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The elements of contrast within the character of an individual and the heights of attainment in a lifetime of activities appear sometimes unexpectedly and serve to distinguish that person from the rest of mankind. Indeed, if personality, intelligence, physical attractiveness, and the love for political life were the only attributes of Kentucky Congressman Glover Cary, although they are unquestionably magnetic qualities, his life and works might deserve their repose from the critical observations of the historian. He, however, demonstrated an unusual concern for his constituents and a certain devotion to humanity, rare qualities if one applies the general connotative meaning to the word politician. This political biography is, therefore, concerned with the development of one man gifted for and enthralled with public life.

No attempt has been made to delve deeply into the personal life of the subject or to emphasize his highly successful private law practice. The author has, instead, attempted to stress Cary's role within the Democratic party, his contributions as a congressman, and the ways in which he reacted to and accepted
the challenges of the times. Utilizing all available sources of information, the author regrets that research was hindered and that some facts will probably forever remain a mystery because most correspondence and personal papers of the Representative had been destroyed before the research was begun.
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CHAPTER I

THE YOUNG OFFICEHOLDER

Glover Cary was a public servant and political leader in Kentucky for a relatively brief period of about thirty years, a time during which he held various local and state offices and ultimately represented his district in Congress.\(^1\) Clearly, Cary was influenced in his work not only by the times in which he lived but also by the heritage bestowed upon him and the climate in which he was reared. Serving in the House of Representatives during an era characterized by an economic depression and the expansion of military defenses, Cary directed his attention primarily to relief programs and world affairs; however, his constant concern remained his constituents' needs and the preservation of the rural way of life which had produced him.\(^2\)

When John E. Cary, the Congressman's grandfather, migrated in the early 1800's from Clark County, Kentucky, with his two brothers, James and Alfred, he settled in

\(^1\)House Doc., 85 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 442 (Serial 12108), 669.

\(^2\)For a detailed account of Cary's work in Congress see pp. 60-136.
McLean County, Kentucky, and devoted his life to the customary occupation of the region, agriculture. By combining farming and politics the Representative's father, Remus Griffith Cary, became prominent in public life in McLean County and remained so for forty years.  

Born in 1847 on a farm near Calhoun, in McLean County, Remus Cary abandoned his few remaining domestic obligations at the age of fourteen—a heavy frost in August had destroyed the crops which he normally tended—and participated for eighteen months as a Union volunteer in the Civil War. After he returned from that conflict, Remus Cary extended his interests beyond those of farming. He attended the Dr. Wayland Alexander Academy, a school at Oakland, in Daviess County, Kentucky; and a few years after his marriage, Remus Cary and his wife, the former Miss Henrietta Allen, moved to Calhoun where he entered the general mercantile business with a partner,

---

3 William Elsey Connelley and E. M. Coulter, History of Kentucky, Charles Kerr, ed. (5 vols., Chicago, 1922), IV, 222. Although available records have failed to reveal the exact date of John E. Cary's arrival in western Kentucky, varied records indicate he was living in the portion of Daviess County that later became McLean County as early as 1840 and that he was married in Daviess County in 1839. "Federal Population Census," 5th census (1830), 6th census (1840), county census records on file in the Owensboro Public Library; Marriage Record of John E. Cary and Mary H. Griffith, Sept. 9, 1839, Book A, Daviess County Court (Clerk's Office).
Henry Wall. Aside from that early business venture which lasted only three years, Remus Cary’s interests were almost entirely politically oriented, and, in many respects, his services to McLean County were paralleled by the first political endeavors of his son, Glover. The elder Cary served three terms as circuit court clerk, two years as county clerk, four years as master commissioner, and five years as a member of the State Board of Equalization; and, like his son, Remus Cary was never defeated for an office he sought.

Glover Cary, who was born May 1, 1885, probably acquired his political talents from his father, but he, undoubtedly, inherited his speaking ability from his mother, who possessed an impressive vocabulary and spoke with ease and brilliance in her daily conversations. Besides his oratorical competence, young Cary was a good student and seemed to learn rapidly without concentrated study; otherwise, the youth appeared to have been of average ability, and his childhood

---

4 Connolley and Coulter, History of Kentucky, IV, 222; Owensboro Messenger, Nov. 25, 1935; interview with Sam Montgomery, Jan. 3, 1971. For a comparison of the careers of Remus and Glover Cary see pp. 6-7.

5 Calhoun McLean County News, Nov. 28, 1935; Franklin Favorite, Nov. 28, 1935.
attributes yielded little indication of his future prominence. 6

The small community of Calhoun also helped to mold Cary's interests and development. There he spent his early life; there he was exposed to the stimulus of visible progress. Around 1900 the youthful Cary certainly observed the packet boats which made four trips per week to the town to load locally-produced goods. The tobacco factories, railroad tie mills, and nearby farms supplied the bulk of those exportations. Equally important as a symbol of the advancement of the area and as a probable influence on the future Congressman was a secondary school called Calhoun College, 7 which employed a nine-

---

6 House Doc., 85 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 42 (Serial 12108), 659; Interview with Mrs. James Epley, Oct. 14, 1970. The middle initial "H.", which is often seen in references to the name, Glover Cary, may have also been a legacy from the Allen side of the family. Members of that family related that the fact the Congressman actually had no middle name was considerably distressing to his wife because of the need for one in formal usage. Cary, therefore, simply adopted an extralegal initial, and he quite possibly chose the "H." because of a family tradition. According to the legend, the famous Henry Clay, who was traveling with the same wagon train as the Allens, gave a baby born at Cumberland Gap to that family a twenty-dollar gold piece. The family purchased a cradle with the money, and since that infant was named after the statesman, every generation of the Allens has had either a "Henry" or a "Henrietta." Perhaps, to Glover Cary the initial "H." meant Henry. Interview with Mrs. J. S. Owens, Oct. 14, 1970; interview with Mrs. Oswald H. Snyder, Jan. 4, 1971.

7 The spelling of this word varies as is noted in Calhoun College, "Annual Announcement" (notice of tuition and curriculum, 1898-99); Mrs. C. R. Smith private collection (Calhoun, Ky.).
member faculty and was headed by Dr. Wayland Alexander, Remus Cary’s former teacher. Glover Cary attended that school where he acquired the nickname "Skip" because of his small size and where he was a member of the Adelphian Society, an academic club. The Congressman’s training in Calhoun, along with his earlier attendance of a school in Owensboro and his two years of study at Centre College from 1902 through 1904, represented his total formal education.

Glover Cary attempted several careers before he finally decided to become a lawyer and to enter politics seriously. For a while he was the first cashier at the Farmers and Merchants Bank in Livermore, Kentucky, but in the year 1906 he became the co-editor of the McLean County News with C. E. Carpenter, the owner of a print shop in Calhoun. Together they performed job printing and published the Democratic newspaper which competed with two others in the county, the Calhoun Star and the Republican Livermore News. In 1907, however, Carpenter returned to Owensboro to form a printing company there.


and Cary's journalistic venture failed because of his inability to find someone to operate the print shop.\footnote{Calhoun McLean County News, Aug. 12, 1921; Hartford Ohio County News, Dec. 11, 1936; interview with Roscoe Downs, Aug. 10, 1970; interview with Carl Ross, Oct. 1, 1970.}

As his father before him had done, the youthful Cary then worked briefly as an educator.\footnote{Remus Cary taught for seven years. Connelley and Coulter, History of Kentucky, IV, 222.} For one school year, 1907-1908, he not only taught the upper levels in Calhoun School which ended with the eighth grade, but also assumed the role of principal. Cary adopted a pragmatic approach to discipline; he taught energetically but had little order. With an attitude of permissiveness and good humor the pedagogue even tolerated such unconventional classroom behavior as the playing of pranks and practical jokes.\footnote{Ibid.; G. H. Cary, Record Book kept while teaching at Calhoun School, 1907-08, Mrs. A. D. Kirk private file (1729 McCreary Ave., Owensboro, Ky.); interview with Mrs. Willie Muster, Oct. 11, 1970; interview with Mrs. Lucian Haynes, Dec. 23, 1970. Cary often demonstrated his sense of humor in his approach to serious situations throughout life. This was especially true during his years as Commonwealth's Attorney (pp. 17-18) and as a state political figure (pp. 34-35, 40-41, 55).}

While attempting other careers, Glover Cary was, in the meantime, receiving valuable training in local political offices. He began his first public work in 1904 as a deputy county clerk in his father's office.
After having been appointed in 1910 by Judge T. F. Birkhead, the young official then became master commissioner, a position he held for six years while he was, in addition, serving as McLean County treasurer.\(^{13}\)

Glover Cary finally found his means to a profitable career and political success by becoming an attorney. He studied law in his father's office and was admitted to the Kentucky State Bar on June 22, 1909,\(^{14}\) after having been encouraged to take the examination by Marvel Mills Logan, who later became a United States senator. While visiting Calhoun for a speaking engagement, Logan had met Cary and believed him to have been "too intelligent to remain a teacher."\(^{15}\) Cary, who had strengthened his ties with his hometown by his marriage on April 4, 1906, to Miss Bessie Whayne Miller, the daughter of Dr. William P. Miller of Calhoun, renewed those bonds when he began

\(^{13}\)Calhoun McLean County News, Aug. 12, 1921; Henderson Sunday Gleaner and Journal, Oct. 12, 1930; interview with Arthur Critser, July 1, 1970. Cary's actual entry into politics was his appointment as master commissioner, the first public position bestowed upon him by someone other than a member of his family.

\(^{14}\)Connelley and Coulter, History of Kentucky, IV, 222. Ironically, Remus Cary was a member of the bar for fifty-two years, a longer period of time than his son's life span. Owensboro Messenger, Nov. 26, 1935.

\(^{15}\)Interview with Beverly M. Vincent, Jan. 9, 1971. According to Edmonson Circuit Court Records, June 22, 1909, Glover Cary took his bar examination at Brownsville, Ky., and M. M. Logan acted as one of the examiners.
the practice of law in Calhoun.\textsuperscript{16} There the unfledged attorney worked independently for several years until the recent law graduate, Carl Ross, entered the profession by joining Cary's office in 1922.\textsuperscript{17}

In his capacity as an attorney, Glover Cary performed his most outstanding service to his home community by providing his assistance in promoting the building of a toll bridge over the Green River between Calhoun and Rumsey. The firm of Stranahan, Harris, and Otis of Toledo, Ohio, sold bonds to private individuals, and the Nashville Bridge Company completed construction in 1928. Because of his significant contribution to the building effort, some members of the community wished to dedicate the bridge to Glover Cary. Insisting that he had been adequately paid for his services, Cary declined the honor but did agree to officiate at the ceremonies held for the opening of the bridge.\textsuperscript{18} Cary's concern for the financial success of the project did not end as it might have with the completion of construction; throughout even his busy years in Congress, the

\textsuperscript{16}Calhoun McLean County News, Aug. 12, 1921; Connelley and Coulter, History of Kentucky, IV, 223; Bowling Green Park City Daily News, Oct. 30, 1934.

\textsuperscript{17}Memorial Services for Glover H. Cary, Proceedings of the Owensboro Bar Association, Jan. 4, 1937, 7.

\textsuperscript{18}Interview with Ross, Oct. 1, 1970; interview with Critser, July 1, 1970; interview with John Rogers, Sept. 21, 1971.
Representative maintained a professional interest in the profitable operation of the bridge.  

The first political office which removed Glover Cary from the realm of local politics and granted him his first experience as a lawmaker was that of Democratic representative of McLean County in the Kentucky General Assembly. After having ridden horseback many miles to campaign in 1913, the Calhoun lawyer was elected for the first time before attaining the age of thirty.

Cary did not quite double the combined votes of his Democratic opponents, Fountain Lochery and G. N. Broadley, in the primary election, but in the general election he received more than fourteen times as many votes as the Republican candidate, C. K. Watkins. Certainly, Cary's decisive victory in 1913, complemented by his lack of opposition for reelection in 1915, indicated the officeholder's overwhelming popularity as well as his political potential.

19 This is specifically indicated by Cary's correspondence with his law partner, A. D. Kirk. Glover Cary to A. D. Kirk, Dec. 30, 1934; Jan. 11, 1935, Kirk private file.


21 Election returns, Proceedings of the McLean County Board of Election Commissioners, Aug. 2, Nov. 4, 1913; Nov. 2, 1915.
### Table I

GLOVER CARY'S POPULARITY IN ELECTION TO KENTUCKY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Glover Cary</th>
<th>Opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913 (Dem. Primary)</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915 (Nov. Gen. Election)</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>unopposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Glover Cary thus served in the 1914, 1916, and special 1917 sessions of the legislature in which he introduced several bills, most of which had little success. During his first term he supported the victorious Claude B. Terrill for Speaker of the House of Representatives and was named to membership on the following standing committees: Court of Appeals, Kentucky Statutes, Mines and Mining, State Prisons and Houses of Reform, Revenue and Taxation, Redistricting-Legislative, and Rules. Despite committee assignments, however, the McLean County Representative's primary

---

22 Journal of the Kentucky House of Representatives, 1914, I, 6; Ibid., 1915, I, 6; Ibid., 1917, 4.

23 Ibid., 1914, I, 8-9, 127-20, 131, 133-35.
interests in that session appeared to have been election procedures.

During the course of the 1914 legislature, Glover Cary introduced three bills to modify election laws, but only one of them actually became a law. One impressive bill he presented to the lawmaking body had as its purposes the regulation of elections, the providing for publication of campaign contributions, the control of contributions, and the control of expenditure of those funds. He also proposed a bill to reduce the number on the county election boards, but it was his House Bill Number 76, which was to amend the existing state primary law, that passed the House on March 16, 1914, and was approved seven days later. That bill, in effect, rewrote the prevailing election law, changed the ballots somewhat, and provided more clearly for the registration of women for the purpose of voting on school questions.

Cary’s only other successful bill during that session repealed an existing law on weights and measures. The House did pass his proposed legislation which was

---

24 Ibid., 482-83.
25 Ibid., 515; Ibid., II, index 71.
designed to regulate insurance companies not authorized to function within Kentucky, but the Senate gave the bill little consideration.\textsuperscript{28} Other legislation Cary sponsored in the 1914 session concerned the prison system, the regulation of the duties of Fire Marshall, and the collection of school taxes.\textsuperscript{29}

In the 1916 General Assembly Glover Cary again supported a winning candidate for Speaker, H. C. Duffy, and served on many important committees: Public Ditches and Fences, Revenue and Taxation, Redistricting-Judicial, Rules, and Appropriations. He was, in addition, chairman of the Committee on Banks and Banking.\textsuperscript{30} But if his prestige had increased since his first term as representative, Cary's ability to obtain passage of bills he sponsored, apparently, had not. The unsuccessful bills he introduced included one to regulate the terms of court in the Sixth Judicial District and another to place prisons and hospitals under one commission.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{28}Kentucky House Journal, 1914, I, 640-44.
\textsuperscript{29}Ibid., 199-200, 482, 993; ibid., II, index 70, 79.
\textsuperscript{30}Ibid., 1916, I, 10-11, 80-81, 85-87. In view of the fact that Glover Cary contributed substantially to the work of the Appropriations Committee while in Congress (pp. 109-36), it is interesting to note his appearance on the corresponding state committee.
\textsuperscript{31}Kentucky House Journal, 1916, I, 111, 129-30; ibid., II, Index 47, 49.
Cary's membership on the Revenue and Taxation Committee governed the remaining legislation he initiated in 1916. Although the McLean County Representative presented four such committee-related bills, including one which required the payment of taxes before voting, only one was enacted into law. House Bill 382, which was offered by Cary on February 1, was approved as a law on March 15, and had as its objective the amending of the existing statute on tax penalties. The measure added other types of taxes for the revenue agent to collect and decreased the amount of the penalty he might keep.\footnote{Ibid., I, 348, 577, 990, 1041; ibid., II, index 59; Kentucky Acts of the General Assembly, 1916, Chap. LXXV, 601-05. See also for comparison, ibid., 1906, Chap. XXII, Sec. 10.}

Since there had not been time to consider necessary tax revision during the 1916 legislature, Governor A. O. Stanley called a special session for that purpose the following year.\footnote{Kontucky House Journal, 1916, I, 25; ibid., 1917, 4-5; Willis, Kentucky Democracy, I, 442.} Glover Cary actively participated in the 1917 session, but his work was, obviously, nonessential to the total efforts and outcome. The McLean County Representative offered amendments to House Bill 1, which called for the creation of a State Tax Commission, but the legislature...
rejected his proposals; nevertheless, Cary did approve of the bill in its entirety.  

Glover Cary's votes during that special session reflected two observable paradoxes. Although he was representing an agricultural area, he voted for the higher tax rates offered for livestock and farm implements. Also, Cary demonstrated during that early stage of his career his disapproval of unnecessary governmental expenditure although he was known for his personal enjoyment in spending money. The Calhoun lawyer advocated frugality by his support of lowered salaries for the Tax Commissioner and a more limited expense budget for the Tax Commission.  

The years immediately following Cary's service in the General Assembly were among the most colorful in his life because they encompassed that period during which he gained recognition and prestige as a lawyer. Cary, who was succeeded by O. V. Brown as Democratic state representative, became County Attorney of McLean County in 1917, a position he held until he

35 Ibid., 301-02.
37 Kentucky House Journal, 1918, 1, 5; Calhoun Star, June 6, 1919.
rose to Commonwealth's Attorney on January 1, 1922.\textsuperscript{38}

During his service in the Sixth Judicial District, which was composed of Daviess, Hancock, Ohio, and McLean counties, Cary traveled about the area and stayed at the county seats while court was in session, often rooming with the circuit judge, George S. Wilson. Although he became so busy he did not always find time even to keep his bills properly paid, the state's attorney never neglected his opportunities for fellowship with the people of his district. After his work day ended Cary often strolled back to town at night and conducted discussions with some members of the community.\textsuperscript{39}

Glover Cary's legal philosophy and his deportment as an attorney gained him the admiration of the general public and the respect of other members of the legal profession. Opposing lawyers considered him to have been courteous to them and just in his manner of thinking, but, certainly, a formidable opponent. After hearing a brief review of the principal facts of a case, Cary was able to conduct a masterful prosecution. He

\textsuperscript{38} Cary was elected county attorney by a smaller majority than he had received in previous races. The vote was 1,383 for Cary and 1,147 for his opponent, W. G. Newton. Election returns, McLean County, Nov. 6, 1917.

\textsuperscript{39} Calhoun McLean County News, Aug. 12, 1921; interview with Ross, Oct. 1, 1970; Memorial Services, Proceedings Owensboro Bar Association, 8-9.
was deemed one of the best speakers within his political party by the time of his election as Commonwealth's Attorney, and he could often convince the jurors of a defendant's guilt by simply talking to them.  

Glover Cary admired the comparatively harsh British judicial system and believed that crime could be most effectively combated by stricter enforcement of laws and more certain justice given to criminals. He thought the guilty were too often acquitted, but, in his opinion, the problems of crime prevention and law enforcement were not hopeless. Cary did not accept the theory that the twentieth century had brought a great crime increase, and he blamed society for developing criminals. "I am convinced," he said, "that some are born criminals, but I am more fully convinced that the environment and surroundings and conditions in life have more to do with making criminals than any other thing."

In addition to his usual serious nature, Cary often displayed an extraordinary sense of humor in the courtroom. In one trial he represented cattle owners

---

40 Hartford Herald, Nov. 16, 1921; Memorial Services, Proceedings Owensboro Bar Association, 5, 10, 16.

41 Glover Cary, "Crime and Its Punishment" (original paper read at the Owensboro Investigator's Club, Feb. 17, 1926), 1-8, Investigator's Club file (Owensboro Public Library); interview with Montgomery, Jan. 3, 1971.

whose livestock was not accepted by the buyers upon delivery. Although a contract had been drawn between the two parties, the market price for cattle had gone down since the agreement had been made, and acceptance of the cattle would have involved a considerable financial loss to the buyers. The opposing lawyer, therefore, became extremely emotional in his defense of the buyers. Responding to those pleadings, Cary noted disparagingly in his summation to the jury that he had seen lawyers actually weep when arguing cases for widows and orphans, but that was the first time he had ever seen a lawyer "cry over a bull calf." The attorney's sense of humor emerged again in another trial in which he was prosecuting a man accused of murder. In reference to the gun that was used to commit the deed, the defendant claimed he used the weapon only for duck hunting. The prosecuting attorney suggested in rebuttal that if such a gun were used on a duck, nothing would be left but the hole.

As Commonwealth's Attorney Glover Cary prosecuted interesting cases such as that of a man accused of making false entries on records of the Bank of Hartford (Kentucky), but the most famous criminal cases with

---

43 Interview with Mrs. A. D. Kirk, July 12, 1970; interview with Ray Sanders, July 21, 1970.

44 Interview with Kirk, July 12, 1970.
which he was connected were those of Carl and Grace Browder.\textsuperscript{45} The Browders robbed the Farmers Bank of West Louisville of all the available cash, and a bystander was shot by a machine gun during the holdup.\textsuperscript{46} The ensuing escape and capture of those criminals was a fascinating episode in itself. After their Studebaker sedan became stuck in the mud at the community of Elba, the couple walked about twelve miles through mud and rain to Calhoun, traveled by car from there to Central City, and eventually reached Atlanta, Georgia, where the authorities apprehended them.\textsuperscript{47}

From his tactics used in those cases, Glover Cary may have earned his reputation as a ruthless prosecutor. Referring to Grace Browder as "the woman with a face of marble" because of her absence of facial expression,\textsuperscript{48} the Commonwealth's Attorney requested and received for her a sentence of twenty years.\textsuperscript{49} Carl

\textsuperscript{45}Hartford Ohio County News, March 11, 18, 1927; Owensboro Inquirer, Feb. 4, 1929; interview with Montgomery, Jan. 3, 1971; interview with Glover Cary, Jr., June 11, 1970.

