

Congressional Record

SEVENTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

The Missing Stars

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUEY P. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

May 12, 1932

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I do not know how much of the cartoon I hold in my hand can be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I send to the desk a clipping taken from the Chicago Tribune to be printed with my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The picture could not be printed without an order from the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. LONG. I will ask, then, that it be held over for the time being. If the picture can not be printed, probably it would better be returned to me, so I can present it to the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. President, this is a sample of considerable publicity going on throughout the United States at this time, and which has been going on for several days, which is styled "The Real Issue in Washington," by the Chicago Tribune of Patriotism versus Communism, with the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] caricatured to represent the high and lofty ideals of "patriotism," and picturing me as representing the communistic idea of government in the United States, carrying a red flag.

The picture does not do justice to the leader on this side of the Chamber, and I am going to ask leave of the Chair to supplement it. I will now state that before rising this afternoon I called the office of the senior Senator from Arkansas, as I have done several times throughout the day, and my friend the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] called for a quorum, and I have again asked that the presence of the Senator from Arkansas be secured, but I regret that he is not here, as he was not the other day. However, I do not feel that, in justice to myself, I should withhold further some answer to this propaganda.

The flag under which the Senator from Arkansas is pictured by the Chicago Tribune has only the stripes, the white and the red. Under it in his hand is a placard containing the words "Jos. T. ROBINSON, Democratic leader of the Senate."

The flag which I am supposed to be holding under this inscription or designation is a genuinely colored red flag only, with a placard on my supposed-to-be breast reading, "HUEY LONG, new Senate radical."

In this cartoon, underneath, on the ground, we find tablets or inscriptions, one labeled "Confiscate Property," another labeled "Raise Taxes," another labeled "Soak the Rich," and another labeled "Soviet Doctrines."

I will not undertake to dispute the designation given to me, but I do wish to complete the designation of the Senator from Arkansas. The flag under which he stands, as I said, contains merely the stripes, and to have done the leader of this side of the Chamber justice, he was entitled to a flag with 48 stars, and those stars are omitted. He was entitled to the stars denoting his achievements, stars denoting his work, stars denoting his study, stars denoting his affiliations.

AN UNACCEPTABLE LEADERSHIP

I find, Mr. President, that the Senator in a public advertisement of himself has provided 43 stars for this flag, leaving only 5 to be supplied, and I have ransacked such modern and ancient volumes of American public life as I could to supply the remaining 5 stars not contained here.

The 43 stars which might well be placed at the masthead of this flag can be gleaned from the advertisement of the law firm of Robinson, House & Moses, wherein we find, as I offered it in the Senate, that if I accept any leadership on this side of the Chamber I will accept the leadership of an attorney for the firm of Henry L. Doherty & Co.; that if I accept any leadership on this side of the Chamber, I will accept an attorney of the Texas Co., a branch of the Standard Oil Co.; that if I accept any leadership on this side of the Chamber, I will accept an attorney of the Power Trust, designated by a number of varied and well-known branches in this country; that if I accept any leadership on this side of the Chamber and seek committees from the leader on this side of the Senate, I will make my petition to an attorney of the chain-store system of the United States, as is represented in his public advertisement; that if I recognize that leadership as my party leadership and make my solicitations and carry my coals to Newcastle, I will petition and humbly submit to the attorney of the life-insurance concerns of this country, of the chain banks, to every chain interest, to every chain-investment interest, to every Oil Trust interest, to every nefarious interest known to this country to-day, as represented by the published advertisement of the distinguished Senator from the State of Arkansas.

It may, Mr. President, be communism for me not to accept that as being a proper sphere and location for my activities. But, I did not do it in the little State of Louisiana, from which I hail. I did not do it in the parish of Winn, of the State of Louisiana, when I lived there; and, as large as the United States Senate may be, it is not yet big enough that I have, by humble petition, to beg favors of the chain-store attorneys who sit in the United States Senate, and of the power-trust attorneys who sit in the United States Senate, and the investment-trust attorneys who sit in the United States Senate, despite whatever recognition they are given by the party of which I am still, and will remain, I hope, a member, and out of which I do not think I can be read by the metropolitan press.

TO BE FOR THE PEOPLE IS NOT TO BE READ OUT OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

The only way they can read me out of the Democratic Party is to beat me down in the State of Louisiana in the Democratic Party, and that has been tried one or two times and can be tried again whenever they see fit. We will have another trial about it before very long down in that section of the country, I hope. So that if the metropolitan press issue, as tendered here by cartoons similar to that appearing in the Chicago Tribune are to be an index, they will have a court before which they can make their plea.

Everybody has not been deceived by this.

But I must complete the flag. There are only 43 stars in the flag, and I ask again that there be incorporated as part of my remarks the extract from the Martindale Legal Directory of 1930, which I submitted before, so that I may complete the 43 stars.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Extract from Martindale's Directory, 1930]

Robinson, House & Moses: J. T. R., '72 '94 a v 1 g U. S. Sen.; J. W. H., jr., '88 '11 a v 1 g; C. H. M., '87 '10 a v 1 g. Associates: Harry E. Meek; W. H. Holmes; J. F. McClerkin; Raymond Roddy; Frank Bird.

