0	1
Mileage	15	6	4	1	4	0
*Military Affairs	13	1	5	5	1	1
Militia	7	1	6	0	0	0
Mines and Mining	16	3	7	1	2	3
*Naval Affairs	8	3	2	3	0	0
Pacific Railroads	5	4	1	0	0	0
Patents	17	6	6	3	2	0
Pensions	12	3	3	4	1	1

TABLE 9--Continued

Committee	Total	East	Mid West	South	West	Border
*Post Office and Civil Service	2	0	0	1	1	0
*Post Office and Post Roads	13	5	3	3	1	1
Printing	13	4	4	5	0	0
Private Land Claims	6	2	2	0	1	1
Public Buildings and Grounds	10	2	1	4	1	2
*Public Lands ^c	15	0	2	5	8	0
*Public Works	3	1	1	1	0	0
Railways and Canals	9	2	5	2	0	0
Revision of the Laws	12	2	6	1	2	1
Rivers and Harbors	12	3	4	5	0	0
Roads	6	1	1	2	1	1
*Rules	13	4	4	4	1	0
Territories	15	3	2	9	1	0
Un-American Activities	3	1	1	1	0	0
Ventilation and Acoustics	7	2	4	1	0	0
*Veterans' Affairs	2	1	0	1	0	0
War Claims	17	9	1	3	3	1
*Ways and Means	14	3	5	4	1	1
Woman Suffrage	3	1	1	0	1	0
World War Veterans' Legislation	2	0	0	1	1	0

^aSource: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory. The committees marked by an asterisk are exclusive committees.

^bName changed to Government Operations in 1952.

^cName changed to Interior and Insular Affairs in 1950.

Summary

As measured by the number of House committee chairmen, the Middle West, East, and West are predominantly Republican sections; while the Border is strongly Democratic and the South almost unanimously Democratic. Sixty-six per cent of the chairmen from the Border states and 96 per cent of the Southern chairmen have been Democrats. The Middle West is 73 per cent Republican, the East 74 per cent, and the West 69 per cent. This, of course, has a very great influence on the sectional distribution of committee chairmen. From 1889 to 1910, when the Republicans dominated the House, the East and Middle West supplied 73 per cent of the chairmen. But in the years from 1911 to 1946, when the Democrats dominated the House, these two sections furnished only 45 per cent of the chairmen. For the entire period, when party control was evenly divided, they supplied 57 per cent.

When this variable is eliminated by choosing a period in which party control is evenly divided, it is found that the distribution of chairmen follows very closely the apportionment of representatives. In the sixty-six-year period from 1889 to 1954, each geographic section received a share of the chairmen within 3 per cent of its share of the congressmen. This was also found to be true of state distribution. The states which have had the largest congressional delegations have had the largest number of chairmen,

and the states with the fewest congressmen have had the fewest chairmen. Furthermore, the states which send the greatest number of Democrats to Congress receive the greatest number of Democratic chairmen. And the same is true of the Republicans.

Outside of the South and Border and a few Western states, Democratic chairmen come primarily from pockets of Democratic strength usually found in large industrial cities. New York City alone has supplied one-fourth of the Democratic chairmen from the three Republican sections and almost two-thirds of the Eastern Democrats. The handful of rural Democratic chairmen from the East and Middle West entered Congress during periods of reform, agrarian discontent, or economic depression when the Republican party had lost popular respect. The six Southern Republicans are accounted for by the existence of a fairly safe, Republican district in each of four Southern states. The minority party in the Border states, profiting from the fact that very few safe Democratic districts exist in this section, received nineteen chairmanships.

One result of the tendency of the distribution of chairman to follow congressional apportionment is the concentration of the great majority of the chairmen in a relatively small number of states. Fifteen states account for 66 per cent of the total number of chairmen; fourteen states

account for 81 per cent of the Republicans; and fourteen states account for 71 per cent of the Democrats.

The sectional distribution of the exclusive chairmen, with one exception, was found to be quite similar to the distribution of the total number of chairmen. Thirty per cent of the chairmen of exclusive committees have been Southerners, but only 24 per cent of the total number of chairmen came from the South.

In most instances sectional representation on the chairmanships of the various committees is quite evenly distributed. The East is represented on 72 of the 77 committees; the Middle West on 71; the South on 65; the West on 45; and the Border, even though it has held only 68 chairmanships, is represented on 40 committees.

A few committees, however, were definitely dominated by particular sections. Examples of this are the irrigation and reclamation committee dominated by the West, the labor committee by the East; the appropriation committee by the Middle West, the rivers and harbors committee by the South, and the District of Columbia committee by the Border.

CHAPTER III

THE FAVORED STATES AND SECTIONS

Objectives and Methods

Sectional domination of the committee chairmanships of Congress is often discussed by journalists and political scientists. Most frequently mentioned is Southern domination of the Democratic chairmanships, but it is sometimes said that the East and Middle West (or the North) dominate the Republican chairmanships. As a rule it is carefully explained that this situation is a result of the seniority system which rewards those regions where the congressmen habitually and easily win reelection, but in regard to the degree and extent of sectional domination these discussions usually give only vague estimates. The following statement is typical:

Southern domination of the machinery of Congress when the Democrats are in the majority has become automatic because of the seniority system. Since the South is Democratic and for years has re-elected its members of Congress more regularly than elsewhere in the nation they usually are senior in length of service. Therefore, the bulk of the committee chairmanships falls to them...¹

¹ Arthur Knock, New York Times, May 24, 1955. Emphasis mine.

On occasion it is stated that the South receives "most of the committee chairmen" when the Democrats are in the majority.² Sometimes it is said that Republican chairmen "tend to represent northern rural areas" or that Democratic chairmen "tend to be mainly southerners."³ It has also been said that the South automatically receives "a score or more" chairmanships when the Democrats win an election.⁴ On rare occasions one finds a specific estimate: In the 82nd Congress, "continuity of service reaped its reward in the eleven chairmanships out of the nineteen standing committees of the House that were held by Southerners."⁵ The last statement makes it possible to see that a little more than one-half of the Democratic chairmen were Southerners.. It is also interesting to note that 234 Democrats sat in the 82nd Congress. Of these, 109 were Southerners. The purpose of this study is to provide an accurate technique for the evaluation of state and sectional representation on the standing committee chairmanships of the House.

² Frederick A. Ogg and P. Orman Ray, Introduction to American Government (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1945) 280. n. Emphasis mine.

³ James M. Burns and Jack W. Peltason, Government by the People (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952), 414. Emphasis mine.

⁴ Robert K. Carr et al., American Democracy in Theory and Practice (New York: Rinehart and Co., 1951), 308. Emphasis mine.

⁵ George B. Calloway, The Legislative Process in Congress (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1953), 367.

To say that a particular state or section is over-represented or dominates the committee chairmanships raises a question of semantics. What is meant by over-representation? by domination? If these terms mean "the bulk," or "most," then no great problem exists; for it is easy to count the chairmen and see that the East and Middle West get "most" of the Republican chairmanships and that "the bulk" of the Democratic chairmen are Southerners. But the term "over-representation" definitely implies that a region receives more than its fair share of the chairmanships, and the term "domination," if emphasized, carries the same connotation. This makes it necessary to establish a criterion to determine what a fair share is, and in this study the criterion will be representation in Congress. That is, it is assumed that representation on the chairmanships should bear some relation to representation in the House and that a state or section is entitled to a share of the chairmen equal to its share of the congressmen.

This criterion will be applied to three items: representation on the Democratic chairmanships, on the Republican chairmanships, and on the total number of chairmanships. The units of measurement are "years served as chairman" and "years represented in Congress" rather than number of chairmen or number of congressmen. For convenience, however, the terms "chairmen" and "congressmen" frequently appear in the text.

A precise meaning has been assigned to the term "over-representation." If a section's percentage of the chairmen is larger than its percentage of the congressmen it is considered to be over-represented. On the other hand, if the percentage of congressmen is larger it is under-represented.

For the measurement of over-representation and under-representation a device called the "chairman ratio" has been used. This ratio is the number of years represented on the chairmanships for each one hundred years represented in Congress. This ratio may also be expressed as the percentage of the years served in Congress which were served as chairman.

In each table in this chapter is a column headed "per cent of the national ratio." This column serves as an index of over-and under-representation with the United States equal to 100. The index figures may be obtained in two ways. For example, in Table 10, it can be seen that the Democratic chairman ratio for the East is 86 per cent of the national Democratic chairman ratio. (That is, the East's ratio of 9.2 is 86 per cent of the national ratio of 10.7). It can also be seen that the East has had 15.9 per cent of the Democratic chairmen and 18.5 per cent of Democratic congressmen. And 15.9 is 86 per cent of 18.5. However, the index is actually computed from the chairman ratio because less arithmetic is needed and therefore less rounding of figures.

Sectional Representation on the Committee Chairmanships

If the term "domination" means "at least one-half," then it can truthfully be said that the East and Middle West have dominated the Republican chairmanships and that the South has dominated the Democratic chairmanships. The first two have received about 80 per cent of the representation on the Republican chairmanships and the South has received about 50 per cent of the representation on the Democratic chairmanships. In a sense, though, they have earned their right to dominate, for these sections have supplied similar shares of the Republican and Democratic congressmen. In fact there is a very strong tendency toward proportionate representation for all sections. That is, each section tends to receive a share of chairmen to which it is entitled on the basis of representation in Congress. This is true in regard to the total number of chairmen (that is, both parties counted together) as well as the Republican and Democratic chairmen. If the term "domination" means "more than a fair share," no section has dominated the chairmanships.

Tables 10, 11, and 12 show sectional over-and under-representation on the chairmanships of all seventy-seven committees for the period from 1889 to 1954. Table 10 compares Democratic representation on the chairmanships to Democratic representation in Congress. Table 11 shows the

TABLE 10
OVER AND UNDERREPRESENTATION ON THE DEMOCRATIC
CHAIRMANSHIPS, BY SECTION, 1889-1954^a

	Per Cent of Democratic Representa- tion in Congress	Per Cent of Representa- tion on Democratic Chairman- ships	Chairman Ratio ^b	Per Cent of National Ratio
United States	100.0	100.0	10.7	100
East	18.5	15.9	9.2	86
Middle West	14.3	14.0	10.6	99
South	47.6	50.2	11.3	106
West	7.5	6.4	9.3	87
Border	12.1	13.4	11.9	111

^aSource: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory.

^bThe chairman ratio is the number of years served as chairman for each 100 years served in Congress.

same for the Republicans. Table 12 provides a composite picture by ignoring the distinction between Republicans and Democrats and comparing total representation on the chairmanships to total representation in Congress. A composite picture such as this can be obtained only during periods in which party control of the House is evenly divided between the two parties. Otherwise the figures will show the sectional aspects of our party system rather than anything which might be described as over-or under-representation.

The conspicuous feature of Table 10 is that each section is so very close to the national Democratic chairman ratio. This means that throughout the years since 1889 each section's share of the Democratic chairmen has been roughly proportionate to its share of the Democratic congressmen. No section has dominated the Democratic chairmanships, and no section is greatly under-represented. All sections are within 14 per cent of the national average. This means that the East, the section furthest from the national Democratic chairman ratio, is so close to proportionate representation that it can be said that one out of five Democratic congressmen and one out of six Democratic chairmen come from this section. The Middle West's share of the Democratic chairmen is within one-half of 1 per cent of its share of the Democratic congressmen.

When the Republican chairmanships are considered, the

tendency toward proportionate representation is still apparent. (Table 11) To be sure, it is not as strong as it is on the Democratic chairmanships and there is one exception to the rule, but the tendency is still present. Four sections are within 17 per cent of the national Republican chairman ratio. The East and Middle West are slightly above the national average, and the West and Border are a little under-represented. The South, as is frequently the case, is an exception to the rule. The South elects very few Republican congressmen, and these have little chance to become chairmen. This section is 69 per cent below the national Republican chairman ratio.

Unless an eye is kept on the absolute figures, percentages can easily be misleading. The South has supplied an insignificant number of both Republican chairmen and Republican congressmen, and for this reason the figure of 69 per cent below the national average for this section does not greatly effect the picture of proportionate representation on the total number of Republican chairmanships. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that a Southern Republican's chances of becoming a committee chairman are very small. The absolute figures are more revealing than the percentages. In the past sixty-six years all Republicans have served 6406 terms in Congress and 892 terms as chairmen. Southern Republicans have served only 164 terms in

TABLE 11
OVER AND UNDERREPRESENTATION ON THE REPUBLICAN
CHAIRMANSHIPS, BY SECTION, 1889-1954^a

	Per Cent of Republican Representa- tion in Congress	Per Cent of Representa- tion on Republican Chairman- ships	Chairman Ratio ^b	Per Cent of National Ratio
United States	100.0	100.0	13.9	100
East	38.4	42.0	15.2	109
Middle West	36.5	38.5	14.7	106
South	2.6	0.8	4.3	31
West	16.3	13.6	11.6	83
Border	6.1	5.1	11.7	84

^aSource: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory.

^bThe chairman ratio is the number of years served as chairman for each 100 years served in Congress.

Congress and seven terms as chairman. Thus, approximately one out of seven Republicans from the entire United States become committee chairmen but only one out of twenty-three Southern Republicans.

The composite picture of representation on the chairmanships, given in Table 12, tells the same story. In the long run each section receives an equitable share of the chairmen. The Border is closest to proportionate representation. This section has supplied approximately 9 per cent of the chairmen and 9 per cent of the congressmen. All sections are within fourteen points of the national chairman ratio. Furthermore, this composite picture is based on a period in which the House was controlled by the Republicans for thirty-four years compared to thirty-two years for the Democrats. If the period were exactly divided, each section would be still closer to the national average.

The South, surprisingly enough, is not above, but ten points below the national chairman ratio. This leads to the conclusion that the one-party system, contrary to popular opinion, has not worked to the advantage of this section. Although this section has received approximately one-half of the Democratic chairmen, its share of the Republican chairmen is so small that it has not received the total representation on the chairmanships to which it was entitled on the basis of representation in Congress.

TABLE 12
OVER AND UNDERREPRESENTATION ON THE COMMITTEE
CHAIRMANSHIPS, BY SECTION, 1889-1954^a

	Per Cent of Total Representa- tion in Congress	Per Cent of Total Representa- tion on Chairman- ships	Chairman Ratio ^b	Per Cent of National Ratio
United States	100.0	100.0	12.1	100
East	27.9	30.1	13.0	107
Middle West	25.2	27.4	13.1	108
South	25.7	23.3	10.9	90
West	12.1	10.3	10.4	86
Border	9.1	8.9	11.8	98

^aSource: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory.

^bThe chairman ratio is the number of years served as chairman for each 100 years served in Congress.

In conclusion, it can be said that the seniority system and one-party politics (or anything else for that matter) have not resulted in any section receiving more than its fair share of the chairmanships, for over-representation simply does not exist to any great extent. However, a word of caution is in order at this point. This picture of almost perfect proportionate representation is based on the chairmanships of all standing committees. Included in this picture are the chairmen of the insignificant committees as well as the powerful and influential ones -- disposition of useless executive papers as well as ways and means. Certainly, if the congressmen from any region were in a position to dominate the chairmanships, they would choose the important committees.

Sectional Representation on the Exclusive Chairmanships

To discover a tendency toward sectional domination of the House committee chairmanships, it is necessary to turn to the more important committees. For representation on the exclusive chairmanships has not been as equitable as it has on the total number of chairmanships.⁶ Over-and under-representation on the chairmanships of the exclusive committees is shown in Table 13.

It is indeed true that the South has dominated the Democratic chairmanships in so far as the more important

6

The exclusive committees are those whose members are permitted to hold only one committee assignment.

TABLE 13
OVER AND UNDERREPRESENTATION ON THE EXCLUSIVE CHAIRMANSHIPS,
BY SECTION, 1889-1954^a

	Democratic Chairmanships		Republican Chairmanships		Total Chairmanships	
	Chairman Ratio ^b	Per Cent of National Ratio	Chairman Ratio ^b	Per Cent of National Ratio	Chairman Ratio ^b	Per Cent of National Ratio
United States	3.1	100	3.5	100	3.2	100
East	1.7	55	3.8	109	3.0	94
Middle West	1.5	48	4.4	126	3.5	109
South	4.3	139	0.0	0	4.1	128
West	1.9	61	2.7	77	2.3	72
Border	2.9	94	0.3	9	2.0	62

^aSource: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory.

^bThe chairman ratio is the number of years served as chairman for each 100 years representation in Congress.

committees are concerned. This section which has received a little less than one-half of the Democratic representation in Congress has had two-thirds of the Democratic representation on the exclusive chairmanships. The South is 39 per cent above the national ratio. All other sections are below it. The Border, though fairly close to proportionate representation, is forty-five points below the South. The East and Middle West have had only one-half of the representation on this group of committees to which they were entitled by virtue of their contributions to Democratic strength in Congress. The West has fared but little better than the East or Middle West. Although the South has not had more than its fair share of the total number of chairmanships, it seems that the tendency of Southern congressmen to win reelection time after time reaps its reward in control of the really significant committees.

The picture of representation on the exclusive Republican chairmanships -- though still one of sectional domination -- is a little different from the Democratic picture. Here the picture is one of a greatly over-represented Middle West, a slightly over-represented East, and three greatly under-represented sections. The Middle West is 26 points above the national average. The East, although only 9 per cent above the national ratio, is 32 points above West and 100 points above the Border. No Southern Republican has ever

held the chairmanship of an exclusive committee. It is true that the East and Middle West, by virtue of their contributions to the Republican party, are entitled to the great majority of the important chairmanships. But they have practically monopolized them. These two sections are entitled to 75 per cent of the representation on the Republican chairmanships; actually they have received 87 per cent of the exclusive posts.

Sectional representation on the total number of exclusive chairmanships (also given in Table 13) is merely a balance between representation on the chairmanships of the two parties. In the index of over-and under-representation each section occupies a position which is between its index positions for the two parties.

A very interesting picture is beginning to emerge. When the Democrats organize the House, each section receives a fair share of the total number of chairmen as determined by its Democratic membership in Congress. The South, however, takes its share in major posts, leaving the minor chairmanships to the Democrats from the rest of the nation. When the Republicans organize the House--though each section except the South receives a fair share of the total number of chairmanships--the East and Middle West take practically all of the exclusive posts.

Without doubt, the seniority system has contributed

to the existence of this situation. One feature of the seniority rule is that members with long and continuous service are given priority in regard to committee assignments. Naturally, if congressmen from certain areas show a propensity to serve longer in the House than congressmen from other areas, the fact of sectional domination of the exclusive chairmanships will be largely explained. It is probably true that Southern Democrats and Eastern and Middle Western Republicans tend to serve longer in the House than Democratic or Republican congressmen from other sections. This is definitely true in regard to chairmen. In the following chapter it will be pointed out that Southern Democratic chairmen serve on the average more than four years longer in the House than Democratic chairmen from the rest of the nation. Republican chairmen from the East and Middle West serve on the average almost two years longer than other Republican chairmen.

Sectional Representation Under the Legislative Reorganization Act

As the South has received more than its fair share of the important Democratic chairmanships since 1889, it would be logical to assume that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 has worked to the advantage of this section. For this act abolished many minor committees and left in existence those on which the South has generally been over-

represented.⁷ The fact is, however, that the Border and Middle West have each had a larger proportionate share of the Democratic chairmen since 1947 than the South. (Table 14) The Middle West is 46 points above the national ratio and 36 points above the South. The Border is 24 points above the South.

This does not mean that the Middle West and Border have dominated; the South still receives a little more than one half of the Democratic chairmanships. But it does mean that the South has lost part of the advantage it once held, and that the Border and Middle West have greatly improved their positions in recent years.⁸ The East, though still below the national average, has also improved its position. The West, however, is 71 points below the national ratio because it has had only one Democratic chairman since the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act. This situation can be summarized as follows: From 1889 to 1954 the South received approximately two thirds of the representation on the exclusive Democratic chairmanships; since 1947,

⁷ Of the 19 committees in existence at the present time, 15 have been counted as exclusive in the present study.

⁸ As noted above in Table 13, the Middle West was 52 per cent below the national chairman ratio for the exclusive Democratic chairmanships. The Border was 6 per cent below, and the South was 39 per cent above. In Table 14, which shows representation on the chairmanships for the period from 1947 to 1954, it can be seen that the South has dropped 29 points while the Border and Middle West have increased their index positions by 40 points and 98 points respectively.

TABLE 14
OVER AND UNDERREPRESENTATION ON THE COMMITTEE CHAIRMANSHIPS,
BY SECTION, 1947-1954^a

	Democratic Chairmanships		Republican Chairmanships		Total Chairmanships	
	Chairman Ratio ^b	Per Cent of National Ratio	Chairman Ratio ^b	Per Cent of National Ratio	Chairman Ratio ^b	Per Cent of National Ratio
United States	4.1	100	4.6	100	4.3	100
East	2.9	71	4.1	89	3.6	84
Middle West	6.0	146	6.3	137	6.2	144
South	4.5	110	0.0	0	4.3	100
West	1.2	29	3.4	74	2.7	63
Border	5.5	134	2.2	48	4.4	102

^aSource: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory.

^bThe chairman ratio is the number of years served as chairman for each 100 years representation in Congress.

this section has received a little more than one half of the representation, very close to a proportionate share. The Middle West and Border have greatly benefitted from the reduction in number of standing committees, and to a lesser extent so has the East. The West, like the South, has lost ground.

This change in representation on the Democratic chairmanships is partially a result of the modification of the committee system. It was noted above that there is a strong tendency toward proportionate representation on the total number of chairmanships, but throughout the years the South has taken its share in exclusive chairmanships leaving the insignificant ones to the Democrats from the rest of the nation. Obviously, if no minor committees exist this situation cannot continue.

The decline of Southern over-representation can in large part be accounted for by the increase in importance of four large urban centers. Greater New York (including parts of New Jersey), Chicago, Cleveland, and Detroit have supplied almost as many Democratic chairmen since 1947 as the twelve Southern states combined. The first Congress organized by the Democrats after the enactment of the La Follette-Monroney Act (the 81st) saw these cities in control of seven committees, just three less than the South. The other two were held by the Border. When the chairmanships were

distributed at the beginning of the 82nd Congress, the South received nine, the Border three, and the West one; six went to New York City, Chicago and Cleveland. Altogether, 26 Democrats have presided over the 19 standing committees since 1947. One half of these came from the South, but nine came from New York City, Chicago, Detroit, and Cleveland.

The seniority system seems to reward one-party districts where-ever they are found -- those in Brooklyn and Cook county as well as Alabama and Georgia. The nine Democratic chairmen from New York City, Cleveland, Detroit, and Chicago have served on the average more than twenty-six years in the House. That they come from safe districts is varified by the results of the election of 1946, an election in which the Democrats lost fifty-four seats to the Republicans. Six of the nine won reelection by a plurality of more than 20 per cent of the two-party vote, and one won by a plurality of 12 per cent. Emanuel Celler won his Brooklyn district by a plurality which composed 58 per cent of the vote. Adolph Sabath of Chicago won by a plurality of 42 per cent. The committees controlled by these four cities includes such important ones as foreign affairs, judiciary, rules, interstate and foreign commerce, education and labor, public works, and merchant marine and fisheries.

Representation on the Republican chairmanships since 1947 follows the same general pattern as it did in regard

to the exclusive chairmanships. The South, West, and Border are again well below the national ratio, and the Middle West is well above it. The East is fairly close to proportionate representation, but since 1947 this section has been 11 points under-represented whereas it was 9 points over-represented on the exclusive chairmanships. (Table 14) Since 1947 the East and Middle West have received more than 81 per cent of the representation on the Republican chairmanships compared to 71 per cent of the Republican representation in Congress.