\textsuperscript{46}Owensboro Inquirer, Jan. 9, 1929.

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid., Jan. 14, 1929. A telephone tip received by the police included the words "Peach Tree Street" and aided in the capture of the fugitives. Interview with Wilber Miller and Lawrence Hager, Sr., July 3, 1970.

\textsuperscript{48}Owensboro Inquirer, Feb. 15, 1929.

\textsuperscript{49}Ibid.
Browder was given a lighter eighteen-year term in prison although Cary had asked for the maximum penalty.50

Cary's timely transition from legislator to County Attorney and Commonwealth's Attorney, whether carefully devised or completely unplanned, proved wise because those governmental positions seemed to remove him directly from politics during a period not necessarily favorable to the Democratic party. Neither political party was in complete control of Kentucky immediately following World War I, and in 1919, just two years after Cary had become County Attorney, the state elective offices were filled by Republicans.51

The following year the Democrats carried Kentucky by only a narrow margin of votes in the presidential election, and in 1924 Republicans were again victorious in the state.52 Between those presidential contests Cary won election in 1921 to the office of Commonwealth's Attorney, but actually lost to his Republican opponent, C. E. Smith, in two of the four counties of the Sixth Judicial District.53 In 1927, when Kentucky elected a

50 Ibid., Feb. 27, 1929.
51 Willis, Kentucky Democracy, I, 471, 456.
53 Hartford Herald, Nov. 16, 1921.
Republican governor, Glover Cary won reelection as Commonwealth's Attorney with a plurality which indicated that his personal popularity was more important than his political alignment. He carried three of the four counties in his district and ran a very close race in the fourth. While the Republicans received 59.3 percent of the Kentucky votes in the 1928 presidential election in a rejection of the wet, Catholic nominee, Cary remained secure in his office until he resigned on February 28, 1931, to enter Congress.

The possibility that Glover Cary influenced the choice of his successor as Commonwealth's Attorney is quite remote although Elmer Brown, who followed him in that office, had known the newly-elected Congressman as a lawyer and as a member of the 1914 General Assembly.

54 Orval W. Baylor, J. Dan Talbott: Champion of Good Government: A Saga of Kentucky Politics from 1900 to 1942 (Louisville, 1942), 83; Hartford Ohio County News, Nov. 11, 1927; election returns, McLean County, Nov. 8, 1927; election returns, Proceeding of the Daviess County Board of Election Commissioners, Nov. 8, 1927; election returns, Proceedings of the Hancock County Board of Election Commissioners, Nov. 8, 1927. The returns were as follows: Ohio Co., Cary-3,134; Martin-3,248; McLean Co., Cary-1,600; Martin-1,340; Daviess Co., Cary-841; Martin-970; Hancock Co., Cary-872; Martin-830.


56 Hartford Ohio County News, Mar. 6, 1931; interview with Elmer Brown, Aug. 27, 1970.
A. D. Kirk, one of Cary's law partners, had suggested another attorney to fill that office, and, besides, the Governor of Kentucky who made the appointment was not of the same political party as Cary.\(^{57}\) Elmer Brown, however, served only until the election of 1932 when he was succeeded by his Democratic opponent, Herman A. Birkhead.\(^{58}\)

Excepting his love for hunting and fishing, Glover Cary's activities in his personal and business life seemed to promote his political interests.\(^{59}\) In 1926 he moved to Owensboro, Kentucky, to establish a law partnership there. Since circuit court convened for longer periods of time in that city, the move was, also, partially a matter of convenience.\(^{60}\) In the larger community Cary became associated as a law partner with the attorney, Wilber Miller, on January 1, 1930, and

\(^{57}\) A. D. Kirk to J. D. Craddock, Sept. 26, 1930, Kirk private file; Baylor, J. Dan Talbott, 83.

\(^{58}\) Interview with Brown, Aug. 27, 1970; Hartford County News, Nov. 6, 1931.

\(^{59}\) Interview with Ross, Oct. 1, 1970; Glover H. Cary to A. O. Stanley, July 2, 1930, A. O. Stanley Papers (Margaret I. King Library, University of Kentucky). According to a membership card in the possession of Mrs. Oswald H. Snyder, Owensboro, Ky., Glover Cary belonged to the Daviess County Game and Fish Association.

later with A. D. Kirk. In 1935 Glover Cary's son, William Ree Cary, was invited to join the firm, and he did so shortly before his father's death.  

Through his work with certain banks, Cary, undoubtedly, established numerous political contacts. He became a director of the Central Trust Bank of Owensboro, the Citizens Deposit Bank of Calhoun, and the Farmers and Merchants Bank of Livermore, and for a while he was president of the Hartford Deposit Bank.  

As a lawyer Cary assisted in the reorganization of the Central Trust Company, and, when the Hartford Bank failed, both he and Wilber Miller were instrumental in its reopening in 1934. Although he gave his law partner most of the credit for that success, Cary displayed great concern over the difficulty in attracting depositors and worked diligently on the project for a considerable length of time.  


Glover Cary was active in community affairs in Owensboro. He belonged to a small Methodist church where he taught the men's bible class. He was also Exalted Ruler of the Owensboro Lodge of Elks and a member of the Odd Fellows Club, the Masonic Lodge, and the Owensboro Shrine Club.  

On March 19, 1926, Cary gained membership in Owensboro's Investigator's Club, a literary organization which was formed in 1894 and had adopted as its purpose the investigation of universal knowledge. Although he remained a member until his resignation on January 20, 1933, the Congressman's attendance record indicates that there were higher priorities for him than that club. He was absent all of 1932 and attended on an irregular basis other years. During his membership the Representative presented only two book reviews, one on *Today and Tomorrow* by Henry Ford and the other on *Disraeli* by André Maurois. He was absent from

---


66 Minutes of Meeting of Owensboro's Investigator's Club, Jan. 20, 1933, Investigator's Club file; Roster, Investigator's Club file.

meetings on the dates established for his presentation of assigned scientific topics, and he, thus, limited his research to two studies on criminology, "Crime and Its Punishment," and "Can the Law Be Enforced?"68

The whole of Cary's life up to the year 1931 seemed to have been only a prelude to his last five years. His activities and interests readied him for the tremendous work which awaited him in Congress, his personal friendships supplied him with much of the support he needed to succeed in that office, and his practice in politics provided him with the skills necessary for success and survival within his own political party.

CHAPTER II

THE ASPIRING POLITICIAN

The year 1930 marks the entrance of Glover Cary into prominence in governmental affairs and in politics. From that time until death ended his career six years later, Cary participated actively in every major election within the state. Having been strongly suggested as a possible candidate in the 1927 gubernatorial election, Cary pursued instead a different political course with his nomination on October 6, 1930, for representative from the Second Congressional District to the United States Congress. His stature as a congressman permitted him to express openly his views on candidates and issues and to influence certain decisions of the electorate.

Glover Cary succeeded John L. Dorsey of Henderson as representative. In the 1930 November election Dorsey was the unopposed Democratic nominee for the short term


26
of Congress, and Glover Cary was the candidate for the regular term. Cary's predecessor, therefore, was not really Dorsey, who had served only three months, but David Kincheloe, who had resigned as congressman to become an associate justice of the United States Customs Court in New York City. Kincheloe had been extremely popular as a representative. Starting with the Sixty-fourth Congress in 1904, he had been elected to each succeeding Congress and had had no opposition within his own Democratic party since first elected. Kincheloe, who was a self-made man with a rural background, had served on the Committee on Agriculture and had advocated support of the League of Nations. Despite Kincheloe's high qualifications, Cary undertook enthusiastically the difficult task of replacing him.

When the probability of David Kincheloe's appointment as judge became known, friends began suggesting Glover Cary as his successor, and as early as September 26, 1930, the choice of the Commonwealth's

---

2Hartford Ohio County News, Dec. 11, 1936; Henderson Morning Gleaner, Nov. 6, 1930. Dorsey was elected to serve only from December to March, and Cary was chosen to serve from March, 1931, until the next term began. U. S. Constitution, Art. I, sec. 4.

3Henderson Morning Gleaner, Oct. 7, 1930.

Attorney for the national office was all but a reality. He received the support of such locally influential people as Lawrence Hager, editor of the Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, and Harry Holder, chairman of the McLean County Democrats; however, his law partner, Wilber Miller, who agreed that Cary might accept the office, did not favor his seeking election at that time. Potential assistance in the acquisition of the office lay also in the fact that the Second Congressional District, which was then composed of Union, Henderson, Daviess, Hancock, McLean, Webster, Hopkins, and Christian counties, included part of the Sixth Judicial District where Cary commanded enviable popularity.

The other official candidate seeking the nomination was Major G. Talbott Berry of Morganfield, Commonwealth's Attorney of Henderson, Union, and Webster counties. However, when the first six counties to cast their votes at the Democratic district committee meeting supported Cary, the Union County chairman moved that Cary's selection be made unanimous. A third

---


candidate, Gates F. Young, who was committee chairman and a friend of Cary's, had also seriously sought the nomination. In an attempt to gain votes, Young had approved for Henderson County chairman a man unacceptable to the district committee. Young's name was, therefore, not placed in nomination. 8

Although unopposed and his own election assured, Cary began his renowned state-wide campaigning for the Democratic party immediately after his nomination in 1930. 9 The candidate directed his efforts more toward discrediting the Republican party than toward establishing a firm basis for the election of candidates of his own party, and his two main points of attack were the tariff and the economic conditions associated with the Hoover administration. 10 Glover Cary blamed the depression on the tariff which he recognized as the reason for


10 The tariff had not been a major issue in the presidential election of 1928, but a bill was introduced in 1929 to place even higher duties on the farmer and increase some other goods. The higher import tax, along with the general economic conditions, prompted attacks on the tariff in 1930. F. W. Taussig, The Tariff History of the United States (8th ed., New York, 1931), 490, 494.
economic retaliation by other nations.\textsuperscript{11} He believed the high tariff had forced American shops to close and had created farm problems. He also criticized the Farm Board and its chairman who was associated with big business. The ardent nominee thought the tariff was a means by which Republican campaign contributors could be repaid.\textsuperscript{12}

Cary also claimed the Republican party was partial to the wealthy, and he favored lower income taxes for those of moderate incomes and higher ones for corporations with their larger incomes.\textsuperscript{13} Disagreeing with the national administration's refunding of income taxes and pointing out that the largest beneficiaries of the refunds were people who had contributed to the Republican campaign, the congressional candidate claimed there was a plot to compel the United States treasury to pay the 1928 Republican campaign expenses.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{11}In response to the enactment of the high tariffs by the United States, the small nations, which were inclined to have high tariffs, added even higher protection. The result was a near stoppage of international trade. \textit{Broadus Mitchell, Depression Decade: From New Era Through New Deal, 1929-1941} (New York, 1947), 5-6.


\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Louisville Courier-Journal}, Oct. 15, 1930.

\textsuperscript{14}\textit{Henderson Morning Gleaner}, Oct. 29, 1930.
Glover Cary also joined others in discussing personalities involved in the election. In a partisan argument he censured the linking of John J. Raskob's chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee with the senatorial campaigns of Marvel Mills Logan and Ben Williamson. John M. Robsion, the Republican nominee for the Senate, had probably made Raskob an issue because of the latter's religion and his stand on prohibition.\(^\text{15}\)

According to a private agreement Cary permitted John L. Dorsey to serve during the unexpired portion of Kincheloe's term which was to terminate the following March.\(^\text{16}\) Dorsey took his seat on December 1, 1930, and Glover Cary resigned his post as Commonwealth's Attorney on February 28, 1931, and began his tenure in Congress four days later.\(^\text{17}\) Afterward, Cary considered his not assuming office in December of 1930 a mistake because of the rule of seniority applied in the House of Representatives.\(^\text{18}\)


\(^{16}\) Interview with Miller and Hager, July 3, 1970; interview with Downs, Aug. 10, 1970.

\(^{17}\) William A. Stevens to author, July 30, 1970; *Hartford Ohio County News*, Dec. 11, 1936; *House Doc.*, 85 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 442 (Serial 12108), 669.

\(^{18}\) Interview with Miller and Hager, July 3, 1970.
During the gubernatorial race of 1931, Glover Cary campaigned even more fervently. He addressed sizeable gatherings in almost every one of the eleven congressional districts in Kentucky in the interest of his party.\textsuperscript{19} Considered "an able and pleasing speaker,"\textsuperscript{20} Cary was heard by the largest crowd to assemble in Lyon County during the entire campaign.\textsuperscript{21}

Cary promoted the election of Judge Ruby Laffoon, a candidate he considered capable and independent of political controls. The Congressman encouraged voters to demonstrate their disapproval of the Republican state administration. They should attempt to understand more fully the workings of the Sampson administration and ignore the accusations connected with Ben Johnson’s membership on the bipartisan highway commission. By associating Johnson’s name with Laffoon’s and by pointing out some of the former’s actions, the Republicans hoped to defeat the Democratic gubernatorial hopeful.

\textsuperscript{19}Hartford Ohio County News, Oct. 30, 1931.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., Oct. 16, 1931.

\textsuperscript{21} Eddyville Lyon County Herald, Oct. 12, 1932. Although he received much acclaim as a speaker, Cary did not usually speak from a written text. He attempted to write addresses, but he was never satisfied with them. George Wilson, a member of the Owensboro Bar Association, believed Cary probably did not think much about the speeches he had written when he delivered them. Interview with Glover Cary, Jr., June 11, 1970; Memorial Services, Proceedings Owensboro Bar Association, 9.
Cary defended Johnson by saying that the Republicans were using the highway commissioner to conceal their own mistakes and that Johnson had actually helped provide western Kentucky with good roads and had saved the state money. Johnson, according to Cary, had attempted to resign from the commission, but Sampson had refused to permit such a move.

While campaigning, Cary again stressed the economic conditions and the high tariff. He blamed much of the unemployment on the moving of factories from the United States to foreign countries, a situation which he believed to be directly attributable to the tariff. The Representative mentioned that Ford and General Motors had established factories in foreign countries in an attempt to evade the high tariffs enacted as retaliatory measures by those nations.

In reference to the economic situation caused in part by the Emergency Tariff of 1921, the Fordney-McCumber Tariff of 1922, and the Hawley-Smoot Tariff of 1930, all of which raised the tax on imports, Cary

---

22 Glover Cary apparently changed his alignments within his political party. Although he defended Johnson in 1931, he later opposed Chandler who had the backing of Johnson. See pp. 52-57.


24 Ibid.

25 Mitchell, Depression Decade, 181.
colorfully called the twenties and early thirties "the era of Faith, Hope, and Charity." The people had had faith under Harding, hope under Coolidge, and were then living on charity under Hoover.

Cary believed that the support of Laffoon's opponent, William Harrison, would indicate that Kentucky approved of the depression. He blamed the so-called "Barons of the East," who had demanded a high tariff, rather than President Hoover for the nation's plight; but he quickly demonstrated how one Democratic president, Woodrow Wilson, had lowered the tariff and had improved conditions. In addition to the tariff, Cary assailed again the refunding of taxes under the Republican presidents. The refunds, which he claimed went to people who had made fortunes during the war, had, as he argued, caused a huge deficit which had to be restored by the masses.

The year 1932 brought two major events in which Congressman Cary participated: he attended the Democratic National Convention, and he stood for reelection to the House of Representatives. Chosen from the Second

---

26 Leitchfield Gazette, Oct. 30, 1931.
27 Ibid.
28 Ibid.
29 Ibid.
Congressional District of Kentucky, he was one of the sixty-six delegates from the state. While some of them had one vote, Cary and the other three party representatives from the Second District had only one-half vote each, a fact which really made very little difference because Kentucky had an instructed delegation. Political allies of Cary's, Governor Ruby Laffoon and Senator M. M. Logan, had led support for Roosevelt at the state convention, and Kentucky's twenty-six votes were to go to Roosevelt.

The main problems which the Kentucky delegation faced at the national convention were decisions on the fight led by the Roosevelt forces against the two-thirds rule for the selection of a candidate, the choice of a permanent chairman, and the prohibition question. Roosevelt's decision to abandon his struggle against the two-thirds rule freed

30 Memorial Services, Proceedings Owensboro Bar Association, 1; House Doc., 85 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 442 (Serial 1210b1, 66; Madisonville Messenger, June 20, 1932.

31 Madisonville Messenger, April 12, 13, June 20, 1932; Paper Listing Kentucky Delegates and Alternates to the Democratic Convention, Barkley Papers (Margaret I. King Library, University of Kentucky).

32 Madisonville Messenger, April 9, 11, 1932.
Kentuckians from taking any position concerning that dilemma. The second problem—whether to vote for Senator Thomas Walsh, whose name was linked with Roosevelt's, or Jouett Shouse, who had been accused of endeavoring to defeat Roosevelt—was solved when the majority, including Cary, approved of Walsh.

On the prohibition issue former drys presented a minority report which stated that the Democratic party should propose an amendment to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment but should not specify how the states should vote on the amendment. That matter in question was resolved by the Kentucky delegation's earlier decision to approve the majority committee reports, a move which bound the Kentucky group to a firm stand against prohibition.

Even with the problems confronting the Kentucky delegation, the Democratic National Convention was

33 Louisville Courier-Journal, June 28, 1932. The significance of the two-thirds rule lay in Smith's possibility of forcing a compromise candidate if Roosevelt could not muster the specified number of votes. William E. Leuchtenburg, Franklin D. Roosevelt
and the New Deal, 1932-1940 (New York, 1963), 5-6.

34 Madisonville Messenger, June 29, 1932; Democratic National Committee Speeches, 1932, Jouett Shouse Papers (Margaret I. King Library, University of Kentucky).

unusually exciting. The Kentuckians listened to an outstanding favorite son, Alben Barkley, deliver the keynote address, and they saw their own choice for president nominated.  

Glover Cary said of the whole affair, "It was a great convention, which adopted a great platform; a platform unequivocal, clear-cut, constructive and progressive."  

The actual election in which he was himself a candidate and in which he sought votes for Roosevelt was the second important political episode for Cary in 1932. Believing that the perpetuity of the United States depended on its outcome, he termed that election "the most important ever waged on American soil."  

The Congressman would have probably devoted more time to the presidential campaign had he not been confronted with numerous problems in his bid for reelection.  

One incident which entailed some embarrassment was the publication before the election of facts concerning the employment of relatives by congressmen, a custom that was not at all unusual. The compiled evidence listed Glover Cary as having his son William on a "patronage" payroll in the House majority room.  

---  

37 Henderson Sunday Gleaner and Journal, July 10, 1932.  
at $105.00 per month. Other Kentuckians listed with relatives on the government payroll were Congressmen C. R. Carden, A. J. May, Voris Gregory, Ralph Gilbert, and Senators Alben Barkley and M. M. Logan.\textsuperscript{39} Strangely enough, Cary was said to have attacked Barkley for what he was accused of doing himself—keeping members of his family on the government payroll.\textsuperscript{40} Later, however, Cary must have changed his opinion of Barkley because he worked closely with the Senator and called him "one of the great leaders of the United States."\textsuperscript{41}

Cary had hoped to have no opposition in the primary election, but he experienced difficulties because of confusion concerning his stand on the Eighteenth Amendment.\textsuperscript{42} Since several constituents were dissatisfied with Cary's failure to support a repeal proposal presented to Congress, a meeting was held in Owensboro to raise support for Frank Goad of Scottsville for congressman from the Second Congressional District. The meeting brought forth another candidate.

\textsuperscript{39}Louisville Courier-Journal, May 20, 1932.

\textsuperscript{40}Francis Douglas to Thomas A. Combs, Aug. 3, 1932, enclosed in a letter from Thomas A. Combs to Senator Alben Barkley, Aug. 10, 1932, Barkley Papers.

\textsuperscript{41}Owensboro Inquirer, Oct. 10, 1935.

\textsuperscript{42}Glover Cary to A. D. Kirk, March 28, 1932, Kirk private file.
when W. O. Smith, County Attorney of Muhlenberg County, unexpectedly announced at the assemblage that he also intended to seek the party nomination. \(^{43}\)

Both Smith and Goad favored the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. The latter, in addition, emphasized more governmental direction from the masses and advocated veterans’ legislation. \(^{44}\) Despite the opposition by both candidates on the repeal issue, Cary had previously announced that he stood for everything in the Democratic platform including repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment and submission of the matter to the people. \(^{45}\) The Representative said that the charges made against him were untrue and that his

\(^{43}\) Madisonville Messenger, June 22, 1932. In March of 1932 Cary, along with six other Kentucky members of the House of Representatives, was absent the day of the vote on the Beck-Linthicum Amendment which would have cleared the way for submission of the repeal question to the people, but Cary said that he was opposed to the measure. Ulric Bell, "Drys Score Victory in House Crash," Louisville Courier-Journal, March 15, 1932.