Attorneys for: Arkansas Power & Light Co.; Louisiana Power & Light Co.; Mississippi Power & Light Co.; Southern Power & Light Co.; Southern Ice & Utilities Co.; Little Rock Gas & Fuel Co.; Southwest Dairies Products Co.; Southwest Ice & Cold Storage Co.; Southwest Joint Stock Land Bank; Pioneer Reserve Life Insurance Co.; Southwest Telephone; Graysonia, Nashville & Ash-down Railway; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co.; Hollenberg Music Co.; Arkansas Portland Cement Co.; Terminal Warehouse Co.; The Texas Co.; Twin City Bank; Guaranty Savings & Loan Co.; The Gus Blass Co.; Kempner Realty Co.; American Building & Loan Association; Boyle-Farrell Land Co.; Cox Cash Stores Co.; Equitable Surety Co.; Associated Employers Liability Co.; Columbian Mutual Life; Southern Surety Co.; Marion Hotel; Lafayette Hotel; Capital Hotel; Merchants Transfer & Storage Co.; Arkansas Transfer Co.; Union Bond & Mortgage Co.; Southern Securities Co.; Southern Mutual Savings Co.; Southern Investors (Inc.); Smith Arkansas Traveller Co.; City Delivery Co.; H. L. Doherty & Co.; Charles E. Gibson & Sons (Inc.); American Surety Co.; Ocean Insurance Co.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, there are five more stars belonging to the Senator from Arkansas. I read in the paper to-day, and I read yesterday, that the Democratic Party, seeking through Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, correlated with other Democrats, including the Senator from Arkansas, have certain designs in mind.

The Hon. Bernard Baruch has now and again ventured forth as the shining torchbearing satellite of Democracy, with certain advocacies to be espoused here in the United States Senate through the leadership of the Senator from Arkansas.

THE TWIN-BED MATES

Who is this Barney Baruch? You can not feed him to the Democratic Party, because we will not have him, nor can the leader of the Democratic Party in this Senate accept him for the Democratic Party of the Nation. He is the right-hand, twin-bed mate of Hooverism in this country. [Laughter.] Everything that Hoover represents is represented by Baruch. He is supposed to have been engaged in the banking business in New York City. Maybe he was. It was not exactly a banking business, but some kind of a stock-market and bucket-shop operation carried on up in that country, legitimate under the law. He never was in any bank that I could find out anything about in modern days. But to Barney Baruch was sent one Eugene Meyer. Eugene Meyer and Baruch operated a certain investment stock marketing racketeering enterprise up in New York City [laughter], one of whom is supposed to be in control of the financial side of the Democratic Party, the other of whom is supposed to be in partnership and in charge of the financial side of the Republican Party. Mr. Eugene Meyer, Mr. Barney Baruch's partner, has been by Mr. Herbert Hoover made the president or chairman of the board of governors of the Federal reserve system of the United States and is to-day the chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

HOOVER'S TWO FOGHORNS

Here one day we hear something is coming from Hoover and the next day something is coming from ROBINSON; one day something is coming from Baruch and the next day something is coming from Meyer, one over here and one over there, and any kind of an analysis will convince any person who makes any study whatever that as we sit here in the United States Senate with Hooverism spouting through the two foghorns, Baruch on the one hand and Meyer on the other, ROBINSON on the left and somebody else on the right, it is like the old patent-medicine salesman that came through my country selling two brands of patent medicine. One of them he called "high pop-a-lorum" and the other he called "low pop-a-hirum." That is the only difference that can be found in what is coming out now from the leadership on the Democratic side here under the

121700--8269

distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, akin in brand, akin in kind, alike in purpose and intent and in results—the same as Hoover has proposed and does propose, the same as is proposed by the wise in the realms of high finance. The only difference is the name, and they are actually erasing or consolidating the names to where now it comes from but one realm.

THE FORTY-FOURTH STAR

So that other star, the forty-fourth star in the diadem—for the Senator from Arkansas should have, "Bring forth the royal diadem, and crown him lord of all"—the forty-fourth star in the diadem of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that should be depicted on the engraving of the celebrated metropolitan press would be his partnership in the present conditions with Herbert Hoover and what Hooverism represents and calls for in this country.

To that flag add another star—"starvation for the masses"—and give him the forty-fifth star. For the forty-sixth star add "pestilence to the country," and then for the next two stars let "misery" and "unemployment" for this country fill out the forty-seventh and forty-eighth stars to the flag that has only stripes; otherwise, if we leave only the stripes, it might be insinuated that the leader on this side of the Chamber—an insinuation not justified—was like unto the zebra in talent rather than representing entire patriotic groups.

But this is not entirely leaving the people beguiled in the United States. The people are not so fooled about this thing as the press may think. I say to my colleagues in the Senate the rabble and humdrum and thumping that may be heard in the newspapers is not appealing to the people of the United States and it is not appealing to the people of the State of Arkansas. I hold in my hand a little message sent out by the Associated Press from Little Rock, Ark. I knew nothing of it until I happened to run across the clipping. It was not in any of the papers of Washington that I saw.