The composite picture since 1947 shows that the Middle West is the only greatly over-represented section. (Table 14) This of course reflects the fact that this section has had more than its share of the chairmanships of both parties.

State Representation

Many states receive an equitable share of the committee chairmen. In Table 15 it can be seen that twenty states are within 15 per cent of the national Democratic chairman ratio; nine states are within ten points of the Republican ratio. The corollary is that a great many states are either over-represented or under-represented. Idaho has had more than four times the representation on the Democratic chairmanships it should have received on the basis of its con-

tribution to Democratic membership in the House. Vermont and New Hampshire have had almost twice the Republican representation they were entitled to receive. Connecticut and Iowa are at least 80 per cent below the national Democratic chairman ratio; Colorado and North Dakota are more than 80 per cent below the Republican ratio.

The range of disparity is great for both parties. On the Democratic chairmanships, ten states are more than 15 per cent over-represented and eighteen states are at least 25 per cent under-represented. On the Republican chairmanships, thirteen states are more than 15 points above the national average and twenty-six states are at least 23 points below it.

The pattern of state representation on the chairmanships follows the geographic outlines of our party system. That is to say, the strongly Democratic states do quite well on the chairmanships of this party and the strongly Republican states usually receive more than a fair share of the Republican chairmen. A Democrat from North Carolina is more likely to become a committee chairman than a Democrat from Kansas. This is undoubtedly a result of the seniority system which rewards safe districts. In fact, there is almost perfect correlation between state representation on the chairmanships and party strength in the various states.

To illustrate this point the states have been grouped

TABLE 15

OVER AND UNDERREPRESENTATION ON THE COMMITTEE CHAIRMANSHIPS,
BY STATE, 1889-1954^a

Democratic Chairmanships			Republican Chairmanships		
	Per Cent of National Chairman Ratio ^b	Per Cent Demo- cratic ^c		Per Cent of National Chairman Ratio ^b	Per Cent Repub- lican ^c
Idaho	467	24	Vermont	189	100
North Carolina	161	93	New Hampshire	175	88
West Virginia	146	50	Maine	161	93
New Jersey	135	32	Iowa	158	89
Wisconsin	128	16	South Dakota	152	89
Missouri	127	71	Utah	150	49
Alabama	121	100	Kansas	142	83
Florida	119	100	Idaho	132	76
Mississippi	118	100	Maryland	129	34
Maine	117	7	Illinois	126	62
New York	115	48	Montana	120	45
Illinois	114	38	Indiana	119	55
Nebraska	114	35	New Jersey	118	68
Texas	114	99	Massachusetts	108	72
Utah	112	51	Wyoming	106	84
Arizona	107	96	Pennsylvania	105	74
Maryland	103	66	West Virginia	101	50
Indiana	100	45	New York	100	52
Virginia	100	93	Oregon	98	90
Ohio	99	38	Minnesota	92	87
New Mexico	99	83	Wisconsin	91	84
Tennessee	98	78	Michigan	90	80
Georgia	98	100	Connecticut	77	72
Montana	96	55	Kentucky	76	22
South Carolina	95	100	Ohio	69	62
Louisiana	94	100	Missouri	68	29
Oklahoma	92	81	Nebraska	66	65
Kentucky	88	78	North Carolina	65	7
Michigan	86	20	California	60	61
California	86	39	Rhode Island	54	53
Colorado	75	50	Washington	48	64
Washington	73	36	Virginia	31	7
Rhode Island	52	47	Tennessee	30	22
Pennsylvania	41	26	Oklahoma	21	19
Massachusetts	36	28	Colorado	14	50
Minnesota	30	13	North Dakota	11	100

TABLE 15--Continued

Democratic Chairmanships			Republican Chairmanships		
	Per Cent of National Chairman Ratio ^b	Per Cent Demo- cratic ^c		Per Cent of National Chairman Ratio ^b	Per Cent Repub- lican ^c
Arkansas	29	100	Delaware	0	64
Connecticut	20	28	New Mexico	0	17
Iowa	18	11	Arizona	0	4
New Hampshire	0	12	Nevada	0	47
Oregon	0	10	Texas	0	1
South Dakota	0	11	South Carolina	0	0
Kansas	0	17	Louisiana	0	0
Wyoming	0	16	Alabama	0	1
Nevada	0	53	Georgia	0	0
Delaware	0	36	Mississippi	0	0
North Dakota	0	0	Florida	0	0
Vermont	0	0	Arkansas	0	0

^aSource: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory.

^bThe chairman ratio is the number of years served as chairman for each 100 years served in Congress.

^cThe percentage Democratic and Republican is based on a state's two-party representation in the House since 1889. Minor party representatives have been excluded.

into three categories: Democratic states, Republican states, and two-party states. This classification has been made on the basis of percentage of the two-party representation in the House since 1889. (Minor party congressmen have been excluded.) If a state's representatives have been at least 60 per cent Republican or Democratic, it is classified as Republican or Democratic accordingly. The remaining states (that is, those in which the party division is as close as 59-41) are two-party states. Using this criterion, 23 states are Republican, 17 are Democratic, and eight are two-party states. The percentage Republican or Democratic is shown in Table 15.

Democrats from strongly Democratic states definitely hold an advantage in the contest for the chairmanships for their party. Of the 17 Democratic states, 16 are either above the national ratio or not more than 12 per cent below it. Only Arkansas can be said to be greatly under-represented. Of the top 28 states in the Democratic index, 16 are Democratic, 5 are two-party states, and 7 are Republican. In the 20 states at the bottom of the scale one finds 16 Republican states, three two-party states, and only one Democratic state.

It is not surprising to find that such states as North Carolina, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, and Texas have fared well in regard to the Democratic chairmanships. And

the pockets of Democratic strength in Jersey City, Newark, New York City, Chicago, Detroit, and Cleveland make it easy to explain why none of the states in which these cities are located is greatly under-represented. But a few states need a word of explanation. Idaho has had more than four times the representation to which it was entitled. West Virginia, which has few safe districts for either party, is 46 per cent above the Democratic ratio. Other states which need explaining are Wisconsin, Maine, Nebraska, Utah, and Indiana. On the other hand, Arkansas (a 100 per cent Democratic state) is 71 points below the national average.

An examination of these states reveals that factors other than the existence of safe districts, to a minor degree at least, enter into the picture of representation on the committee chairmanships. One of these is accident or the element of chance. One feature of seniority is that it is an automatic system of promotion, and a chairmanship often depends upon a spin of the wheel of fortune. Whether a particular congressman becomes a committee chairman frequently depends upon the whims or turns of mind of the senior members of the committee; or it may depend upon the natural laws of life and death or the fortunes of political parties. Another factor which enters into the picture of representation on the chairmanships is the vitality of a state's two-party system. As one party will benefit from the existence

of safe districts so the other party will profit from their absence. Hence, Indiana and West Virginia have done quite well in regard to the chairmanships of both parties.

Idaho owes its phenominal figure (467 per cent of the Democratic ratio) to what might be described as two accidents.¹⁰ The first is that Compton I. White managed to serve sixteen years in the House from a state which was for many years strongly Republican. From its admission into the Union in 1890 until 1954, Democrats from Idaho served but twelve terms in Congress; White accounts for eight terms. He was first elected at the beginning of the New Deal period (1932) and served continuously until he was defeated for reelection in 1946 when the Republicans won majority control of the House. The second accident was that he became a committee chairman after one term in the House and for twelve years presided over a standing committee. In 1933 he was assigned to the number six majority position on irrigation and reclamation. In 1935, Dennis Chavez, the former chairman, was in the Senate; Miles C. Allgood, the ranking majority member, had been defeated for renomination; Allard H. Gasque, the number three Democrat, was chairman of another

10

In dealing with state representation the figures are much smaller than they are for the five geographic sections. Hence, a change of one or two years representation on the chairmanships has a tremendous effect on the chairman ratio. This is especially pronounced in the case of small states such as Idaho which receive only one of two representatives.

committee; the number four Democrat, Charles H. Martin, was Governor of Oregon; Terry M. Carpenter, the number five Democrat, had been defeated for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination of Nebraska; White became chairman of irrigation and reclamation. Thus Idaho, a state which has had but twenty-four years Democratic representation in the House has had twelve years representation on the Democratic chairmanships.

Utah and Maine, like Idaho, have had but one Democratic chairman. However, the total Democratic representation in the House of these two states is so small that one chairman boosts the chairman ratio considerably. Since 1889 Democrats from Utah have served twenty-five terms in the House and Democrats from Maine have served but eight terms. J.W. Robinson, of Utah, served two years as chairman of the public lands committee and four years as chairman of the roads committee. His seven consecutive terms were served during the New Deal period, and he was defeated for reelection in 1946. Simon N. Hamlin, of Maine, served but one term in Congress, but as a freshman he became chairman of the insignificant memorials committee.

The fact that Wisconsin is 28 points above the national Democratic ratio may also be explained as an accident. Of the five Democratic chairmen from this state, none served more than six years in the House; one served only four years.

However, four Wisconsin Democrats were fortunate enough to become committee chairmen after only one term in Congress, and the fifth had to wait only four years for his promotion. And all received minor posts.

That Indiana, West Virginia, and Nebraska have done well in regard to the Democratic chairmanships cannot be explained by accident. The Democrats have profited from the absence of safe Republican districts. In fact, few safe districts for either party exist in these states.¹¹ Indiana and West Virginia are truly two-party states. Their party representation in the House changes with the election results. When the Republican party is in the ascendancy these two states are likely to send a majority of Republicans to Congress; when the climate of opinion favors the Democratic party they will send Democrats to Congress. Nebraska, though predominantly Republican throughout the years, has on occasion failed to send a single Republican to the House.

And when the fortunes of the Democratic party run high for a long period of time without a setback (as during the New Deal period and the Wilson era), it is possible for Democratic congressmen from these three states to achieve

11

See Cortez A. M. Ewing, "Primaries as Real Elections," The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, XXIX (March, 1949), pp. 293-298. From 1896 to 1946, 93.1 per cent of the elections in Indiana were won by a plurality of less than 20 per cent of the total vote. In Nebraska, 75.2 per cent of the elections were close as determined by this 20 per cent plurality test.

several terms of continuous service in the House. This, of course, enables them to become chairmen. Indiana has had twelve Democratic chairmen, West Virginia five, and Nebraska three. Of the twenty chairmen from these states, fifteen served at least eight years in the House. Nine served at least twelve years.

The under-representation of Arkansas on the Democratic chairmanships is more difficult to explain than the over-representation of Nebraska. Arkansas has not had a committee chairman since 1915. A partial explanation for the under-representation of this state is the fact that none of its five chairmen have held office for more than two terms. Three served but one term or less as chairmen. These five chairmen give Arkansas a total of less than fourteen years representation on the Democratic chairmanships.

Republicans from strongly Republican states hold a decisive advantage in the contests for the committee chairmanships. Of the 23 Republican states, 16 are either above the national Republican chairman ratio or not more than ten points below it. (Table 15) Of the top 23 states in the Republican index, 17 may be classified as strongly Republican and five as two-party states; only one is Democratic. The 25 states at the bottom of the index includes 16 Democratic states, three two-party states, and six Republican states.

Maryland is the only Democratic state above the national Republican chairman ratio. The Republican party in this state is in a situation similar to that of the Democratic party in Nebraska. The Republicans are definitely the minority party but are strong enough to elect congressmen when the political tides are running in favor of the party. And when the Republican party is in the ascendancy for a long period of time (as from 1895 to 1910 or from 1919 to 1930), Republicans from this state can achieve several terms of continuous service.

Two-party states such as Utah, Montana, Indiana, West Virginia, and New York have done well on the Republican chairmanships. The first four have profited from the absence of safe Democratic districts, but New York is in a different category. The latter is a two-party state in a different sense of the word. Its congressional delegation has been evenly divided between the two major parties because there are many safe Democratic districts in New York City and many safe Republican districts in upstate New York. Few safe districts exist for either party in West Virginia, Indiana, Utah, and Montana. The party complexions of the congressional delegations of these states are given to violent changes. In 1920 these four states sent only Republicans to the House; in 1932 they sent only Democrats.

Summary

The widely held view that the South is over-represented on the Democratic chairmanship and that the East and Middle West are over-represented on the Republican chairmanships is essentially correct. It is indeed true that these sections have received more than a fair share of the chairmanships of the more important committees. The South, a section which has had but one-half of the Democratic representation in the House of Representatives since 1889, has supplied approximately two-thirds of the chairmen of the exclusive committees. To be specific, the South is 39 per cent over-represented on this group of committees. The East and Middle West have supplied 87 per cent of the Republican chairmen of the exclusive committees. A fair share for these two sections, based on Republican representation in the House, would have been but 75 per cent. And there is little reason to doubt the common explanation that this situation is a result of the combined force of the seniority system and the lack of a vigorous two-party system in many congressional constituencies.

Furthermore, an examination of state representation on the committee chairmanships leads to the same conclusion. The strongly Democratic states tend to be over-represented on the Democratic chairmanships and the strongly Republican

states tend to be over-represented on the Republican chairmanships. For example, North Carolina (a state in which nine out of ten congressmen since 1889 have been Democrats) has received 60 per cent more than a fair share of the Democratic chairmen. Iowa (a state whose congressional delegations since 1889 have been 89 per cent Republican) has received 58 per cent more than a fair share of the Republican chairmen.

However, a word of caution is needed. For several reasons, it would be easy to exaggerate the degree and extent of state and sectional over-representation on the House committee chairmanships. In the first place, sectional over-representation is a phenomena found only on the exclusive chairmanships. It does not exist in so far as the total number of chairmanships are concerned. When all committees are considered it is found that each geographic section has received an almost perfect proportionate share of the chairmen since 1889. This applies to both the Republican and Democratic chairmanships. In the second place, the South has lost part of the advantage it once held in regard to the important Democratic chairmanships. Since the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 this section has received a smaller proportionate share of the Democratic chairmanships than the Middle West or the Border states. This decline in Southern over-representation can in large

part be accounted for by the increase in importance of several large urban centers. Seniority rewards Democrats from Detroit, Brooklyn, and Chicago as well as Southerners. However, there has been little change in representation on the Republican chairmanships since 1946.

A third factor which makes it easy to exaggerate over-representation on the House committee chairmanships is the fact that many states have received an equitable share of the chairmen. Twenty states are within 15 per cent of proportionate representation on the Democratic chairmanships, and nine states are within 10 per cent of proportionate representation on the Republican chairmanships.

And there are exceptions to the rule that strongly Democratic and strongly Republican states tend to be over-represented on the Democratic and Republican chairmanships. The two-party states have done quite well on the chairmanships of both parties, and in a few instances Republican states have received a fair share of the Democratic chairmen while a few Democratic states have received an equitable share of the Republican chairmen. This leads to an important modification of the commonly accepted causal relationship between one-party politics, seniority, and over-representation. It is indeed true that the seniority system seems to reward the so-called safe districts. But it is also true that seniority is an automatic system of promotion, and this

means that committee chairmanships sometimes depend upon accident or chance rather than the accumulation of many years of service. Furthermore, there is the factor which might be called the reverse side of the tendency of the seniority system to reward safe districts. As one party will benefit from the existence of safe districts so the other party will profit from their absence. This point is well illustrated by the fact that such states as Indiana and West Virginia, where few safe districts exist for either party, have received an equitable share of the chairmanships of both parties.

CHAPTER IV

SENIORITY

The Origin of the Rule of Seniority

The origin of the rule of seniority in the House of Representatives is usually associated with the overthrow of "Czar" Cannon in 1910 and 1911. Before this, the Speaker appointed all committees including the chairmen. Since 1911 standing committee members and chairmen have been "elected" by the House. In actual practice, however, they have been chosen by the committee on committees and approved by the party caucus. In the exercise of this authority, the committee on committees has usually, though not invariably, been guided by the rule of seniority. That is, this committee has usually followed the practice of awarding the chairmanships and the more important committee assignments to the members with the longest service. There is reason to believe that the Speaker also followed this practice and that the rule of seniority did not suddenly come into existence on April 5, 1911 at the moment the House transferred to itself the duty of naming committees. This date is a

landmark in the development of the rule, but seniority, like most institutions, gradually evolved into what it is today over a long period of time.

The reasons for assigning this date as the beginning of seniority are not difficult to find. The overthrow of Cannon marks a basic shift in the power structure of the House -- a shift from centralized control to decentralized control -- and the change in the procedure for naming committees was one of the most important formal manifestations of that shift. It is undoubtedly true that the rule of seniority began to play a more important role at this time. Before this the Speaker used his authority to appoint committees to consolidate his position of leadership and to insure party regularity. Since 1911 these factors have had little if any influence, and seniority has become so firmly entrenched that the authority to name committees can no longer be used to insure party cohesion. The overthrow of Cannon does indeed mark the beginning of a more rigid application of the seniority principle, but it does not mark the origin of the rule.

Without doubt the rule of seniority was well established prior to 1911. Speaker Cannon, in 1909, had this to say in praise of government by the "experienced":

A man comes here for his first term, and although he may be a man of great ability and high character, how is any one to know it? He must prove it, and until

he does prove it he must serve his probation and be put, not on the Ways and Means Committee to frame a tariff bill or on the Appropriations Committee, but on an unimportant committee, where he can show what he has in him and learn the business of government.¹

According to De Alva Stanwood Alexander, who sat in the House from 1897 to 1911, the change in the method of selecting committees "made no perceptible change in the manner of making up committees." For the committee on committees "in no wise departed from the rules which formerly guided the Speaker." These rules were "fitness, experience, and geographical location" and the "long established custom of promoting older members and placing at the head of each committee the person entitled by long service to the chairmanship."²

That the Speaker usually placed "at the head of each committee the person entitled by long service" is verified by an examination of the appointments made by Joseph G. Cannon. During the eight years he served as Speaker Cannon appointed 244 chairmen. On 212 occasions he either promoted the ranking majority member or reappointed the chairman who had presided over the committee in the previous Congress. Twelve other appointments cannot be considered as violations of the seniority principle. On twenty occasions, however,

¹
Congressional Record, 61st Congress, 1st Session, quoted in Galloway, Congress at the Crossroads, 188.

²
De Alva Stanwood Alexander, History and Procedure of the House of Representatives (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916), 83. Emphasis mine.

Cannon definitely departed from the practice of awarding the chairmanship to the person entitled to it by long service. On the basis of this it can be said that the Speaker usually deferred to seniority, but on the other hand, the number of exceptions is great enough to mean that the appointment of chairmen was a very real power in the hands of the Speaker.

As data have not been collected for the period prior to the election of Thomas B. Reed to the speakership, the only definite statement which can be made is that seniority has been a factor in the selection of chairmen since 1889. However, it is interesting to observe that it has always been the practice in the House to designate a member's rank on a committee by the order in which he was named to the committee. Previous to November 23, 1804, according to Asher C. Hinds, this practice was based on custom and usage only, but on this date it was written into the rules of the House.³

The rule of 1804 was adopted as a result of a controversy over the chairmanship of the committee on claims. On November 6, 1804 John Cotton Smith of Connecticut, the chairman, was excused by the House from further service on the committee. Samuel W. Dana, who had not previously been a member of the committee, was appointed by the Speaker "in his stead." The members of the claims committee contended

³ Hinds, Precedents of the House of Representatives, IV, 913. See also Luce, Legislative Procedure, 121.

that this made Dana chairman, but Dana contended that as the last-named member of the committee he should go to the foot of the list. The matter was brought before the House and on November 23 the following rule was adopted:

That the first-named member of any committee appointed by the Speaker or the House shall be the chairman, and in case of his absence, or being excused by the House, the next-named member, and so on, as often as the case shall happen, unless the committee shall, by a majority of their number, elect a chairman.⁴

This rule was a compromise of the existing controversy for it gave the committee the authority to name its own chairman. The members of the committee on claims availed themselves of this authority and "by a majority of their number" elected Dana chairman. Nevertheless, this rule specifically designated as chairman "the first-named member of any committee" and provided that in the case of a vacancy the "next-named member" should become chairman, "and so on, as often as the case shall happen." This rule, which continued in effect until 1911, does not necessarily mark the beginning of seniority because the rule of seniority, as we understand it today, involves the reassignment of members to the same committee from congress to congress. But the rule of 1804 did provide for "seniority" during the life of a congress or, in the case of a select committee, during the life of the committee.

⁴ Hinds, Precedents of the House of Representatives, IV, 914.

The Overthrow of Cannon and the Legislative
Reorganization Act

Two events of the last half century have had a marked influence on the development of the rule of seniority in the House of Representatives. The general revision of the House Rules in 1910 and 1911, sometimes called the overthrow of "Czar" Cannon, changed the method of selecting chairmen and committee members from appointment by the Speaker to election by the House. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, among other things, reduced the number of standing committees from forty-eight to nineteen.

The search for the meaning of the overthrow of Cannon and its effect on the seniority system is a nebulous affair. Undoubtedly, the new method resulted in a great change in the actual operation of the seniority rule, but if measured by length of service required to become a committee chairman, its effects are scarcely discernible. Before 1910 it took almost as long to climb the ladder of seniority as it did in the three decades following the overthrow of Cannon.⁵ For under the new system the committee on committees merely

5

The number of standing committees in existence at any given time has a pronounced effect upon the average length of time required to become a committee chairman. However, the number of standing committees in existence from 1889 to 1910 was approximately the same as the number varied from 49 to 61, and in the second period the number of standing committees ranged from 46 to 60.

continued the practice of promoting the senior member of a committee -- a practice long followed by the Speaker. In the period from 1889 to 1910, a congressman had to serve an apprenticeship of a little over six years before being promoted to the chairmanship of a standing committee; from 1911 to 1946, he had to serve only a little over seven years. (Table 16)

Perhaps the real significance of the rules change of 1911 is to be found in the disappearance of party responsibility. As noted above, Cannon departed from the established practice of promoting the ranking majority member in approximately one out of every twelve appointments. He certainly possessed a power which might be called the "threat of not promoting." The committee on committees, although it has been known to ignore the seniority rule, has been bound more closely to it and has been less free to use the authority to name committees as a disciplinary measure.⁶

Measured by the number of years required to become a committee chairman, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is far more important in the development of the rule of seniority than the overthrow of "Czar" Cannon. The latter technically changed the method of selecting chairmen but

6

Several instances in which the committee on committees failed to follow the seniority rule are mentioned in Floyd M. Riddick, Congressional Procedure (Boston: Chapman and Grimes, 1941),

TABLE 16

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS SERVED IN CONGRESS PRIOR TO BECOMING
CHAIRMAN OF A STANDING COMMITTEE, BY POLITICAL PARTY AND
GEOGRAPHIC SECTION, SELECTED PERIODS, 1889-1954

	1889-1910	1911-1946	1947-1954	1889-1954
United States	6.1	7.5	16.6	7.4
East	6.3	6.1	19.4	6.9
Middle West	6.3	6.9	15.8	7.1
South	6.8	9.2	15.2	9.1
West	5.1	6.9	14.8	6.8
Border	4.8	7.6	16.8	7.0
Republicans	6.2	6.9	16.2	7.1
East	6.7	6.1	19.3	7.1
Middle West	6.4	8.0	14.1	7.5
South	2.8	6.0	--	3.9
West	5.1	7.3	15.1	6.8
Border	4.6	4.4	20.0	5.1
Democrats	5.9	7.8	17.0	7.9
East	3.4	6.1	19.6	6.3
Middle West	6.1	5.2	21.4	6.1
South	7.2	9.2	15.2	9.2
West	---	6.5	14.0	6.7
Border	5.1	8.8	15.2	8.1

Source: Compiled from data in various issues of
Congressional Directory.

resulted in very little increase in the period of apprenticeship. The latter, by reducing the number of standing committees from forty-eight to nineteen, limited the chairmanships to congressmen with exceedingly long tenures. Before the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act, it was not uncommon for a congressman who had served only three or four terms to become chairman of a standing committee. Many became chairman after only one or two terms. Since 1947, it has taken on the average more than sixteen years to become a committee chairman. (Table 16) In other words, the average time required to become a chairman has more than doubled.