\(^{44}\) Madisonville Messenger, June 22, July 14, 1932.

adversaries in Owensboro were "alleged Republicans" who had "no more politics than a snake has hips." Some voters were not convinced that the Congressman sincerely supported the repeal of prohibition. One individual who had heard him speak even described Cary as being "as dry as stale toast." In reply to a letter written to the Louisville Courier-Journal which had stated that Cary upheld repeal, emphasis was given to the fact that Cary had not only not favored the Beck-Linthicum Resolution, which was, in essence, a dry stand, but that he had also announced he favored only resubmission of the question to the people. He was thus accused of adhering to the same position on prohibition as the Republicans and of having the backing of Urey Woodson, who had opposed the majority report at the Democratic National Convention, and the Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, which was charging that opposition to Cary was being financed by "evil" liquor interests.

During his campaigning Glover Cary attempted to avoid the prohibition issue as much as possible

47 Douglas to Combs, Aug. 3, 1932, Barkley Papers.
while identifying himself with Roosevelt and the Democratic program. He considered the economic troubles the most important issue in the election.\textsuperscript{149} The Congressman agreed with the Democratic plan for an extensive reduction of governmental expenditures, and he stressed the Republican responsibility for the economic situation.\textsuperscript{50} Cary said the Republican slogan was "Work for Hoover—you haven't anything else to do."\textsuperscript{51}

On the tariff issue the Congressman was in agreement with the Roosevelt program. Roosevelt had said that the Hawley-Smoot Tariff was one of the most important causes of the world-wide depression, and the Democratic party platform had condemned that act by stating that it had prompted retaliatory measures by more than forty countries.\textsuperscript{52} Cary advocated the reciprocal trade law proposed by the party platform.\textsuperscript{53} Thus, his three year war against the tariff received legitimacy by his party's stand.

\textsuperscript{149}Madisonville Messenger, July 14, 1932.


\textsuperscript{52}Mitchell, Depression Decade, 75; "Text of the Party Platforms," 640.

\textsuperscript{53}Henderson Morning Gleaner, Aug. 5, 1932, July 5, 1934; "Text of the Party Platforms," 639.
Another measure emphasized by Congressman Cary was the veterans' bonus. In his words, the money given to the ex-soldiers "would have done more good if spent by the soldiers all over the country than if given to tottering railroads and banks to pay their debts to Wall Street and the international bankers." Such a stand was certain to win votes.

Glover Cary's competition for Congress changed drastically even before the primary election took place. W. O. Smith withdrew from the race and urged his friends in the Second Congressional District to give their votes to Cary because he and the Congressman agreed on major issues. Smith's withdrawal left only Goad to oppose Cary in the primary; however, as events evolved, the selection of congressmen was made from the state-at-large.

54 Douglas to Combs, Aug. 3, 1932, Barkley Papers.
56 Cary also received the support of various labor organizations. L. E. Whitler to officers and members of all Kentucky lodges of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Oct. 31, 1932, Barkley Papers; J. A. Franklin to officers and members of subordinate lodges of the International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders, Welders, and Helpers, Oct. 7, 1932, Barkley Papers; Roy Horn to local unions of the International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers, Sept. 30, 1932, Barkley Papers.
57 Madisonville Messenger, July 15, 1932; Owensboro Inquirer, July 15, 1932.
rather than from congressional districts. The results of the 1930 census had eliminated two Kentucky seats in the House of Representatives, and the state legislature had passed a redistricting law establishing a new Second District composed of fifteen counties, Daviess, McLean, Henderson, Webster, Union, Hopkins, Ohio, Butler, Edmonson, Warren, Logan, Simpson, Todd, Allen, and Muhlenberg. Because of a court decision the redistricting law was declared invalid, statewide races were designated, and all candidates who filed within the proper period of time were eligible to run.

There was speculation about what effect the election by the state-at-large would have. There was the possibility that three of the districts could choose the nine Democratic nominees. If all the Democrats in the fifth, sixth, and eighth districts concentrated on nine candidates and the Democrats in the other districts scattered their votes among all the candidates, such a situation could result. Members of the Democratic party of the proposed Second District


60Madisonville Messenger, July 26, 1932.
were, therefore, encouraged to insure themselves of representation by concentrating their votes on Cary. 61

Although the turnout at the polls was light with only about 50 per cent of the Democratic vote being cast, Cary, who was well-supported in his home county despite his opposition with its paid workers at the polls, received overwhelming endorsement from the entire proposed Second District. 62 He surpassed his closest opponent in Daviess County by over 2,000 votes there, and he obtained a larger vote in Webster County than any of the other candidates for Congress by polling more votes than even the senatorial candidate, Alben Barkley. 63 Cary more than doubled the votes received by his nearest opponent in McLean County, and he led all other Democratic candidates in Logan and Todd counties. 64

Intense interest was reflected in voter participation in the November general election. The


63 Dixon Journal, Aug. 12, 1932; election returns, Daviess County, Aug. 6, 1932.

64 Election returns, McLean County, Aug. 6, 1932; election returns, Proceedings of the Logan County Board of Election Commissioners, Aug. 6, 1932; election returns, Proceedings of the Todd County Board of Election Commissioners, Aug. 9, 1932.
largest number of Kentucky voters in history, 983,063 of them, cast their ballots and gave Roosevelt 59.1 per cent of the total popular votes cast in the state, or more votes than any other presidential candidate had received.\(^{65}\) The campaign within the state had been a stirring one. At the official opening of the Democratic campaign held at Cynthiana in October, 10,000 persons were present.\(^{66}\) All the congressional nominees, including Cary, were active near election day, and some of the principal speakers were Maurice H. Thatcher, former Senator J. M. Robsion, former Governor Flem D. Sampson, and former Governor Edwin P. Morrow for the Republicans, and Alben Barkley, J. C. W. Beckham, and Governor Ruby Laffoon for the Democrats.\(^{67}\)

The state-at-large election did deny the Republicans any of the congressional seats from Kentucky. The Democratic congressional candidates, who received far more votes than their Republican opponents, were endorsed almost as emphatically as Roosevelt.\(^{68}\) In the proposed Second District only

\(^{65}\) Bill Weaver, "The Campaign of 1932 and the New Deal Relief Program in Kentucky" (master's thesis, Western Kentucky College, 1964), 17; Harrison, "Kentucky and the Presidential Elections," 324.
\(^{67}\) Ibid., Nov. 1, 1932.
\(^{68}\) Ibid., Nov. 10, 1932.
Ohio, Butler, Edmonson, and Allen counties gave the Republicans a majority.\(^6^9\) On a state-wide basis Glover Cary was sixth in rank among the chosen representatives according to the number of votes received, although there was not a great deal of difference between any of the Democratic candidates.

**TABLE II**

VOTES RECEIVED BY SUCCESSFUL DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES IN 1932 GENERAL ELECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Votes Pollled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fred Vinson</td>
<td>575,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Young Brown</td>
<td>574,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. J. May</td>
<td>574,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent Spence</td>
<td>574,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgil Chapman</td>
<td>573,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover Cary</td>
<td>573,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. V. Gregory</td>
<td>573,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap Carden</td>
<td>573,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finley Hamilton</td>
<td>573,024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The election of 1932 began a period of twenty years of Democratic presidential successes.\(^7^0\) Because of his premature death, Cary did not politically benefit from the long period of Democratic supremacy, but, at

---


\(^{7^0}\) Ibid., 6; Harrison, "Kentucky and the Presidential Elections," 324.
least, he genuinely appreciated the 1932 victory. The Democrats' gain of ninety-three seats in the House of Representatives and the Republicans' loss of ninety-seven created vacancies on important committees and ousted high ranking Republican members. The outcome of the election enhanced Glover Cary's status as representative and gave him an opportunity to assume more responsibilities of the office.

Cary's reelection in 1934 was quiet and uneventful when compared to the election of 1932. He was the only Democrat in the state to receive the unopposed nomination of his party, and he had only nominal opposition when he ran in the general election in the newly-drawn Second Congressional District. The Republican candidate for congressman, Walter G. Newton of Livermore, withdrew several weeks before the election, and that left only the Socialist and Prohibition party candidates to oppose Cary.

---


72 See pp. 62-64.


74 Franklin Favorite, June 28, 1934; Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Oct. 28, 1934.
The Congressman found extensive campaigning unnecessary under the circumstances. He, however, stressed that one of his achievements in Congress had been his work on a subcommittee to eliminate unnecessary permanent appropriations. He also pointed out that he was in agreement with the New Deal programs. Believing that the one issue in the election was the continuance of President Roosevelt's recovery measures, Cary viewed as vital the election of pro-Roosevelt candidates rather than "the old crowd who wrecked our economic structure." He praised the New Deal and gave especial commendation to Roosevelt when he said:

> From the day your president and mine entered the White House he has realized that partisan politics is not a matter of concern to a hungry man, and as a great American, a great humanitarian and a devout believer in the efficacy of the Golden Rule, has devoted his entire time to the work of relieving his unfortunate countrymen, sought men of character and ability and drafted them to aid him in solving the greatest and most perplexing problem that ever confronted a ruler on either side of the Atlantic.

---

75 Hartford Ohio County News, June 29, 1934.


77 Franklin Favorite, Oct. 25, 1934.

Cary carried every county in the Second District. While the race with his Prohibition and Socialist opponents was close in Allen, Butler, and Ohio counties where a large Republican vote went to W. M. Likens, the Prohibition candidate, Cary did exceedingly well in other counties. In Webster he tripled his opponents' votes, and in Logan, Todd, and Daviess counties his margin of victory was even more substantial. Throughout the district Cary received 18,411 votes to 5,189 for Likens and 912 for Sandefur. Although Cary experienced an easy win, the Democratic triumph in Kentucky was not as impressive as in 1932. Nationally, the Democrats increased their representation in the House

79 Madisonville Messenger, Nov. 8, 1934. In Allen County the vote was Cary-604, Sandefur-13, and Likens-590. In Ohio County Cary received 1,175 votes to 213 for Sandefur and 988 for Likens. Election returns, Proceedings of the Allen County Board of Election Commissioners, Aug., 1934; Hartford Ohio County News, Nov. 9, 1934.

80 Dixon Journal, Nov. 9, 1934; election returns, Logan County, Nov. 6, 1934; election returns, Todd County, Nov. 7, 1934; election returns, Daviess County, Nov. 6, 1934.

81 Madisonville Messenger, Nov. 8, 1934.

82 Lexington Herald, Nov. 7, 1934. One explanation for the loss of strength in Kentucky by the party was the condition of the state government under the Laffoon administration. Effects of the depression and the Governor's plan for reorganization of the state government, a scheme to weaken his opposition but one seen by some as a form of controlled politics, had helped to cause a lack of confidence in the Democratic party. Thomas D. Clark, A History of Kentucky (Lexington, 1960), 438.
from 313 to 332—a rare occurrence in a non-presidential election year. 83

The year 1935 was an exciting one for Kentucky partly because a political contest for governor lasted from January to November. 84 As Republicanism declined in the state, factionalism developed within the Democratic party, a phenomenon which coincided with A. B. "Happy" Chandler's acquisition of political influence. While he was lieutenant governor, Chandler had challenged the administration headed by Governor Ruby Laffoon, who was closely aligned with Thomas Rhea. 85 In 1935, therefore, Rhea became the candidate endorsed by Laffoon, and Chandler, who had been "ripped" of all power under Laffoon, was backed by Dan Talbott. 86

Chandler had halted the administration's plan to forego the primary election and nominate Rhea by convention, and later, during Governor Laffoon's absence, Chandler called a special session of the legislature at which a compulsory primary law was enacted. 87


84Baylor, J. Dan Talbott, 307.

85Jewell and Cunningham, Kentucky Politics, 14; Clark, History of Kentucky, 438.

86Baylor, J. Dan Talbott, xxix, 275, 307.

87Jewell and Cunningham, Kentucky Politics, 14.
Cary was one of the four congressmen who refused to declare himself in favor of a primary instead of the earlier proposed convention. His support of Tom Rhea was not surprising since he had strived for the election of Laffoon as governor in 1931. It was suggested that if Rhea were elected, Governor Laffoon, Rhea, and Cary would head the Kentucky delegation to the 1936 Democratic National Convention—something that would not happen if Chandler won.

Glover Cary gave numerous reasons why he was supporting Rhea. He considered Rhea, first of all, the candidate best equipped by experience and ability and a faithful member of his party. He approved of Rhea's platform which proposed the exemption of homesteads under $7,500 from state taxes and called for the perfecting and correcting of the existing sales tax.

---

89 See pp. 33-35.
90 Letter to the editor by Lawrence P. Tanner, Louisville Courier-Journal, July 18, 1935.
91 Glover Cary, radio address given over WHAS, July, 1935, Mrs. Oswald H. Snyder private collection (1915 McGreary Ave., Owensboro, Ky.).
92 Hartford Ohio County News, Aug. 9, 1935; Elkton Todd County Standard, Aug. 1, 1935; Cary, radio address, Snyder private collection; Greenville Leader, June 14, 1935.
Chandler, who had fought Laffoon on the enactment of the sales tax, found a major issue by demanding its repeal.\textsuperscript{93}

Another significant reason for Cary's support of Rhea was the latter's adherence to President Roosevelt's programs.\textsuperscript{94} Cary thought there would be good federal-state cooperation if Rhea were elected.\textsuperscript{95} He certainly recalled that Chandler had worked against the nomination of Roosevelt in 1932 and that Chandler and his backers had brought a Roosevelt adversary into the state to make a speech to the legislature.\textsuperscript{96}

Glover Cary also opposed Chandler because he believed Chandler would be controlled by others. In the event of Chandler's election, the Congressman thought that Ben Johnson, the former highway chairman, would be the real governor. Cary also criticized former Governor J. C. W. Beckham's backing of Chandler because Ben Johnson had betrayed Beckham in 1927 in favor of the Republican candidate, Flem Sampson.\textsuperscript{97} Cary evaluated the situation as a strange one since Rhea had been

\textsuperscript{93}Jewell and Cunningham, \textit{Kentucky Politics}, 134.

\textsuperscript{94}Cary, radio address, Snyder private collection.

\textsuperscript{95}Greenville \textit{Leader}, June 14, 1935.

\textsuperscript{96}Lexington \textit{Herald}, July 6, 1935; Cary, radio address, Snyder private collection.

\textsuperscript{97}Cary, radio address, Snyder private collection; Elkton \textit{Todd County Standard}, Aug. 1, 1935.
Beckham’s lifelong friend. As he described the alignment, “The Democrats of Kentucky are very much amused to see Governor Beckham trying to crawl in the same bed with Col. Ben Johnson.”98 In addition, he admonished people of the state to beware of the bipartisan machine which was upholding Chandler.99

Glover Cary was correct in his early speculation that, although several men were running for the office of governor, the race was really between Rhea and Chandler.100 Rhea led in the first primary and Chandler was second. The other candidates followed far behind with none receiving more than 50,000 votes.101 Cary’s influence may have assisted Rhea because that candidate received considerable support from some of the counties of the Second Congressional District. He obtained the largest vote ever given a candidate in a primary election in Muhlenberg County, and he carried twenty-eight of the thirty precincts in Webster County.102

Ironically, the Laffoon-Rhea forces had insisted upon the necessity of having two primaries, and, although

98 Cary, radio address, Snyder private collection.
99 Ibid.
100 Ibid.
101 Baylor, J. Dan Talbott, 330.
102 Jewell, Kentucky Votes, II, 14-15; Greenville Leader, Aug. 9, 1935; Dixon Journal, Aug. 9, 1935.
he led in the first primary, Rhea was defeated by Chandler in the run-off election. After the first primary all the eliminated candidates but one announced in favor of Chandler. Rhea's opponent received the nomination with a substantial margin of votes, but the loser managed to carry his home congressional district by a majority of 16,254 votes. Rhea was given majorities in nine of the fifteen counties in the district with Daviess, Simpson, Union, and McLean shifting to Chandler in the second primary. Glover Cary's actions on behalf of Rhea must receive some credit for the latter's regional triumph.

The primary left much bitterness within the factionally-split Democratic party. Governor Laffoon and some members bolted and worked actively to secure the election of the Republican gubernatorial nominee, King Swope. Laffoon and Rhea allegedly refused to meet with President Roosevelt when he passed through Cincinnati

---

103 Clark, History of Kentucky, 439; Jewell and Cunningham, Kentucky Politics, 15.
104 Baylor, J. Dan Talbott, 332.
106 At one rally, the official opening of the Rhea campaign held on June 8, 1935, at Bowling Green, there was an estimated crowd of 20,000 to 40,000 people to whom Cary spoke. Greenville Leader, June 14, 1935; Elkton Todd County Standard, June 13, 1935.
because they believed he would request that they support Chandler in the November contest. Cary did not share their spirit for revenge. He had stated before the first primary was held that when the party contest was over, "all forces of Democracy should be behind the winner in that primary . . . " Cary congratulated Chandler on his victory, and he categorized primary elections as mere "family disturbances." To him the primary was only a "practice game" to prepare for the Republicans.

Admittedly, Glover Cary was disappointed with the outcome of the second primary. He had not wanted Rhea to lose because of their close friendship, but he desired party unity and he considered Chandler's nomination a party mandate to support the triumphant campaigner. Cary himself traveled to thirty-four counties during a speaking tour on behalf of Chandler, and he, in a sense, broke with Rhea by verbally attacking anyone who bolted his party. He continued,

108 Cary radio address, Snyder private collection.  
110 Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Oct. 27, 1935.  
however, to maintain that the double primary should be eliminated.\footnote{112}{Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Nov. 3, 1935; Henderson Morning Gleaner, Nov. 2, 1935.}

The most important reason for Cary's willingness to switch loyalty to Chandler was the need for state agreement with national Democratic policies. The choice of a Democrat for governor meant to Cary the approval of the Roosevelt administration. The Congressman declared that the Roosevelt program with its deficit spending was beneficial to Kentucky,\footnote{113}{Henderson Morning Gleaner, Nov. 2, 1935; Louisville Courier-Journal, Oct. 17, 1935; Scottsville Allen County News, Oct. 16, 1935; Hartford Ohio County News, Nov. 8, 1935.} and he thought the election of a Republican governor would be "a slap in the face to the National Administration"\footnote{114}{Scottsville Allen County News, Oct. 16, 1935.} and a setback to the New Deal.\footnote{115}{Editorial, "Time for Action," Franklin Favorite, Sept. 26, 1935.} He foresaw also that a Republican governor and a Democratic legislature would operate inefficiently together.\footnote{116}{Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Oct. 27, 1935.}

Chandler received the endorsement of the national administration, and there was extensive federal spending
on New Deal projects in the state during his campaign.\textsuperscript{117} King Swope avoided the federal economic schemes as an issue, and Chandler won an easy victory. He carried all but six counties in the Second Congressional District.\textsuperscript{118}

During the 1930's while his personal popularity soared, Congressman Cary was undeniably a political influence throughout the state. He was never personally defeated, but the outcome of the 1935 gubernatorial election must have instilled some semblance of failure in him. At the height of his prestige in Congress, Cary had become entangled in party factionalism and had supported the losing side, a stand which would effect his last bid for reelection in 1936.


CHAPTER III

THE NEW DEALER

When he entered Congress, Glover Cary's immediate objective became that of improving the economic circumstances of his constituents. Many of them had become victims of the Great Depression; and that depression, together with legislative control by the Democratic party, the imposing leadership of Franklin Roosevelt, and the numerous relief proposals presented to Congress decidedly influenced the Representative's work during the earlier portion of his service in the nation's lawmaking body. Although he endorsed the entire New Deal program, Cary was primarily concerned with alleviating the plight of the farmer, improving banking conditions, and instituting public work projects.

The depression, which reached its nadir in 1932, brought severe conditions which Cary readily blamed on the Republican administration. He thought the nation's adherence for twelve years to what he termed "the Hamiltonian principles" of that party "got

---

1 Leitchfield Gazette, Oct. 30, 1931.
us in a deplorable fix." Cary repeatedly assailed the tariffs enacted under the Republicans, and he criticized the government's permitting the sale of worthless securities to the American people by those whom he labeled as "vandals of finance." Even in the more severe stages of the depression, however, the Congressman's outlook was optimistic because he was generally pleased with the progress of Roosevelt's relief and recovery programs. He predicted forthcoming normal economic conditions, and he retained an abiding faith in the democratic form of government.

The depression ushered in an almost inevitable change of political control in favor of the Democratic party. The 1930 mid-term elections left the Republicans with a slight margin in House representation, but the Democrats were able to fill the vacancies which had elapsed between that November election and the opening of the Seventy-second Congress. With only 1 Farmer-Laborite and 214 Republican representatives, the 219

---

2Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, April 14, 1935.

3Henderson Morning Gleaner, July 5, 1934. The speculative rise in the stock market had been caused in part by the easy-money policy of the Federal Reserve System which was intended to turn back the flow of gold from Europe to the United States. Mitchell, Depression Decade, 10. For an account of Gary's opinions concerning the tariff, see pp. 30-31, 34-35.