That the Legislative Reorganization Act has enhanced the importance of seniority might be objected to on the grounds that no subcommittee chairmen are included in this study. For it is possible that the "short tenure" congressmen who formerly served as chairmen of minor standing committees are now serving as chairmen of subcommittees. However, George B. Galloway contends that there has been no increase in the total number of standing subcommittees in Congress since the passage of the act. In the House there has actually been a reduction in the total number. In 1945 there were ninety-seven standing subcommittees in the House; in 1952 there were only seventy-two.⁷

⁷George B. Galloway, The Legislative Process in Congress (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1953), 312.

Tables 17 and 18, which are based on total length of service in the House rather than length of service prior to becoming chairman, tell the same story as Table 16. Following the overthrow of Cannon there was a small increase in the average number of years served in Congress, but following the Legislative Reorganization Act there was a large increase. Before 1910 the "short tenure" chairman (that is, one who served eight years or less) was not uncommon; in the years from 1911 to 1946, he was less common; but since 1947 he has practically disappeared.

Length of Service

Many persons would undoubtedly agree that "obviously it takes a decade or two to become a committee chairman."⁸ This may be obvious, but it is true only when applied to the very recent past and to a limited number of committees. Since 1889 it has taken, not a decade or two, but a little over seven years for a congressman to reach the top of his committee. Only in the past eight years--since the number of standing committees was reduced to nineteen--has it been necessary for a congressman to serve a decade or more in order to become a committee chairman. On fifty-seven of the seventy-seven committees the chairmen have served, on the average, less than ten years prior to becoming chairman.

8

James M. Burns and Jack W. Peltason, Government by the People (New York: Prentice Hall, 1952), 413.

TABLE 17

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS SERVED IN CONGRESS BY CHAIRMEN OF
STANDING COMMITTEES, BY POLITICAL PARTY AND GEOGRAPHIC
SECTION, SELECTED PERIODS, 1889-1954

	1889-1910	1911-1946	1947-1954	1889-1954
United States	11.9	14.7	22.4	13.6
East	12.3	13.4	24.2	13.2
Middle West	11.8	13.3	21.2	12.5
South	12.7	17.4	22.9	16.3
West	10.5	12.7	19.4	12.3
Border	10.0	15.0	24.0	13.5
Republicans	12.5	13.7	20.9	13.2
East	13.2	13.8	23.8	13.7
Middle West	12.9	14.1	19.0	13.3
South	5.8	15.4	--	9.0
West	10.5	13.6	20.2	12.6
Border	9.5	10.6	22.0	10.7
Democrats	10.2	15.4	24.0	14.2
East	6.1	12.9	24.7	11.6
Middle West	7.4	12.0	28.2	10.3
South	13.6	17.4	22.9	16.6
West	--	11.6	16.0	11.6
Border	10.3	16.8	26.9	14.9

Source: Compiled from data in various issues of
Congressional Directory.

TABLE 18

PERCENTAGE OF STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN SERVING 8 YEARS
OR LESS IN CONGRESS, BY GEOGRAPHIC SECTION,
SELECTED PERIODS, 1889-1954

	1889-1910	1911-1946	1947-1954	1889-1954
United States	42	23	4	30
East	41	29	0	34
Middle West	47	33	6	40
South	25	9	8	13
West	43	31	0	34
Border	53	20	0	30

Source: Compiled from data in various issues of
Congressional Directory.

The conspicuous features of Table 19 (which gives the distribution of the chairmanships according to the number of years served in the House prior to becoming chairman) is the very high proportion of the chairmen who had served so briefly at the time of their promotion to the chairmanship. Seven out of ten chairmanships were awarded to congressmen with no more than eight years service; four out of ten went to representatives who had served only one or two terms.

On the other hand, it did take a decade or two for a considerable number of congressmen to reach the top of their committees. Three out of ten had to serve at least nine years. And for thirty-three congressmen, more than two decades were needed to win a chairmanship; five had to serve at least twenty-nine years.

As one would expect, most of the chairmen who served but three or four terms received a minor chairmanship, and those with unusually long periods of prior service received an important post. (Table 20) Of the sixty-five congressmen who had to serve at least seventeen years, fifty-one became chairmen of exclusive committees. (That is, those committees considered to be of sufficient importance that membership on one of them precludes membership on any other committee.) Altogether, 581 members of the House with no more than eight years service have been promoted to the chairmanship of a standing committee. Of these, 528 became chairmen of "non-exclusive" committees.

TABLE 19

DISTRIBUTION OF STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRMANSHIPS BY NUMBER OF YEARS SERVED IN
CONGRESS PRIOR TO BECOMING CHAIRMAN, BY GEOGRAPHIC SECTION, 1889-1954

Number Chairmen whose service prior to becoming chairmen was:									
	4 years or less	5-8 years	9-12 years	13-16 years	17-20 years	21-24 years	25-28 years	29 years or more	total
United States	346	235	107	79	32	19	9	5	832
East	114	71	30	15	6	8	3	1	248
Middle West	113	62	26	23	7	2	4	3	240
South	49	49	36	29	12	5	1	1	182
West	39	35	8	4	3	4	1	0	94
Border	31	18	7	8	4	0	0	0	68

Source: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory.

TABLE 20

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CHAIRMANSIPS OF EXCLUSIVE COMMITTEES BY NUMBER OF YEARS SERVED
IN CONGRESS PRIOR TO BECOMING CHAIRMAN, BY GEOGRAPHIC SECTION, 1889-1954

Number exclusive chairmen whose service in Congress prior to becoming chairmen was:									
	4 years or less	5-8 years	9-12 years	13-16 years	17-20 years	21-24 years	25-28 years	29 years or more	total
United States	14	39	42	43	27	13	6	5	189
East	6	11	15	8	4	5	1	1	51
Middle West	4	10	10	14	6	0	3	3	50
South	0	11	13	15	10	5	1	1	56
West	2	5	3	3	3	3	1	0	20
Border	2	2	1	3	4	0	0	0	12

Source: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory.

Because so many chairmen serve several decades in the House and because these are the ones who are best known, it is easy to form an exaggerated picture of the length of time chairmen usually serve in the House. Joseph G. Cannon, Adolph Sabath, Sam Rayburn, Robert L. Doughton, Carl Vinson--these names are familiar to anyone with even a casual interest in American politics. Each has served at least forty years. But who has heard of James N. Castle, Mae E. Nolan, Simon H. Hamlin, Henry M. Youmans, George F. Rogers, or Clarence D. Coughlin? Each of these persons served one term in the House. For every chairman who serves fifteen terms there are two who serve but one or two terms; for every chairman who serves twenty-five years there are four who serve eight years or less. The distribution of chairmen according to the number of years served in the House is given in Table 21.

But when the chairmen of the exclusive committees are considered it is difficult to exaggerate the length of service in the House. (Table 22) Four out of ten have served more than two decades, and one out of seven have served three decades. Only nine of the 184 exclusive chairmen have served eight years or less.

The Long Tenure Chairmen

Almost all of the "long tenure" chairmen (that is, those with at least seventeen years service in the House)

TABLE 21

DISTRIBUTION OF CHAIRMEN OF STANDING COMMITTEES BY NUMBER OF YEARS SERVED IN
CONGRESS BY GEOGRAPHIC SECTION, 1889-1954

	Number chairmen who served:								total	
	4 years or less	5-8 years	9-12 years	13-16 years	17-20 years	21-24 years	25-28 years	29 years or more		
United States	69	142	140	130	103	58	22	32	696	8
East	26	43	37	36	29	11	9	11	202	
Middle West	22	56	39	33	23	13	3	8	197	
South	7	14	30	38	38	22	5	10	164	
West	9	17	24	10	8	3	4	2	77	
Border	5	12	10	13	5	9	1	1	56	

Source: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory.

TABLE 22

DISTRIBUTION OF CHAIRMEN OF EXCLUSIVE COMMITTEES BY NUMBER OF YEARS SERVED IN CONGRESS, BY GEOGRAPHIC SECTION, 1889-1954

Number exclusive chairmen who served:									
	4 years or less	5-8 years	9-12 years	13-16 years	17-20 years	21-24 years	25-28 years	29 years or more	total
United States	1	8	22	36	45	36	11	25	184
East	1	5	5	8	14	5	5	7	50
Middle West	0	2	5	10	12	10	1	7	47
South	0	0	5	11	15	14	2	8	55
West	0	1	5	3	3	3	3	2	20
Border	0	0	2	4	1	4	0	1	12

Source: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory.

belong to the political party which is dominant in their section. Very few Democrats from the East, Middle West, or West serve seventeen years, and the long tenure Republican from the South or the Border is indeed rare. (Table 23) Of the 109 long tenure Democratic chairmen, eighty-six came from the Southern and Border states; and of the 106 long tenure Republicans, all but five came from the three Republican sections.

The East, Middle West, and West have produced a total of 129 Democratic chairmen. It was pointed out in an earlier chapter that most of these come from "pockets" of Democratic strength usually found in large cities. New York City alone has contributed a sizeable number. This is made especially clear by an examination of the constituencies of the long tenure chairmen.

Of the twenty-three long tenure Democrats from the East, Middle West, and West, fifteen came from large urban centers of one half million population or over: one from Wayne County, Michigan; one from Chicago, one from Cleveland, one from Buffalo, and eleven from metropolitan New York (including two from Jersey City). Three others came from fairly large Middle Western cities: one from Springfield, Illinois; one from Youngstown, Ohio; and one from Toledo, Ohio. Only five came from districts which can be classified as rural, and three of these came from Western states.

TABLE 23

NUMBER OF CHAIRMEN WHO SERVED 17 YEARS OR MORE IN
CONGRESS, BY POLITICAL PARTY AND GEOGRAPHIC
SECTION, 1889-1954*

	Republicans	Democrats	Total
United States	106	109	215
East	48	12	60
Mid West	39	8	47
South	1	74	75
West	14	3	17
Border	4	12	16

*Source: Compiled from data in various issues of
Congressional Directory.

The South and the Border have produced but five long tenure Republican chairmen, and three of these are accounted for by the existence of one or two safe Republican districts in Tennessee and Kentucky. The lone Southern Republican with at least seventeen years service is J. Will Taylor who came from a district which included Knoxville, Tennessee. Of the four long tenure Republicans from the Border states, two came from Kentucky and two from Missouri. One of the Missouri Republicans was from St. Louis and one from a district in the south-western part of the state. The two Kentucky Republicans came from districts in the south-eastern part of the state.

The "Failures"

Curiously enough, long and continuous service in the House does not guarantee a chairmanship. A majority of the congressmen who serve twenty or thirty years eventually reap the reward of good health and the ability to win elections by obtaining a standing committee chairmanship--usually an important one. Yet it sometimes occurs that a congressman is the victim of his party's fortunes. A few congressmen with many years continuous service failed to win a chairmanship because the wrong political party controlled the House during the latter part of their service. Others had the misfortune to be assigned to committees behind future septuagenarians or octogenarians.

To the gods alone
Belongs it never to be old or die,

and from the viewpoint of a few ranking majority members, Sophocles might well have included House committee chairmen along with the gods.

In the twenty-four-year period from 1931 to 1954, no less than 145 congressmen with ten or more terms of service have sat in the House of Representatives. Of these, eighty-six are included in the list of chairmen, but fifty-nine never rose higher than the number two position on their committees. (Table 24) A few of the fifty-nine "failures" should perhaps not be included because three became chairmen in 1955 (after the end of the period covered by this study), and five have served as Speaker or Floor Leader. In addition to these, eleven are still serving in the House and may, of course, eventually become committee chairmen. But if these are excluded there still remains forty congressmen with ten or more terms of service who never held a chairmanship.

A few of these can be partially explained by the fact that their terms of service were not consecutive. For example, Zebulon Weaver of North Carolina served fourteen terms in Congress, but his longest consecutive service was eight terms. Virgil Chapman of Kentucky served eleven terms in the House before going to the Senate, but his tenure was

TABLE 24
NUMBER OF CONGRESSMEN WITH TEN OR MORE TERMS OF SERVICE IN THE HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1931-1954

	Number who served:				total
	10-11 terms	12-13 terms	14-15 terms	16 or more terms	
Standing Committee Chairmen	35	22	11	18	86
Congressmen who never held a chairmanship	37	9	11	2	59
Total number of Congressmen	72	31	22	20	145

101

Source: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory.

broken when he was defeated for reelection in 1928.

Fourteen congressmen with long and continuous service had little opportunity to become committee chairmen because their own political party did not control the House during the latter part of their service. Allen T. Treadway, a Republican from Massachusetts, served sixteen consecutive terms in the House, but the last seven congresses in which he served were controlled by the Democrats. During his last six terms in office he was the senior minority member of the committee on ways and means. George Holden Tinkham, also a Republican from Massachusetts, served fourteen consecutive terms, but the Democrats controlled the last six congresses in which he served. However, Tinkham did not even become the ranking minority member of his committee. During the 77th Congress, his last term in office, he was the third ranking minority member of the foreign affairs committee. Hamilton Fish of New York served thirteen consecutive terms in the House and was the senior minority member of foreign affairs for six terms.

At least seventeen congressmen failed to become committee chairmen because two or three decades was not sufficient time to accumulate the necessary seniority; they were assigned to committees behind men who lived too long and were reelected too many times. Roy O. Woodruff of Michigan served seventeen terms, the last sixteen consecutively. In the 80th Congress, he occupied the number three

majority position on the ways and means committee-behind Harold Knutson and Daniel Reed. Woodruff managed to outlast Knutson by two terms, but not Reed who is now, at the age of seventy-nine, serving his nineteenth term in the House. Patrick H. Drewry of Virginia served fifteen terms continuously, and for fourteen years held the number two majority position on the naval affairs committee behind Carl Vinson. Thomas H. Cullen of New York served thirteen consecutive terms, the last four as the second ranking Democrat on the ways and means committee behind Robert L. Doughton.

The case of E. E. Cox of Georgia is especially interesting. He served fourteen consecutive terms; but he was unfortunate enough to be appointed to the rules committee after Adolph Sabath and for twelve years held the number two majority position on this committee. On November 4, 1952 both Sabath and Cox were reelected to the 83rd Congress. Two days later Sabath died, but Congress was not in session and Cox could not officially become chairman until elected by the House. On December 24, ten days before the convening of the 83rd Congress, Cox died; but even if he had lived he would not have become chairman because the Republicans organized Congress.

The Southern Chairmen

The South is consistently unique. "It fits none of the dominant national political characteristics. It is a

one-party section."⁹ Democrats win 95 per cent of the congressional elections, and 96 per cent of its chairmen have been Democrats. No other section is so completely dominated by a single political party. The South's unique political behavior is perhaps nowhere more apparent than in a study of seniority in Congress. Southern chairmen serve longer in the House than do chairmen from the rest of the nation, and Southerners have to serve a longer period of apprenticeship before being elevated to a chairmanship. This section receives an unusually large share of the important chairmanships and relatively few of the minor posts.

The median tenure in the House of Representatives for all chairmen is approximately twelve years, but seven out of ten Southerners serve thirteen years or more. (Table 25) The East and Border are fairly close to the national median, but the majority of the chairmen from the Middle West and West serve twelve years or less. Furthermore, Southerners serve on the average about three years longer than the chairmen from any other section. (Table 17) Almost one-half of the Southern chairmen serve at least seventeen years in the House, but only one-fourth of the chairmen from the rest of the nation serve as long as this. (Table 21)

9

Cortez A. M. Ewing, Congressional Elections, 1896-1944 (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 1947), 88.

TABLE 25
 NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN SERVING
 12 YEARS OR LESS AND 13 YEARS OR MORE IN CONGRESS BY
 GEOGRAPHIC SECTION, 1889-1954

	12 years or less		13 years or more	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
United States	351	50	345	50
East	106	52	96	48
Middle West	117	59	80	41
South	51	31	113	69
West	50	65	27	35
Border	27	48	29	52

Source: Compiled from data in various issues of
Congressional Directory.

Not only do Southerners serve longer in the House but they must also serve a longer apprenticeship before becoming chairmen. On the average they have served two years longer than the chairmen from any other section. (Table 16) Almost one-half of the Southerners had to serve at least nine years before winning a chairmanship, but only one-fourth of the other chairmen had to serve this long. (Table 19)

That Southern chairmen serve longer in the House is not difficult to understand, but the cause of the long period of prior service is more elusive. The former is a result of the well known fact that Southern congressmen have unusually long tenures. Because of the lack of Republican opposition in general elections and the South's habit of renominating its congressmen time after time, Southern representatives frequently achieve two decades of service. When a public office holder in the South desires to succeed himself in office, Southern voters rarely deny him that privilege.¹⁰ Of the 145 congressmen in Table 24 with ten or more terms of service, no less than 36 per cent are Southerners.

It is entirely possible that long and continuous service in the House is in itself the cause of long periods of

Cortez A. M. Ewing, Primary Elections in the South (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1953). Based on 2260 primary contests in which incumbents were candidates (including 938 legislative races), it was found that the incumbents were successful in approximately 92 per cent of the contests.

prior service. Geography is one of the most influential considerations in assigning representatives to committees, and for this reason a few committees have been dominated by congressmen from particular regions. For example, the South has dominated the agriculture committee. In the 79th Congress twelve of the seventeen Democratic members of this committee were Southerners; and six of the seven Democratic chairmen came from Southern states. Thus it is not unusual for a Southerner, destined to serve two or three decades in the House, to find himself assigned to a committee behind another Southerner who still has many years to live and many times to be reelected. Hampton P. Fulmer of South Carolina had to wait twenty years for his promotion to the chairmanship of the agriculture committee because he was serving behind Marvin Jones of Texas. Fulmer was the second ranking majority member for ten years. It took Robert L. Doughton of North Carolina twenty-two years to become chairman of ways and means because he was serving behind James W. Collier of Mississippi and Charles R. Crisp of Georgia. Patrick H. Drewry of Virginia served fifteen terms and never became a committee chairman because he was serving behind Carl Vinson of Georgia.

Furthermore, long and continuous service enables Southerners to claim positions on the more important committee -- where it takes longer to become a committee chairman.

One half of the chairmen of the exclusive committees served at least thirteen years prior to their promotion. (Table 20) Less than one-fifth of the total number of chairmen had to serve thirteen years. The South has furnished 30 per cent of the 189 chairmanships of the eighteen exclusive committees compared to 20 per cent of the chairmanships of the remaining fifty-nine committees.

The Eastern and Middle Western Republicans

As the Southerners are conspicuous in a study of all chairmen so the Republicans from the East and Middle West are conspicuous in a study of Republican chairmen. Republicans from these two sections serve on the average almost two years longer in the House than Republicans from the rest of the nation.¹¹ And like the Southerners, the Republicans from the East and Middle West have to serve a long apprenticeship before being elevated to the chairmanship. Republicans from these two sections have to serve about one year longer than Republicans from the rest of the nation before becoming chairmen.¹² The explanation of the long period of prior

11

The 294 Republican chairmen from the East and Middle West have served an average of 13.5 years in the House. The 78 Republicans from the West, Border, and South have served an average of 11.9 years in the House.

12

The Republicans from the East and Middle West have had to serve on the average 7.3 years prior to becoming committee chairmen. The Republicans from the West, Border, and South have had to serve 6.2 years.

service for the Eastern and Middle Western Republicans is the same as it is in the case of the Southern Democrats. These sections receive more than their share of the important Republican chairmanships where it takes longer to climb the ladder of seniority.

Committee Eminence

To a very great extent, length of service in the House at the time of promotion to the chairmanship reflects a committee's popularity among congressmen. For this reason it is a good criterion for the evaluation of the relative importance of the various committees. A long period of prior service means, first of all, that new assignments to a committee are usually given to representatives with fairly long service. Secondly, it means that members are reluctant to leave a committee once assigned to it. These factors are, of course, modified by such things as the health and the ability to win elections of the senior members of the committees and the fortunes of political parties.

In Table 26 the seventy-seven committees are ranked in order from the highest to the lowest average number of years service prior to becoming chairman. Those committees on which the members are not permitted to hold another committee assignment (that is, the exclusive committees) are found near the top. Of the first fourteen committees all are considered exclusive except the House administration

TABLE 26

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS SERVED IN CONGRESS PRIOR TO
BECOMING CHAIRMAN OF STANDING COMMITTEES,
BY COMMITTEE, 1889-1954

Committee	Number Chairmen	Average
1 Veterans' Affairs	2	24.7
2 Armed Services	3	23.3
3 Ways and Means	14	18.2
4 Public Works	3	17.9
5 Appropriations	16	16.9
6 Rules	13	16.4
7 Interstate and Foreign Commerce	14	15.5
8 Judiciary	14	14.5
9 Foreign Affairs	16	14.2
10 Education and Labor	4	13.7
11 Agriculture	12	12.5
12 House Administration	3	12.0
13 Naval Affairs	8	11.1
14 Military Affairs	13	11.0
15 Flood Control	6	11.0
16 Woman Suffrage	3	10.9
17 Rivers and Harbors	12	10.2
18 Post Office and Post Roads	13	10.1
19 Insular Affairs	12	10.0
20 Roads	6	10.0
21 Banking and Currency	14	9.3
22 Public Lands	15	9.2
23 World War Veterans' Legislation	2	9.0
24 Library	13	9.0
25 Merchant Marine and Fisheries	13	8.6
26 Public Buildings and Grounds	10	8.4
27 Memorials	9	8.1
28 Post Office and Civil Service	2	8.0
29 Manufactures	7	8.0
30 Indian Affairs	13	7.8
31 District of Columbia	16	7.4
32 Expenditures in the Executive Departments	6	7.4
33 Territories	15	7.4

TABLE 26--Continued

Committee	Number Chairmen	Average
34 Immigration and Naturalization	9	7.0
35 Private Land Claims	6	6.8
36 Invalid Pensions	13	6.7
37 Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River	7	6.6
38 Civil Service	8	6.5
39 War Claims	17	6.4
40 Irrigation and Reclamation	14	6.4
41 Education	16	6.3
42 Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and Labor	3	6.0
43 Disposition of Useless Executive Papers	7	6.0
44 Un-American Activities	3	5.9
45 Claims	14	5.8
46 Expenditures in the Interior Department	12	5.8
47 Expenditures in the State Department	10	5.6
48 Patents	17	5.5
49 Accounts	15	5.5
50 Census	13	5.3
51 Mines and Mining	16	5.2
52 Coinage, Weights, and Measures	11	5.2
53 Pensions	12	5.2
54 Expenditures in the Post Office Department	12	5.2
55 Labor	14	5.2
56 Printing	13	5.1
57 Expenditures in the Department of Justice	18	5.1
58 Industrial Arts and Expositions	9	4.8
59 Alcoholic Liquor Traffic	10	4.8
60 Expenditures in the Treasury Department	12	4.7
61 Revision of the Laws	12	4.7
62 Expenditures in the War Department	12	4.6
63 Militia	7	4.5
64 Pacific Railroads	5	4.4
65 Expenditures in the Navy Department	13	4.4
66 Elections No. 2	11	4.4

TABLE 26--Continued

Committee	Number Chairmen	Average
67 Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress	15	4.4
68 Ventilation and Acoustics	7	4.2
69 Elections No. 3	16	4.0
70 Elections No. 1	21	3.7
71 Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture	10	3.4
72 Expenditures on Public Buildings	15	3.3
73 Railways and Canals	9	3.3
74 Expenditures in the Department of Commerce	8	3.1
75 Expenditures in the Department of Labor	5	2.8
76 Enrolled Bills	18	2.8
77 Mileage	15	2.6

Source: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory.

committee, and all of the exclusive committees are to be found among the top twenty-eight committees. At the bottom of the list one finds such committees as mileage, enrolled bills, railways and canals, ventilation and acoustics, pacific railroads, militia, revision of the laws, alcoholic liquor traffic, industrial arts and expositions, printing, and many of the various expenditures and elections committees. Very surprising is the fact that the committees on labor, mines and mining, and coinage, weights, and measures are so near the bottom of the list. All three rank lower than the committee on the disposition of useless executive papers--the "waste basket committee."

Table 26 should not be interpreted to mean that the veterans' affairs and armed services committees are more important than ways and means or that public works is more important than rules or appropriations. The six new committees created by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 have had only two or three chairmen (too few for the averages to be very significant), and all of the chairmen of these committees have, of course, served in the period since 1947, the period of the greatest prior service. The result is that the importance of the following committees is exaggerated: veterans' affairs, armed services, public works, education and labor, House administration, and post office and civil service. If the three chairmen of ways and means who have

served since 1947 were used to compute the average for this committee--rather than the fourteen who have served since 1889--the average prior service would be 28.6 years rather than the 18.2 years shown in the Table. The same is true for the other committees.

Nevertheless, if the committees with only three or four chairmen are excluded, it is believed that the remaining committees are ranked in the order of their eminence and that the criterion of length of service required to become chairman is a valid one. In fact, Table 26 is in almost complete agreement with a study made by John C. Eberhart of Northwestern University.¹³ This study ranked the committees on the basis of committee assignments rather than length of service required to become chairman. Some five thousand committee appointments were used in this study which covers the years from 1914 to 1941. Below, in the left hand column, is a list of the thirteen top committees as determined by Eberhart's study. In the right hand column is a list of the top eighteen committees as determined by the length of service required to become chairman. Those committees with only four chairmen or less are excluded from the latter groups.

¹³
Reported in Galloway, Congress at the Crossroads, 90.

1. Ways and Means	1. Ways and Means
2. Appropriation	2. Appropriations
3. Rules	3. Rules
4. Interstate and Foreign Commerce	4. Interstate and Foreign Commerce
5. Judiciary	5. Judiciary
6. Agriculture	6. Foreign Affairs
7. Foreign Affairs	7. Agriculture
8. Naval Affairs	8. Naval Affairs
9. Banking and Currency	9. Military Affairs
10. Rivers and Harbors	10. Flood Control
11. Military Affairs	11. Rivers and Harbors
12. Post Office and Post Roads	12. Post Office and Post Roads
13. Merchant Marine and Fisheries	13. Insular Affairs
	14. Roads
	15. Banking and Currency
	16. Public Lands
	17. Library
	18. Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Summary

The custom of awarding the chairmanship of a standing committee to the member with the longest service was well established in the House long before the overthrow of Cannon in 1911. In approximately eleven out of every twelve instances, Speaker Cannon either promoted the ranking majority member to the chairmanship or reappointed the chairman who had presided over the committee in the previous Congress. Throughout the period from 1889 to 1910--the era of "dictatorial" Speakers such as Reed, Crisp, Henderson, and Cannon--it took almost as long to climb the ladder of seniority as it did in the period from 1911 to 1946 when the chairmen were selected by the committee on committees. When the Speaker appointed chairmen it took a little over six years to become

a committee chairman; after the authority to name chairmen was transferred to the committee on committees it took a little over seven years.

Measured by the number of years required to become a committee chairman, the overthrow of Cannon is less important in the development of seniority than the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The former resulted in very little increase in the period of apprenticeship; the latter, by reducing the number of standing committees, greatly enhanced the importance of the seniority principle. The Legislative Reorganization Act limited the chairmanships to congressmen with exceedingly long tenures. Since 1947 it has taken on the average more than sixteen years to become a committee chairman.

But this does not mean that the overthrow of Cannon was of little importance in the development of seniority. For indeed this event was a landmark in the development of the rule. Although the Speaker usually deferred to the seniority principle, he nevertheless ignored it occasionally. The Speaker was guided by seniority in appointing chairman, but he certainly possessed a power which might be called the "threat of not promoting." Cannon departed from the custom of awarding the chairmanship to the senior member in approximately one out of every twelve appointments. This was undoubtedly one of the most important powers possessed by the

Speaker during the "era of strong Speakers" from 1889 to 1910. Since 1911 the committee on committees has been bound more closely to the rule of seniority than was the Speaker and has been less free to use the authority to name committees as a disciplinary measure. The overthrow of Cannon marks the beginning of a more rigid application of the seniority principle.

It would be easy to form an exaggerated picture of the length of time committee chairmen usually serve in the House, and it would be easy to make the same mistake in regard to the length of time required to become a committee chairmen. When all committees are considered--the minor as well as the important ones--it is found that the number of chairmen who serve no more than four terms in the House is much greater than the number who serve nine terms or more. Furthermore, almost one-half of the total number of chairmanships have gone to congressmen with only one or two terms of service at the time of their promotion, and seven out of ten chairmanships have been awarded to congressmen with no more than eight years service. In regard to the important committees, however, it would be difficult to exaggerate the length of service of the chairmen. On a few of the more important committees it takes at least a decade or two to become a committee chairman, and the great majority of the exclusive chairmen have served at least nine terms in the House.

Of special significance in a study of seniority are the Southern Democrats and the Eastern and Middle Western Republicans. Southern Democrats serve longer in the House than do chairmen from the rest of the nation, and Eastern and Middle Western Republicans serve longer than other Republicans. This helps to explain the fact noted in the previous chapter that these two groups have dominated the exclusive chairmanships of their respective parties. It is also true that these two groups have to serve a longer apprenticeship before becoming committee chairmen. The fact that they tend to accumulate unusually long periods of service in the House enables them to claim positions on the important committees where it takes longer to climb to the top of the committee.

Although most congressmen who achieve two or three decades of service in the House eventually become chairmen, long and continuous service does not guarantee a chairmanship. From 1931 to 1954 no less than 145 congressmen with ten or more terms of service sat in the House of Representatives. Of these, fifty-nine failed to become chairmen. A few of these failed to reach the top of their committees because their terms of service were not consecutive; some failed because their own political party did not control the House during the latter part of their service; others failed because the men ahead of them lived too long and were re-elected too many times.

Since length of service in the House at the time of promotion to the chairmanship tends to reflect a committee's popularity among congressmen, it is a good criterion for the evaluation of the relative importance of the various committees. Using this criterion the most important committees are ways and means, appropriations, and rules. Following these committees in importance are interstate and foreign commerce, judiciary, foreign affairs, agriculture, naval affairs, military affairs, flood control, rivers and harbors, post office and post roads, insular affairs, roads, banking and currency, and public lands. A list of the less important committees would include the following: mileage, enrolled bills, ventilation and acoustics, revision of the laws, alcoholic liquor traffic, industrial arts and expositions, printing, and the various expenditures and elections committees.

CHAPTER V

TENURE AS CHAIRMAN

Length of Service

Death, defeat at the polls of individuals and political parties, the desire to resume the practice of law or engage in business pursuits, and the ambition to hold other governmental positions combine to make tenure as chairman of House standing committees relatively short. The greatest limiting factor on the length of time chairmen hold office is party control of the House. But since 1889 the opportunity for long tenure has been great for there have been two instances in which one political party controlled the House of Representatives for sixteen consecutive years, another instance of twelve consecutive years, and one of eight. Yet only one out of seven chairmanships have endured for more than three terms. One-half of the chairmanships have lasted for one term or less, many for only one session of Congress, and some for only a few months.

The average chairmanship lasts approximately two terms. (3.9 years) More meaningful than the average, however, is the distribution of the chairmanships according to

length of time served as chairman as shown in Table 27.

From this table it can be seen that three out of four chairmanships were held for two terms or less; only one out of seven were held for as long as four terms.

A handful of chairmanships have endured for more than twelve years. Included in this group are seven Republican and eleven Democratic chairmanships. The champion committee chairman is Robert L. Doughton of North Carolina who presided over the ways and means committee for nine terms. John Rankin of Mississippi was chairman of the world war veterans committee for eight terms, and John A. T. Hull of Iowa presided over military affairs for a similar period. Other eight-term-chairmen are: Carl Vinson of Georgia, chairman of naval affairs; Fritz Lanham of Texas, chairman of public buildings and grounds; Joseph J. Mansfield of Texas, rivers and harbors; and Samuel Dickstein of New York, immigration and naturalization.

It will be recalled that a few congressmen have held the chairmanship of more than one committee. If this is taken into consideration the longest tenure as chairman is twenty-four years, the record again being held by Robert L. Doughton. In addition to his nine terms as chairman of ways and means he presided over an expenditures committee for three terms. John Rankin and Carl Vinson each served a total of twenty years as chairman of two committees.¹ Joseph G.

¹In 1955, Vinson began his eleventh term as chairman.

TABLE 27

DISTRIBUTION OF CHAIRMANSIPS BY NUMBER OF TERMS SERVED AS CHAIRMAN,
BY GEOGRAPHIC SECTION AND POLITICAL PARTY, 1889-1954*

Number of chairmanships which lasted:								
	One term	Two terms	Three terms	Four terms	Five terms	Six terms	Over six terms	Total
Total:								
East	131	53	25	18	6	9	6	248
Mid West	130	54	25	14	8	6	3	240
South	84	44	24	16	4	2	8	182
West	49	26	8	5	4	2	0	94
Border	25	20	10	9	3	0	1	68
United States	419	197	92	62	25	19	18	832
Republicans:								
East	94	39	24	11	3	9	4	184
Mid West	91	42	20	10	6	5	3	177
South	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
West	30	20	6	4	2	2	0	64
Border	11	7	5	2	0	0	0	25
United States	231	109	55	27	11	16	7	456
Democrats:								
East	37	14	1	7	3	0	2	64
Mid West	39	12	5	4	2	1	0	63
South	79	43	24	16	4	2	8	176
West	19	6	2	1	2	0	0	30
Border	14	13	5	7	3	0	1	43
United States	188	88	37	35	14	3	11	376

*Source: Compiled from data in various issues of Congressional Directory.

Cannon of Illinois and Mart T. Norton of New Jersey each served a total of nine terms as chairmen of three committees, and Adolph Sabath of Illinois presided over two committees for a total of nine terms.

Reasons for Leaving the Chairmanships

More significant than the length of time the chairmanships endured are the causes for their termination, for obviously the time any chairman holds his office is determined by the forces and factors which deprive him of that office or cause him voluntarily to resign or retire. The primary cause for the relatively rapid turnover in the committee chairmanships is defeat. One-half of the chairmanships were vacated because individual chairmen were defeated in primaries or elections or because their political parties failed to retain majority control of the House of Representatives. Many chairmen gave up their positions in order to accept other offices in the House. Many failed to seek re-nomination. It may be true of justices of the Supreme Court that few die and none resign, but this statement may not be applied with accuracy to the chairmen of House standing committees. No less than one out of every six has either died or resigned from the House while serving as chairman.

The many reasons for which congressmen leave the chairmanships of standing committees may be grouped into the following categories: (1) party lost control of the House,

(2) death, (3) defeated for renomination or reelection, (4) change in the rules of the House, (5) accepted another position in the House, (6) resigned from Congress, (7) did not seek renomination. The number of chairmen who gave up their office for each of these reasons is given in Table 28. In the first four categories the chairmen were involuntarily deprived of their office, and those in the last three categories may be classed as voluntarily giving up their positions.

Involuntary Loss of Chairmanship

Well over one-half of the chairmen held on to their office until deprived of it by forces beyond their control. Included in this group are twelve who lost their positions as a result of changes in the House rules. Joseph G. Cannon was relieved of the chairmanship of the rules committee in 1910, and eleven were demoted when the committees over which they presided were abolished.² Also included are 58 who died while serving as chairman, 184 who were defeated in primaries or elections, and 247 who gave up the chairmanship of a standing committee as a result of a change in part

²The number who lost their positions as a result of the abolition of committees is quite small because on two occasions reorganization of the committee system has been accompanied by changes in the party control of the House. Standing committees were abolished or combined with other committees in the 61st and 79th Congresses, but the reorganizations did not go into effect until the following Congresses--after the change in party control of the House.

control of the House.³

When campaigning for another term in the House, it is not unusual for a committee chairman to remind his constituents that as a chairman he will be in a better position to provide "pork" for the community than a newly elected congressman with no experience or seniority. It may well be true that these appeals sway large numbers of voters, for the reelection rate of committee chairmen is undoubtedly very high. But the figures in Table 29 prove that in many instances these appeals fall on deaf ears. Approximately one out of every five chairmanships has been vacated because the incumbent was defeated in a primary or election.

Of the 184 chairmen who were defeated, the great majority were defeated in general elections rather than primaries. Table 29 In four geographic sections the number defeated for reelection is more than twice as great as the number defeated in primaries. The South, running true to form, is an exception to the rule. Seventeen out of twenty-four Southerners were defeated for renomination. This, of course, results from what is popularly called the one-party

³The figure of 247 in the "party lost control" category is conservative. Frequently defeat in primaries or elections, failure to seek renomination, and resignation from Congress coincide with elections in which one political party loses its congressional majority. And when this has occurred the chairmen are counted in these groups rather than the "party lost control" category. In other words a chairman is not counted in the latter category unless he returned to the House in a Congress in which his own political party gave up control to the other party.

TABLE 28
REASONS FOR LEAVING THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF
HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEES^a

Reason	Number
Involuntary Loss of Chairmanship	
(1) Party Lost Control of House	247
(2) Death	58
(3) Defeated for Renomination or Reelection	184
(4) Change in Rules of House	12
Voluntary Loss of Chairmanship	
(5) Accepted Another Position in House . .	153
(6) Resigned from Congress	53
(7) Did not Seek Renomination	157
Total	864 ^b

^aCompiled from data in the Biographical Directory of the American Congress and various issues of Congressional Directory.

^bThis total is greater than the total number of chairmanships because some chairmen left the chairmanship of one committee more than once.

TABLE 29

SECTIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSE COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN
DEFEATED IN PRIMARIES AND ELECTIONS*

	Defeated for renomination	Defeated for reelection	Total
East	13	30	43
Mid West	22	50	72
South	17	7	24
West	6	17	23
Border	6	16	22
United States	64	120	184

*Compiled from data in Biographical Directory of the American Congress and various issues of the Congressional Directory.

system in this section.

Voluntary Loss of Chairmanship

Of the 153 congressmen who gave up a committee chairmanship to accept other positions in the House, the great majority left the chairmanship of one committee in order to accept the chairmanship of another. But almost one-third of the chairmen in this category gave up a minor chairmanship to accept mere membership on a more important committee, and six gave up a chairmanship to become Speaker of the House or majority floor leader. A study of this category reveals a definite preference for certain committees and indicates that some chairmanships were not highly valued. The various expenditures and elections committees rate very low indeed in the scale of preference though this group of committees accounts for almost one-half of all chairmen in this category.⁴ Other committees which account for a large part of this category are mileage, ventilation and acoustics, industrial arts and expositions, territories, census, disposition of executive papers, memorials, printing, enrolled bills, militia, and the various pensions and claims committees.

The chairmen who resigned from the House and those who did not seek renomination may be considered together

⁴The expenditures and elections committees account for 22 of the 51 chairmen who gave up a chairmanship for mere membership on another committee and for 48 of the 96 who became chairmen of other committees.

for these two groups voluntarily left a committee chairmanship by the process of giving up their membership in the House of Representatives. The leading motives for the chairmen in this category have been the desire to resume the practice of law or engage in business pursuits and the lure of the judiciary and the United States Senate. A few chairmen resigned or chose not to run again in order to become candidates for Governor or to accept other state or local offices; others accepted positions in the executive branch of the national government; three resigned to enter military service; some chairmen left Congress to engage in newspaper work, follow literary pursuits, resume the practice of medicine, become lobbyists, or to retire to private life. One chairman gave up his committee to become Vice President of the United States, and another refused to run for renomination after a controversy as to whether congressmen should run "at large" or by districts. The number of chairmen who resigned or failed to seek renomination for each of these reasons is given in Table 30.

Well over one-half of the resignations and failures to seek renomination are accounted for by the desire to practice law, enter business, accept a judicial appointment, or enter the United States Senate. The Senate accounts for fourteen resignations and fourteen failures to seek renomination. Of the seventeen who resigned from the House to accept judicial appointments, eight accepted state or local

TABLE 30

DISTRIBUTION OF CHAIRMEN BY REASON FOR RESIGNING FROM THE HOUSE AND FAILING TO SEEK RENOMINATION, 1889-1954*

Reason	Resigned	Did not run	Total
To resume the practice of law	5	44	49
To engage in business pursuits	1	31	32
To accept appointment to or become a candidate for the United States Senate	14	14	28
To accept a judicial appointment	17	0	17
To accept appointment to the executive branch of the national government	5	6	11
To retire to private life	0	11	11
To become a candidate for Governor	4	4	8
To engage in newspaper work	0	5	5
Miscellaneous	5	7	12
Reason not given	2	35	37
Total	53	157	210

*The reasons for resigning or not seeking renomination are based on the biographical sketches in Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1950.

judicial posts and nine accepted national appointments; none, however, was appointed to the United States Supreme Court. A total of eighty-one chairmen left Congress to practice law or engage in business, and it is interesting to note that of all chairmen who have served since 1889, one out of every eight has found business or law more attractive than the chairmanships of a House standing committee.

Other than business, law, the Senate, and the judiciary, the most important reasons for resigning or not seeking renomination are national executive appointments, gubernatorial ambitions, newspaper work, and the desire to retire to private life. However these reasons account for only 17 per cent of the 210 chairmen who voluntarily left the House of Representatives. Of the twelve chairmen in the miscellaneous category, three resigned to enter military service, four accepted appointment to or became candidates for state or local offices, one resumed the practice of medicine, one engaged in literary pursuits, another became a lobbyist, another became Vice President of the United States, and one refused to seek renomination after a controversy concerning the method of electing congressmen.

Since many of the chairmen in the "reason not given" category were lawyers and businessmen by profession, it would be reasonable to assume that a few, at least, resumed their vocational pursuits. However the great majority of this group probably retired from Congress because of ill

health or advanced age, for many of them were quite old and some of them died very soon after leaving office.

Summary

In summary it can be said that tenure as chairman of House standing committees has been relatively brief and that the turnover in chairmanships has been quite rapid. Approximately one-half of the chairmanships have endured for two years or less, and only one out of seven has lasted for more than six years. Only one out of every twenty-two chairmanships has endured for more than ten years.

The primary cause for short tenure is defeat at the polls. Fifty per cent of the chairmanships have been vacated for this reason, 21 per cent because the incumbent was defeated in a primary or election and 29 per cent because a political party lost its congressional majority. Other forces and factors which have combined to cause brief tenure are death, the desire to move up to more important committees or to become Speaker of the House or majority floor leader, the abolition of committees, the desire to become a state Governor, enter the United States Senate, serve in the executive branch of the national government, or hold a judicial position, and the attractiveness of business and the practice of law.

CHAPTER VI

QUALIFICATIONS

Profession and Occupation

Most chairmen are professional public office holders. However, few if any admit to belonging to this honorable profession; consequently it has been necessary to classify them as doctors, lawyers, merchants, bankers, manufacturers, preachers, teachers, farmers, and journalists. Any attempt to use such a classification must of necessity be somewhat arbitrary because many chairmen have a wide variety of professional and occupational interests. Thomas Dunn English, a Democrat from New Jersey who was chairman of the alcoholic liquor traffic committee, was a Doctor of Medicine, a member of the bar, a poet, and a journalist. Many of the lawyers have also been journalists, teachers, bankers, and businessmen, and almost all of the bankers have had other interests. According to the Biographical Directory of the American Congress, Charles L. Gifford was interested in oysters, real estate, and cranberries. Furthermore, many lawyers and businessmen are listed in the Directory as school teachers, farmers, and laborers, but a close examination reveals that

very few genuine farmers, teachers, and workers are included in the list of chairmen. For example, seventy-six "teachers" merely taught school for a year or two while "reading law" or preparing for admission to the bar. In this study an attempt has been made to classify the chairmen according to their primary interests.

Lawyers dominate the committee chairmanships of the House of Representatives to an even greater extent than they dominate Congress. Table 31 Two out of every three chairmen are attorneys. Of the 696 chairmen, 463 (or 67 per cent) practiced law while ten others were members of the bar who did not practice. In the 77th Congress, 60 per cent of the 531 Senators and Representatives were lawyers.¹ In the 81st Congress, 57 per cent of the members were attorneys.² And in the 82nd Congress the figure was 56 per cent.³

The explanation of the dominance of the chairmanships by lawyers is much the same as the explanation of their dominance of Congress. Naturally, the forces and factors which enable lawyers to win election to Congress also enable them to win reelection, accumulate seniority, and become chairmen. An excellent discussion of the predominance of

¹Madge B. McKinney, "The Personnel of the Seventy-Seventh Congress," American Political Science Review, XXXVI (February, 1942), 67-74.

²United States News and World Report (November 26, 1948), 11-13.

³Galloway, The Legislative Process in Congress, 374.

TABLE 31

OCCUPATIONS AND PROFESSIONS OF HOUSE
COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN, 1889-1954

Occupation	Number
Law	463
Business	124
Journalism	39
Education	13
Agriculture	12
Public office and/or civil service . . .	11
Labor	10
Medicine and surgery	8
Congressional secretaryship	5
No occupation or profession	4
Dentistry	1
Preaching	1
Non-commissioned army officer	1
Engineering	1
Football coaching	1
Pharmacy	1
Professional acting	1
Total	696

Source: Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950).

lawyers in Congress is found in a widely used textbook in American government.⁴ One reason is that a lawyer's business is a "talking business" which "brings him into frequent and fighting contact with public questions." Another reason is that a lawyer often works for himself, "and this independence makes it possible for him to take time out to run for public office." Furthermore, a lawyer may continue to practice law after being elected to Congress. That is to say, the practice of law frequently provides both the income and the leisure necessary for participation in politics. Perhaps the most important reason for the domination of Congress by lawyers is the fact that "the average ignorant person sees perfect logic in sending 'lawyers to make the laws.'"

Many of the lawyers had occupational and professional interests in addition to the practice of law. Seventy-six taught school for a few years prior to their admission to the bar.⁵ A sizable portion had agricultural and business interests. Twenty-five were bankers. Also to be found among the lawyers are thirteen journalists, two physicians, a Methodist preacher, a playwright and author, and a professional baseball player.

Table 32 (which gives the sectional distribution of

⁴Claudius O. Johnson, American Government, National, State and Local (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1951), 303-304.

⁵Those who taught school after their admission to the bar are counted as teachers in this study.

TABLE 32

SECTIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF LAWYERS

	Number Lawyers	Number Chairmen	Percentage Lawyers
United States	463	696	67
East	99	202	49
Middle West	138	197	70
South	137	164	84
West	49	77	64
Border	40	56	72

Source: Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950).

the lawyers) shows that lawyers dominate the Southern chairmanships to a greater extent than the chairmanships of any other section. Only one-half of the Eastern chairmen and less than three-fourths of the chairmen from the West, Border, and Middle West are attorneys; but 84 per cent of the Southerners are practicing members of the bar. This probably indicates that the South elects more lawyers to Congress. This point may help to explain why the South tends to dominate the important Democratic chairmanships. As noted above, lawyers dominate the committee chairmanships even more than they dominate the membership of Congress. If it is true that lawyers hold an advantage in the contest for the chairmanships and the South elects a larger percentage of lawyers to Congress than the remainder of the nation, then Southern domination of the important Democratic chairmanships is partially explained. On the other hand it could be argued that this line of thought mistakes cause for effect. The fact that so many Southerners are lawyers may be a contributing cause of the domination of the House committee chairmanships by the legal profession.