4Henderson Morning Gleaner, July 5, 1934; Cong. Record, 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 639 (March 20, 1933).
Democratic members were able to organize the House when it convened in 1931.\(^5\) Glover Cary, therefore, never served in a Republican-controlled House, a state of affairs which facilitated his rapid political advancements as well as his ability to influence and secure desired legislation.\(^6\)

The Seventy-second Congress, the first full one in which Cary served, was dominated by politics. The Democrats were able to elect all the House officers from members of their party, but they could not achieve a working majority. The principal measures proposed by the Republican administration were enacted, and there were few serious attempts to pass bills contrary to President Hoover's wishes.\(^7\)

Cary's most active governmental participation took place during the sessions of the Seventy-third and

---

\(^5\) Hatcher, "Fred Vinson," 268; E. Pendleton Herring, "First Session of the Seventy-second Congress, December 7, 1931, to July 16, 1932," The American Political Science Review, XXVI (Oct. 1932), 848. Until changed by amendment, a Congress that was elected in November of one year did not assemble until December of the next year. U. S. Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 4.

\(^6\) The Seventy-first Congress to which Cary was elected was not in session when his term began in March, 1931.

Seventy-fourth Congresses which were controlled by the Democrats. While open hostility existed between members of the opposing parties, the Seventy-third Congress gave impressive support to President Roosevelt's program.\(^8\) Having heeded most of the wishes of the administration during its 405 days in session, the Seventy-fourth Congress was loftily praised by some and attacked by others.\(^9\) The chief criticisms were its extravagance and its so-called "rubber-stamp" congressmen, many of whom were serving their first or second terms and did not desire to be known as opponents of the President.\(^10\)

Such was the political atmosphere in which Cary spent his years in Congress. Not only was there a Democratic House to evaluate his proposals, but also there were several prominent Democratic members of Congress from Kentucky to assist him in the passage of measures. They included Senators Alben Barkley and M. M. Logan and Congressmen Fred Vinson, Voris Gregory, Brent Spence,


Virgil Chapman, Cap Carden, A. J. May, John Young Brown, Finley Hamilton, and Emmett O'Neal.\textsuperscript{11}

President Roosevelt's course of close government participation in banking, currency management, industry, and agriculture, and a portion of his recovery phase of the New Deal encompassed the years of Cary's service in Congress.\textsuperscript{12} The Representative was greatly impressed by Roosevelt's leadership, and he agreed completely with the Chief Executive's relief program.\textsuperscript{13} Believing that Roosevelt had restored confidence in the American people, Cary praised the President when he said in 1933:

\begin{quote}
... this man of the hour, the deliverer of the American people, assumed his herculean \textit{sic} task with a coolness, deliberation, and determination that immediately made him the master of the situation which instilled confidence in the Congress and the American people of his ability as a leader in an hour of national peril.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

Cary was only one among the many members of Congress who supported the President and his New Deal measures. Following the administration's recommendations, the Seventy-third Congress appropriated

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{11} Editorial, "The Kentucky Delegation," Madisonville \textit{Messenger}, May 23, 1933; Owensboro \textit{Messenger} and \textit{Inquirer}, Jan. 6, 1935.
\item \textsuperscript{12} Mitchell, \textit{Depression Decade}, 405.
\item \textsuperscript{13} \textit{Cong. Record}, 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 1587 (April 12, 1933).
\item \textsuperscript{14} \textit{Tbid.}, 639 (March 20, 1933).
\end{itemize}
$15,220,000,000, and the Seventy-Fourth appropriated $20,033,079,000, a triumph which occurred in the latter because 350 of the 561 members owed their seats to their pledge to back the New Deal. Although the Seventy-fourth Congress did act somewhat independently of the President's wishes, at least 90 per cent of the administration's "must" bills were passed. 15

Among important New Deal measures which Cary voted to enact were the Glass-Steagall Bill to provide for the sound operation of the banking system, legislation to establish the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Soil Conservation Bill. 16 He also supported the Public Utility Holding Company Bill, which called for the regulation of all public utilities and which he believed had allayed fears of the domination of utilities, 17 and the Revenue Bill of 1935, better known as the "soak the


17 Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 10639 (July 2, 1935); Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Sept. 1, 1935.
rich tax bill." In addition, Cary voted for the Snyder-Cuffey Coal Bill, a measure that guaranteed collective bargaining and created a national commission to fix prices and control the production of coal. He believed that bill would stabilize the mining industry and benefit both operators and laborers.

Other proposals in which the Congressman demonstrated a particular interest included the Stock Exchange Bill, which he believed would protect American investments in the future, and the Social Security Bill, which he explained to his constituents. Cary, likewise, informed the people of his area about the Wagner Bill, a plan to give government sanction to collective bargaining by labor unions and to require employers to allow the unionization of their plants, and about the workings of the National Industrial Recovery Act. His definition of the NRA was "Nobly Recovering America."

---

18 Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 12499 (Aug. 5, 1935); Robinson, "Congress Finally Adjourns," 194.

19 Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 13666 (Aug. 19, 1935); Leuchtenburg, Roosevelt and the New Deal, 161.

20 Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Sept. 1, 1935.

21 Ibid.; Henderson Morning Gleaner, July 5, 1934.

22 Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, July 2, 1933, Sept. 1, 1935; Leuchtenburg, Roosevelt and the New Deal, 151.

23 Elkton Todd County Standard, Nov. 2, 1933.
The three aspects of the depression which concerned the Congressman the most were the mounting agricultural difficulties, the defaulting banks, and the widespread unemployment. Because the farmers had been in economic trouble throughout the 1920's and had experienced critical problems after 1929, the amelioration of their predicament was Cary's first undertaking as a member of Congress. The farmers' output in 1929 was 27 per cent larger than twenty years previously, but farm problems increased because many changes, such as the falling birth rate, restricted immigration, and the reduced intake of cereals, prevented the consumption of farm staples. From 1929 to 1933, the proportion of the total national gross income from agricultural products dropped from 14.7 per cent to 9.6 per cent because of decreased foreign demand, and Hoover's attempts to alleviate the farmers' plight had failed. Under the circumstances, it was not surprising that Cary believed the farmers had suffered more than any other group during the depression.25

---

One of the most distressing agricultural problems was the high percentage of farms under mortgage. When Roosevelt became president, two-fifths of the nation's farms were mortgaged, and the situation was especially grave in Kentucky.26 A severe drought had destroyed the crops there in 1932, and Congressman Ralph Gilbert, who had been assigned to study the farm mortgage matter, estimated that the owners of one-half of the state's mortgaged farms could not meet their mortgage and tax bills.27

The Democratic party platform of 1932 included plans for better financing of farm mortgages at low rates of interest on an amortization plan. Preference was to be given to those whose homes and farms were sold under foreclosure.28 Cary worked actively toward his party's goal for agriculture even before Roosevelt was elected. Esteeming the farmer highly and believing that the economic foundation of the United States was agriculture, the Congressman asserted there could be no

26Schlesinger, New Deal in Action, 19. Cary estimated that 75 per cent of the nation's farms were mortgaged. Leitchfield Gazette, Oct. 30, 1931.

27Jewell and Cunningham, Kentucky Politics, 7; Louisville Courier-Journal, Nov. 26, 1932.

permanent prosperity until farming was stabilized. 29
He criticized the interest rate, which he believed had contributed to the agricultural problems, and he charged that the government had given assistance to all kinds of industry except farming. 30

In 1932 a farm bloc headed by Representative Hatton Sumners of Texas was organized in Congress. Glover Cary, in conjunction with Congressmen Ralph Gilbert of Kentucky and John Sandlin of Louisiana, was named to draft a bill to provide for the refinancing of farm mortgages at an interest rate of 3 per cent or less. 31 Representative Gilbert consulted with Bernard M. Baruch and Representative Henry Steagall, who agreed that provision had to be made for the farmer to pay his debts, and Glover Cary set up a series of conferences with Reconstruction Finance Corporation representatives in an attempt to gain assistance for the rural areas. The congressional group agreed there

29 Cary, speech on H. R. 4795, Snyder private collection. In Cary's own words, "Are not the ax and the plow as necessary to human happiness and progress as the sword and pen?" Glover Cary, undated speech given at Woodman of the World meeting, Bonnie Sosh private collection (539 Ewing Ct., Owensboro, Ky.).

30 Cary, speech on H. R. 4795, Snyder private collection.

31 Louisville Courier-Journal, June 23, 1932.
should be no attempt to proceed further than to furnish relief to those who still had substantial equity in their farms.  

Although most members of Congress wished to wait to pass farm measures until March 4, 1933, when Roosevelt took office and complete Democratic control of both houses was a fact, parity plans were underway by January of 1933, and three farm mortgage bills, including one introduced by Glover Cary, had been presented to Congress by January 5. One of those proposals, which was introduced by Representative James McClintic of Oklahoma, sought to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans at 4 per cent for 20 years to landowners who were unable to retire their mortgages. While it had basically the same provisions, another bill sponsored by Representative E. E. Cox and Senator Walter George, both of Georgia, offered a plan whereby the original indebtedness of a farmer might be reduced by 50 per cent.

Glover Cary's bill, which was introduced on January 4, 1933, was similar in intent to the Cox bill.


Its stated purposes were the liquidating and refinancing of agricultural indebtedness and the encouragement and promotion of agriculture, industry, and commerce. While Cary and other backers of the measure said the bill would not only aid the farmers but also would promote bank liquidity, enhance the trading value of land, and have a general stabilizing effect on the economy, the Congressman said its actual aim was the establishment of a means whereby the farmer could retain his property until conditions improved.

The Cary bill called for a credit system to carry out the liquidating and refunding of mortgages through the Federal Farm Loan System and the Federal Reserve Bank. Loans secured by first mortgages based on 50 per cent of the average valuation of land over the last five years were to be made to farmers, and the interest on the loans was to be set at only 3 per cent during the first 5 years with 1 per cent of the principal added to the interest payment each year after that. Money with which to finance the plan was to be acquired through the sale of farm loan bonds, and any family


which had lost a farm through indebtedness or foreclosure after 1928 would be eligible for the loans. 37

As with other relief measures Cary's farm loan bill was not seriously considered under the defeated Republican administration. However, on March 16, 1933, President Roosevelt sent a message to Congress asking for immediate consideration of a bill to aid agriculture. That same day Representative H. P. Fulmer of South Carolina introduced a bill designed to balance production and consumption in order to re-establish the farmers' pre-war purchasing power, and Congressman Cary reintroduced his farm loan measure. 38 This opportunity to assist the farmer had not arrived quickly enough for Cary. In 1933 he stated that:

"Any attempt made by the followers of the principle that agriculture should receive aid from the Government has been met with opposition by those interested in big business who put forth the propaganda that legislation attempting to refinance the farmer and place his heavy burden of debt where it could be carried would be class legislation." 39


38 "Progress Made by Major Legislation: From February 21st to March 21th, 1933," The Congressional Digest, 12 (April 1933), 122; Cong. Rec., 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 581 (March 16, 1933).

39 Cary, speech on H. R. 4795, Snyder private collection.
Roosevelt did not specifically request legislation for the refinancing of rural debts and mortgages until April 3, 1933. He then recognized that the government must allow the farmer time to regain his land, that the farmer's interest rates must be low, and that there should be a readjustment of the principal of the debt. In response the House took up consideration of Representative Marvin Jones' farm mortgage bill on April 11, 1933. Similar in intent and function to the Cary bill, the Jones measure differed in that it was more detailed, allotted a specific amount of money to be loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC), and permitted a higher rate of interest on both the bonds sold and the loans granted.

With the exception of the maximum interest rate on loans which he thought should be 3 per cent instead of the specified 1 1/2 per cent, Cary agreed with Jones' H. R. 4795. Indeed, his advocacy of the passage of

40 "Progress Made by Major Legislation: From March 24 to April 22, 1933," The Congressional Digest, 12 (May 1933), 156.


42 Cary, speech on H. R. 4795, Snyder private collection.
that bill probably increased his popularity in his home
district.43 During a speech given in Congress in favor
of the bill, the Representative stated he believed its
particular form of emergency relief made it "the most
important measure that has come or will come before
this Congress . . . ."44 Cary defended the costs of
implementing the farm loan plan. He believed the
benefits would outweigh the expenses. According to
the Congressman, the money invested in the program
would eventually be returned, and the government
would ultimately lose nothing. Also favoring the
refinancing of the small homeowners, Glover Cary
urged the swift passage of that relief legislation.45

The Jones bill passed the House with only
twelve opposing votes, but it was indefinitely post-
poned on May 12, 1933, because its text was included
in H. R. 3835, the Farm Relief Bill.46 Approved on
May 12, 1933, the Farm Relief Bill did not prevent
the foreclosures, which came more rapidly than public

43A. D. Kirk to Glover Cary, April 6, 1933, Kirk private file.

44 Cary, speech on H. R. 4795, Snyder private collection.

45 Ibid.

46 Cong. Record, 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 1680 (April 13, 1933); Ibid., 3297 (May 12, 1933).
money for assistance, but the final result of the farm program was, quite likely, in accord with Cary's hopes. In 1934 Congress passed the Frazier-Lemke Farm Mortgage Bill which required all holders of unpaid mortgages to forego forced sales for five years if the farmers involved paid them a rent that was ruled fair by the district judge. That law was declared unconstitutional but was replaced by another, and by the summer of 1936, the Farm Credit Administration had made available about $3,700,000,000 to farmers. Cary remained optimistic that laws could be passed to circumvent the Supreme Court decisions, and he continued to believe in the President's determination to continue agricultural recovery. In 1936, during the last months of his life, the Congressman recognized the recovery of the farmers when he noted the differences between the farming conditions during the last days of the Hoover administration and those under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

47 Ibid., 3499 (May 16, 1933); Mitchell, Depression Decade, 209; Memorial Services, Proceedings Owensboro Bar Association, 14.


49 Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Jan. 19, 1936.
Glover Cary was also interested in acquiring governmental assistance in the recovery of banks in Kentucky and throughout the nation. According to the Emergency Banking Act, which was approved on March 9, 1933, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was permitted to supply capital to banks by buying their preferred stock. Cary thought that the banking act needed to be amended in order to allow all closed banks that could be opened to be opened quickly and to aid others having difficulty in complying with provisions of the Emergency Banking Act.

On March 17, 1933, Representative Henry Steagall introduced a bill to provide for direct loans by the Federal Reserve banks to state banks and trust companies. A state bank, with written approval of the state banking department or commission from which it received its charter, was to apply to the Federal Reserve bank of its district. In lieu of subscribing to stock in the Federal Reserve bank, it was to maintain a reserve balance as required by the Federal Reserve Act until it was out of debt.

50 Cong. Record, 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 630 (March 20, 1933); Mitchell, Depression Decade, 13th.


52 Cong. Record, 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 607, 630-31 (March 17, 1933).
Since Kentucky had many state banks, Cary approved the Steagall banking measure. He vigorously defended the bill in Congress by explaining that it extended the benefits provided under the Emergency Banking Act to state banks and trust companies which were not members of the Federal Reserve System. Cary thought the bill was fair because the state banks and trust companies would be required to maintain a specified reserve balance and because the state banks deserved the same consideration as the larger state member banks and the national banks which were already being aided by the Emergency Banking Act. While Representative Steagall also defended the bill, Congressmen Bertrand Snell, who raised the question of unfair treatment to Federal Reserve members, and Carroll Beedy, who thought the bill was unclear and suggested its originator was actually Huey Long of Louisiana, led opposition to the banking proposal. The bill passed the House on March 20, 1933, and was approved by the President four days later.

---


54 *Cong. Record*, 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 631-32, 636 (March 20, 1933); Louisville Courier-Journal, March 21, 1933.

55 *Cong. Record*, 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 641 (March 20, 1933); *Ibid.*, 1743 (April 14, 1933).
The provisions of the Emergency Banking Act were, therefore, extended to about 9,000 state banks and trust companies, but Cary knew that temporary help alone was not sufficient. In 1933 the Congressman was convinced that the only way to eliminate completely the hoarding of money and to restore confidence in the banks was to establish strictly-supervised federal guarantees of bank deposits. In May of 1935, he voted in favor of the Glass-Steagall Bill which provided for the sound operation of the banking system, and later he praised the government's closer control over the Federal Reserve System and the federal guarantee of bank deposits which he had advocated two years prior to the enactment of such a measure.

Another phase of the New Deal Program with which Cary worked was that of public works. The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), which had among its purposes the relief and removal of a portion of workers from the labor market, was established in March of 1933. In seven years it enrolled more than 2,250,000 young men in 1,500 camps throughout the nation. Several of those camps

---

56 Ibid., 639 (March 20, 1933); Louisville Courier-Journal, March 21, 1933.

57 Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 7270 (May 9, 1935); Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Sept. 1, 1935.

58 Mitchell, Depression Decade, 328-29.
were located in the Second Congressional District in Kentucky. One was located at Mammoth Cave National Park, and others, set up for the purpose of drainage and reclamation of old ditches, were located at Owensboro and Sebree. Cary cooperated with W. H. Tyler, the United States agricultural engineering bureau representative in charge of drainage work in the area, in formulating plans to reclaim more than $2,000,000 worth of dredge ditches in Daviess and nearby counties, including Ohio and Henderson. Cary also announced plans to promote flood control in McLean County by the building of a dike. After an executive order had called for the closing of the CCC camp at Hartford, the Representative aided in retaining it by signing a petition to keep it and by voting for a measure to sustain all camps with an enlistment of 163 or more workers. In addition, he attempted to gain congressional sanction for a Rough River flood control proposal, but his suggestion was rejected.

---


60 Hartford Ohio County News, March 20, 27, April 3, 10, 1936; Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 2 Sess., 3962-63 (March 18, 1936).

In 1935 the President extended his public works program through the Relief Appropriation Act. Glover Cary viewed that bill, which provided $4,280,000,000 for various forms of relief, as one of the most important pieces of legislation passed in that term of Congress. Cary was himself mainly credited with having secured projects financed by the federal government which provided improvements amounting to $4,292,417 in counties of the Second District. The projects financed in that fashion included municipal waterplants, a county courthouse, a city hall, a hospital, sewer systems, and several post office buildings, including one at Greenville. The Congressman likewise helped to secure funds with which to build Beech Grove and Sacramento Schools in McLean County, and he was instrumental in obtaining $106,000 for the Blue and Gray State Park at Fairview. He further improved his district by helping to acquire funds through the

62 Mitchell, Depression Decade, 315, 319; Leuchtenburg, Roosevelt and the New Deal, 125; Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Sept. 1, 1935.

63 Hartford Ohio County News, July 31, 1936; Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, July 26, 1936; Greenville Leader, May 8, 1936; Scottsville Allen County News, April 29, 1936.

64 Interview with Critser, July 1, 1970; Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, July 26, 1936.
Rural Electrification Administration for the building of electrical power lines in Henderson County.\textsuperscript{65}

Glover Cary's role in the New Deal program was basically a quiet one. Though impressed by the President and his unorthodox solutions to the depression, the Representative delved into the problems which most directly affected his district and state. They were, however, in many instances the same problems as those disturbing the entire nation. He persisted in a somewhat limited approach to his duties by his attentiveness to local political obligations, but his service on the Naval Appropriations Subcommittee finally transformed him into a Congressman whose first priority was national affairs.

\textsuperscript{65}Henderson Morning Gleaner, May 6, 7, 1936.
CHAPTER IV
THE EXPEDIENT REPRESENTATIVE

Throughout his service in Congress, Glover Cary was regarded as a representative of all the people of his district. To his credit he was industrious, knowledgeable in history and current affairs, able to converse intelligently on almost any topic, and, above all, loyal to his constituents; but as a public servant the Congressman was constantly plagued with obligations and demands.\(^1\) Although he earnestly desired to improve his district, Cary did not fail to reap the political benefits which accompanied his efforts on behalf of his district and the people he represented. In several instances political expediency also governed his stand on controversial issues and stimulated his desire to gain recognition and prestige in Congress.

Cary handled individual problems and requests with care. During his service in Congress, he introduced a total of sixty-one pension bills and seventeen other

\(^1\)Editorial, "The Fallen Leader," Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Dec. 6, 1936; Memorial Services, Proceedings Owensboro Bar Association, 9.
measures to provide for private assistance. He also made numerous appointments which were influenced by political exigencies: those for employment, such as positions as postmasters and public workers, and those for education, ones to the Annapolis Naval Academy and the United States Military Academy at West Point. Cary, doubtless, enjoyed his power of appointment because he complained of disliking the civil service system for which the Roosevelt administration was a "stickler."

He privately acknowledged the large number of qualified applicants who prevented the appointment of men he favored for the positions as being the greatest problem of civil service.3 A. D. Kirk, Cary's law partner and perhaps the most important single influence upon his decisions concerning affairs of the Second Congressional

---

2Conn. Record, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., 10378 (May 16, 1932); ibid., 10607 (May 18, 1932); ibid., 5226 (March 3, 1932); ibid., 6896 (March 26, 1932); ibid., 2 Sess., 1779 (Jan. 13, 1933); ibid., 2790 (Jan. 28, 1933); ibid., 3561 (Feb. 7, 1933); ibid., 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 702 (March 21, 1933); ibid., 3502 (May 17, 1933); ibid., 2 Sess., 5204 (March 22, 1934); ibid., 6690 (April 16, 1934); ibid., 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 77 (Jan. 3, 1935); ibid., 212 (Jan. 8, 1935); ibid., 535 (Jan. 16, 1935); ibid., 740 (Jan. 21, 1935); ibid., 784 (Jan. 22, 1935); ibid., 1292 (Jan. 30, 1935); ibid., 2698 (Feb. 27, 1935); ibid., 2807 (March 1, 1935); ibid., 2 Sess., 153 (Jan. 7, 1936).