Next to the lawyers the largest single group among the chairmen were businessmen. Of the 696 chairmen, a total of 124 (or 18 per cent) were business men. Table 31 This figure is very close to the percentages for the membership of Congress. Of the 531 Senators and Representatives in the

81st Congress, 88 (or 19 per cent) were businessmen.⁶ The figure for the 82nd Congress was 17 per cent.⁷ And for the 79th Congress it was 18 per cent.⁸

The business interests represented among the chairmen are many and varied. Included in the list of chairmen are retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers; hardware merchants and railway presidents; lumber kings, coal mine owners, hotel operators, public utility presidents, and cranberry merchants. But more than one-half of the businessmen had interests in banking, real estate, or insurance. The businessmen may be classified as follows:

Type of business	Number
Banking	47
Real Estate and/or insurance	20
Other business and/or manufacturing	57
Total	124

These figures are indeed quite conservative for they do not include the lawyers, journalists, teachers, and physicians who also had business connections. If these are counted the number of bankers is increased considerably for twenty-five lawyers, three newspapermen, and one Doctor of Medicine had banking interests. Thus a total of seventy-six chairmen

⁶United States News and World Report (November 26, 1948), 11-13.

⁷Galloway, The Legislative Process in Congress, 374.

⁸Galloway, Congress at the Crossroads, 349.

(or 11 per cent) could be classified as bankers.

The third largest occupational group among the chairmen were the newsmen. A total of thirty-nine chairmen were editors, publishers, or journalists.⁹ The proportion of the chairmen who were newspapermen agrees very closely with personnel studies of Congress. Their number is considerably smaller than the number of businessmen or lawyers but much larger than any other occupational group.

Although more than one hundred chairmen are listed in the Biographical Directory as teachers, only thirteen may be classified as being primarily engaged in educational work. Of these five were public school teachers or administrators, three were college professors, and five were college deans, vice presidents, or presidents. Simeon D. Fess, a chairman of the education committee, was president of Antioch College; and Willis C. Hawley, a chairman of the ways and means committee, was president of two colleges: the Oregon State Normal School and Willamette University. Louis W. Fairfield was vice president of Tri-State College in Angola, Indiana, and William E. Andrews was vice president of Hastings College in Nebraska. John R. Murdock was dean of the Arizona State Teachers' College in Tempe before entering Congress. The

⁹This figure does not include thirteen lawyers and one Army Master Sergeant who are also journalists, but it does include twelve chairmen who could conceivably be classified as bankers, businessmen, teachers, preachers, or physicians.

three college professors were Dewey Short of the armed services committee, Henry W. Temple of the foreign affairs committee, and James T. McCleary of the library committee. Short was "professor of ethics, psychology, and political philosophy" at Southwestern College in Winfield, Kansas. Temple was a professor of history and political science at Washington and Jefferson College in Washington, Pennsylvania. McCleary was a "professor of civil government and history" in the normal school in Mankato, Minnesota.

Like the teachers, the genuine farmers and laborers are few in number. Many chairmen are listed in the Biographical Directory as having agricultural interests, but in most cases the primary occupational interest is in some other field. Upon close examination the "farmers" become lawyers or bankers. Of the ten laborers listed in Table 31, five were union officials. The labor leaders were: Frederick N. Zihlman,¹⁰ James P. Maher,¹¹ and William B. Wilson¹² of the labor committee; Reuben T. Wood¹³ of the War Claims

¹⁰Zihlman was President of the Maryland State Federation of Labor.

¹¹Maher was Treasurer of the United Hatters of North America.

¹²Wilson was Secretary-Treasurer of the United Mine Workers of America.

¹³Wood was President of the Missouri State Federation of Labor.

committee; and Mahlan M. Garland¹⁴ of the mines and mining committee.

Journalism, business, and law account for nine out of ten chairmen, but it should be noted that the figures in Table 31 for the other occupational groups are actually minimum figures. For example, some postmasters and county officials have been counted as lawyers or businessmen rather than in the "public official and/or civil service" category. Ten chairmen served as secretaries to congressmen before entering Congress but only five are counted in this category in the table. Three graduates of medical schools are not included in the "medicine and surgery" category because two were practicing attorneys and one was a journalist. The "no occupation or profession" category is composed of the four women who presided over House committees.¹⁵ Charles A. Eaton is the only chairman considered as a preacher, but Dewey Short, Henry W. Temple, Grant M. Hudson, and Washington Gardner could possibly be counted as such. However, Temple and Short have been counted as teachers, Gardner as a lawyer, and Hudson as a Businessman.

Education

In terms of educational attainment, House committee

¹⁴Garland was President of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers and a Vice President of the American Federation of Labor.

¹⁵The four women are Mae E. Nolan, Mary T. Norton, Edith Norse Rogers, and Caroline O'Day.

chairmen are well above the national average. Seven out of ten have received college training and one-half were college graduates. Table 33 But when compared to several recent studies of the personnel of Congress it is found that the average chairman is below the average congressman in regard to academic training.¹⁶ These studies indicate that approximately 88 per cent of the members of the 77th and 81st Congresses attended college. Only 72 per cent of the chairmen received college training. Sixty-nine per cent of the members of the 81st Congress were college graduates. Only 50 per cent of chairmen graduated from college. This discrepancy can perhaps be explained by the fact that the majority of the chairmen were born and received their education during the nineteenth century or the early part of the twentieth century when college attendance was less common, whereas the studies of the personnel of Congress are based on recent years.

Only twenty-four chairmen received college training beyond the bachelor's degree.¹⁷ None received a Ph. D. or J. D. degree, but eleven were graduated from medical school

¹⁶See footnotes 1, 2, 3, and 8 of this chapter.

¹⁷The Biographical Directory of the American Congress does not note the name of the degree received, but it is careful to state whether the person merely "attended" college or "graduated" from college. Here it is assumed that a first graduation is a bachelor's degree, a second graduation a master's degree, a first graduation from a law school a bachelor of law degree, etc.

and one from the Harvard Dental School. Two did not receive graduate degrees but merely pursued graduate study after receiving the second bachelor's degree.¹⁸ Two others, Charles A. Eaton and Henry W. Temple, were graduated from theological seminary after receiving bachelor's degrees. The remaining eight chairmen received master's degrees.¹⁹ Three of these pursued graduate study beyond the master's degree. The "most educated" chairman is Dewey Short. After graduating from Baker University in Kansas in 1919 and from Boston University in 1922, he attended Harvard University, Heidelberg University, the University of Berlin, Oxford University, and Drury College. John R. Murdock was graduated from State Teachers' College in Kirksville, Missouri, in 1912 and from the State University of Iowa in 1925 and also took graduate work at the University of Arizona and the University of California at Berkeley. John S. Benham was graduated from the Indiana State Normal School at Terre Haute in 1893 and from Indiana University in 1903 and then "specialized in history at the University of Chicago for several terms."

¹⁸Lister Hill "took special law courses" at the University of Michigan and Columbia University after receiving two bachelor's degrees from the University of Alabama. Simeon D. Fess, after receiving two bachelor's degrees from Ohio Northern University, was a "graduate student and lecturer" at the University of Chicago.

¹⁹The eight Chairmen who received master's degrees are John S. Benham, Bertrand H. Snell, Dewey Short, William E. Andrews, John R. Murdock, Will Rogers, Henry S. Boutell, and Clement Brumbaugh.

TABLE 33

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF HOUSE COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

College Attendance:

Graduate study beyond the bachelor's degree	24
Law degree and second bachelor's degree	84
Law degree only	111
Bachelor's degree other than law	131
Attended college	135
Attended or graduated from business college	16
Total law school graduates	198
Total college graduates	350
Total with college training	501

Non-College Attendance:

Attended or graduated from secondary school	76
Attended elementary school only	110
No school attendance indicated	9
Total with no college training.	195
Total	696

Source: Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950).

Some of the chairmen in the "no school attendance indicated" category in Table 33 probably attended school. According to the Biographical Directory Thaddeus M. Mahon, Thomas Jefferson Henderson, William D. Kelley, and Richard P. Bland "pursued" an academic" or "classical" course of study. James O'Donnell "pursued preparatory studies and learned the printing trade." Eugene F. Loud, Charles Daniels, and Hatton W. Summers "studied law." David J. Lewis was "self-educated" and "studied law and Latin."

Age

House committee chairmen are elected to Congress at about the same average age as that for other members of the House. In the 79th Congress (1945-1947) the median age of all first-term members of the House of Representatives was 46.²⁰ The median age of chairmen at the time of their first election to Congress was 43. Table 34 This does not mean that chairmen are elected to Congress three years earlier than other Representatives. Through the years the median ages of first-term members have been increasing; in the 41st Congress (1869-1871) it was 42.²¹ And all of the chairmen (except one) were elected to Congress before the 79th Congress. Furthermore, the items compared are not identical. The "age at the time of election" is, of course, less than

²⁰Galloway, Congress at the Crossroads, 29.

²¹Ibid.

TABLE 34

MEDIAN AGE OF HOUSE COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN AT THE TIME
OF THEIR FIRST ELECTION TO CONGRESS, 1889-1954

United States	43
East	45
Middle West	43
South	40
West	44
Border	43

Source: Compiled from data in various issues of the Congressional Directory and from the Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950).

the "age of first-termers," and for all chairmen elected prior to the adoption of the "lame duck" amendment it is more than a year smaller.

Most chairmen are elected to Congress between the ages of thirty-six and fifty. Table 35 Very few are elected before the age of thirty or after the age of sixty. More than four out of ten are elected between the ages of thirty-seven and forty-five.

In regard to age at first election to Congress, the South, as usual, runs contrary to the political pattern of the rest of the nation. Southern chairmen enter Congress earlier than other chairmen. The median age for the South is 40; for the Border and Middle West it is 43, for the West 44, and for the East 45. Table 34 This point is made especially clear by Table 36. One-fourth of the Southern chairmen are elected to Congress by the age of thirty-five, and three-fourths by the age of forty-five.

New chairmen are typical members of the House in so far as age is concerned. That is to say, the average age at the time of promotion to the chairmanship is approximately the same as the average age of all Representatives. The average for the chairmen was 52.5, and according to the studies of the personnel of Congress referred to above the average age of all Representatives was 52.

As might be expected the average age at the time of promotion to the chairmanship was greater for the important

TABLE 35

SECTIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF CHAIRMEN BY AGE ELECTED TO CONGRESS

Age	United States	East	Mid West	South	West	Border
26-30	27	6	5	11	3	2
31-35	75	16	16	29	9	5
36-40	155	35	49	44	12	15
41-45	170	52	45	38	18	17
46-50	123	44	33	20	16	10
51-55	78	20	31	15	8	4
56-60	45	21	13	4	4	3
61 and over	20	8	3	3	6	0
Not known	3	0	2	0	1	0
Total	696	202	197	164	77	56

Source: Compiled from data in various issues of the Congressional Directory and from the Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950).

TABLE 36

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CHAIRMEN AT THE TIME
OF THEIR ELECTION TO CONGRESS

Percentage of Chairmen						
Age group	East	Mid West	South	West	Border	United States
30 years or less	3	3	7	4	4	4
35 years or less	11	11	24	16	13	15
40 years or less	28	36	51	31	39	37
45 years or less	54	58	74	55	70	61
50 years or less	76	76	87	77	87	80
55 years or less	86	92	96	87	95	91

Source: Compiled from data in various issues of the Congressional Directory and from the Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950).

committees than it was for the minor committees. Table 37 The average age at which congressmen became chairmen of the ways and means committee was almost sixty years. And for the committees on rules, foreign affairs, appropriations, interstate and foreign commerce, and judiciary the average age was 56 or over. For many of the minor committees the average age at the time of promotion to the chairmanship was less than the average age of Representatives. This applies to the committees on industrial arts and expositions, rail-ways and canals, enrolled bills, mileage, private land claims, pensions, labor, and the various elections and ex-penditures committees.

Previous Public Service

Four out of five chairmen held public office previous to their election to the House. Table 38 Only 125 (or 18 per cent) are listed in the Biographical Directory as having had no previous public service, and a few of these were elected to Congress at an early age and had little opportunity for public service. The road most frequently traveled by the chairmen on their way to Congress is the one which leads from law school to the House by way of the county attorney's office and the state legislature.

The most likely place to find future House chairmen is in the state legislative chamber. Well over one-third had previous legislative experience; three out of ten served

TABLE 37

AVERAGE AGE OF CHAIRMEN AT THE TIME OF PROMOTION TO THE
CHAIRMANSHIP FOR SELECTED COMMITTEES

Committee	Average Age
Ways and Means	59.8
Judiciary	59.3
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	59.2
Appropriations	58.5
Foreign Affairs	58.3
Rules	56.0
Memorials	55.7
Post Office and Post Roads	55.1
Military Affairs	54.9
Immigration and Naturalization	54.8
Banking and Currency	54.4
Disposition of Executive Committees	54.3
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	54.1
Census	54.1
Rivers and Harbors	54.0
Agriculture	53.8
Public Lands	53.1
Irrigation and Reclamation	53.0
Ventilation and Acoustics	52.4
War Claims	52.1
Territories	51.9
Four Elections Committees	51.2
Labor	51.1
Pensions	50.4
Thirteen Expenditures Committees	50.4
Private Land Claims	49.8
Mileage	48.5
Enrolled Bills	47.9
Railways and Canals	46.8
Industrial Arts and Expositions	45.3

Source: Compiled from data in various issues of the Congressional Directory and from the Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950).

TABLE 38

PREVIOUS PUBLIC SERVICE OF HOUSE COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Position	Number
Legislative	
State House of Representatives	205
Speaker of the House	30
State Senate	145
President Pro Tempore	17
Lieutenant Governor	10
City Council	42
Judicial	
County, District, or Circuit	57
State Supreme Court	2
City	9
Prosecuting Attorney	
County, District, or Circuit	163
State	21
United States	13
City	57
Administrative or Executive Official	
County	85
State	91
United States	61
City	79
Mayor	60
Governor	5
Secretary to Congressman	10
No Public Service Indicated	125

Source: Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950).

in the lower House and two out of ten in the State Senate. Presiding officers are well represented for thirty served as Speakers of the House, seventeen as President Pro Tempore, and ten as Lieutenant Governors. Forty-two chairmen served on city councils.

Former judges and prosecuting attorneys are also widely represented. One-fourth of the chairmen served as county, district, or circuit attorney prior to their election to the House, while many others served as city attorney, United States attorney, or state Attorney General. Fifty-seven served as county, district, or circuit judge, while nine had judicial experience on municipal courts and two on state supreme courts. However, none served on a national court. Many also served in national, state, and local administrative or executive positions. This category includes a wide variety of offices--everything from postal employees and postmasters, county and city clerks, sheriffs, school board members, and tax assessors to secretaries of state, collectors of internal revenue, and governors.

Summary

House committee chairmen seem to be a representative cross-section of the membership of the House. The typical chairman, like the typical Representative, is a lawyer who was elected to the House in his early forties. In regard to education he is well above the national average and probably

attended law school. The average age of Representatives was 52 and chairmen usually receive their office at about this same age. Most Representatives have had previous experience in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the state and local governments. And so have the chairmen.

Lawyers dominate both the membership of the House and the committee chairmanships. Studies of the personnel of Congress indicate that 54 to 60 per cent of the Representatives are lawyers. The figure for the chairmen is 67 per cent.

For the entire membership of the House the most numerous occupational groups after the lawyers are the businessmen and newspapermen. This is also true of the chairmen, for 18 per cent of the chairmen are businessmen and 5 per cent are editors, publishers, or journalists. Chairmen from other occupational and professional groups are few in number.

As most Representatives have received college training so the great majority of the chairmen attended or graduated from college. Seventy-two per cent of the chairmen received college training and one-half received degrees. But a disproportionately large share of this was legal training. Of the 350 college graduates among the chairmen, 198 received law school degrees.

House committee chairmen are elected to Congress at about the same age as other members. The median age of

chairmen at the time of their first election and the median age of first-term Representatives was in the early or mid-forties. Southern chairmen, however, are elected at an earlier age than other chairmen. The average age at the time of promotion to the chairmanship was 52.5. And as might be expected this figure was higher for the important committees than it was for the minor committees. The range was from 45.3 years on the industrial arts and expositions committee to 59.8 years on the ways and means committee.

Eighty-two per cent of the chairmen held public office before their election to the House. The offices most frequently held by future chairmen were prosecuting attorney, state representative, state senator, and county, district, or circuit judge.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

The Questions

As noted in the introductory chapter, this study is limited in scope to the investigation of two problems relating to the standing committee chairmanships of the House of Representatives. The first is the problem of the sectional and regional basis of the chairmanships, and the second, the problem of seniority and the selection of chairmen. In this chapter an attempt will be made to answer a series of seven questions which are frequently raised concerning these two problems.

The first three questions relate to the degree and extent of sectional domination of the committee chairmanships:

1. Does the South really dominate the Democratic chairmanships?
2. Do the East and Middle West really dominate the Republican chairmanships?
3. Are the chairmanships of the various committees dominated by particular sections?

Following this is a question concerning the relationship between seniority and sectionalism:

4. Is sectional domination of the committee chairmanships a result of the combined force of the seniority system and the existence of a one-party system in large areas of the United States?

Seniority (or as it is sometimes called, "the rule of senility") receives the blame for many of the ills of Congress. Among other things it is said that seniority ignores ability and promotes unqualified men to positions of leadership, causes sectional domination of the chairmanships, destroys party responsibility, flouts accountability to the electoral mandate, enables chairmen to be arbitrary with impunity, discriminates against "liberals," and, finally, discourages able men from seeking election to Congress because of the long term as an apprentice necessary for attaining a position of leadership.

In conclusion, three questions are directed toward the operation and effects of the seniority system:

5. Is the apprentice period for committee chairman too long?
6. Does the seniority system promote unqualified men to the chairmanship of standing committees?
7. Is seniority the cause of party irresponsibility?

Does the South Really Dominate the
Democratic Chairmanships?

The answer to this question is a qualified yes, but the qualifications are of some significance. It can be said without qualification that the South has dominated the chairmanships of the exclusive or important committees.¹ This section which has received slightly less than one-half of the Democratic representation in the House since 1889 has had two-thirds of the Democratic representation on the exclusive chairmanships. Table 13 Furthermore, an examination of state representation on the committee chairmanships reveals that many of the Southern states tend to be over-represented on the Democratic chairmanships. Table 15 North Carolina, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, and Texas have each had more Democratic chairmen than they were entitled to receive on the basis of Democratic representation in Congress.

But a word of caution is necessary. For several reasons it would be easy to exaggerate the degree and extent of Southern over-representation on the Democratic chairmanships. In the first place, the over-representation of the South is a phenomenon found only on the exclusive chairmanships. It does not exist in so far as the total number of chairmanships is concerned. Since 1889 each geographic

¹The exclusive committees are those whose members are permitted to hold only one committee assignment.

section has received an almost perfect proportionate share of the total number of Democratic chairmanships. Table 10 While it is true that the South has received one-half of the committee headships since 1889, it is also a fact that this region has provided almost one-half of the Democratic representatives. If the term "domination" means "at least one-half" it can be said that the South has dominated committee leadership. In a sense, though, this section has earned the right to dominate for it has contributed almost one-half of the party strength in the House.

Curiously enough, the South is actually under-represented on the chairmanships of the fifty-nine "non-exclusive" committees. On the basis of Democratic representation in the House it is entitled to 47.6 per cent of the chairmanships. Yet the South has received only 43.8 per cent of the "non-exclusive" chairmanships.

A second reason which makes it necessary to qualify the assertion that the South dominates Democratic chairmanships is that this region seems to have lost part of the advantage it once held in regard to the more important committees. Since the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the South has received a smaller proportionate share of the Democratic chairmanships than the Middle West or Border States. Table 14 Using Democratic representation in the House as the criterion for a "fair share" of the chairmen, the South is only 10 per cent over-represented.

The Border states have received 34 per cent more than a fair share of the chairmen since 1947; the Middle West is 46 per cent over-represented. Since the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act, twenty-six Democrats have presided over standing committees in the House. Nine of these came from Democratic "pockets" in four great northern cities--Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and Greater New York, while the twelve Southern states have contributed but thirteen.

A third factor which makes it easy to exaggerate Southern over-representation on the chairmanships is the fact that several Southern states are not over-represented. Virginia, Tennessee, and Georgia are very close to proportionate representation. Table 15 That is to say, these states have received a percentage of the Democratic chairmen which is nearly identical to their percentage of Democratic congressmen. South Carolina, Louisiana, and Oklahoma are somewhat under-represented, while Arkansas has received much less than its fair share of the chairmanships.

On the other hand, many non-Southern states are over-represented. For example, Idaho has had more than four times the representation to which it was entitled. Thus, also, New Jersey, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Missouri, Maine, New York, Illinois, Nebraska, Utah, and Arizona have each received more than a fair share of the representation on the Democratic chairmanships. Table 15

Another interesting feature of the Democratic

chairmanships is the fact that many Southern states have produced fewer chairmen since 1889 than some of the Northern states. New York has contributed more committee chairmen than any other state, and Ohio has had more than Georgia. Illinois has produced a larger number of Democratic chairmen than eight of the twelve Southern states. However, Indiana and Mississippi have each had twelve chairmen. Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7

Do the East and Middle West Really Dominate
the Republican Chairmanships?

Eastern and Middle Western domination of Republican chairmanships is considerably greater than Southern supremacy of Democratic committee leadership, yet it is still necessary to make a few important qualifications. On the exclusive committees the term "monopolize" is perhaps more appropriate than the term "dominate." By virtue of their contributions to Republican strength in the House, the East and Middle West are entitled to 75 per cent of the committee chairmen. They have actually received 87 per cent of the representation on the exclusive posts. Table 15

Unlike the case of the Democratic chairmanships, there has been no significant change in Republican representation since the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Table 14 The East and Middle West continue unchallenged in their positions of dominance. In spite of the fact that these two sections have elected but 71 per

cent of the Republican representatives in the House since 1947, they have received 81 per cent of the chairmanships.

The picture of state representation on the Republican chairmanships also presents elements of regional over-representation. Table 15 Of the sixteen states from the East and Middle West, seven (Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, and New Jersey) are considerably over-represented. Six others (Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New York, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan) have received a share of the chairmen which is very close to a proportionate share. On the other hand, many states outside of the East and Middle West have received more than a fair share of the Republican chairmen; and two Eastern states (Connecticut and Rhode Island) and one Middle Western state (Ohio) are under-represented. Utah, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming have each received a larger proportionate share of the Republican chairmen than Pennsylvania, New York, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Connecticut, Ohio, or Rhode Island.

In discussing regional supremacy of the Republican chairmanships, it should be remembered that over-representation is limited mainly to important committees. When all committees, the insignificant as well as the important, are considered it is found that each geographic section tends to receive a share of the chairmen which is proportionate to its contribution to party strength in the House. Table 11 This tendency is not so strong as it is on the Democratic

chairmanships, yet it is still present.

Are the Various Committees Dominated
by Particular Sections?

Some committees have been definitely dominated by particular regions, or by a combination of two regions, but in general it can be said that representation on the chairmanships of most of the seventy-seven standing committees has been equitable. Each geographic section has held at least one chairmanship on a fairly large number of committees. The three largest (the East, South, and Middle West) are represented on practically all of the committees.² The ninety-four Western chairmanships are distributed among forty-five committees; and the Border--even though this section has had fewer chairmanships than the total number of committees--is represented on forty different committees. In this direction, it is significant to note that each region is widely represented on the leading committees.

Table 9

Relatively few committees have shown a definite preference for chairmen from particular sections. The most conspicuous example of this is the West's domination of the irrigation and reclamation committee. From 1889 until this committee was abolished in 1946 it had fourteen chairmen of

²The East is represented on the chairmanships of 72 of the 77 committees, the South on 65, and the Middle West on 71.

which eleven were Westerners. During this period, the West controlled the leadership of the committee for forty-three years. No other committee has been so completely dominated by a single section, even though the South has had more than its share of the chairmen of such important committees as agriculture, judiciary, naval affairs, and ways and means. The East is well represented in labor, banking and currency, civil service, and immigration and naturalization. The Border states have also fared quite well on mines and mining and District of Columbia, while the Middle West has held the chairmanships of the committees on appropriations for thirty-one years and that of military affairs for twenty-four years.

In a few instances, committees have been dominated by a combination of two regions. The flood control committee was monopolized during the thirty-two years of its existence by the South and Middle West. All of the Democratic chairmen of this committee were Southerners, and all of its Republican leaders came from the Middle West. Together the West and South controlled the chairmanship of the public lands committee for a total of fifty-two years.

Is Sectional Domination of the Chairmanships a
Result of Seniority and Safe Districts?

A widely held view among political scientists is that sectional domination of the committee chairmanships is a result of two facts: (1) the existence of what is popularly called a one-party system in large areas of the United States

and (2) the rule of seniority. While the former enables congressmen to establish records of long and continuous service, the latter promotes to chairmanships those who are able to compile such records. This view is essentially correct, but it is somewhat over-simplified and requires some clarification and modification. One point which needs to be clarified is one already noted in the preceding discussion: sectional domination of the committee chairmanships is not so extensive as it is sometimes assumed to be. It exists only on the important committees, and there are definite exceptions to the rule.

And there is another point which requires more emphasis. Seniority "stacks the cards" in favor of one-party districts--and not necessarily in favor of particular geographic sections. It is only because "safe" districts are concentrated on a definite geographic pattern that certain regions benefit from the seniority system. Thus it can be said that our party system is the primary cause of sectional domination of committee chairmanships and that seniority is a secondary cause. The latter can contribute to geographic domination of the chairmanships only in so far as a particular region is dominated by a single party. In fact, it is conceivable that seniority could work to prevent sectional domination. If, for example, the "safe" districts of a political party were scattered throughout the nation, rather than concentrated in a small area, the seniority system would

tend to ensure a wide distribution of chairmen. Indeed, this may explain the decline of Southern over-representation in recent years. The growth of Democratic strength in the industrial cities of the East and Middle West has resulted in districts which are almost as safely Democrat as any in the South. Conversely, the failure of the Republican party to increase its strength in traditionally Democratic areas explains the continued domination of the Republican chairmanships by the East and Middle West.

In spite of regional over-representation on the chairmanships of exclusive committees, it is most important to note that seniority rewards strong partisanship rather than particular regions per se. The corollary of this is not a tendency toward regional over-representation but a tendency toward proportionate representation. That is to say, seniority tends to give each geographic area a share of the chairmanships which is proportionate to its contribution to party strength in the House. This is evident in most of the tables presented in this study.³ Thus, the East is the most greatly under-represented section on the Democratic chairmanships, yet this section has received 16 per cent of the Democratic chairmen while contributing 18.5 per cent of the Democratic congressmen. It is true that Southern Republicans have little chance to head House committees, but

³See especially Tables 10, 11, 12, and 15.

other regions have received a percentage of the Republican chairmen which is very close to their contribution to Republican strength in the House. This tendency is also apparent in regard to state representation on the chairmanships; many states receive a proportionate share of the chairmen.

The conviction that seniority rewards one-party districts also requires slight modification. One feature of seniority is that it is an automatic system of promotion, and this means that committee chairmanships sometimes depend upon accident or chance rather than the accumulation of many years of service. Whether a particular congressman becomes a committee chairman occasionally depends upon the whims or turns of mind of the senior members of the committees; or, it may depend upon the natural laws of life and death or the fortunes of political parties. Many congressmen are promoted to the headship of a committee after one or two terms of service in the House. Table 19 Many congressmen who serve twenty or thirty years never receive a chairmanship.

Table 24 Moreover, there is that aspect of seniority which might be called the reverse side of the tendency of seniority to reward one-party districts. As the majority party benefits from the existence of safe districts, so the minority party profits from their absence. It is significant that states such as Indiana and West Virginia, where few safe districts exist for either party, are well represented on the chairmanships of both major political parties.

The significance of the preceding discussion is that representation on the committee chairmanships of the House is basically a reflection of the American party system. The geographic distribution of chairmen tends to follow the regional pattern of party strength. A change in the formal procedure for the selection of chairmen would probably result in some change in the sectional make-up of the committee chairmanships, but to produce significant changes it would be necessary to alter radically the nature of our party system.

Is the Apprentice Period for Chairman Too Long?

It is sometimes assumed that it takes ten or twenty years to become a committee chairman.⁴ However, this assumption has been correct only in the very recent past and in the case of a few committees. Since 1889 it has taken approximately seven and one-half years for a member of the House to climb the ladder of seniority to the top of his committee. Table 16 On fifty-seven of the seventy-seven committees the chairmen have served, on the average, less than ten years prior to their promotion to the chairmanships.

Table 26 On twenty committees the average prior service is less than five years. It is interesting to note that 40 per cent of the total number of chairmanships during this

⁴Supra,

period were awarded to representatives with only one or two terms of service. Table 19

The overthrow of "Czar" Cannon in 1910 and 1911 had very little effect upon the length of time required to become a committee chairman. Before this event, a congressman had to serve an apprenticeship of a little over six years before hope of promotion to the headship of a standing committee. During the period from 1911 to 1946, he had to serve only a little over seven years.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 has had great effect upon the length of service required to win promotion to the chairmanship of a standing committee. By reducing the number of standing committees from forty-eight to nineteen, this act eliminated the minor committees--and the minor chairmanships. The effect of this has been to limit committee headships to congressmen with exceedingly long tenures and thus greatly enhancing the importance of the seniority system. Before 1946 it was not uncommon for a congressman with only two or three terms of service to become a committee chairman. Since this date it requires more than sixteen years because the average time required to become a chairman has more than doubled.

It is possible that this result of the Legislative Reorganization Act has been offset by increased use of subcommittees and greater flexibility in the choice of subcommittee chairmen. However, George B. Galloway contends that

there has been no increase in the total number of standing subcommittees in Congress since the passage of the act. In the House there has actually been a reduction in the total number. In 1945 there were 97 standing subcommittees in the House; in 1952 there were only 72.⁵

Does Seniority Promote Unqualified Men to
the Committee Chairmanships?

If legal training and the practice of law are qualifications for presiding over standing committees, then House committee chairmen are extraordinarily well qualified for their positions. No less than two out of three are practicing lawyers. Before entering Congress many chairmen served as prosecuting attorneys, many others served as judges, and approximately three out of every ten graduated from law school. The "best qualified" group among the chairmen are the Southerners. Of the 164 Southern chairmen, 137 were lawyers. But if one agrees with Sir Thomas More that lawyers are "a sort of people whose profession it is to disguise matters," the only possible conclusion is that the qualifications of House committee chairmen are very poor. Unlike in "Utopia," it cannot be said of the chairmen that "they have no lawyers among them."

A great weakness in the qualifications of chairmen,

⁵George B. Galloway, The Legislative Process in Congress (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1953), 312.

as determined by their professional and occupational background, is the almost total exclusion of many important occupational groups. Law, business, and journalism account for nine out of ten chairmen. Without doubt, these professions provide experience which is useful in presiding over committees; but if other vocations contribute something toward ability, leadership in the House must of necessity suffer.

Happily, the monopoly of the chairmanships by law, business, and journalism is partially off-set by the wide variety of public service and the high educational attainment of the chairmen. Four out of five chairmen held public office prior to their election to the House. Much of this public service was in legislative bodies: three out of ten served in the lower branch of state legislatures, two out of ten served in state senates, and a few served in city councils. Former judges and prosecuting attorneys are also well represented among the chairmen as are national, state, and local administrative officials. The list of House committee chairmen includes mayors, Speakers and Presidents Pro Tempore of State Assemblies, secretaries of state, lieutenant governors, and collectors of internal revenue as well as postmasters, county sheriffs, and tax assessors. Committee chairmen are also generally well above the national average in educational achievement. Seven out of ten had college training, one-half were college graduates, and one out of

six held a second college degree.

Sir Thomas More might have taken a dim view of this rosy educational picture. Far too much of it was in the field of law. Of the 350 college graduates among the committee chairmen, 198 (or 57 per cent) received degrees from law school. If one assumes that a wide representation of the various areas of education is desirable, this is indeed a weakness in the educational qualifications of the chairmen of House committees. Yet it also suggests a practical method of improvement. It is widely known that the majority of committee chairmen--nay of all American legislators--are products of our law schools. Hence, an improvement in the standards of our law schools might eventually bear fruit in increased competence in our committee chairmen.

Though there are undoubtedly instances in which poorly qualified men have been elevated to a committee chairmanship because of the rule of seniority, it would be difficult to maintain that this institution rewards incompetence and discriminates against ability. The committee chairmen are a representative cross section of the House itself. The typical chairman is like the typical representative in regard to age, education, previous public service, and profession and occupation. In view of the fact that committee chairmen are drawn from the membership of the House by an automatic system of promotion this should surprise no one. The obvious conclusion is this: To the extent that representatives are

poorly qualified so are chairmen. To improve chairmen it would be necessary to improve congressmen.

Is Seniority the Cause of Party Irresponsibility?

One of the most serious and widespread criticisms of the seniority system centers about the belief that it destroys party responsibility and enables chairmen to be arbitrary. It has been said that seniority "makes it difficult to provide effective and responsible party government," and that a "committee chairman can safely ignore the legislative wishes of his party organization."⁶ In this direction, the Committee on Political Parties of the American Political Science Association recommended that the seniority rule be modified so as to exclude from the chairmanships those disloyal to their party program.⁷

Closely related to this is the charge that seniority discriminates against "liberals" and favors "conservatives." Indeed, the latter may be considered the basic criticism for it frequently underlies all others.⁸ For example, George B. Galloway names the destruction of party responsibility as "one of the greatest drawbacks of the seniority system," but

⁶Robert K. Carr et al., American Democracy in Theory and Practice (New York: Rinehart and Company, 1951), 308. For similar statements see almost any textbook in American government.

⁷Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System (New York: Rinehart and Company, 1950).

⁸However, this is seldom specifically stated but implied "between the lines."

he relates this "drawback" to the predominance of conservatives among the chairmen. To illustrate his point he mentions the legislative program of the New Deal, much of which "was defeated, delayed, or diluted by the old-timers who were in control" of the legislative machinery. He also quotes the executive vice president of Labor's Non Partisan League to the effect that "the seniority line is also the line of cleavage between the progressives and conservatives within the Democratic Party."⁹

Without doubt the rule of seniority contributes to the lack of party responsibility. The two are so closely related that it is sometimes assumed that this method of selecting chairmen originated with the overthrow of Speaker Cannon in 1910 and 1911. Before this revolt, chairmen and committee members were appointed by the Speaker, and the two decades prior to 1910 constitute a period of "party responsibility," or, as some would prefer to say, an era of "dictatorial Speakers." In 1911, the Speaker was deprived of the power to appoint standing committees. This authority, although technically transferred to the House itself, has since been exercised by the committee on committees which has been generally guided by the seniority principle. Since this time, there has been a general decline in party cohesion.

⁹George B. Galloway, Congress at the Crossroads (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946), 190-191.

Actually the institution of seniority was well established long before 1910 and 1911, but the changes made in the House rules during these years had a great effect upon its development.

In so far as seniority is concerned, the real significance of the dethronement of "Czar" Cannon, lay not in the origin of the rule but in the beginning of its more rigid application. Before this the Speaker used his authority to name committees to ensure party cohesion. True, the Speaker was guided by the seniority principle, but he occasionally departed from established practice. Thus during the eight years he served as Speaker, Cannon departed from the precedent on twenty occasions. In any case, he exercised a power which might be appropriately called the "threat of not promoting." The committee on committees has been bound more closely to the rule of seniority than the Speaker, and it has been less free in its use of the authority to appoint chairmen as a disciplinary measure.

Seniority is a coin with two sides. The best known aspect is that mentioned above--promotion by seniority. Equally important, in so far as party responsibility is concerned, is the reverse side--that which guarantees a chairman from removal without his consent. That is to say, the rule which prevents the "dethronement" of chairmen is as destructive of party responsibility as the rule which automatically promotes the man with the longest continuous

service. In the study of public administration and in critiques of the American presidency it is recognized that the power of removal is a necessary ingredient of the authority to supervise and direct. Likewise, it is true that the power to remove chairmen would tend to make them more responsible to those who possessed such power. Many are the reasons for the termination of chairmen's terms of office, but removal for lack of party loyalty is not among them.

Table 28

APPENDIX

LIST OF HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN, BY COMMITTEE, PARTY, STATE, AND CONGRESS, 1889-1954

Committee on Accounts			Congress Number
Henry J. Spooner	Rep.	R.I.	51
Harry Wells Rusk	Dem.	Md.	52-53
J. Frank Aldrich	Rep.	Ill.	54
Benjamin B. Odell, Jr.	Rep.	N.Y.	55
Melville Bull	Rep.	R.I.	56-57
Charles Q. Hildebrandt	Rep.	Ohio	58
H. Burd Cassel	Rep.	Pa.	59
James A. Hughes	Rep.	W. Va.	60-61
James T. Lloyd	Dem.	Mo.	62-64
Frank Park	Dem.	Ga.	65
Clifford Ireland	Rep.	Ill.	66-67
Clarence MacGregor	Rep.	N.Y.	68-70
Charles L. Underhill	Rep.	Mass.	71
Lindsay C. Warren	Dem.	N.C.	72-76
John J. Cochran	Dem.	Mo.	77-79
Committee on Agriculture			
E. H. Funston	Rep.	Kan.	51
William H. Hatch	Dem.	Mo.	52-53
James W. Wadsworth	Rep.	N.Y.	54-59
Charles F. Scott	Rep.	Kan.	60-61
John Lamb	Dem.	Va.	62
Asbury F. Lever	Dem.	S.C.	63-65
Gilbert N. Haugen	Rep.	Iowa	66-71
Marvin Jones	Dem.	Tex.	72-76
Hampton P. Fulmer	Dem.	S.C.	77-78
John W. Flannagan, Jr.	Dem.	Va.	79
Clifford R. Hope	Rep.	Kan.	80-83
Harold D. Cooley	Dem.	N.C.	81-82

Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic

Thomas Dunn English	Dem.	N.J.	53
Elijah A. Morse	Rep.	Mass.	54
Henry C. Brewster	Rep.	N.Y.	55
Nehemiah D. Sperry	Rep.	Conn.	56-61
Ezekiel S. Candler, Jr.	Dem.	Miss.	62
Adolph J. Sabath	Dem.	Ill.	63-65
Addison T. Smith	Rep.	Idaho	66-67
Thomas D. Schall	Rep.	Minn.	67
John L. Cable	Rep.	Ohio	68
Grant M. Hudson	Rep.	Mich.	69

Committee on Appropriations

William S. Holman	Dem.	Ind.	52
Joseph D. Sayers	Dem.	Tex.	53
Joseph G. Cannon	Rep.	Ill.	51; 54-57
James A. Hemenway	Rep.	Ind.	58
James A. Tawney	Rep.	Minn.	59-61
John J. Fitzgerald	Dem.	N.Y.	62-65
Swager Sherley	Dem.	Ky.	65
James W. Good	Rep.	Iowa	66-67
Martin B. Madden	Rep.	Ill.	67-70
Daniel R. Anthony	Rep.	Kan.	70
William R. Wood	Rep.	Ind.	71
Joseph W. Byrns	Dem.	Tenn.	72
James P. Buchanan	Dem.	Tex.	73-75
Edward T. Taylor	Dem.	Colo.	75-77
Clarence Cannon	Dem.	Mo.	77-79; 81-82
John Taber	Rep.	N.Y.	80; 83

Committee on Armed Services

Walter G. Andrews	Rep.	N.Y.	80
Carl Vinson	Dem.	Ga.	81-82
Dewey Short	Rep.	Mo.	83

Committee on Banking and Currency

George W. E. Dorsey	Rep.	Neb.	51
Henry Bacon	Dem.	N.Y.	52
William M. Springer	Dem.	Ill.	53
Joseph H. Walker	Rep.	Mass.	54-55
Marriott Brosius	Rep.	Pa.	56
Charles N. Fowler	Rep.	N.J.	57-60
Edward B. Vreeland	Rep.	N.Y.	61
Arsene P. Pujo	Dem.	La.	62
Carter Glass	Dem.	Va.	63-65
Edmund Platt	Rep.	N.Y.	66
Louis T. McFadden	Rep.	Pa.	66-71
Henry B. Steagall	Dem.	Ala.	72-78
Brent Spence	Dem.	Ky.	78-79; 81-82
Jesse P. Wolcott	Rep.	Mich.	80; 83

Committee on Census

Edgar D. Crumpacker	Rep.	Ind.	58-61
William C. Houston	Dem.	Tenn.	62
Harvey Helm	Dem.	Ky.	63-65
Charles A. Nichols	Rep.	Mich.	66
Isaac Siegel	Rep.	N.Y.	66-67
Charles L. Faust	Rep.	Mo.	68
E. Hart Fenn	Rep.	Conn.	69-71
Ralph F. Lozier	Dem.	Mo.	72-73
William H. Larrabee	Dem.	Ind.	74-75
Brooks Fletcher	Dem.	Ohio	75
Matthew A. Dunn	Dem.	Pa.	76
Guy L. Moser	Dem.	Pa.	77
A. Leonard Allen	Dem.	La.	78-79

Committee on Civil Service

Robert E. DeForest	Dem.	Conn.	53
Marriott Brosius	Rep.	Pa.	54-55
Frederick H. Gillett	Rep.	Mass.	56-61
Hannibal L. Godwin	Dem.	N.C.	62-65
Frederick R. Lehlbach	Rep.	N.Y.	66-71
Lamar Jeffers	Dem.	Ala.	72-73
Robert Ramspeck	Dem.	Ga.	74-79
Jennings Randolph	Dem.	W.Va.	79

Committee on Coinage Weights, and Measures

Edwin H. Conger	Rep.	Iowa	51
Richard P. Bland	Dem.	Mo.	52-53
Charles W. Stone	Rep.	Pa.	54-55
James H. Southard	Rep.	Ohio	56-59
William B. McKinley	Rep.	Ill.	60-61
Thomas W. Hardwick	Dem.	Ga.	62-63
William A. Ashbrook	Dem.	Ohio	64-65
Albert H. Vestal	Rep.	Ind.	66-68
Randolph Perkins	Rep.	N.J.	69-71
Andrew L. Somers	Dem.	N.Y.	72-78
Campton I. White	Dem.	Idaho	79

Committee on Claims

W. G. Laidlaw	Rep.	N.Y.	51
Benjamin H. Bunn	Dem.	N.C.	52-53
Charles N. Brumm	Rep.	Pa.	54-55
Joseph V. Graff	Rep.	Ill.	56-58
James M. Miller	Rep.	Kan.	59-60
George W. Prince	Rep.	Ill.	61
Edward W. Pou	Dem.	N.C.	62-64
Hubert D. Stephens	Dem.	Miss.	65
George W. Edmonds	Rep.	Pa.	66-68
Charles L. Underhill	Rep.	Mass.	69-70
Ed. M. Irwin	Rep.	Ill.	71
Loring M. Black	Dem.	N.Y.	72-73
Ambrose J. Kennedy	Dem.	Md.	74-76
Dan R. McGehee	Dem.	Miss.	77-79

Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers

J. Fred C. Talbott	Dem.	Md.	63-65
Merrill Moores	Rep.	Ind.	66-68
Edward H. Wason	Rep.	N.H.	69-71
Robert A. (Lex) Green	Dem.	Fla.	72-73
Ambrose J. Kennedy	Dem.	Md.	73
Charles J. Colden	Dem.	Calif.	74-75
Alfred J. Elliott	Dem.	Calif.	76-79

Committee on District of Columbia

William W. Grant	Rep.	Vt.	51
John J. Hemphill	Dem.	S.C.	52
John T. Heard	Dem.	Mo.	53
Joseph W. Babcock	Rep.	Wis.	54-59
Samuel W. Smith	Rep.	Mich.	60-61
Ben Johnson	Dem.	Ky.	62-65
Carl E. Mapes	Rep.	Mich.	66
Benjamin K. Focht	Rep.	Pa.	67
Stuart F. Reed	Rep.	W. Va.	68
Frederick N. Zihlman	Rep.	Md.	69-71
Mary T. Norton	Dem.	N.J.	72-75
Vincent L. Palmisano	Dem.	Md.	75
Jennings Randolph	Dem.	W. Va.	76-79
John L. McMillan	Dem.	S.C.	79, 81-82
Everett M. Dirksen	Rep.	Ill.	80
Sid Simpson	Rep.	Ill.	83

Committee on Education

James O'Donnell	Rep.	Mich.	51
Walter I. Hayes	Dem.	Ia.	52
Benjamin A. Enloe	Dem.	Tenn.	53
Galusha A. Grow	Rep.	Pa.	54-57
George N. Southwick	Rep.	N.Y.	58-60
James F. Burke	Rep.	Pa.	61
Asbury F. Lever	Dem.	S.C.	62
Dudley M. Hughes	Dem.	Ga.	63-64
William J. Sears	Dem.	Fla.	65
Simeon D. Fess	Rep.	Ohio	66-67
Frederick W. Dallinger	Rep.	Mass.	68
Daniel A. Reed	Rep.	N.Y.	69-71
John J. Douglass	Dem.	Mass.	72-73
Vincent L. Palmisano	Dem.	Md.	74-75
William H. Larrabee	Dem.	Ind.	75-77
Graham A. Barden	Dem.	N.C.	78-79

Committee on Education and Labor

Fred A. Hartley, Jr.	Rep.	N.J.	80
John Lesinski	Dem.	Mich.	81
Graham A. Barden	Dem.	N.C.	82
Samuel K. McConnell, Jr.	Rep.	Pa.	83

Committee on Election of President, Vice President,
and Representatives in Congress

Ashbel P. Fitch	Dem.	N.Y.	53
Newton Martin Curtis	Rep.	N.Y.	54
John B. Corliss	Rep.	Mich.	55-57
Joseph H. Gaines	Rep.	W. Va.	58-61
William W. Rucker	Dem.	Mo.	62-65
Florian Lampert	Rep.	Wis.	66
William E. Andrews	Rep.	Nebr.	67
Hays B. White	Rep.	Kan.	68-70
Charles L. Gifford	Rep.	Mass.	71
Samuel Rutherford	Dem.	Ga.	72
Patrick J. Carley	Dem.	N.Y.	72-73
Brooks Fletcher	Dem.	Ohio	74-75
Caroline O'Day	Dem.	N.Y.	75-77
Eugene Worley	Dem.	Tex.	78
Herbert C. Bonner	Dem.	N.C.	79