3Interview with Miller and Hager, July 3, 1970; Franklin Favorite, June 6, 1935; Bowling Green Park City Daily News, May 5, 1936; A. D. Kirk to Glover Cary, Feb. 8, 1932, May 25, 1934, Kirk private file; Glover Cary to A. D. Kirk, May 12, 1934, Kirk private file; Wilber Miller to Mary Hancock, July 12, 1935, Kirk private file.
District, suggested individuals for the Representative to consider for appointments and to contact for information; he even evaluated pending legislation for Cary. Although he valued his partner's judgment highly and appreciated the assistance, Cary was, at times, unable to follow Kirk's advice because of his own personal and political friends in need of jobs.

After they had been appointed, Cary attempted to aid public employees who were in danger of losing their jobs, and he managed to retain his sense of humor despite the numerous entreaties for public positions. Because of the many applicants for postmaster at Philpot, Wilber Miller, another of Cary's law partners, jokingly telephoned Cary, disguised his voice, and said he wanted the job. In response, the Congressman offered the applicant the post because, as he humorously explained, he

---

4Glover Cary to A. D. Kirk, March 30, 1935, Kirk private file; A. D. Kirk to Glover Cary, Dec. 6, 1932, March 4, April 17, 19, June 19, July 7, 12, 1933, May 8, 14, 25, 1934, March 4, 1935, Kirk private file. Cary wrote Kirk, "You do not know how much I appreciate the thoughtful things you write me. They mean a great deal and I always try to follow them out." Glover Cary to A. D. Kirk, April 19, 1933, Kirk private file.

5Glover Cary to A. D. Kirk, May 12, 1934, Kirk private file.
had arranged for the location of four new postoffices there.  

Upon entering Congress, Cary adopted a policy of supporting Hoover's proposals unless they were contrary to Democratic party wishes. For example, he voted to establish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which provided emergency financing facilities for financial institutions, railroads, and businesses, because he thought the measure would aid in the reopening and the stabilizing of banks. He also supported the administration-approved Glass-Steagall Bill of 1932 to improve the Federal Reserve System. But as his opposition to the tariff exemplified, Cary, without hesitation, endorsed Democratic party causes to which the Republican members of Congress were bitterly opposed. Because of repeated criticisms of the high tariff, one of the first chores confronting the new Democratic House in 1931 was that of tariff reform. The members wrote a

6Interview with Miller and Hager, July 3, 1970; Glover Cary to A. D. Kirk, April 19, 1932, June 12, 1933, May 12, 1934, Kirk private file; Arch Coleman to Glover Cary, April 14, 1934, Kirk private file; A. D. Kirk to Glover Cary, May 8, 1934, Kirk private file.

7Mitchell, Depression Decade, 77; Cong. Record, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., 2080-81 (Jan. 15, 1932); Dixon Journal, Jan. 29, 1932; Leuchtenburg, Roosevelt and the New Deal, 71.

8Cong. Record, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., 4003 (Feb. 15, 1932); Louisville Courier-Journal, Feb. 16, 1932.
bill which revised the administrative functions of the Tariff Commission. It removed from the President the power to put rate changes into effect and called for congressional approval of any recommendations for changes from the Commission. Cary, along with all other Democratic members, supported the measure. Indeed, Cary's only open break with his party on Hoover policies occurred in a vote on December 18, 1931, on a moratorium to authorize the postponement of foreign debts which were payable to the United States. The Congressman voted against the proposal even though it passed the Democratic House by a vote of 318 to 100. Cary's problem, at times, was not whether to support his party but how to align himself within the party. In 1933, for example, when the election of a speaker was pending, Cary favored either John McDuffie or Joseph Byrns although Henry T. Rainey was ultimately chosen.


11Glover Cary to A. D. Kirk, Jan. 20, 1933, Kirk private file; E. Pendleton Herring, "First Session of the Seventy-third Congress, March 9, 1933, to June 16, 1933," The American Political Science Review, XXVIII (Feb. 1934), 58; Cong. Record, 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 70 (March 9, 1933).
The most difficult issue for Cary to handle was that of prohibition; his position remained somewhat unclear although his earlier sympathies seemed to be with those who resisted the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. In January of 1932 the Congressman went on record as opposing the Beck-Linthicum Amendment, and the following month he presented to the House of Representatives a petition drawn up by various Madisonville churches to protest the repeal of prohibition. However, just three days after the submission of that petition, Cary voted in favor of a House Joint Resolution for the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. Although ratification of the Twentieth Amendment was not completed until January 23, 1933, by the time Roosevelt was elected it was certain national prohibition would end, and it was after that time that Cary definitely favored repeal. On December 2, 1932, the Representative stated he would support a bill to levy a tax on beer and that he would favor whatever percentage of alcohol was agreed upon by the Democratic party leaders. Later that month he voted for the Collier Beer Bill, which provided for a tax on

---

12 Cong. Rec., 72 Cong., 1 Sess., 2095 (Jan. 15, 1932); ibid., 4179 (Feb. 17, 1932); ibid., 4516 (Feb. 20, 1932).

13 Hatcher, "Fred Vinson," 289; Perkins, New Age of Franklin Roosevelt, 15.
beer and was in accord with the Democratic party platform, and he again cast his vote in favor of a resolution for repeal. Cary's advocacy of the repeal of prohibition, therefore, coincided, for the most part, with his party's wet stand.

In contrast to his support of Hoover's programs and his own party's stand on repeal, Cary defied the Roosevelt program on at least two issues to protect the interests of his constituents. One such instance was his stand on a reciprocal trade agreement which involved the importation of whiskey. In 1934 Congress had granted to Roosevelt the authority to raise or lower tariff duties as much as 50 per cent in order to gain trade concessions from other nations. Secretary of State Cordell Hull was thus able to negotiate reciprocal agreements which were effective for three years. One such imminent agreement, which was proposed to lower the tariff barriers with Canada, was probably prompted by the high price of domestic whiskey.15

Kentucky members in the House of Representatives, who met in a caucus the middle of March, 1935, to decide

on action against the suggested agreement, formulated a program of opposition to the growing liquor trust, the probable cause of the high price of whiskey distilled in the United States. Cary said the trust was barring competition from independent distillers; liquor was being distilled under less than one-third of the more than eighty licenses which had been issued in Kentucky. In brief, the Representative believed the liquor industry was "getting into the hands of the worst trust the country has ever seen." 16

The nine Kentucky representatives decided to attend the trade agreement hearing where they planned to file an opposing statement calling attention to the alleged monopolies in the American liquor industry. The caucus appointed Cary to write a letter to the chairman of the Federal Alcohol Control Administration (FACA), requesting detailed information for use in the Kentucky representatives' arguments. They also enlisted the support of some Midwestern congressmen who had complained of the small number of permits issued in their states. Cary was chosen to be the spokesman at the hearing for the group opposing the tariff reduction. The protests against the supposed liquor trust and the pressure exerted by the states were effective against the agreement, and on April 9, 1935, the FACA announced

16Owensboro Inquirer, March 15, 1935.
that it had decided to permit more distilling. Cary's role had run counter to his public statements concerning the tariff and to the desires of the administration, but his stand was, doubtless, sanctioned by most residents of his congressional district.

On the issue of the enactment of legislation to aid veterans, Cary again placed political expediency above loyalty to President Roosevelt. During his campaign for reelection in 1932, Cary maintained that he had attended to the interests of the World War veterans, but soon afterward, on March 12, 1933, he voted for the Economy Bill, which was an administration request to eliminate $400,000,000 from payments to veterans. After that time, however, Congressman Cary's support of legislation favoring the ex-soldiers was steadfast.

By election time in 1934, Cary was attempting to defend Roosevelt's stand and justify the Economy Bill. Cary conceded that the bill had been too extreme but that he had voted to amend it and that the President had made new regulations by executive order to aid the veterans. That same year Cary voted, as did six other

---

18 Elkton Todd County Standard, Aug. 4, 1932; Leuchtenburg, Roosevelt and the New Deal, 45; Louisville Courier-Journal, March 12, 1933.
19 Henderson Morning Cleaner, July 5, 1934.
Kentucky congressmen, for immediate consideration of full payment of the $2,200,000,000 soldiers' bonus. When Roosevelt vetoed the bill for reasons of economy, Cary was one of the 290 Democrats in the House who voted to override that veto. Without similar Senate action, however, the measure was not adopted. 20

The soldiers' bonus issue arose again in the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress and became the outstanding difference between the President and the lawmakers. The Patman Bill to provide for the immediate cash payment of the veterans' adjusted silver certificates had the approval of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, but the disapproval of Roosevelt; and although the Chief Executive appeared before both houses and read a message vetoing the measure, Cary voted with a two-thirds majority of the House membership to override his veto. The Senate, however, did not supply the necessary two-thirds vote to enact the bill. 21

When Congress reconsidered the bonus question in 1936,
Cary again supported the passage of adjusted silver certificates against the President's wishes. That time the bonus bill became law when both the House and the Senate refused to sustain Roosevelt's veto.22

Very early during his service in Congress, Cary endeavored to secure public parks within his district, a move certain to increase his popularity among his constituents. On February 16, 1932, he introduced a bill to provide for the erection of a memorial at Henderson honoring John James Audubon, a painter who produced excellent work when he lived at Henderson between 1810 and 1819. Although his bill was not even reported out of committee, Audubon Park was established as a state facility in 1934 under the administration of Governor Chandler. The state and the WPA shared the cost, and the CCC was responsible for much of the outdoor developing.23 On January 3, 1935, Cary presented a bill to provide for the commemoration of the death of Granville Allen, the first

---

22"The Seventy-fourth Congress Breaks Records," 11; Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 2 Sess., 292 (Jan. 10, 1936); ibid., 976 (Jan. 24, 1936); ibid., 1015 (Jan. 27, 1936).

23Cong. Record, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., 4104 (Feb. 16, 1932); Joe Creason, "One of Kentucky's Best Parks," Louisville Courier-Journal, July 20, 1947; Department of Conservation, Division of Parks, "Audubon State Park and Museum" (Frankfort, Ky., [n. d.]); Audubon Memorial State Park (pamphlet located in Kentucky Library, Western Kentucky University), 5.
soldier to lose his life in Kentucky during the Civil
War, but that bill also died in committee. Four days
later Cary introduced a measure to transfer 447 2 acres
of land between Hopkins and Christian counties from the
national government to Kentucky for state park purposes.
The land area in question had originally been part of
5,000 acres ceded by the state to the federal government
for a veterans' hospital. With the approval of the
Veterans' Administration and with three technical
committee amendments, the bill passed the House on
May 6, but proceeded no farther.

Although the efforts of others were more
significant, Cary aided the Mammoth Cave park movement
during his entire term in office. While public sentiment
was against private ownership of the cave as early as
1870, M. M. Logan demonstrated an interest in it as a
site for a national park about 1905, and Representative
R. Y. Thomas introduced a series of unsuccessful bills
for that purpose between 1911 and 1919. In 1923 the
movement gained momentum when the director of the

---

24 Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 49 (Jan. 3, 1935).
25 Ibid., 178 (Jan. 7, 1935); ibid., 7011 (May 6, 1935); House Report, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 457 (Serial 9886), 1, 4. Cary introduced another bill to transfer
a portion of land in Muhlenberg County in order to
build a highway there, but it, likewise, was never
reported out of the Senate committee. Cong. Record,
74 Cong., 2 Sess., 824 (May 28, 1936).
National Park Service recognized the need for parks east of the Mississippi River. Logan became president of the Mammoth Cave Park Association established in 1924 for the purpose of making a park of the area, and two years later on May 28, 1926, Senator Richard P. Ernst, with the support of Senator Alben Barkley, introduced a successful bill to establish Mammoth Cave National Park. A companion bill was also presented to the House by Congressman Maurice H. Thatcher.  

In compliance with the federal law, Kentucky passed the Jurisdiction Bill in 1930, which allowed the transfer of the park area to the United States government, but it finally became obvious that the minimum 45,310 acres, as provided by Ernst's bill, would never be obtained by condemnation suits in local courts in Kentucky and that the federal government should initiate condemnation proceedings and protect the area. In response to that need, Cary introduced his bill concerning the development of Mammoth Cave National Park on April 12, 1933. Accompanied by a

26 Bowling Green Park City Daily News, Oct. 30, 1934; Margaret M. Bridwell, The Story of Mammoth Cave National Park: A Brief History (Mammoth Cave, Ky., 1952), 10, 42-46; Cong. Record, 69 Cong., 1 Sess., 9007 (May 8, 1926); Ibid., 9452 (May 14, 1926); Ibid., 8961 (May 28, 1926).

27 Bridwell, Story of Mammoth Cave, 46-49; Cong. Record, 69 Cong., 1 Sess., 9362 (May 13, 1926).

28 Cong. Record, 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 1615 (April 12, 1933).
similar one presented to the Senate by Logan, the Cary bill provided for the amending of the measure which had established the cave area as a national park. Its primary purposes were to grant to the federal government the administration of the area before all the contemplated land for the park was acquired and, thereby, to replace that function of the Kentucky Park Commission. Through Cary's bill the National Park Service would administer and protect a minimum area of 20,000 acres--less than one-half the original amount required for control by the federal government.\textsuperscript{29}

During the hearings on Cary's H. R. 4935, the Congressman defended the bill by pointing out the potential of the area as well as its natural beauty. He submitted a statement showing that the people of that section and of all the state were willing for the area to be taken over as a park; however, the existence of some local opposition and adverse conditions near the park were exposed when Arno Cammerer, the Director of the National Parks, disclosed that some people were setting the woods on fire for spite.\textsuperscript{30} Most of the

\textsuperscript{29}Bowling Green Park City Daily News, Oct. 30, 1934; "Creation and Revision of National Park Boundaries," House, Committee on Public Lands, Hearings on H. R. 4935, 73 Cong., 2 sess. (1934), 18; Owensboro Inquirer, March 13, 1934; Hartford Ohio County News, June 1, 1934; Madisonville Messenger, April 14, 1934.

\textsuperscript{30}"Creation and Revision of National Park Boundaries," 18-20, 29.
opposition from the Committee on Public Lands, which reviewed the measure, arose because of an amendment suggested by the Park Commission of Kentucky which called for condemnation proceedings. Although he admitted the impossibility of acquiring all the land necessary for the park without such suits and he noted the "outrageous" prices juries in the local courts were demanding, Cary told the committee that he did not agree with the general principle involved in condemnation. Representative Dennis Chavez of New Mexico was in sympathy with the bill, but did not like the provision for condemnation, which he considered "very unusual." Representative Robert Rich of Pennsylvania expressed the view that the people of Kentucky might resent that form of interference from the federal government. Otherwise, Rich was concerned about the cost of operating the park, but Cary insisted the enactment of the bill would not entail any additional governmental expense. 31

Also instrumental in influencing the Committee's decision on the bill were a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, to the chairman, René L. DeRouen, and an executive order of December 23, 1933, authorizing the purchase of land for emergency

31 Ibid., 19, 22-25, 31; Owensboro Inquirer, March 13, 1934.
conservation work. Ickes' letter stated that some of the advantages in turning the land over to the government were better patrolling and control of the area, the elimination of renters, and the restoration of cultivated areas to their former woodland growth. The executive order stressed the need for the lands in order to provide employment. 32 Without wholehearted support the Committee reported the bill with an amendment suggested by Ickes, which stipulated no general development until the major portion of the remainder of land had been accepted by the Secretary of the Interior. 33

On April 25, 1934, Logan's S. 618, the companion bill to H. R. 4935, passed the Senate and was substituted in the House on May 7 for Cary's bill. It received little opposition on the floor, but Representative Ralph R. Eltse of California wanted to know if PWA funds were to be used for the purchase of lands. Explaining that the lands had been bought with state funds and that the state legislature had appropriated an additional $250,000 to make further purchases, Cary noted that the caves themselves were already producing about $75,000 in revenue annually and would become self-sustaining. Without further question the bill passed and was approved by

32 House Report, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 983 (Serial 9775), 3-4.

33 Ibid., 1, 3; "Creation and Revision of National Park Boundaries," 19, 32.
the President on May 15, 1934. \(^{34}\) On May 28, members of the Kentucky Park Commission and the Mammoth Cave Park Association met with officials of the National Park Association and made arrangements to carry that law into effect; however, it was not until July 1, 1941, when the minimum acreage was obtained, that Mammoth Cave gained national park status. \(^{35}\)

Cary also enhanced his prestige and heightened his local popularity by his efforts to obtain a bridge across the Ohio River at Owensboro. Although many prominent residents of that community, as well as Senator Barkley and Governor Chandler, labored long and wielded considerable pressure to secure the bridge, Glover Cary was the undisputed prime mover of the bridge-building effort. From 1932 until his death in 1936, he sought support and funds for the construction. \(^{36}\)

As early as 1907 the Owensboro and Rockport Bridge and Terminal Company was incorporated for the purpose of building a bridge at Rockport, the originally-proposed site about eight miles east of Owensboro. Financial difficulties caused by the panic of 1907 halted

\(^{34}\) Cong. Record, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., 7265 (April 25, 1934); ibid., 8214 (May 7, 1934); ibid., 8641 (May 15, 1934).

\(^{35}\) Bridwell, Story of Mammoth Cave, 49, 52.

\(^{36}\) Interview with Vincent, Jan. 9, 1971; interview with Miller and Hager, July 3, 1970; interview with Brown, Aug. 27, 1970.
the effort, and the First World War and the Great Depression brought financial disaster to two later efforts. By 1931 a movement existed to locate the bridge at Owensboro. In that year the president of the Owensboro Chamber of Commerce appointed a committee to work with the Kentucky Highway Commission to build a bridge at that city. The following year on March 30, 1932, Cary introduced his bill to authorize the state of Kentucky, in cooperation with Indiana, to build, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near Owensboro. The bill, which had the approval of the War and Agriculture Departments, was favorably reported on May 11, and was considered by the whole House on June 6, when Senator Barkley's S. 4635, a similar measure, was substituted for Cary's.

The Senate substitution was more detailed than the Cary bill. It stated as reasons for building the bridge the promotion of interstate commerce, the improvement of postal service, and more adequate provision for

37 Hugh O. Potter, Daviess County Sesquicentennial Historical Factbook (Owensboro, Ky., 1965); William Foster Hayes, Sixty Years of Owensboro, 1883-1943 (Owensboro, Ky., n. d.), 140-42; Cong. Record, 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 5054 (June 15, 1933).

38 Louisville Courier-Journal, Feb. 11, 1932; Cong. Record, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., 7159 (March 30, 1932).

39 Cong. Record, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., 10042 (May 11, 1932); ibid., 12093 (June 6, 1932); House Report, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1275 (Serial 9493), 1.
the military. The bill, which gave the Kentucky Highway Commission the right to acquire and condemn any property necessary and provided for tolls and for a sinking fund to pay the debt and free the bridge from tolls, passed the House and was approved by the President on June 9, 1932.40

Because poor financial conditions had interfered with the undertaking, Glover Cary introduced a bill on May 9 of the next year to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge by one and three years respectively.41 The bill was favorably reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but received some opposition in the general debate from Representatives John A. Cochran, Ralph R. Eltse, and Thomas A. Jenkins. When questioned about the number of times the same proposal had been before the House, Cary explained that the measure was being considered for the first time although an earlier attempt had been made to place the bridge at Rockport. Jacob L. Milligan, the chairman of the committee which reviewed the bill, answered the query concerning the reports from the War and Agriculture Departments by stating that they were both favorable even though the

40 Cong. Record, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., 12093 (June 6, 1932); ibid., 12412 (June 9, 1932).

41 Ibid., 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 4575 (May 9, 1933); ibid., 4930 (June 3, 1933).
Agriculture Department was opposed to toll bridges. Representative Cochran, who opposed all bills involving the sale of bonds for bridges, presented the strongest arguments against the bill because he disliked the sale of bonds in places other than where bridges were built.  

On June 5, 1933, Barkley's S. 1815, which had passed the Senate two days previously, was substituted in the House for Cary's companion bill, passed, and became law two days later when Roosevelt signed it.

A delegation of approximately thirty businessmen and some members of the Kentucky Highway Department visited Washington in 1936 to impress federal authorities with the significance of the bridge-building project. Accompanied by Cary, the delegation urged a PWA grant to help finance the bridge. With the Congressman's assistance a pledge of favorable consideration was received in the event that further PWA funds became available for the proposed structure.

---

42 Ibid., 4715 (May 31, 1933); ibid., 5053-54 (June 15, 1933); House Report, 73 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 182 (Serial 9774), I.

43 Cong. Record, 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 4742 (June 1, 1933); ibid., 4930 (June 3, 1933); ibid., 5054 (June 5, 1933); ibid., 5981 (June 14, 1933). Despite the work of Cary and others to obtain a bridge at Owensboro, as late as May 22, 1934, a representative from Indiana introduced a bill to place the bridge at Rockport. Cong. Record, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., 9310 (May 22, 1934).

44 Hayes, Sixty Years, 143; Potter, Daviess County.

45 Owensboro Inquirer, Jan. 24, 1936.
the necessary legislation had been enacted and the request had been made for funds, Gary's biggest problem in completing plans for construction became that of finding a means whereby a road could be built in Indiana from the bridge to the main highway eight miles away. It was a problem the Congressman never solved because of his untimely death, but his successor in office, Beverly M. Vincent, pursued and completed the work Cary had begun.\footnote{Interview with Vincent, Jan. 9, 1971.}

Upon taking his seat in the House, Vincent introduced another bill to build a bridge across the Ohio River at Owensboro. His bill assured the building of the road in Indiana by establishing the Owensboro Bridge Commission, which had the authority to acquire and condemn land in Indiana.\footnote{Ibid.; Cong. Record, 75 Cong., 1 Sess., 6869 (July 6, 1937); \underline{ibid.}, 8034-35 (Aug. 2, 1937).} After the bill had become law on August 14, 1937, a PWA grant of 45 percent of the cost of the effort was made to the Commission on June 24, 1938, and in September of that year bonds in the amount of $1,400,000 were sold. Work was begun on August 12, 1938, following an agreement by the Kentucky Highway Department to pay for the maintenance and operation of the bridge if the tolls were insufficient.
to cover those costs. The formal dedication of the bridge took place on July 30, 1940. Wilber K. Miller paid an "eloquent tribute" to his late law partner when the bridge was dedicated to the memory of Glover Cary. Many of the Congressman's friends, however, were disappointed. They had hoped that the Owensboro Bridge would be named for Cary because of his relentless efforts to secure it.

Cary's rapid rise to a position of prominence and influence in the House of Representatives augmented his popularity in his home district. Although he served on only two committees while in office, his work during his first assignment to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads was so satisfactory he was removed from that committee and elevated to the powerful Committee on Appropriations on March 14, 1933, at the beginning of his second term. Furthermore, by January 3, 1934, he had been named to the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations of which he later became chairman.

48Hayes, Sixty Years, 143-44; Potter, Daviess County; Cong. Record, 75 Cong., 1 Sess., 9457 (Aug. 20, 1937).

49Hayes, Sixty Years, 147; interview with Kirk, July 12, 1970; Owensboro Inquirer, July 30, 1940.
by the rule of seniority and to the Subcommittee on Permanent Appropriations.⁵⁰

Cary's service on the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads was short-lived and functioned only as a means to a higher post. In 1932 he reported a bill for that committee which required postmasters to account for money collected on parcels delivered at their offices. The proposal to place upon the postmasters some degree of financial responsibility for funds collected on C. O. D. mail was urged by the Post Office Department and was passed without opposition on June 28, 1932, but was not considered by the entire Senate.⁵¹ Cary sponsored only one bill concerning postal affairs, which he introduced on February 12, 1932. The measure sought to increase postal revenues $4,000,000 by prohibiting commercial concerns from putting mailable materials without postage in a letter box.⁵² The committee amended the bill by lowering the fine from $1,000 to $300 and by eliminating

⁵⁰ House Doc., 75 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 354 (Serial 10124); Cong. Record, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., 552 (Dec. 15, 1931); ibid., 73 Cong., 1 Sess., 371 (March 14, 1933); ibid., 73 Cong., 2 Sess., 13 (Jan. 3, 1934); William A. Stevens to author, July 3, 1970.

⁵¹ Cong. Record, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., 649 (March 16, 1932); ibid., 1317 (June 15, 1932); ibid., 1409 (June 27, 1932); ibid., 14132 (June 28, 1932); House Report, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1635 (Serial 9493), 1-2.

⁵² Cong. Record, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., 3645 (Feb. 12, 1932); Louisville Courier-Journal, March 6, 1932.
the three year prison sentence for violation of that law. James M. Mead, the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, defended the bill by explaining that it was directed toward utility companies rather than toward individuals. Although there remained some objection to the measure because of the inclusion of a fine, it passed the House on March 9, 1932, but was not reported out of committee in the Senate. 53

During his campaign for reelection in 1934, Cary emphasized his role as a member of the Subcommittee on Permanent Appropriations, a congressional group assigned in 1933 to conduct an investigation into continuing allotments of money. 54 The Subcommittee studied the rarely-examined sums of money which were automatically granted without specific congressional consideration and occurred most noticeably in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Interior, the Treasury Department, and the War Department. The plan was to eliminate, after the investigation

53 Cong. Record, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., 5575-77 (March 9, 1932); ibid., 5629 (March 10, 1932); House Report, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 742 (Serial 9492), 1-2.

was completed, some of the continuing appropriations which amounted to about $140,000,000 per year.55

The Subcommittee barely began its work in 1933 when Congress adjourned, but met again in 1934 with several new members, including Cary, and presented to the Seventy-third Congress hearings containing nearly a thousand pages and including every permanent appropriation since 1798. The investigation revealed 253 appropriations previously undisclosed.56 The Subcommittee, therefore, introduced a bill to provide that permanent appropriations be made subject to annual consideration and appropriation. Representative Anthony J. Griffith, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Permanent Appropriations, believed the appropriations were unconstitutional.57 Cary thought the bill to rid the standing appropriations was the most important measure that Congress had considered although he acknowledged that all permanent appropriations would not be eliminated—especially those in the War and Navy


57Cong. Record, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., 7727 (April 30, 1934); Ibid., 8241 (May 7, 1934).
As he explained:

I believe it will do more to protect the Treasury of the United States against raids that are constantly made upon it than any piece of legislation that has been presented here. In short, all this legislation means is to stop these annual, recurring appropriations.

The bill passed the House on May 7, 1934, and was sent to the Senate where it was amended. The House, which objected to two Senate amendments, one to allow fees collected from national banks to cover salaries and expenses of national bank examiners and the other to allow the existence of the Naval Hospital fund, appointed a conference committee of which Cary was a member. Finally, the two Senate amendments were deleted and the bill was approved by the President on June 13, 1934.

Through continuous efforts Congressman Cary gained not only the confidence of his constituents, a fact made evident by his popularity at the polls, but also the admiration and respect of his colleagues. By attempting to improve his district, the Representative enhanced his own prestige in Congress, and by willingly

---

58 Ibid., 8246 (May 7, 1934).
59 Ibid.
60 Ibid.; ibid., 11397 (June 13, 1934).
61 Ibid., 12143, 11980 (June 16, 1934); ibid., 12455 (June 13, 1934).
accepting the responsibilities of his office, he gained support from those whom he represented. Cary was a realistic officeholder who was ever mindful that he was responsible to the public for his actions.
CHAPTER V

THE NAVAL EXPERT

During the final three years of his life, Glover Cary devoted more time and energy to a study of the requirements for an adequate Navy than to any other single undertaking of his career. As a member of the House Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, the Representative handled the huge appropriation bills for the Navy during the period of rapid rearmament immediately preceding World War II. His role became increasingly significant because of the magnitude of the measures he presented to Congress and the worsening world situation which had prompted those bills. President Roosevelt, who had served as an Assistant Secretary of the Navy under Woodrow Wilson, furthered Cary in his position by urging the development of a big Navy and by making the Congressman a special protégé.¹

Drastically affecting the Representative's work on the Subcommittee were certain past policies of the

¹Cong. Record, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., 13 (Jan. 3, 1934); William A. Stevens to author, July 30, 1970.
United States, most particularly the participation in
the disarmament agreements which had been attempts to
eliminate rivalry among the naval powers following
World War I. The Washington Treaty of 1922, the first
of those naval limitation agreements, disallowed
competition among signatories in capital ships and
aircraft carriers. A ratio for the number of vessels
permitted each nation was set at 5:5:3 for the United
States, Britain, and Japan, respectively, and at 1.67
for both France and Italy. In accordance with the
treaty, the United States voluntarily relinquished
its naval supremacy by cancelling numerous contracts
for vessels, by consenting to scrap twenty completed
battleships, and by agreeing, with a few exceptions,
not to increase bases or fortifications in the Pacific.

Continuing its disarmament policy, the nation
signed the Treaty of London in 1930. The ratio of

2William H. Stanley, "Should the U. S. Navy Be
Built Up to Treaty Strength?" The Congressional
Quarterly, XIII (April 1934), 120.

3Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 6389 (April 25,
1935); Carl Vinson, "Provisions of the Vinson Navy Bill,"
The Congressional Digest, 13 (April 1934), 119; Robert
Greenhalgh Albion and Jennie Barnes Pope, Sea Lanes in
Wartime: The American Experience, 1775-1942 (New York,
1942), 332; Claude Swanson, "Department of the Navy,"
The Democratic Book: 1936 ([n. p.], [n. d.]), 145,
book located in Jouett Shouse Papers.

4George T. Davis, A Navy Second to None: The
Development of Modern American Naval Policy (New York,
1940), 316.
5:5:3 in capital ships and aircraft carriers for the United States, Britain, and Japan was retained; however, the United States agreed to an increased ratio in cruisers for both Japan and Britain and to Japan's receiving an increased ratio in destroyers and parity in submarines. In addition, the treaty established 20 years for aircraft carriers and cruisers, 16 years for destroyers, and 13 years for submarines as the ages at which they became obsolete and could be replaced. It required that they be destroyed before replacement—a provision which became especially important to the naval building program because of the large number of vessels which were becoming obsolete within the terms of the treaty.5 Since the United States had built no ships in 1922, 1923, 1924, and 1929, and few during the other years following the signing of the naval agreements, many vessels were becoming "over age" during the 1930's, and it became mandatory that the United States build replacements to prevent the Navy's growing weaker during the period of Cary's service on the Subcommittee.6

When France and Italy refused to sign the London Naval Treaty, the United States, Britain, and Japan

5Stanley, "Should Navy Be Built Up?,” 120, 122; Frederick Hale, "How the U. S. Navy Stands Today," The Congressional Digest, 13 (April 1934), 118.

became its only signatories. President Hoover and
Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson supported the
treaty, but many senators and naval experts disliked
the provisions concerning cruisers and the concessions
to Japan. 7 In his evaluation of the attempts to limit
naval power, Cary thought that the United States'
initiation of the principle of limitation was worth-
while and laudable, but he realistically recognized
the expense involved in the destruction of eleven new
capital ships worth $380,000,000 for which the United
States had gained no tangible benefits. Realizing
also that the nation had not been as alert as it should
have been, Cary, as did Roosevelt, emphasized that the
United States' not building to treaty strength had
allowed the co-treaty powers to develop superior
navies. 8

In 1935 Glover Cary voiced the sentiment of
most Americans when he said the nation could not depend
upon disarmament for protection in the future. Refusing
to follow the example set by the United States, Japan

7 Stanley, "Should Navy Be Built Up?", 120;
Davis, Navy Second to None, 347-49.

8 Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 6230-31
(April 23, 1935); Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer,
Merely Fills Past Neglect," clipping included in
scrapbook, Snyder private collection; Henry
Roosevelt, "What Is an Adequate Navy?" Vital
was already up to treaty strength by 1934, and Great Britain's program called for a treaty strength navy by 1936. Cary, therefore, blamed Britain and Japan for shaping the United States' naval policy when he presented the huge 1935 Naval Appropriation Bill to Congress. The problems of arms limitation were further increased when Germany, France, and Italy, which had not signed the London Naval Treaty and had no restraints on their naval programs, began building vessels. Indeed, with the failure of the Geneva Disarmament Conference, which had begun in 1932, and with Japan's formal notice in 1934 that it would not be bound by the existing naval agreements after December 31, 1936, the world armament race was a reality by the mid-1930's.

9 In 1922 when the United States laid down no ships, Japan laid down 34; and, furthermore, between the years 1922 and 1933, the total tonnage laid down by the three great naval powers was 175,835 for the United States, 392,429 for Britain, and 362,914 for Japan. Swanson, "Department of the Navy," 146; Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 629 (April 23, 1935).

10 Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 629, 631 (April 23, 1935); "Progress Made by Major Legislation: From January 20 to February 20, 1934," The Congressional Digest, 13 (March 1934), 90.

Besides the withdrawal of Japan from the treaty obligations and the pending end of the naval limitations, the world situation warranted naval buildup by the United States. While the United States depended upon treaties as a means of preventing war, Japan violated the Nine-Power Treaty and the Pact of Paris by invading Manchuria in 1931.12 Another cause for alarm was Adolf Hitler's rise to power in 1933 with the subsequent reports of Nazi plans for world domination. Although the United States stayed on a non-entanglement course in foreign affairs, aggression in other parts of the world was met in the American Congress by the passage of measures to strengthen the defenses, especially the Navy.13

In contrast to President Hoover, who had favored the London Naval Treaty, President Roosevelt, having been influenced by Rear Admiral B. A. Fiske who advocated a large Navy, advanced the "greatest


13 Davis, Navy Second to None, 358; Nevins, New Deal and World Affairs, 77-78; Schroeder, Axis Alliance, 1, 6; Charles A. Beard, American Foreign Policy in the Making, 1932-1940: A Study in Responsibilities (New Haven, Conn., 1946), 157.
naval expansion in history."\textsuperscript{14} While there was some opposition to his naval program, the new Democratic President received support from his naval advisors, who had been selected because they favored a big Navy, the Congress, which reflected more of an isolationist spirit than Roosevelt, and the American people, who had been informed of the need for the increase in armaments partly through the efforts of such organizations as the American Legion.\textsuperscript{15} Immediately after Roosevelt assumed office, Secretary of the Navy Claude Swanson announced that the United States fleet would be built to full treaty strength, but the domestic program for recovery in 1933 took precedence over naval expansion. The National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933, did, however, authorize the President to allot money to equip and


to build thirty-two naval vessels. The building of warships in that fashion could be defended as a means of producing jobs.\textsuperscript{16}

During the second session of the Seventy-third Congress, it soon became apparent that the naval building program would be further expanded. Congress passed the Vinson-Trammel Bill of 1934, which authorized the replacement of obsolete ships and the building to treaty limits. The new law provided for the construction of 102 new vessels, but, as both Roosevelt and Cary stressed, the completion of the measure was dependent upon appropriations.\textsuperscript{17}

Glover Cary's appointment to the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations on January 3, 1934, occurred at a time when interest in the development of an adequate Navy was at an all-time high.\textsuperscript{18} The Naval Appropriation Bill for 1935, which he helped to draft, called for more enlisted personnel in the Navy and Marine Corps and for the commencement of additional ship construction. Of the total $284,747,244, the

\textsuperscript{16}Nevins, New Deal and World Affairs, 82-83; Davis, Navy Second to None, 146, 359.

\textsuperscript{17}Davis, Navy Second to None, 359, 361; "Progress Made by Major Legislation: From January 20 to February 20, 1934;" 90; Swanson, "Department of the Navy," 145; Reiley, "Money for Navy," clipping included in scrapbook, Snyder private collection.

\textsuperscript{18}Cong. Record, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., 13 (Jan. 3, 1934).
Subcommittee allotted an increase over the previous year's measure of $2,294,215 for construction and machinery.\(^{19}\) Having passed the House on January 24, the bill was sent to the Senate where it was substantially increased and passed on February 10.\(^{20}\) Cary served as a member of the conference committee which finally established the amount of the appropriation at $286,543,132.\(^{21}\)

By March of 1934 Cary complained to his law partner that he was becoming tired and that the work was almost unbearable, but when the time arrived for him to resume his duties as chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations in 1935, the Congressman was again eager to start work.\(^{22}\) During the Subcommittee's six weeks' inquiry into the needs of the Navy, Cary was thorough in his investigation and worked with great vigor, but he was ever mindful of the large amount of work his job entailed. Although the nation's naval building policy had not changed

\(^{19}\)House Report, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 335 (Serial 9775), 2', 25.

\(^{20}\)"Progress Made by Major Legislation: From January 20 to February 20, 1934," 90.

\(^{21}\)Congressional Record, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., 2769 (Feb. 19, 1934); House Report, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 746 (Serial 9887), 28.

\(^{22}\)Glover Cary to A. D. Kirk, March 16, 1934, Jan. 11, 1935, Kirk private files.
since announced in 1933, Cary brought to the floor of Congress the largest peacetime naval appropriation bill in history. It was, in fact, the biggest bill of its type in more than fifteen years and one that was justified as a defensive measure.  

Glover Cary received praise for his courtesy and diligence, but he and the Subcommittee were severely criticized by Congressmen Fred J. Sisson of New York and Charles W. Tobey of New Hampshire for selecting hearings witnesses who favored a big Navy and for not making the bill and the report available to the entire House in time for study. The Subcommittee members were also questioned about the wording of their report, which seemed to indicate that the amount of the appropriation was more than was necessary for defense. Indeed, the decreases made by the group reflected an attempt to determine policy and were a manifestation of latent isolationist sentiment. Cary freely admitted that the proposed measure was not as generous as the Navy Department had desired; nevertheless, he feared criticism because of the munificence of the bill.

---


24 *Congressional Record*, 74th Cong., 1 Sess., 6224 (April 23, 1935); *ibid.*, 6416-17 (April 25, 1935).
The executive budget recommended an appropriation of $485,443,847 for the 1936 fiscal year, but the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, reducing the amount by $27,657,586, presented a bill which provided a total of $457,786,261, a figure far below the estimated annual amount of $555,000,000 needed to maintain a treaty navy. The most controversial reduction was the Subcommittee's halving of the $29,380,000 allotted for the construction of twenty-four replacement vessels.\(^{25}\) Despite administration pressure, the Subcommittee tried to prevent the building of those ships because of their possible impact upon another pending naval conference. The Subcommittee members believed the delay in building the ships would be an expression of faith in disarmament, and Cary pointed out that the money could easily be appropriated at the beginning of the next session if the government still desired to undertake the new construction.\(^{26}\)

The Subcommittee effected two major reductions in the budget for naval aviation, one in the number of


\(^{26}\)House Report, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 746 (Serial 9887), 3; Owensboro Inquirer, April 24, 1935. Cary received much criticism for the reduction in the amount of money allotted for new ship construction, and the sum was soon replaced. See pp. 126, 133.
spare engines and spare parts, and the other in the amount provided for lighter-than-air activities. The Subcommittee believed many of the spares were unnecessary because they would become obsolete, and Cary reiterated experts' opinions when he said the lighter-than-air craft possessed commercial value but were of no benefit to the Navy. Otherwise, the congressional group refused to recommend three items to be financed through PWA funds, including a $2,750,000 project for dredging and for harbor and channel improvement at Pearl Harbor, because of the question of the availability of future funds to complete the work. A sum of $19,690,000 in mere postponements accounted for a major part of the total decrease. 27

Even with the Subcommittee's reductions, which were certain to be viewed with dissatisfaction by the Naval Reserve Officer's Association, the amount of the bill far surpassed the previous year's appropriation of $264,747,244. Eighty-five per cent of the budget increase was responsive to legislation such as the Vinson-Trammel Act or to the nation's policy of building within treaty proportions to replace overage tonnage, and new ship construction accounted for more

than one-half the increase in the bill. Other significant increases in the Naval Appropriation Bill for 1936 included 11,000 more enlisted men, more money for the naval reserve, 555 more airplanes, the provision for each congressman's appointing four cadets to the Naval Academy instead of three, the added expenses incurred by the re-opening of the training station at Great Lakes, Illinois, a larger allotment for more scientific and technical personnel at the Naval Research Laboratory, and $7,500,000 to create a reserve supply of domestically produced and processed strategic materials.

When he brought the 1936 Naval Appropriation Bill to the floor of the House on April 24, 1935, Glover Cary apologized for its great size, but he declared it to be necessary for proper defense. The Congressman thought the amount required to maintain an
adequate Navy was exorbitant, but he believed the American people had no choice but to pay it. Although stating that the nation was in no imminent danger of war, Cary quoted George Washington's advice on the need for sound military defenses, and he stressed the United States' lack of preparedness at the onset of World War I, which drew the nation into the conflict.\(^3\) Having defied anyone to declare the defense measures to be an indication of United States' entry into the naval race in 1934, Cary probably surprised few of his constituents to whom he had announced:

> I believe that our greatest assurance against war is to maintain the greatest army that ever followed a flag, to possess a navy that is mistress of the seven seas and an air corps that is unsurpassed by any \(...\)^3

Because House debate on the Naval Appropriation Bill, H. R. 7672, closely followed the passage of the $400,000,000 Army appropriation measure, a group of inland members, led by a coastal Representative, Fred J. Sisson, was prepared to object strenuously to the large measure.\(^3\) Those opposing the bill, including Representatives Gerald J. Boileau of Wisconsin, \(^3\)

---

\(^3\)Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 6228 (April 23, 1935); Henderson Morning Gleaner, July 5, 1934.

\(^3\)Henderson Morning Gleaner, July 5, 1934.

\(^3\)Owensboro Inquirer, April 24, 1935; Owensboro Messenger, April 27, 1935.
Henry C. Luckey of Nebraska, Maury Maverick of Texas, Fred Biermann of Iowa, and Theodore Christianson of Minnesota, criticized both the Assistant Secretary of the Navy Henry Roosevelt because he favored naval expansion and Congressman Cary because he advocated an unequalled Army and Navy. Their chief objections to the bill itself were the enormous amounts of money to be appropriated, the questionable need for such drastic increases in defense, and the provision for an increase in the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy. 34

Opponents of the measure offered other uses for the money that was being spent on naval expansion. Their suggestions included government spending for more public works, pensions, public schools, and for veterans' benefits. 35 Disapproving the appointment of one additional cadet per congressman, some members asserted that more officers were not needed and that the inclusion of the proposal was an attempt to gain support for administration measures. Cary responded by saying that more officers were needed to man the increasing number of ships. 36

34 Davis, Navy Second to None, 390; Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 6323, 6326-27 (April 24, 1935); ibid., 6417 (April 25, 1935); ibid., 6475 (April 26, 1935).