Committee on Elections No. 1

Jonathan H. Rowell	Rep.	Ill.	51
Charles T. O'Ferrall	Dem.	Va.	52-53
Charles Daniels	Rep.	N.Y.	54
Robert W. Tayler	Rep.	Ohio	55-57
James R. Mann	Rep.	Ill.	58-60
Charles L. Knapp	Rep.	N.Y.	61
Timothy T. Ansberry	Dem.	Ohio	62
J. D. Post	Dem.	Ohio	63
Hubert D. Stephens	Dem.	Miss.	64
Riley J. Wilson	Dem.	La.	65
Frederick W. Dallinger	Rep.	Mass.	66-67
R. Clint Cole	Rep.	Ohio	68
Don B. Colton	Rep.	Utah	69-70
Carroll L. Beedy	Rep.	Ma.	70-71
J. Bayard Clark	Dem.	N.C.	72-73
Homer C. Parker	Dem.	Ga.	73
Cleveland Dear	Dem.	La.	74
Milton H. West	Dem.	Tex.	75
C. Jasper Bell	Dem.	Mo.	76-77
Thomas G. Abernathy	Dem.	Miss.	78
James Domengeaux	Dem.	La.	78-79

Committee on Elections No. 2

Henry U. Johnson	Rep.	Ind.	54-55
Walter L. Weaver	Rep.	Ohio	56
Marlin E. Olmsted	Rep.	Pa.	57-60
James M. Miller	Rep.	Kan.	61
James A. Hamill	Dem.	N.J.	62-65
Louis B. Goodall	Rep.	Ma.	66
Robert Luce	Rep.	Mass.	67
John M. Nelson	Rep.	Wis.	68
Bird J. Vincent	Rep.	Mich.	69-71
Joseph A. Gavagan	Dem.	N.Y.	72-76
Ed Gossett	Dem.	Texas	77-79

Committee on Elections No. 3

Samuel W. McCall	Rep.	Mass.	54
James A. Walker	Rep.	Va.	55
William S. Mesick	Rep.	Mich.	56
Edgar Weeks	Rep.	Mich.	57
Michael E. Driscoll	Rep.	N.Y.	58-61
Henry M. Goldfogle	Dem.	N.Y.	62-63
Lewis L. Morgan	Dem.	La.	64
Walter A. Watson	Dem.	Va.	65
Cassius C. Dowell	Rep.	Ia.	66-67
Richard N. Elliott	Rep.	Ind.	68
Charles L. Gifford	Rep.	Mass.	69-70
Willis G. Sears	Rep.	Neb.	71
John H. Kerr	Dem.	N.C.	72-75
Albert Thomas	Dem.	Tex.	76
Hugh Peterson	Dem.	Ga.	77-78
O. C. Fisher	Dem.	Tex.	79

Committee on Enrolled Bills

Robert P. Kennedy	Rep.	Ohio	51
John G. Warwick	Dem.	Ohio	52
Albert J. Pearson	Dem.	Ohio	53
Alva L. Hager	Rep.	Ia.	54-55
William B. Baker	Rep.	Md.	56
Frank C. Wachter	Rep.	Md.	57-59
William W. Wilson	Rep.	Ill.	60-61
Ben Cravens	Dem.	Ark.	62
William A. Ashbrook	Dem.	Ohio	63
Ladislav Lazaro	Dem.	La.	64-65
John R. Ramsey	Rep.	N.J.	66

Edwin D. Ricketts	Rep.	Ohio	67
Benjamin L. Rosenbloom	Rep.	W.Va.	68
Guy E. Campbell	Rep.	Pa.	69-71
Claude V. Parsons	Dem.	Ill.	72-76
Michael J. Kirwan	Dem.	Ohio	77
Arthur G. Klein	Dem.	N.Y.	78
George F. Rogers	Dem.	N.Y.	79

Committee on Expenditures in the Department
of Agriculture

Robert M. LaFollette	Rep.	Wis.	51
Paul C. Edmunds	Dem.	Va.	52-53
Charles W. Gillet	Rep.	N.Y.	54-57
Charles F. Wright	Rep.	Pa.	58
Charles E. Littlefield	Rep.	Ma.	59-60
William H. Graham	Rep.	Pa.	61
Ralph W. Moss	Dem.	Ind.	62
Robert L. Doughton	Dem.	N.C.	63-65
John M. Baer	Rep.	S.Dak.	66
Edward J. King	Rep.	Ill.	67-69

Committee on Expenditures in the
Department of Commerce

John H. Rothermel	Dem.	Pa.	63
Charles B. Smith	Dem.	N.Y.	64
Robert Crosser	Dem.	Ohio	65
Thomas S. Williams	Rep.	Ill.	66
Frank Murphy	Rep.	Ohio	67
Clarence D. Coughlin	Rep.	Pa.	67
Roy G. Fitzgerald	Rep.	Ohio	68
Henry R. Rathbone	Rep.	Ill.	69

Committee on Expenditures in the Department
of Commerce and Labor

David J. Foster	Rep.	Vt.	59-60
Washington Gardner	Rep.	Mich.	61
John H. Rothermel	Dem.	Pa.	62

Committee on Expenditures in the
Department of Labor

James P. Maher	Dem.	N.Y.	63-64
Christopher D. Sullivan	Dem.	N.Y.	65
Anderson H. Walters	Rep.	Pa.	66-67

Guy E. Campbell	Rep.	Pa.	68
Carroll L. Beedy	Rep.	Ma.	69

Committee on Expenditures in the
Department of Justice

James S. Sherman	Rep.	N.Y.	51
John M. Allen	Dem.	Miss.	52
Edward J. Dumphy	Dem.	N.Y.	53
William R. Ellis	Rep.	Ore.	54
Cyrus A. Sulloway	Rep.	N.H.	55
Jonathan P. Dolliver	Rep.	Ia.	56
Jesse Overstreet	Rep.	Ind.	57
William A. Calderhead	Rep.	Kan.	58-59
Sydney E. Mudd	Rep.	Md.	60-61
Jack Beall	Dem.	Tex.	62
Robert F. Broussard	Dem.	La.	63
Warren Worth Bailey	Dem.	Pa.	64
John E. Raker	Dem.	Calif.	65
William B. Walton	Dem.	N.Mex.	65
Wallace H. White, Jr.	Rep.	Ma.	66
Stuart F. Reed	Rep.	W.Va.	67
Sidney C. Roach	Rep.	Mo.	68
Willis G. Sears	Rep.	Neb.	69

Committee on Expenditures in the
Executive Departments

William Williamson	Rep.	S.Dak.	70-71
John J. Cochran	Dem.	Mo.	72-76
James A. O'Leary	Dem.	N.Y.	77-78
Carter Manasco	Dem.	Ala.	78-79
Clare E. Hoffman	Rep.	Mich.	81, 83
William L. Dawson	Dem.	Ill.	81-82

Committee on Expenditures in the
Interior Department

Nathaniel P. Banks	Rep.	Mass.	51
James W. Owens	Dem.	Ohio	52
Henry G. Turner	Dem.	Ga.	53
Charles Curtis	Rep.	Kan.	54-57
Edward S. Minor	Rep.	Wis.	58-59
Gilbert N. Haugen	Rep.	Ia.	60
Bird S. McGuire	Rep.	Okla.	61
James M. Graham	Dem.	Ill.	62-63
Tom Stout	Dem.	Mont.	64
William W. Hastings	Dem.	Okla.	65

Aaron S. Kreider	Rep.	Pa.	66-67
William Williamson	Rep.	S.Dak.	68-69

Committee on Expenditures in the
Navy Department

John G. Sawyer	Rep.	N.Y.	51
Charles A. O. McClellan	Dem.	Ind.	52
Benton McMillin	Dem.	Tenn.	53
Henry F. Thomas	Rep.	Mich.	54
James F. Stewart	Rep.	N.J.	55-57
William S. Greene	Rep.	Mass.	58
Joseph W. Fordney	Rep.	Mich.	59
Henry S. Boutell	Rep.	Ill.	60-61
Rufus Hardy	Dem.	Tex.	62-65
Reuben L. Haskell	Rep.	N.Y.	66
Leonard S. Echols	Rep.	W.Va.	66-67
William F. Kopp	Rep.	Ia.	68
George F. Brumm	Rep.	Pa.	69

Committee on Expenditures in the
Post Office Department

John M. Brower	Rep.	N.C.	51
William C. Oates	Dem.	Ala.	52-53
Henry H. Bingham	Rep.	Pa.	54
Irving P. Wanger	Rep.	Pa.	55-61
William A. Ashbrook	Dem.	Ohio	62
James M. Gudger	Dem.	N.C.	63
Clyde H. Tavenner	Dem.	Ill.	64
Edward Keating	Dem.	Colo.	65
Frederick N. Zihlman	Rep.	Md.	66-67
James P. Glynn	Rep.	Conn.	67
Mae E. Nolan	Rep.	Calif.	68
Philip D. Swing	Rep.	Calif.	69

Committee on Expenditures in the
State Department

Joseph A. Scranton	Rep.	Pa.	51
Rufus E. Lester	Dem.	Ga.	52-53
Lemuel E. Quigg	Rep.	N.Y.	54-55
William Alden Smith	Rep.	Mich.	56
John H. Ketcham	Rep.	N.Y.	57-59
John W. Weeks	Rep.	Mass.	59-60
Don C. Edwards	Rep.	Ky.	61
Courtney W. Hamlin	Dem.	Mo.	62-65
Richard N. Elliott	Rep.	Ind.	66-67
J. Will Taylor	Rep.	Tenn.	68-69

Committee Expenditures in the
Treasury Department

Lewis E. Atkinson	Rep.	Pa.	51
George H. Brickner	Dem.	Wis.	52
Charles Barwig	Dem.	Wis.	53
Charles H. Grosvenor	Rep.	Ohio	54
Robert G. Cousins	Rep.	Ia.	55-59
Philip Knopf	Rep.	Ill.	59-60
Ebenezer J. Hill	Rep.	Conn.	61
William E. Cox	Dem.	Ind.	62
Charles O. Lobeck	Dem.	Neb.	63-65
Porter H. Dale	Rep.	Vt.	66-67
William N. Vaile	Rep.	Colo.	68
Ernest W. Gibson	Rep.	Vt.	69

Committee on Expenditures in the War Department

Robert M. Yardley	Rep.	Pa.	51
Alexander B. Montgomery	Dem.	Ky.	52-53
William W. Grout	Rep.	Vt.	55-56
James R. Young	Rep.	Pa.	57
William R. Warnock	Rep.	Ohio	58
George P. Lawrence	Rep.	Mass.	59-61
Harvey Helm	Dem.	Ky.	62
John A. M. Adair	Dem.	Ind.	63-64
Peter J. Dooling	Dem.	N.Y.	65
William J. Graham	Rep.	Ill.	66
Royal C. Johnson	Rep.	S.Dak.	67-68
Thaddeus C. Sweet	Rep.	N.Y.	69

Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings

T. S. Flood	Rep.	N.Y.	51
Henry M. Youmans	Dem.	Mich.	52
William H. Crain	Dem.	Tex.	53
Thomas Settle	Rep.	N.C.	54
David G. Colson	Rep.	Ky.	55
Robert J. Gamble	Rep.	S.Dak.	56
Loren Fletcher	Rep.	Minn.	57
James A. Hughes	Rep.	W.Va.	58-59
E. Stevens Henry	Rep.	Conn.	60-61
Cyrus Cline	Dem.	Ind.	62
Thomas F. Konop	Dem.	Wis.	63-64
James V. McClintic	Dem.	Okla.	65
Ira G. Hersey	Rep.	Ma.	66
John S. Benham	Rep.	Ind.	67
Elmer O. Leatherwood	Rep.	Utah	68-69

Committee on Flood Control

Benjamin G. Humphreys	Dem.	Miss.	64-65
William A. Rodenberg	Rep.	Ill.	66-67
Thomas D. Schall	Rep.	Minn.	68
Frank R. Reid	Rep.	Ill.	69-71
Riley J. Wilson	Dem.	La.	72-74
William M. Whittington	Dem.	Miss.	75-79

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Robert R. Hitt	Rep.	Ill.	51, 54-59
James H. Blount	Dem.	Ga.	52
James B. McCreary	Dem.	Ky.	53
Robert G. Cousins	Rep.	Ia.	59-60
David J. Foster	Rep.	Vt.	61
William Sulzer	Dem.	N.Y.	62
Henry D. Flood	Dem.	Va.	62-65
Stephen G. Porter	Rep.	Pa.	66-70
J. Charles Linthicum	Dem.	Md.	72
Sam D. McReynolds	Dem.	Tenn.	72-76
Sol Bloom	Dem.	N.Y.	76-79, 81
Charles A. Eaton	Rep.	N.J.	80
John Kee	Dem.	W.Va.	81-82
James P. Richards	Dem.	S.C.	82
Robert B. Chipperfield	Rep.	Ill.	83

Committee on House Administration

Karl M. LeCompte	Rep.	Ia.	80, 83
Mary T. Norton	Dem.	N.J.	81
Thomas B. Stanley	Dem.	Va.	82

Committee on Immigration and Naturalization

Jacob A. Geissenhainer	Dem.	N.J.	53
Richard Bartholdt	Rep.	Mo.	54
Lorenzo Danford	Rep.	Ohio	55
William B. Shattuck	Rep.	Ohio	56-57
Benjamin F. Howell	Rep.	N.J.	58-61
John L. Burnett	Dem.	Ala.	62-65
Albert Johnson	Rep.	Wash.	66-71
Samuel Dickstein	Dem.	N.Y.	72-79
John Lesinski	Dem.	Mich.	79

Committee on Indian Affairs

Bishop W. Perkins	Rep.	Kan.	51
Samuel W. Peel	Dem.	Ark.	52
William S. Holman	Dem.	Ind.	53
James S. Sherman	Rep.	N.Y.	54-60
Charles H. Burke	Rep.	S.Dak.	61
John H. Stephens	Dem.	Tex.	62-64
Charles D. Carter	Dem.	Okla.	65
Homer P. Snyder	Rep.	N.Y.	66-68
Scott Leavitt	Rep.	Mont.	69-71
Edgar Howard	Dem.	Neb.	72-73
Will Rogers	Dem.	Okla.	74-77
James F. O'Connor	Dem.	Mont.	78
Henry M. Jackson	Dem.	Wash.	79

Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions

James A. Tawney	Rep.	Minn.	58
Augustus P. Gardner	Rep.	Mass.	59-60
William A. Rodenberg	Rep.	Ill.	61
J. Thomas Heflin	Dem.	Ala.	62
Edwin S. Underhill	Dem.	N.Y.	63
James C. Cantrill	Dem.	Ky.	64-65
Oscar E. Bland	Rep.	Ind.	66-67
Daniel A. Reed	Rep.	N.Y.	68
George A. Welsh	Rep.	Pa.	69

Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation

George W. Cooper	Dem.	Ind.	53
Binger Hermann	Rep.	Ore.	54
William R. Ellis	Rep.	Ore.	55
Thomas H. Tongue	Rep.	Ore.	56-57
Frank W. Mondell	Rep.	Wyo.	58-59
William A. Reeder	Rep.	Kan.	60-61
William R. Smith	Dem.	Tex.	62-64
Edward T. Taylor	Dem.	Colo.	65
M. P. Kinkaid	Rep.	Neb.	66-67
Addison T. Smith	Rep.	Ida.	67-71
Robert S. Hall	Dem.	Miss.	72
Dennis Chavez	Dem.	N.Mex.	73
Compton I. White	Dem.	Ida.	74-78
John R. Murdock	Dem.	Ariz.	79

Committee on Insular Affairs

Henry A. Cooper	Rep.	Wis.	56-60
Marlin E. Olmsted	Rep.	Pa.	61
William A. Jones	Dem.	Va.	62-65
Finis J. Garrett	Dem.	Tenn.	65
Horace M. Towner	Rep.	Ia.	66-67
Louis W. Fairfield	Rep.	Ind.	68
Edgar R. Kiess	Rep.	Pa.	69-71
Harold Knutson	Rep.	Minn.	71
Butler B. Hare	Dem.	S.C.	72
John McDuffie	Dem.	Ala.	73
Leo Kocialkowski	Dem.	Ill.	74-77
C. Jasper Bell	Dem.	Mo.	78-79

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Charles S. Baker	Rep.	N.Y.	51
Roger Q. Mills	Dem.	Tex.	52
George D. Wise	Dem.	Va.	52-53
William P. Hepburn	Rep.	Ia.	54-60
James R. Mann	Rep.	Ill.	61
William C. Adamson	Dem.	Ga.	62-65
Thetus W. Sims	Dem.	Tenn.	65
John J. Esch	Rep.	Wis.	66
Samuel E. Winslow	Rep.	Mass.	67-68
James S. Parker	Rep.	N.Y.	69-71
Sam Rayburn	Dem.	Tex.	72-74
Clarence F. Lea	Dem.	Calif.	75-79
Charles A. Wolverton	Rep.	N.J.	80, 83
Robert Crosser	Dem.	Ohio	81-82

Committee on Invalid Pensions

Edmund N. Morrill	Rep.	Kan.	51
Augustus N. Martin	Dem.	Ind.	52-53
John A. Pickler	Rep.	S. Dak.	54
George W. Ray	Rep.	N.Y.	55
Cyrus A. Sulloway	Rep.	N.H.	56-61
Isaac R. Sherwood	Dem.	Ohio	62-65
Charles E. Fuller	Rep.	Ill.	66-69
William I. Swoope	Rep.	Pa.	69
W. T. Fitzgerald	Rep.	Ohio	70
John M. Nelson	Rep.	Wis.	71
Mell G. Underwood	Dem.	Ohio	72-74
John Lesinski	Dem.	Mich.	74-79
Augustine B. Kelley	Dem.	Pa.	79

Committee on Judiciary

Ezra B. Taylor	Rep.	Ohio	51
David B. Culberson	Dem.	Tex.	52-53
David B. Henderson	Rep.	Ia.	54-55
George W. Ray	Rep.	N.Y.	56-57
John J. Jenkins	Rep.	Wis.	57-60
Richard Wayne Parker	Rep.	N.J.	61
Henry D. Clayton	Dem.	Ala.	62-63
Edwin Y. Webb	Dem.	N.C.	63-65
Andrew J. Volstead	Rep.	Minn.	66-67
George S. Graham	Rep.	Pa.	68-71
Hatton W. Summers	Dem.	Tex.	72-79
Earl C. Michener	Rep.	Mich.	80
Emanuel Celler	Dem.	N.Y.	81-82
Chauncey W. Reed	Rep.	Ill.	83

Committee on Labor

W. H. Wade	Rep.	Mo.	51
John C. Tarsney	Dem.	Mo.	52
Lawrence E. McGann	Dem.	Ill.	53
Thomas W. Phillips	Rep.	Pa.	54
John J. Gardner	Rep.	N.J.	55-61
William B. Wilson	Dem.	Pa.	62
David J. Lewis	Dem.	Md.	63-64
James P. Maher	Dem.	N.Y.	65
J. M. C. Smith	Rep.	Mich.	66
John I. Nolan	Rep.	Calif.	67
Frederick N. Zihlman	Rep.	Md.	68
William E. Kopp	Rep.	Ia.	69-71
William P. Connery, Jr.	Dem.	Mass.	72-75
Mary T. Norton	Dem.	N.J.	75-79

Committee on Levees and Improvements
of the Mississippi River

Julius C. Burrows	Rep.	Mich.	51
Samuel M. Robertson	Dem.	La.	52
John M. Allen	Dem.	Miss.	53
George W. Ray	Rep.	N.Y.	54
Richard Bartholdt	Rep.	Mo.	55-58
George W. Prince	Rep.	Ill.	59-60
Philip P. Campbell	Rep.	Kan.	61

Committee on Library

Charles O'Neill	Rep.	Pa.	51
Amos J. Cummings	Dem.	N.Y.	52
John R. Fellows	Dem.	N.Y.	53
Alfred C. Harmer	Rep.	Pa.	54-55
James T. McCleary	Rep.	Minn.	56-59
Samuel W. McCall	Rep.	Mass.	60-61
James L. Slayden	Dem.	Tex.	62-65
Norman J. Gould	Rep.	N.Y.	66-67
Robert Luce	Rep.	Mass.	68-71
Ralph Gilbert	Dem.	Ky.	72
Kent E. Keller	Dem.	Ill.	73-76
Robert T. Secrest	Dem.	Ohio	77
Donald L. O'Toole	Dem.	N.Y.	78-79

Committee on Manufactures

William D. Kelley	Rep.	Pa.	51
Charles H. Page	Dem.	R.I.	52-53
Lewis Dewart Apsley	Rep.	Mass.	54
George W. Faris	Rep.	Ind.	55-56
George W. Steele	Rep.	Ind.	57
Joseph C. Sibley	Rep.	Pa.	58-59
Henry McMorran	Rep.	Mich.	60-61

Committee on Memorials

Burton L. French	Rep.	Ida.	70-71
Frank Crowther	Rep.	N.Y.	71
John H. Morehead	Dem.	Neb.	72-73
Simon M. Hamlin	Dem.	Ma.	74
Pete Jarmon	Dem.	Ala.	75
Alfred L. Bulwinkle	Dem.	N.C.	76
Harry P. Beam	Dem.	Ill.	77
John R. Murdock	Dem.	Ariz.	78
Antonio M. Fernandez	Dem.	N.Mex.	79

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Sereno E. Payne	Rep.	N.Y.	54-55
Charles H. Grosvenor	Rep.	Ohio	56-59
William S. Greene	Rep.	Mass.	60-61, 66-68
Joshus W. Alexander	Dem.	Mo.	62-65
Frank D. Scott	Rep.	Mich.	69
Wallace H. White, Jr.	Rep.	Ma.	70-71
Ewin L. Davis	Dem.	Tenn.	72

Schuyler Otis Bland	Dem.	Va.	73-79, 81
Alvin F. Weichel	Rep.	Ohio	80, 83
Edward J. Hart	Dem.	N.J.	82

Committee on Mileage

John Lind	Rep.	Minn.	51
James N. Castle	Dem.	Minn.	52
Thomas Lynch	Dem.	Wis.	53
Ashley B. Wright	Rep.	Mass.	54
John A. Barham	Rep.	Calif.	55-56
William A. Reeder	Rep.	Kan.	57-59
Charles N. Brumm	Rep.	Pa.	60
Charles A. Kennedy	Rep.	Ia.	61
Robert E. Lee	Dem.	Pa.	62
Warren Worth Bailey	Dem.	Pa.	63
James F. Byrnes	Dem.	S.C.	64
C. C. Dill	Dem.	Wash.	65
John A. Elston	Rep.	Calif.	66
John Reber	Rep.	Pa.	67
Carroll L. Beedy	Rep.	Ma.	68-69

Committee on Military Affairs

Byron M. Cutcheon	Rep.	Mich.	51
Joseph H. Outhwaite	Dem.	Ohio	52-53
John A. T. Hull	Rep.	Iowa	54-61
James Hay	Dem.	Va.	62-64
S. Hubert Dent, Jr.	Dem.	Ala.	64-65
Julius Kahn	Rep.	Calif.	66-68
John C. McKenzie	Rep.	Ill.	68
John M. Morin	Rep.	Pa.	69-70
W. Frank James	Rep.	Mich.	71
Percy E. Quin	Dem.	Miss.	72
John J. McSwain	Dem.	S.C.	72-74
Lister Hill	Dem.	Ala.	75
Andrew J. May	Dem.	Ky.	76-79

Committee on Militia

D. B. Henderson	Rep.	Iowa	51
Edward Lane	Dem.	Ill.	52
William S. Forman	Dem.	Ill.	53
Benjamin F. Marsh	Rep.	Ill.	54-56
Charles Dick	Rep.	Ohio	57-58
Edward De V. Morrell	Rep.	Pa.	58-59
Halvor Steenerson	Rep.	Minn.	60-61

Committee on Mines and Mining

Thomas H. Carter	Rep.	Mont.	51
William H. H. Cowles	Dem.	N.C.	52
Thomas A. E. Weadock	Dem.	Mich.	53
David D. Aitken	Rep.	Mich.	54
Charles H. Grosvenor	Rep.	Ohio	55
Rosseau O. Crump	Rep.	Mich.	56
Frank M. Eddy	Rep.	Minn.	57
Webster E. Brown	Rep.	Wis.	58-59
George F. Huff	Rep.	Pa.	60-61
Martin D. Foster	Dem.	Ill.	62-65
Mahlon M. Garland	Rep.	Pa.	66
Marion E. Rhodes	Rep.	Mo.	67
John M. Robsion	Rep.	Ky.	68-70
W. H. Sproul	Rep.	Kan.	71
Joe L. Smith	Dem.	W.Va.	72-78
Andrew L. Somers	Dem.		

Committee on Naval Affairs

Charles A. Boutelle	Rep.	Ma.	51, 54-56
Hilary A. Herbert	Dem.	Ala.	52
Amos J. Cummings	Dem.	N.Y.	53
George Edmund Foss	Rep.	Ill.	57-61
Lemuel P. Padgett	Dem.	Tenn.	62-65
Thomas S. Butler	Rep.	Pa.	66-70
Fred A. Britten	Rep.	Ill.	71
Carl Vinson	Dem.	Ga.	72-79

Committee on Pacific Railroads

John Dalzell	Rep.	Pa.	51
James B. Reilly	Dem.	Pa.	52-53
H. Henry Powers	Rep.	Vt.	54-56
William Alden Smith	Rep.	Mich.	57-58
Thomas S. Butler	Rep.	Pa.	59-61

Committee on Patents

Benjamin Butterworth	Rep.	N.Y.	51
George D. Tillman	Dem.	S.C.	52
James W. Covert	Dem.	N.Y.	53
William F. Draper	Rep.	Mass.	54
Josiah D. Hicks	Rep.	Pa.	55

Winfield S. Kerr	Rep.	Ohio	56
Walter Reeves	Rep.	Ill.	57
Frank D. Currier	Rep.	N.H.	58-61
William A. Oldfield	Dem.	Ark.	62-63
Martin A. Morrison	Dem.	Ind.	64
Charles B. Smith	Dem.	N.Y.	65
John I. Nolan	Rep.	Calif.	66
Florian Lampert	Rep.	Wis.	67-68
Albert H. Vestal	Rep.	Ind.	69-71
William I. Sirovich	Dem.	N.Y.	72-76
Charles Kramer	Dem.	Calif.	76-77
Frank W. Boykin	Dem.	Ala.	78-79

Committee on Pensions

Milton DeLano	Rep.	N.Y.	51
Robert P. C. Wilson	Dem.	Mo.	52
Charles L. Moses	Dem.	Ga.	53
Henry C. Loudenslager	Rep.	N.J.	54-61
William Richardson	Dem.	Ala.	62-63
John A. Key	Dem.	Ohio	63-65
Allard H. Gasque	Dem.	S.C.	72-75
Martin F. Smith	Dem.	Wash.	76-77
Charles A. Buckley	Dem.	N.Y.	78-79

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Edward H. Rees	Rep.	Kan.	80, 83
Tom Murray	Dem.	Tenn.	81-82

Committee on Post Office and Post Roads

Henry H. Bingham	Rep.	Pa.	51
John S. Henderson	Dem.	N.C.	52-53
Eugene F. Loud	Rep.	Calif.	54-57
Halvor Steenerson	Rep.	Minn.	66-67
W. W. Griest	Rep.	Pa.	68-70
Archie D. Sanders	Rep.	N.Y.	71
James M. Mead	Dem.	N.Y.	72-75
Milton A. Romjue	Dem.	Mo.	76-77
Thomas G. Burch	Dem.	Va.	78-79
George D. O'Brien	Dem.	Mich.	79

Committee on Printing

Charles A. Russell	Rep.	Conn.	51
James D. Richardson	Dem.	Tenn.	52-53
George D. Perkins	Rep.	Iowa	54-55
Joel P. Heatwole	Rep.	Minn.	56-57
Charles B. Landis	Rep.	Ind.	58-60
Allen F. Cooper	Rep.	Pa.	61
David E. Finley	Dem.	S.C.	62
Henry A. Barnhart	Dem.	Ind.	63-65
Edgar R. Kiess	Rep.	Pa.	66-68
Edward M. Beers	Rep.	Pa.	69-71
William F. Stevenson	Dem.	S.C.	72
J. Walter Lambeth	Dem.	N.C.	73-75
Pete Jarman	Dem.	Ala.	76-79

Committee on Private Land Claims

Lucien B. Caswell	Rep.	Wis.	51
Ashbel P. Fitch	Dem.	N.Y.	52
John O. Pendleton	Dem.	W.Va.	53
George W. Smith	Rep.	Ill.	54-59
Thomas F. Marshall	Rep.	N.Dak.	60
Ernest W. Roberts	Rep.	Mass.	61

Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds

Seth L. Millikin	Rep.	Ma.	51, 54
John H. Bankhead	Dem.	Ala.	52-53
David H. Mercer	Rep.	Neb.	55-57
Charles W. Gillet	Rep.	N.Y.	58
Richard Bartholdt	Rep.	Mo.	59-61
Morris Sheppard	Dem.	Tex.	62
Frank Clark	Dem.	Fla.	63-65
John W. Langley	Rep.	Ky.	66-68
Richard N. Elliott	Rep.	Ind.	69-71
Fritz G. Lanham	Dem.	Tex.	72-79

Committee on Public Lands

Lewis E. Payson	Rep.	Ill.	51
Thomas C. McRae	Dem.	Ark.	52-53
John F. Lacey	Rep.	Ia.	54-59
Frank W. Mandell	Rep.	Wyo.	60-61
Joseph T. Robinson	Dem.	Ark.	62
Scott Ferris	Dem.	Okla.	63-65

Nicholas J. Sinnott	Rep.	Ore.	66-70
Don B. Colton	Rep.	Utah	70-71
John M. Evans	Dem.	Mont.	72
Rene L. DeRouen	Dem.	La.	73-76
J. W. Robinson	Dem.	Utah	77
J. Hardin Peterson	Dem.	Fla.	78-79, 81
Richard J. Welch	Rep.	Calif.	80
John R. Murdock	Dem.	Ariz.	82
A. L. Miller	Rep.	Neb.	83

Committee on Public Works

George A. Dondero	Rep.	Mich.	80, 83
William M. Whittington	Dem.	Miss.	81
Charles A. Buckley	Dem.	N.Y.	82

Committee on Railways and Canals

H. C. McCormick	Rep.	Pa.	51
Thomas C. Catchings	Dem.	Miss.	52-53
Charles A. Chickering	Rep.	N.Y.	54-55
James H. Davidson	Rep.	Wis.	56-61
Charles A. Korbly	Dem.	Ind.	62
Martin Dies	Dem.	Tex.	63-64
Clement Brumbaugh	Dem.	Ohio	65
Loren E. Wheeler	Rep.	Ill.	66-67
Oscar E. Keller	Rep.	Minn.	68-69

Committee on Revision of the Laws

Thomas M. Browne	Rep.	Ind.	51
William T. Ellis	Dem.	Ky.	52-53
William W. Bowers	Rep.	Calif.	54
Vespasian Warner	Rep.	Ill.	55-58
Reuben O. Moon	Rep.	Pa.	59-60
John T. Watkins	Dem.	La.	62-65
Byron B. Harlan	Dem.	Ohio	72-73
Raymond J. Cannon	Dem.	Wis.	74-75
Eugene J. Keogh	Dem.	N.Y.	76-79

Committee on Rivers and Harbors

T. J. Henderson	Rep.	Ill.	51
Newton C. Blanchard	Dem.	La.	52-53
Warren B. Hooker	Rep.	N.Y.	54-55
Henry A. Cooper	Rep.	Wis.	55
Theodore E. Burton	Rep.	Ohio	56-60

DeAlva S. Alexander	Rep.	N.Y.	61
Stephen M. Sparkman	Dem.	Fla.	62-64
John H. Small	Dem.	N.C.	65
Joseph J. Mansfield	Dem.	Tex.	72-79

Committee on Roads

Dorsey W. Shackelford	Dem.	Mo.	63-65
Thomas B. Dunn	Rep.	N.Y.	66-67
Cassius C. Dowell	Rep.	Ia.	68-71
Edward B. Almon	Dem.	Ala.	72-73
Wilburn Cartwright	Dem.	Okla.	73-77
J. W. Robinson	Dem.	Utah	78-79

Committee on Rules

Thomas B. Reed	Rep.	Ma.	51, 54-55
Charles F. Crisp	Dem.	Ga.	52-53
David B. Henderson	Rep.	Iowa	56-57
Joseph G. Cannon	Rep.	Ill.	58-60
John Dalzell	Rep.	Pa.	61
Robert L. Henry	Dem.	Tex.	62-64
Edward W. Pou	Dem.	N.C.	65, 72-73
Philip P. Campbell	Rep.	Kan.	66-67
Bertrand H. Snell	Rep.	N.Y.	68-71
William B. Bankhead	Dem.	Ala.	73
John O'Connor	Dem.	N.Y.	75
Adolph J. Sabath	Dem.	Ill.	76-79, 81-82
Leo E. Allen	Rep.	Ill.	80, 83

Committee on Territories

Isaac S. Struble	Rep.	Iowa	51
Joseph E. Washington	Dem.	Tenn.	52
Joseph Wheeler	Dem.	Ala.	53
Joseph A. Scranton	Rep.	Pa.	54
William S. Knox	Rep.	Mass.	55-57
Edward L. Hamilton	Rep.	Mich.	58-61
Henry D. Flood	Dem.	Va.	62
Benjamin G. Humphrey	Dem.	Miss.	62
William C. Houston	Dem.	Tenn.	65
Charles F. Curry	Rep.	Calif.	66-71
Ernest W. Gibson	Rep.	Vt.	71
Guinn Williams	Dem.	Tex.	72
Bolivar E. Kemp	Dem.	La.	73
Lex Green	Dem.	Fla.	73-78
Hugh Peterson	Dem.	Ga.	79

Committee on Un-American Activities

John S. Wood	Dem.	Ga.	79, 81-82
J. Parnell Thomas	Rep.	N.J.	80
Harold H. Velde	Rep.	Ill.	83

Committee on Ventilation and Acoustics

George W. Shell	Dem.	S.C.	53
William S. Linton	Rep.	Mich.	54
Joel P. Heatwole	Rep.	Minn.	55
George W. Prince	Rep.	Ill.	56
Roswell P. Bishop	Rep.	Mich.	57-59
William H. Graham	Rep.	Pa.	60
George D. McCreary	Rep.	Pa.	61

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Edith Nourse Rogers	Rep.	Mass.	80, 83
John E. Rankin	Dem.	Miss.	81-82

Committee on War Claims

Orasby B. Thomas	Rep.	Wis.	51
Frank E. Beltzhoover	Dem.	Pa.	52-53
Thaddeus M. Mahon	Rep.	Pa.	54-59
Kittredge Haskins	Rep.	Vt.	60
Charles B. Law	Rep.	N.Y.	61
Thetus W. Sims	Dem.	Tenn.	62
Alexander W. Gregg	Dem.	Tex.	63-65
Benjamin K. Focht	Rep.	Pa.	66
Bertrand H. Snell	Rep.	N.Y.	67
James G. Strong	Rep.	Kan.	68-71
Miles C. Allgood	Dem.	Ala.	72-73
John H. Hoeppel	Dem.	Calif.	74
Alfred F. Beiter	Dem.	N.Y.	75
Reuben T. Wood	Dem.	Mo.	76
Joseph A. Gavagan	Dem.	N.Y.	77-78
Edward J. Hart	Dem.	N.J.	78
Clair Engle	Dem.	Calif.	79

Committee on Ways and Means

William McKinley	Rep.	Ohio	51
William M. Springer	Dem.	Ill.	52
William L. Wilson	Dem.	W.Va.	53
Nelson Dingley, Jr.	Rep.	Ma.	54-55
Sereno E. Payne	Rep.	N.Y.	56-61
Oscar W. Underwood	Dem.	Ala.	62-63
Claude Kitchin	Dem.	N.C.	64-65
Joseph W. Fordney	Rep.	Mich.	66-67
William R. Green	Rep.	Iowa	68-70
Willis G. Hawley	Rep.	Ore.	71
James W. Collier	Dem.	Miss.	72
Robert L. Doughton	Dem.	N.C.	73-79, 81-82
Harold Knutson	Rep.	Minn.	80
Daniel A. Reed	Rep.	N.Y.	83

Committee on Woman Suffrage

John E. Raker	Dem.	Calif.	65
James R. Mann	Rep.	Ill.	66
Wallace H. White, Jr.	Rep.	Ma.	67-69

Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation

Royal C. Johnson	Rep.	S. Dak.	68-71
John E. Rankin	Dem.	Miss.	72-79

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources of Statistical and Biographical Data

Cannon, Clarence. Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States. 6 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1935-1941.

Congressional Record. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889-1954.

Harrison, James L. (compiler). Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950.

Hinds, Asher C. Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States. 5 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1907.

Johnson, Allen, Malone, Dumas, and Starr, Harris E. (eds.). Dictionary of American Biography. 21 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928-1944.

Official Congressional Directory. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889-1954.

Rules and Manual, United States House of Representatives. 1889-1954.

Who's Who in America. 28 vols. Chicago: The A. N. Marquis Co., 1899-1955.

Biographies, Autobiographies, and Memoirs of Chairmen and Speakers

Arnett, Alex M. Claude Kitchen and the Wilson War Policies. Boston: Little, Brown, 1937.

Babson, R. W. W. B. Wilson and the Department of Labor. Chicago: Brentano's, 1919.

- Barnes, J. A. John G. Carlisle, Financial Statesman. New York: Dodd, Meade, 1931.
- Bartholdt, Richard. From Steerage to Congress; Reminiscences and Reflections. Philadelphia: Dorrance, 1930.
- Blake, Israel G. The Holmans, of Veraestau. Oxford, Ohio: Mississippi Valley Press, 1943.
- Bloom, Sol. Autobiography of Sol Bloom. New York: Putnam, 1948.
- Bolles, Blair. Tyrant From Illinois: Uncle Joe Cannon's Experiment With Personal Power. New York: Norton, 1951.
- Brent, E. W. Martin B. Madden. 1901.
- Briggs, J. E. William Peters Hepburn. Iowa City: Iowa State Historical Society, 1919.
- Busbey, L. White. Uncle Joe Cannon. New York: Henry Holt, 1927.
- Byars, W. V. An American Commoner, the Life and Times of Richard Parker Bland. Columbia, Missouri: 1900.
- Celler, Emanuel. You Never Leave Brooklyn. New York: John Day, 1953.
- Clark, Champ. My Quarter Century of American Politics. 2 vols. New York: Harper, 1920.
- De Leon, T. C. Joseph Wheeler. 1889.
- Dingley, E. N. The Life and Times of Nelson Dingley, Jr. Kalamazoo: 1902.
- Evans, L. B. Samuel W. McCall. 1916.
- Glass, Carter. An Adventure in Constructive Finance. Garden City: Doubleday, Doran, 1927.
- Harrington, Fred Harvey. Fighting Politician: Major General N. P. Banks. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1948.
- Horan, Kenneth (O'Donnell). Papa Went to Congress. Garden City: Doubleday, 1946.

- James, Marquis. Mr. Garner of Texas. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1939.
- La Follette, Belle Case and La Follette, Fola. Robert M. La Follette. 2 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1953.
- La Follette, Robert M. Autobiography. Madison: 1913.
- McCall, Samuel W. Life of Thomas Brackett Reed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1914.
- O'Ferrall, Charles T. Forty Years of Active Service. 1904.
- Olcott, C. S. The Life of William McKinley. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916.
- Palmer, James E. Carter Glass, Unreconstructed Rebel. Roanoke: Institute of American Biography, 1938.
- Robinson, W. A. Thomas B. Reed, Parliamentarian. New York: Dodd, Meade, 1930.
- Russell, J. A. Joseph Warren Fordney. Boston: Stratford, 1928.
- Smith, Rixie and Beasley, Norman. Carter Glass: A Biography. Boston: Longmans, Green, 1939.
- Stephenson, George N. John Lind of Minnesota. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1935.
- Summers, Festus Paul. William L. Wilson and Tariff Reform; A Biography. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1953.
- Timmons, Bascomb M. Garner of Texas; A Personal History. New York: Harper, 1948.
- Underwood, Oscar W. Changing Sands of Party Politics. 1927.
- Washburn, C. G. The Life of John W. Weeks. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1928.

Books

- Alexander, De Alva Stanwood. History and Procedure of the House of Representatives. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916.

- American Political Science Association. Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System. New York: Rinehart, 1950.
- Atkinson, C. R. The Committee on Rules and the Overthrow of Speaker Cannon. New York: 1911.
- Bailey, Stephen K. Congress Makes a Law. New York: Columbia University Press, 1950.
- Bailey, Stephen K. and Samuel, Howard D. Congress at Work. New York: Henry Holt, 1952.
- Beard, Charles A. Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration. Washington: Brookings Institution, 1934.
- Brown, George R. The Leadership of Congress. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1922.
- Burns, James M. Congress on Trial. New York: Harper, 1949.
- Carr, Robert K. The House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1945-1950. Cornell University Press, 1952.
- _____, et al. American Democracy in Theory and Practice, the National Government. New York: Rinehart, 1951.
- Chamberlain, Lawrence H. The President, Congress and Legislation. New York: Columbia University Press, 1946.
- Chiu, C. W. The Speaker of the House of Representatives Since 1896. New York: 1928.
- Dahl, Robert A. Congress and Foreign Policy. New Haven: Yale Institute of International Studies, 1949.
- Dimock, Marshall E. Congressional Investigating Committees. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1929.
- Ewing, Cortez A. M. Congressional Elections, 1896-1944. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1947.
- _____. Primary Elections in the South. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1953.
- Follett, Mary P. The Speakers of the House of Representatives. New York: Longmans, Green, 1896.
- Ford, H. J. Representative Government. New York: Henry Holt, 1924.

- Fuller, H. B. The Speakers of the House. Boston: 1909.
- Galloway, George B. Congress at the Crossroads. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.
- _____. The Legislative Process in Congress. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1953.
- Gillett, Frederick H. George Frisbie Hoar. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1934.
- Griffith, Ernest S. Congress: Its Contemporary Role. New York: New York University Press, 1951.
- Gross, Bertram M. The Legislative Struggle: A Study in Group Combat. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953.
- Hasbrouck, Paul D. Party Government in the House of Representatives. New York: Macmillan, 1927.
- Heller, Robert. Strengthening the Congress. Washington: National Planning Association, 1945.
- Holcombe, Arthur N. Our More Perfect Union. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.
- Kefauver, Estes and Levin, Jack. A Twentieth-Century Congress. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1947.
- Key, V. O. Jr. A Primer of Statistics for Political Scientists. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1954.
- Luce, Robert. Congress, An Explanation. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.
- _____. Legislative Assemblies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924.
- _____. Legislative Principles. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1930.
- _____. Legislative Problems. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1935.
- _____. Legislative Procedure. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1922.
- McCall, Samuel W. The Business of Congress. New York: Columbia University Press, 1911.

McConachie, Lauros G. Congressional Committees. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1898.

McCown, Ada C. The Congressional Conference Committee. New York: Columbia University Press, 1927.

Norris, George W. Fighting Liberal; the Autobiography of George W. Norris. New York: Macmillan, 1945.

Ogg, Frederick A. and Ray, P. Orman. Introduction to American Government. (Eighth edition). New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1945.

Riddick, Floyd M. Congressional Procedure. Boston: Chapman and Grimes, 1941.

_____. The United States Congress: Organization and Procedure. Washington: National Capital Publishers, 1949.

Simpkins, F. B. The Tillman Movement in South Carolina. Durham: Duke University Press, 1926.

Smith, T. V. The Legislative Way of Life. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940.

Steiner, Gilbert Y. The Congressional Conference Committee: Seventieth to Eightieth Congress. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1951.

Truman, David B. The Governmental Process. New York: Knopf, 1951.

Turner, Julins. Party and Constituency: Pressures on Congress. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1951.

Walker, Harvey. The Legislative Process. New York: Ronald, 1948.

Westphal, Albert C. F. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.

Willoughby, W. F. Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration. Washington: Brookings Institution, 1934.

Wilson, H. H. Congress: Corruption and Compromise. New York: Rinehart, 1951.

Wilson, Woodrow. Congressional Government: A Study in American Politics. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1885.

Young, Roland A. This Is Congress. New York: Harper, 1943.

Articles

Armstrong, W. P. "Private John Allen: A Lawyer Who Had the Saving Grace," American Bar Association Journal, XXXIII (October, 1947), 990-994.

Atkinson, C. R. and Beard, C. A. "The Syndication of the Speakership," Political Science Quarterly, XXVI (September, 1911), 381-414.

Beal, John R. "Adolph J. Sabath," Public Men In and Out of Office. Edited by J. T. Salter. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1946, pp. 196-209.

Bone, Hugh A. "Sol Bloom," Public Men In and Out of Office. Edited by J. T. Salter. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1946, pp. 225-239.

Broughton, Philip S. "Congress Is Far From Reorganized," The New York Times Magazine (May 18, 1947), p. 7.

Cannon, Joseph G. "Powers of the Speaker," Century Magazine, LXXVIII (June, 1909), 306-312.

Chamberlain, Lawrence H. "Congress--Diagnosis and Prescription," Political Science Quarterly, LX (September, 1945), 437-445.

Ewing, Cortez A. M. "Primaries as Real Elections," The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, XXIX (March, 1949), 293-298.

French, Burton K. "Subcommittees of Congress," American Political Science Review, IX (February, 1915), 68-92.

Harris, Joseph P. "The Reorganization of Congress," Public Administration Review, VI (Summer, 1946), 267-282.

"Judge Hatton W. Summers," American Bar Association Journal, XXXII (September, 1946), 558-559.

Leupp, F. E. "Personal Recollections of Thomas B. Reed," Outlook, XCVI (September 3, 1910), 36-40.

- Luce, Robert. "Petty Business in Congress," American Political Science Review, XXVI (October, 1932), 815-827.
- McKinney, Madge B. "The Personnel of the Seventy-Seventh Congress," American Political Science Review, XXXVI (February, 1942), 67-74.
- Mumford, F. B. "William H. Hatch," Missouri Historical Review (July, 1924).
- Pollock, J. K. "The Seniority Rule in Congress," North American Review, CCXXII (December, 1925--February, 1926), 235-245.
- Porter R. R. "Thomas B. Reed of Maine," McClure's Magazine (October, 1893).
- Quarles, J. A. "William Lyne Wilson," Sewanee Review (January, 1901).
- Rankin, Robert S. "Robert L. Doughton," Public Men In and Out of Office. Edited by J. T. Salter. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1946, pp. 167-180.
- "Representative Knutson--a Bronko in a Wheelhorse Position," Business Week (February 22, 1947), p. 16.
- Riddick, Floyd M. "Sam Rayburn," Public Men In and Out of Office. Edited by J. T. Salter. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1946, pp. 147-166.
- Schattschneider, E. E. "Congress in Conflict," Yale Review XLI (Winter, 1952), 181-193.
- Shull, Charles, W. "The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946," Temple Law Quarterly (January, 1947).
- Thomas, Elbert D. "How Congress Functions Under Its Reorganization Act," American Political Science Review, XLIII (December, 1949), 1179-1189.
- Wilson, W. H. "William Lyne Wilson," Publications of the Southern Historical Association (July, 1901).