35 Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 6327, 6334, 6337 (April 24, 1935); ibid., 6477-78 (April 26, 1935).

36 Owensboro Messenger, April 27, 1935; Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 6473-74 (April 26, 1935).
Several representatives argued that such a generous appropriation for naval defenses was not required because of existing world treaties to insure peace and the improbability that any nation, even Japan, would attempt to attack the United States. Adhering to that view, Boileau offered an amendment to eliminate the providing of funds for the construction of additional ships, cruisers, submarines, and other types of naval vessels. The amendment was, however, defeated by a vote of 92 to 20 after Cary objected to it on the basis it would interrupt the continuity of the naval building program, would necessitate the scrapping of many ships under construction, would add to the unemployment problem, and would increase problems of defense against air attack. Representative Herman P. Kopplemann of Connecticut, with the support of Sisson, proposed another amendment to weaken the appropriation bill by withholding all funds for construction until March 1, 1936. That attempt also failed by a vote of 78 to 17.

Oddly enough, there were few questions raised about the type of equipment or training designated by the bill. Carl Vinson of Georgia offered an amendment

37 Cong. Rec. 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 6323-24, 6331, 6333 (April 21, 1935); ibid., 6475, 6479 (April 26, 1935).

38 Ibid., 6481-83 (April 26, 1935).
to change the bill's requirement for staff officers to receive specialty training within two years after graduation from the Naval Academy, but the amendment was rejected 80 to 23 after Cary said the provision in the bill would increase both efficiency and economy. 39 Maverick wished an explanation of the types of ships, and John D. Dingell of Michigan favored a continuation of the experiments with the all-metal lighter-than-air ships. 40 Few other suggestions emerged from the opposition, and no attempt was made to restore the amount sliced from the allowance for new ship construction. Proponents of the bill, including Representatives Kent E. Keller of Illinois, Benjamin K. Focht of Pennsylvania, and Carl Vinson, spoke in its favor before the House passed it on April 26, 1935. 41

In the Senate there were few serious objections to the 1936 Naval Appropriation Bill, but some members did try to weaken it by offering a number of unsuccessful amendments. Members of the Senate Munitions Committee tried to modify the measure in order to control the profits shipbuilders might make and to grant to the State Department the decision of where future maneuvers

39 Ibid., 6470-72 (April 26, 1935).

40 Ibid., 6235 (April 23, 1935); ibid., 6475 (April 26, 1935).

41 Ibid., 6323, 6331 (April 24, 1935); ibid., 6388 (April 25, 1935); ibid., 6484-86, 6488 (April 26, 1935).
would be held. Senator Gerald P. Nye of North Dakota opposed the construction of the twenty-four new ships specified in the proposed legislation and offered an amendment to prevent collusion among the shipyards. 42 As was speculated, the Senate restored the $11,690,000 for beginning the construction of new ships that the House had deleted and passed the bill 55-18. 43 Because of the various Senate modifications which resulted in a larger appropriation, a conference in which Cary participated was held to compromise the differences. In the final bill only $6,000,000, instead of $11,690,000, was made available for new ship construction, and the direct appropriation agreed upon by the conferees was only $879,118 in excess of the total amount originally passed by the House. 44 With both houses in agreement, the President approved the 1936 Naval Appropriation Bill on June 19, 1935. 45

Although most congressmen ignored the demands for economy and were willing to listen to men like

---


44 Louisville Courier-Journal, May 25, 1935; Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 8536 (June 3, 1935); Conference Report, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1262 (Serial 9088), 3-4.

45 Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 10291 (June 27, 1935); Owensboro Inquirer, June 25, 1935.
himself who favored an expanded Navy, Cary was, apparently, unsure of his constituents' attitudes because he vigorously defended the large navy measure both inside and outside Congress. He said spending should be curbed, but he reminded the people that they demanded a large Navy. He justified the large expenditure as a means of rectifying past negligence while emphasizing that the cost of a treaty Navy was greater for the United States because of the high standard of living. Ships were only a small part of the expense of maintaining an adequate Navy, Cary asserted. Other costs involved naval stations and weapons and pay and subsistence of personnel.

Before Cary presented another naval appropriation measure to Congress in 1936, world problems had increased and Cary's work load had grown correspondingly. On December 7, 1935, the five leading naval powers again met in London to formulate an agreement, but national demands doomed the conference to failure.

---

46 Davis, Navy Second to None, 354; Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Sept. 1, 1935.

47 Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., 6231 (April 23, 1935); Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Jan. 27, 1935; Reilley, "Money For Navy," clipping included in scrapbook, Snyder private collection.

48 The Vinson-Trammel Act had discouraged United States' participation in the 1935 naval conference because of the fear the nation might have to accept compromises unsatisfactory to Navy interests. Davis, Navy Second to None, 362.
The United States urged the continuation of the principles established by the Treaties of Washington and London, but Britain rejected proportional reduction and even requested an increase in the number of cruisers. France and Italy opposed the idea of fixed ratios, and Japan demanded naval power strong enough to challenge an Anglo-American fleet. The failure of the conference was almost certain when Japan withdrew on January 15, 1936. Obviously, no agreement based on existing treaties was possible.49 Another treaty, which advanced the world naval race, was, however, signed by Britain and Germany on June 18, 1935. Although Germany had agreed to limit the total tonnage of its fleet to 35 per cent or less of the entire tonnage of the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, other powers declared the arrangement a breach of the Versailles Treaty and a means whereby Germany could quadruple its fleet. In response to the Anglo-German Treaty, France announced plans to build up its navy without regard to limitations.50

By signing the naval treaty with Germany, Britain simply agreed with what the Reich intended to do with or without sanction. On March 16, 1935, Germany had already repudiated the disarmament clauses of the

49 Ibid., 365-66; Schroeder, Axis Alliance, 6-7.
50 Davis, Navy Second to None, 363-64.
Treaty of Versailles. The world situation also worsened in other respects. The crisis continued in the Orient, Mussolini waged aggression against Ethiopia, and tension grew between Italy and Great Britain in the Mediterranean and in North East Africa.  

The United States reacted to the worsening world conditions not only by strengthening defenses but also by placing restraints on commerce with belligerents, by forbidding the granting of loans to warring nations, and by preventing the drafting of men in order to wage a war of aggression. Roosevelt reluctantly agreed to the neutrality legislation, but Cary unquestionably approved it. The Neutrality Act of 1935 was, to the Congressman, a means of preventing United States' intervention in the conflict between Italy and Ethiopia. War seemed unlikely because another neutrality bill was passed in 1936 and the President stated nothing which indicated pending American

---


53 Nevins, New Deal and World Affairs, 93; Beard, American Foreign Policy, 165; Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Sept. 1, 1935. Cary actually did not believe the American people would support an overseas war. Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Sept. 1, 1935.
involvement in European entanglements. Roosevelt, however, told Congress there was no alternative to maintaining adequate defenses to keep out of war.\textsuperscript{54}

It was not unexpected, therefore, when estimates for the combined Army and Navy appropriations for 1937 reached a record $1,100,000,000.\textsuperscript{55} Glover Cary conducted the hearings on the naval measure where witnesses included Henry Roosevelt, the acting Secretary of the Navy, and Captain H. F. Kimmel, the budget officer of the Navy. They emphasized the obsolescence of many craft and asserted that the reasons for increases over the 1936 appropriations were due almost entirely to the construction, the completion, and the manning of new vessels, rather than to policy changes.\textsuperscript{56}

The Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations approved and presented to the House a bill allotting $531,066,707 for naval maintenance and development. That amount, along with other available funds, provided

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{54}Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1936; Beard, \textit{American Foreign Policy}, 171; Davis, \textit{Navy Second to None}, 370.

\item \textsuperscript{55}Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1936; Owensboro Inquirer, Jan. 6, Feb. 16, 1936.

\end{itemize}
a total of $592,237,707, a figure somewhat in excess of Admiral William H. Stanley's estimated annual $555,000,000 needed to attain and maintain a treaty Navy. The bill called for adding more officers and for increasing the enlisted strength of the Navy from 93,500 to 100,000, with 3,000 of the 100,000 men to be added the next year. It further designated the building of 333 new airplanes, 12 new destroyers, and 6 new submarines. The allotment for continuing construction on 84 vessels of various types was $168,500,000, and the total new appropriation for ship construction amounted to $182,500,000. The most important provision of the proposed legislation, however, gave authority to the President to undertake the replacement of two capital ships in the event any foreign signatory of a naval treaty began capital ship replacement.

58 Washington Evening Star, April 30, 1936; Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, March 15, 1936.
59 Henderson Sunday Gleaner and Journal, Feb. 16, 1936; Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1936; Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Feb. 16, 1936. For aviation in 1937, H. R. 12527 granted a sum of $15,410,000, or $6,587,690 more than was granted for the 1936 fiscal year. House Report, 74 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 2548 (Serial 9993), 17.
reductions amounting to $23,805,119 which the Subcommittee effects in the budget, $15,000,000 was merely a deferment. 61

After having devoted several months to a study of the naval needs for 1937, Cary became ill with pneumonia shortly after he concluded the hearings on the appropriation bill, and he was unable to continue his work on it. 62 The introduction of the bill was delayed in the belief that the Subcommittee chairman might recuperate in time to defend it, but, realizing that Cary's condition was serious, North Carolina Representative William B. Umstead, of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, reported H. R. 12527, on April 30, 1936. 63 Although he was unable to be present during the House debate, Cary gave approval to the bill through his remarks at the hearings, through his statements to the newspapers, and through his prepared speech which was read to the House. Apologizing to the members for the size of the measure, the Representative


62 Shortly before he became ill in 1936, Cary remarked to a friend that his position on the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations was a "man killing job." Interview with Downs, Aug. 10, 1970.

63 Owensboro Messenger, April 30, 1936; Washington Herald, April 14, 15, 1936; Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 2 Sess., 66th (April 30, 1936).
declared the huge appropriation necessary for the nation's security because of past negligence. Cary contended that the United States' not building to treaty strength while other nations enlarged their navies had created the need for rapid ship replacement. Having lost faith in disarmament conferences, Cary said that no developments which would have any effect on the 1937 appropriation bill could be expected at the London Naval Conference. 64

When he discussed the costs of ship construction, which accounted for more than 80 per cent of the net budget increase, Glover Cary reminded other congressmen that the Subcommittee had attempted reductions in the 1936 bill, an action which brought considerable criticism and was finally rejected by the Senate. 65 The Subcommittee chairman also defended personnel increases as being necessary to meet the requirements for an expanded Navy. 66 Believing, however, that proponents

---

64 Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 2 Sess., 6464-65, 6469 (April 30, 1936); Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1936. Cary apparently still hoped disarmament would work because he thought the United States should consider attending another naval meeting if one were held. Cong. Record, 74 Cong., 2 Sess., 6469 (April 30, 1936).


66 Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, March 15, 1936.
of a large Navy had "a touch of the easy-money mania," 67 Cary emphasized reductions in the original estimates of the amounts for the Naval Reserve, and in the number of appointments to Annapolis Naval Academy. 68

Few members of the House of Representatives were present when H. R. 12527 was considered, and the arguments used by those for and against the bill were similar to those employed in 1935. Opponents, including Congressmen Ernest Lundeen of Minnesota, Vito Marcantonio of New York, Verner W. Main of Michigan, Robert F. Rich of Pennsylvania, and Fred Biermann of Iowa, stressed the cost, their belief that the nation had entered the world naval race, and the improbability of invasion or attack. 69 During Cary's absence Congressman William B. Umstead became the chief defender of the measure. He was joined by Representatives John W. McCormack of Massachusetts and John A. Martin of Colorado, who noted the importance of preparedness, and by Everett Dirksen of Illinois, who argued that proper defense was vital to the nation's commerce. 70 Approved by President Roosevelt on June 3, 1936, the

---

68 Ibid., 6465, 6467 (April 30, 1936).
69 Ibid., 6472-74, 6478-82, 6486 (April 30, 1936).
70 Ibid., 6470, 6478, 6480, 6486 (April 30, 1936).
1937 Naval Appropriation Bill in its final form eliminated the House proposal for $5,000,000 to establish a reserve supply of strategic materials but increased a few other items through Senate proposals.71

**RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATIONS BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>1936</th>
<th>1937</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$27,342,000</td>
<td>$88,310,000</td>
<td>$115,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Machinery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$284,747,244</td>
<td>$457,786,261</td>
<td>$531,068,707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: House Report, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 335 (Serial 9775), 23; ibid., 74 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 746 (Serial 9887), 27-28; ibid., 2 Sess., No. 2548 (Serial 9993), 25.

Besides the bills he helped to prepare, Cary's other obligations as a member of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations included the inspection of naval facilities and recommendations for naval activities. The Representative visited the naval station at Key West, Florida, the Naval Reserve Armory at Jacksonville, Florida, and the Pensacola Naval Air Station in May of 1935. The following year he examined the west coast Marine Corps posts, navy yards, and flying fields.

---

71Ibid., 9228 (June 8, 1936); Conference Report, 74 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 2778 (Serial 9994), 3.
during a tour of the area. Cary served also on a board of visitors to the Naval Academy at Annapolis.\textsuperscript{72}

Having predicted diminishing expenditures for the Navy after the 1937 fiscal year, Cary was wrong in his assumption that the world situation would not alter the United States' naval build-up program. He anticipated an orderly expansion to treaty strength by 1942, not American involvement in another world war.\textsuperscript{73} But the Congressman was, in his own right, an expert on the needs of the Navy. He believed in the importance of an adequate Navy, and he endeavored to obtain it. Only illness and an untimely death forestalled his advancement as a statesman or a possible presidential naval advisor.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{72}Report of the Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs on the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, and on the Other Naval Activities in the State of Florida, 74th Cong., 2 Sess., No. 379, 1621-23; Owensboro Inquirer, July 12, 1935; Cong. Record, 74th Cong., 2 Sess., 713 (Jan. 15, 1936).
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{73}Cong. Record, 74th Cong., 2 Sess., 6468 (April 30, 1936).
\end{flushright}
EPILOGUE

The final year of Glover Cary's life was characterized by disappointment and political tension. His illness, which lingered from April until his death on December 5, 1936, thwarted his efforts to complete several pressing governmental tasks and prevented his campaigning actively in the 1936 election. Political foes Cary had acquired during the 1935 gubernatorial contest further complicated his bid for reelection and later even reappeared to block the selection of the Congressman's widow as his successor.1

Ill and somewhat embittered by political realities, Cary faced two adversaries in his quest for renomination by the Democratic party in 1936.2 Urged by no particular political faction, Rodney Whitlow, a resident of Todd County, sought the endorsement of the Democrats by promising to aid

1Owensboro Messenger, April 3, 1936; Henderson Sunday Gleaner and Journal, Dec. 6, 1936; Louisville Courier-Journal, Dec. 6, 1936.

2In the winter of 1935, Cary complained of the lack of appreciation for his service to his district and of the unfairness of being required to run for reelection every two years. House Doc., 75 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 354 (Serial 10124), 37-38.
the farmers and the miners and to extend electricity to all rural homes. The opponent who frightened Cary, however, was Lawrence Tanner, a Calhoun lawyer and the husband of Mrs. Glover Cary's cousin. Attempting to defeat a relative and former friend and a man who had assisted him professionally, Tanner first publicly criticized Cary during the 1935 gubernatorial race. Because he favored the election of Chandler, Tanner assailed Cary for his support of Tom Rhea and for his attack on former-Governor J. C. W. Beckham who backed Chandler. In addition, Tanner, who said that the Representative's "weasel words of praise to those who supported Roosevelt in 1932" would deceive no one, accused Cary of failure to uphold the program of the President. While advocating the production of inexpensive electricity through government agencies, the candidate charged Cary with being a member of a corporation and utilities law firm in Owensboro.

According to Tanner, the Congressman had not been

3Elkton Todd County Standard, April 30, 1936; Morgantown Green River Republican, July 16, 1936.
5Letter to the editor by Lawrence P. Tanner, Louisville Courier-Journal, July 18, 1935.
just to his constituents, and he was "doomed to retirement" unless he quickly changed his policies.  

Although Tanner was running without strong political backing, Cary was compelled to find a way to campaign despite his illness. Owensboro supporters of Cary, therefore, organized a twenty-five automobile motorcade which toured twelve counties of the Second Congressional District in two days. Because Cary was unable to participate himself, friends of the Congressman gave speeches emphasizing the candidate's experience, his support of President Roosevelt, his close personal connection with the President, and his efforts to aid farmers and laborers; and band concerts were provided for entertainment. Cary's overwhelming victory proved that his fears were unfounded. Winning 77.3 per cent of the votes cast in the 1936 Democratic primary, the Representative received 41,057 ballots to Whitlow's


7One possible reason for Cary's concern was that he would lose the seniority he had gained and the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations even if he were reelected at a later date. Joseph P. Chamberlain, Legislative Processes: National and State (New York, 1936), 54.

8Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, July 26, 1936; Hartford Ohio County News, July 31, 1936; Dixon Journal, July 31, 1936; Morgantown Green River Republican, July 30, 1936.
Whitlow carried his home county, but Tanner did not even receive half as many votes as Cary in McLean County.\textsuperscript{10}

In the general election in November, Cary was opposed by the Republican candidate Claude E. Smith, an Owensboro and Hartford attorney.\textsuperscript{11} Hospitalized and still unable to campaign, Cary issued a statement urging the voters to support Roosevelt.\textsuperscript{12} Otherwise, his campaign consisted of speeches made in his behalf by his son William, a member of the Cary, Miller, and Kirk law firm, and by Congressman Brent Spence.\textsuperscript{13} Cary, who was undoubtedly assisted by a state-wide Democratic victory for Roosevelt, won reelection to the Seventy-fifth Congress by obtaining 64 per cent of the votes.\textsuperscript{14}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{9}Jewell, Kentucky Votes, III, 37; Hartford Ohio County News, Aug. 7, 1936; Dixon Journal, Aug. 7, 1936.
\item \textsuperscript{10}Election returns, Todd County, Aug. 3, 1936; election returns, McLean County, Aug. 1, 1936.
\item \textsuperscript{11}Hartford Ohio County News, June 26, 1936.
\item \textsuperscript{12}Louisville Courier-Journal, Dec. 3, 1936; Owensboro Messenger, Oct. 28, 1936.
\item \textsuperscript{13}Owensboro Messenger, Oct. 29, 1936; Dixon Journal, Oct. 9, 1936.
\item \textsuperscript{14}Dixon Journal, Nov. 6, 1936; Shannon and McQuown, Presidential Politics, 115; Harrison, "Kentucky and the Presidential Elections," 325; Jewell, Kentucky Votes, III, 41; House Doc., 85 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 442 (Serial 12108), 569.
\end{itemize}
Glover Cary did not live to begin his new term in Congress. Although he had strived to secure a post-office in Greenville and had attempted to complete work on legislation while ill, the pneumonia which struck Cary in April prevented his introduction of the 1937 Naval Appropriation Bill to Congress and interrupted his participation in the hearings on the State, Justice, Labor and Commerce Supply Bill.\footnote{Owensboro Inquirer, April 2, 1936; Owensboro Messenger, April 3, 4, 1936; editorial, "The Fallen Leader," Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer, Dec. 6, 1936; Greenville Leader, May 8, 1936.} The Congressman never fully recovered, but his condition improved in May when he was visited in the Naval Hospital by the President and later in July when he was able to return home to Owensboro to rest.\footnote{William A. Stevens to A. D. Kirk, May 1, 1936, Kirk private file; Owensboro Inquirer, July 7, 1936.} However, in mid-August Cary was again hospitalized in Bethesda Hospital in Cincinnati, Ohio, where he died at 9:25 p.m. on December 5, 1936, following two operations for an abscess on the lung and the renewal of hemorrhages.\footnote{Henderson Sunday Cleaner and Journal, Dec. 6, 1936; Louisville Courier-Journal, Dec. 3, 6, 1936; House Doc., 75 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 354 (Serial 10124), 35; House Doc., 85 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 442 (Serial 12108), 669.} 

Friends of Cary mourned the loss of their still-youthful Representative, and tributes such as the following one from the Owensboro Messenger appeared.
The years hung lightly above his shoulders, but he had lived more than most men who attain the allotted threescore years and ten, for his life was one of deeds, not years; thoughts, not breaths; feelings, not figures on a dial.  

While flags on Capitol Hill in Washington flew at half-staff, funeral services for the Congressman were conducted by the Reverend Bedford Turner, pastor of the Settle Memorial Methodist Church in Owensboro. Many prominent governmental leaders, including the Sergeant at Arms of the House, Kenneth Romney, Senator Alben Barkley, and Representative Fred Vinson, attended what turned out to be one of the largest funerals ever held in that city. Interment, however, was in the cemetery in his place of birth, Calhoun.

Because of her financial need and the desire to fulfill Cary's plans, Mrs. Cary decided to try for the vacancy in Congress left by her husband. Many

---


19 Louisville Courier-Journal, Dec. 8, 1936; Owensboro Messenger, Dec. 8, 1936; Scottsville Allen County News, Dec. 9, 1936; interview with Miller and Hager, July 3, 1970; House Doc., 65 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 142 (Serial 12108), 669. Cary would probably have disapproved of such a large funeral. He had once said that all men were equal in death and that the memory of all men should be equally preserved. Cary, speech given at Woodman of the World meeting, Sosh private collection.

leading Democrats throughout the Second Congressional District and newspapers such as the Owensboro Messenger, the Central City Times-Argus, the Henderson Gleaner and Journal, the Dixon Journal, and the Providence Daily Enterprise supported Mrs. Cary. The party nominee for the vacancy was to be chosen at a Democratic district committee meeting composed of county chairmen. Since Governor Chandler could determine the time for the meeting, it was speculated that he might appoint a time when he believed control by the administration was possible. Although the leading contenders for the position were Beverly M. Vincent, Hubert Meredith, and Mrs. Cary, many supporters of the Congressman's widow soon realized that enough votes to obtain her nomination could not be gained, and they switched support to Vincent at the meeting held in Owensboro on February 11, 1937. In the general election in March, Vincent was unopposed.


22 Louisville Courier-Journal, Dec. 6, 1936; Scottsville Allen County News, Dec. 9, 1936.

and victorious, but Mrs. Cary received a few scattered write-in votes.24

Despite the untimely end of his life, Cary was, perhaps, the most fascinating political figure ever produced by his section of the state. He was, without doubt, a product of his times, and within that time structure he played many roles. Commencing his career in politics around the beginning of the twentieth century in a rural area of Kentucky, his attitudes seemed relatively untouched by the growing problems connected with industrialism and urbanization, but his manner of thought was in tune with the reform movement and the idealism which characterized the era.

While serving in various county offices and proving his ability in the field of law, Cary progressed steadily until he finally became a distinguished congressman. In that position he endeavored to improve substantially the district he represented and to assist the farmers and other victims of the Great Depression; however, his work in Congress was influenced, not only by practical approaches applied in the New Deal programs,

24 New York Times, March 3, 1937; interview with Vincent, Jan. 9, 1971; election returns, Daviess County, March 2, 1937; election returns, Allen County, March 2, 1937; election returns, Proceedings of the Simpson County Board of Election Commissioners, March 2, 1937. Mrs. Cary supported Vincent while he was in Congress, and in 1941 he suggested that she be appointed acting postmaster in Owensboro. Owensboro Inquirer, March 2, 1941.
but also by the cynicism and the fear present in the years immediately preceding World War II. The existence of dictatorships, totalitarianism, and aggression in the world greatly increased his responsibilities as chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, and in that capacity his ability was most evident. Although representing an inland area and having had no prior training in naval affairs, Cary rapidly became an expert on the requirements of an adequate Navy.

Throughout the state of Kentucky, though, the name Glover Cary is synonymous with the prototype of a politician from a bygone period: one whose whole life was governed by politics, one who spoke what he thought and what usually won him votes, one who mingled with the people and identified with them and with their problems, and, finally, one who created a measure of excitement wherever he went. Renowned as an orator, Cary traveled about the state speaking in behalf of such people as President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Tom Rhea, and Ruby Laffoon, and opposing President Herbert Hoover, the tariff, and Republicanism in general.

Cary was always popular within Democratic circles and in the general elections. He was seldom unopposed, but he knew no defeats, and his political victories were impressive. Although he continued to
be a towering figure within his party, Cary's opposition to A. B. "Happy" Chandler in the 1935 Democratic gubernatorial primary was probably his greatest political mistake and the source of much disappointment and disillusionment which seemed to surround the last year of his life.

Since death ended his career when he was only fifty-one years old, there has been much speculation about what he would have ultimately accomplished had he but lived a few years longer. Regardless, one must view his life for what it was while taking into account the immense energy and personal ambition required to accomplish so much in so short a time. He believed that the greatest achievement of anyone was that of doing something to better humanity; and, in contrast to his political aspirations, Glover Cary spent his life trying to improve situations for people he represented and with whom he came in contact.
CRITICAL ESSAY ON SOURCES

Government Documents

The outstanding portions of Cary's public career are traceable through government documents. A considerable amount of pertinent information is available in the records of Daviess, McLean, Hancock, Logan, Todd, Allen, and Simpson counties. The marriage record of John E. Cary and Mary H. Griffith, Sept. 9, 1839, Book A, Daviess County Court Clerk's Office, serves as an indicator of the time of arrival of Cary's grandfather into western Kentucky; and the extent of Cary's political popularity, along with the strengths of his opponents, is revealed in election returns found in the Proceedings of the County Board of Election Commissioners of Daviess Co., 1927, 1932, 1934, 1937; McLean Co., 1913, 1915, 1917, 1927, 1932, 1936; Hancock Co., 1927; Logan Co., 1932, 1934; Todd Co., 1932, 1934, 1936; Allen Co., 1934, 1937; and Simpson Co., 1937. Edmonson Circuit Court Records of June 22, 1909, provided confirmation of the date Cary passed the Kentucky bar examination.

The state documents of greatest value to this study were the Journals of the Kentucky House of
Representatives, 1914-1918, which contain a record of legislation proposed to the House by Cary. The Kentucky Acts of the General Assembly, 1906, 1914, 1916, were also referred to. Both sources were examined at the Kentucky Library, Western Kentucky University, and at the Kentucky State Archives, Frankfort. Of little significance was a publication by the Kentucky Department of Conservation, Division of Parks, entitled Audubon State Park and Museum (Frankfort, Ky., [n. d.]).

Extensive government documents dealing with Cary's service in Congress are available. The Congressional Record (1926, 1931-1937), vols. LXVII, LXXV-LXXXI, was the most important source of information on his interests and endeavors as Congressman. Supplementing the Congressional Record were several House Reports, subcommittee Hearings, and Conference Reports available at the Margaret I. King Library, University of Kentucky. Useful in the study of Cary's connection with the Mammoth Cave park movement were House Report, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 983 (Serial 9775), and "Creation and Revision of National Park Boundaries," House, Committee on Public Lands, Hearings on H. R. 4935, 73 Cong., 2 Sess. (1934). House Report, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1275 (Serial 9493), and House Report, 73 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 182 (Serial 9774), provided material on the bridge-building effort at Owensboro. A wealth of information about Cary's work on the Subcommittee on
Naval Appropriations was obtained from: House Report, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 335 (Serial 9775); House Report, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 746 (Serial 9887); House Report, 74 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 2548 (Serial 9993); "Naval Appropriations for 1936," House, Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, Hearings on H. R. 7672, 74 Cong., 1 Sess. (1935); and "Naval Appropriations for 1937," House, Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, Hearings on H. R. 12527, 74 Cong., 2 Sess. (1936). Conference Report, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1262 (Serial 9888), and Conference Report, 74 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 2778 (Serial 9994), were also helpful in studying naval appropriations for 1936 and 1937.

Of limited use were the following documents: House Report, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1635 (Serial 9493), and House Report, 72 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 742 (Serial 9492), concerning Cary's work on the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads; House Report, 74 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 457 (Serial 9886), about a proposal to establish a state park; House Report, 73 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 1414 (Serial 9776), which presented views of the members of the Subcommittee on Permanent Appropriations; the Report of the Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs on the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, and on Other Naval Activities in the State of Florida, 74 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 379; a reprint of a speech on H. R. 4795 given in Congress,
April 11, 1933, by Cary and located in the private collection of Mrs. Oswald H. Snyder, 1915 McCreary Ave., Owensboro, Ky.; and the U. S. Constitution.

Three other documents of the federal government supplied information of a more personal nature about the subject. The rolls of Daviess County and Clark County of the Fifth and Sixth Censuses of the United States (1830, 1840), which are on microfilm at the Owensboro Public Library, were employed to ascertain the place of residence of Cary's grandfather. Excellent general information about the Congressman is found in Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1961, House Doc., 85 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 442 (Serial 12108); and several contemporaries reflected upon their relationships with Cary in House Doc., 75 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 354 (Serial 10124), the memorial services held in Congress for Cary.

Newspapers

The most plentiful type of source material used for this study was the newspaper. The objectivity of many of the western Kentucky pro-Democratic newspapers between 1927 and 1936, those most frequently having reference to Cary, is questionable, but such publications were invaluable aids in determining sequences of events, significant political episodes, and the degree of rapport existent between the Congressman and his
constituents. A guide to the Louisville Courier-Journal and the New York Times Index were quite helpful in locating articles about the subject although other papers used offered no research tools.

The Owensboro Messenger (morning edition), the Owensboro Inquirer (evening edition), and the Owensboro Messenger and Inquirer (Sunday edition) came under common editorship in 1929 but were entitled differently until 1954 when the name of all three became the Messenger and Inquirer. Of the microfilmed files at the newspaper office which date back to 1877, those between Jan. 9, 1929, and March 2, 1941, supplied a great deal of information on Cary as Commonwealth's Attorney, his political career, and his work in Congress. Most articles tended to be favorable to the Representative.

Particularly helpful in studying the elections of 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1935, and in understanding Cary's stand on controversial issues was the Louisville Courier-Journal. Files between May 23, 1930, and April 10, 1937, were used at the Kentucky Library, although one article of July 20, 1947, was acquired from Mrs. Oswald H. Snyder. Located at the Henderson Public Library where incomplete files on microfilm date from 1900 to 1971, the Henderson Morning Gleaner (daily edition) and the Henderson Sunday Gleaner and Journal, Oct. 7, 1930-
Dec. 6, 1936, emphasized Cary's attitudes toward the tariff, taxation, and veterans' legislation.

Both the weekly Hartford Ohio County News, March 11, 1927-Dec. 11, 1936, and the daily Madisonville Messenger, April 9, 1932-Nov. 8, 1934, examined in their respective newspaper offices, contained news of Cary's advocacy of New Deal measures and his participation in elections. Also emphasizing political contests were: the Dixon Journal, Jan. 29, 1932-Dec. 18, 1936; the Elkton Todd County Standard, April 4, 1932-April 30, 1936; the Franklin Favorite, June 28, 1934-Nov. 28, 1935; the Greenville Leader, June 14, 1935-May 8, 1936; and the Scottsville Allen County News, Oct. 16, 1935-Dec. 9, 1936. All except the Dixon Journal, a weekly newspaper no longer in existence which was found in the office of the Providence Journal-Enterprise, were used at their place of publication.

Fire destroyed the files of the Calhoun McLean County News for the years covered by this study, but a few people retain individual copies. Issues of Aug. 12, 1921, Nov. 28, 1935, and Jan. 9, 1947, were acquired from Arthur Critser and Karl Kerrick. Also obtained from private sources, these newspapers were of limited value: the Calhoun Star, April 25, June 6, 1919; the Hartford Herald, Nov. 16, 1921; the Eddyville Lyon County Herald, Oct. 12, 1932; the Leitchfield Gazette, Oct. 30, 1931; the Central City Times-Argus, Dec. 11,
1936; and the Danville Advocate, an undated clipping in a scrapbook belonging to Mrs. Oswald H. Snyder. Another undated clipping, Henry J. Reilley, "Money for Navy Merely Fills Past Neglect," was, in addition, obtained from the Snyder private collection. Also used were the following: at the Kentucky Library, the Bowling Green Park City Daily News, Oct. 30, 1934-May 5, 1936; at the Margaret I. King Library, the Lexington Herald, Oct. 16, 1932, Nov. 7, 1934, and July 6, 1935; and at their respective newspaper offices, the Morgantown Green River Republican, 1936 issues; the Sturgis News, Sept. 12, 1935; and the Hopkinsville Daily Kentucky New Era, Jan. 14, 1935.

Out of state newspapers were of some help. The Evansville Courier, Aug. 9, 1932, provided an election account. Supplying information about Cary's service on the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations and his fatal illness were: the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1936; the Washington Herald, Feb. 18, April 4, 15, 1936; and the Washington Evening Star, April 30, 1936. Also of some value was the New York Times, April 9, 1930, Jan. 5, 1933, Feb. 13, March 3, 1937.

Interviews

Members of the family, friends, and associates of the Congressman were able to clarify many aspects of
his career, but, more importantly, they were able to reveal personality traits and convictions indiscernible from other sources. All interviews discussed below were conducted by the author. Cary's cousin, Mrs. J. S. Owens, interviewed on Oct. 14, 1970, and his daughter, Mrs. Oswald H. Snyder, interviewed on Jan. 4, 1971, shed some light on the family background. On Oct. 14, 1970, Mrs. James Epley, a childhood friend and classmate, described the Congressman's early life, and on Oct. 11, 1970, Mrs. Willie Muster, one of Cary's students, gave an account of his role as a teacher.

Especially helpful in relating Cary's entry into politics were: McLean County Court House employee, Sam Montgomery, interviewed on Jan. 3, 1971; a lifelong political ally, Arthur Critser, interviewed on July 1, 1970; and a member of the 1914 Kentucky General Assembly, Elmer Brown, interviewed on Aug. 27, 1970. Carl Ross, who spoke with the author on Oct. 1, 1970, was Cary's first law partner. His recollections of the Representative's earliest endeavors in the practice of law and of Cary's promotion of the building of a bridge between Calhoun and Rumsey were invaluable to this study. Interviewed on Sept. 21, 1971, John Rogers also contributed information about that bridge, which he had helped to construct.

Several individuals provided summaries of Cary's life and touched on his activities in Congress.
Journalist and National Democratic Committeeman Lawrence Hager, Sr., and law partner Wilber Miller supported Cary throughout his career as Congressman. Interviewed together on July 3, 1970, they contributed much general information about the subject. Glover Cary, Jr., interviewed on June 11, 1970, also explained some pertinent facts. Adding sidelights of Cary's personality were his law partner's wife, Mrs. A. D. Kirk, who was interviewed on July 12, 1970, and Ray Sanders, a postal employee, who was interviewed on July 21, 1970. Roscoe Downs, who later became editor of the Hancock County Clarion, worked in Washington, D. C. during Cary's service in Congress. On Aug. 10, 1970, he recounted meetings with the Congressman in the nation's capital. Elected to fill the vacancy in Congress left by Cary's death, Beverly M. Vincent, who was interviewed on Jan. 9, 1971, not only recalled his predecessor's function in the bridge-building effort at Owensboro and the circumstances of the project's completion, but he also supplied a few facts about his selection as Cary's successor. Also furnishing some information about the choice of Vincent for congressman were C. V. Watson, interviewed on July 22, 1970, and Mrs. Lucian Haynes, interviewed on Dec. 23, 1970.
Manuscripts

The private file of Mrs. A. D. Kirk, 1729 McCreary Ave., Owensboro, Ky., contains invaluable correspondence between Jan. 20, 1931, and May 1, 1936, either of, or about, Congressman Cary. Twenty-three letters dealing with congressional appointments and legislation were exchanged between Cary and his law partner, A. D. Kirk. Other letters used included: Glover Cary to J. D. Craddock, Sept. 26, 1930; Wilber Miller to Mary Hancock, July 12, 1935; Arch Coleman to Glover Cary, April 14, 1934; and William A. Stevens to A. D. Kirk, May 1, 1936. Mrs. Kirk also possesses a record book which Cary kept while teaching at Calhoun School, 1907-1908.

Next in importance to the Kirk private file were the Barkley Papers (Margaret I. King Library). The political files contained a few letters of some help: Francis Douglas to Thomas A. Combs, Aug. 3, 1932, enclosed in a letter from Thomas A. Combs to Senator Alben Barkley, Aug. 10, 1932; L. E. Whitler to officers and members of all Kentucky lodges of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Oct. 31, 1932; J. A. Franklin to officers and members of subordinate lodges of the International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders, Welders, and Helpers, Oct. 7, 1932; and Roy Horn to local unions...
of the International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers, Sept. 30, 1932. A paper listing the Kentucky delegates and alternates to the 1932 Democratic National Convention was also used.

The A. O. Stanley Papers (Margaret I. King Library) contain one piece of correspondence from Clover Cary to A. O. Stanley, July 2, 1930; and a letter from D. H. Kincheloe to Thomas R. Underwood, Dec. 15, 1926, which provides material on Cary's predecessor in Congress, is in the Thomas Rust Underwood Papers (Margaret I. King Library). A good summary of Cary's career was obtained from a letter from William A. Stevens, Cary's secretary in Washington, to the author, July 30, 1970. Essential to understanding Cary's views on law enforcement was an original paper written by the Congressman entitled "Crime and Its Punishment." Read to Owensboro's Investigator's Club on February 17, 1928, the essay is preserved in the Investigator's Club file (Owensboro Public Library). An undated speech given by Cary at a Woodman of the World meeting was found in the private collection of Bonnie Sosh, 539 Ewing Ct., Owensboro, Ky., but it was of limited use.
Minutes and Proceedings

Few records dealing with Cary's membership in various organizations are available. The Minutes of the Meetings of Owensboro's Investigator's Club, Sept. 17, 1926, Jan. 14, Dec. 16, 1927, Jan. 18, Dec. 20, 1929, Aug. 15, 1930, June 17, 1932, and Jan. 20, 1933, in the Investigator's Club file (Owensboro Public Library), indicate the dates of the Congressman's membership in that club and his particular studies for presentation to the group. Included with the minutes is a roster listing dates of attendance. The Memorial Services for Glover H. Cary, Proceedings of the Owensboro Bar Association, Jan. 4, 1937, contain a number of eulogies given by other members; however, the comments are favorable to Cary because of the very nature of the statements.

Articles

Only one article in a periodical dealt specifically with Cary; however, magazines and journals served as the major source of background information. "Glover H. Cary: Owensboro Second District," The Democratic Woman's Journal, VII (Oct. 1934), 7, was a short biographical sketch published during an election year for publicity purposes. Other articles touched on the politics of the era and the work of Congress.

A number of articles considered congressional problems or measures in which Cary took considerable interest. The tariff issue was treated in "Tariff, Politics and the 72d Congress," The Congressional Digest, 11 (March 1932), 65-66. Articles which discussed farm relief proposals were "The Month in Congress: Political Developments," ibid., 12 (Jan. 1933), 25-27, and "Progress


Several articles described naval needs and the build-up program of the 1930's. William H. Stanley, "Should the U. S. Navy Be Built Up to Treaty Strength?," The Congressional Quarterly, XIII (April 1934), 120, 122, presented arguments favoring a larger Navy; and Carl Vinson, "Provisions of the Vinson Navy Bill," The Congressional Digest, 13 (April 1934), 119, contended that adequate defense was possible through a big Navy. Other articles dealing with the condition of the Navy were: Frederick Hale, "How the U. S. Navy Stands Today," ibid., 118; Henry Roosevelt, "What Is an Adequate Navy?" Vital Speeches of the Day, II (Dec. 16,
Short biographical sketches of Cary are included in: William E. Connelley and E. M. Coulter, History of Kentucky (Chicago, 1922), 5 vols.; Albert Nelson Marquis, ed., Who's Who in America: A Biographical Dictionary of Notable Living Men and Women of the United States, 1936-37 (Chicago, 1936); and George Lee Willis, Sr., Kentucky Democracy: A History of the Party and Its Representative Members-Past and Present (Louisville, 1935), 3 vols. All three present background material with which to begin research, but Willis' work tends to be biased in favor of each individual discussed at length.

While they do not specifically mention Cary, several books describe political life in Kentucky during Cary's lifetime. An excellent general history is Thomas D. Clark, A History of Kentucky (Lexington, 1960), which discusses state elections of the period. Orval W. Baylor, J. Dan Talbott: Champion of Good Government: A Saga of Kentucky Politics from 1900 to 1942 (Louisville, 1942), emphasizes the political influence of Talbott, but in the process reveals much about the 1935 election of Chandler as Governor and


While he was in Congress, Cary advocated certain projects and types of legislation which are treated in books. Hugh O. Potter, Daviess County Sesquicentennial Historical Factbook (Owensboro, Ky., 1965), and William Foster Hayes, Sixty Years of Owensboro, 1883-1943 (Owensboro, Ky., [n. d.]) both explore Cary’s role in the bridge-building effort at Owensboro. Although it does not specifically mention


Unpublished Works, Speeches and Pamphlets

A number of unpublished materials, especially of a political nature, were useful. John Henry Hatcher, "Fred Vinson: Congressman from Kentucky" (doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1961), described the political atmosphere during the time Cary served in Congress. Valuable information concerning the election of 1932 was found in Bill Weaver, "The Campaign of 1932 and the New Deal Relief Program in Kentucky" (master's thesis, Western Kentucky College, 1964), and in the Democratic National Committee Speeches, 1932, Jouett Shouse Papers (Margaret I. King Library). A sketch of Glover Cary used for publicity purposes in the 1934 election was available in the Thomas Rust Underwood Papers (Margaret I. King Library); and a radio address, given July, 1935, by Cary over WHAS during the gubernatorial election campaign and located in the Snyder private collection explained the Congressman's views on candidates.
Of limited use were: a copy of a radio speech given July 30, 1932, by Franklin Roosevelt, located in the Barkley Papers; the attendance records of Centre College, 1902-04; "A History of the Investigator's Club," Investigator's Club file (Owensboro Public Library); an annual announcement of Calhoun College, 1898-99, Mrs. C. H. Smith private collection, Calhoun, Ky.; and a pamphlet located in the Kentucky Library entitled Audubon Memorial State Park.