It seems that on the 2d day of May, in Little Rock, Ark., a mass meeting was held. I have forgotten what time it was I spoke when the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] responded. Yes; I remember now that it was on the 29th of April. But on the 2d day of May there was a political mass meeting held in Little Rock, Ark., and I have the report given in the Associated Press about that mass meeting. A resolution was adopted in the home town of the senior Senator from Arkansas, the leader on this side of the Chamber. If the Senate will pardon my seeming immodesty in reading this resolution, I want to read it to the Senate.

TO HUEY P. LONG:

We, as citizens of Arkansas, assembled in a mass meeting at the city park, Little Rock, wish to commend you for your attacks on the Republican Senator from Arkansas, JOSEPH T. ROBINSON. Yoke ROBINSON and Hoover together and let them go down Salt Creek to political oblivion and you will rid the Nation of two of its greatest menaces. Keep the good fight up.

It was adopted, so the Associated Press said, with one dissenting vote.

In the city of Chicago, the home of the Chicago Tribune, there has not been any such unanimity for the Tribune as might have been expected. I send to the desk and ask to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a resolution unanimously adopted by the Chicago Federation of Labor showing that so far as we are being told there is no particular unanimity or feeling anywhere except it be that the people realize that in the tax bill now before the Senate something should be done to cut down the swollen fortunes of the country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the printing of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit A.)

REDUCE SWOLLEN FORTUNES

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, what have I advocated on this side of the Senate? What have I said that could be expected to by anyone? My resignation from committees, I

think, was such an act as would have been done by any man on either side of the Chamber. I asked the leader on this side of the Chamber for certain committee assignments, and he gave me those assignments as I had requested them.

The time came when, from what I saw and from what I heard, I could no longer go along and recognize him as my leader, and the least honorable thing which I could do was to tender back the assignments I had requested, such as has been done in my political lifetime by many men whom I have similarly honored and who found they did not care to go along further in an organization of which I was the head.

I advocated nothing which I did not think could have been accepted by the Senator from Arkansas. He said, however, that it was so contrary to his purpose, so contrary to his understanding of propriety that he could not allow the tax bill to be used for the purpose of limiting the fortunes of this country; that at any time the Democratic Party ever championed any such thing as that they would have a new leader. He has fallen into the category against which we were warned by a publication in this country in 1921. I want to read from an editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post on October 2, 1921, about six or seven lines. The title of this editorial is "Lost Leaders." I skip two or three paragraphs and I read the following:

There is a real pathos about a certain class of politicians to be found in every world capital. These are the men who are almost great but who have definitely missed greatness by a gap that is narrow, yet unbridgeable. They are public servants of marked and acknowledged ability.

In public life, as in the professions, the men most to be pitied are those second-raters whose inborn talents would have made them first-raters if they could have mustered a little more courage, a little sterner devotion to principle, a sense of duty a little higher; if they could have lost their heads at the right time and refused to play it safe; if, in short, they could have brought themselves to pay the price that the truest success exacts even of genius itself.

WILL NOT BE RUN OUT

The great trouble, as pointed out by this article, in this Senate and in every other legislative body in the country in America to-day and probably in all the foreign countries, is that the humdrum and the claptrap, the power of the press, has been so elusive and so evasive in stating rightly the real purposes and needs of the American people, that a corn cob and a lightning bug will run the ordinary man out. I do not propose to be run out by this corn cob and lightning bug display that is made in defense of the Senator from Arkansas at this time. I have not advocated anything, Mr. President, that is not advocated by practically everybody else either in private or in public. I have not said anything that is not necessary for this country. I see the tax bill has been reported. We read in the public press that the President of the United States rebuked the committee and ordered them to come on in with the bill. We read in the public press that one day the surtaxes were raised up to 55 per cent, but that the next day the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Ogden L. Mills, recommended that they be cut down to 45 per cent; and accordingly the surtaxes, as I understand from the public press, though I have not had the time as yet to read the draft of the bill itself, were finally cut down to 45 per cent instead of 55 per cent to benefit wealth.

I had proposed a resolution which still lies here, on which there has never been a vote. I had proposed a resolution, coupled with amendments which I had offered to the tax bill, by which the fortune of every living man that could be inherited by any one child should not exceed \$5,000,000; that no man could grant an inheritance to one child in excess of \$5,000,000—not that he could not transmit more money than \$5,000,000, but that no one person could inherit more than \$5,000,000 exclusive of taxes. That was the amendment that I sought by the resolution to have sent as an instruction to the Finance Committee—that as to an inheritance no one person could inherit more than \$5,000,000.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] said that was confiscation of property, but in the next breath

he said that it was not confiscation of property, but that it was a matter of inheritance which could either be withheld or which could be granted by the State—evidently showing that in his own mind he had sufficient legal training out of which he could find that this was not a confiscation but a mere regulation of the right of descent and inheritance to impose by law.

I next proposed that no one man should have an income in excess of \$1,000,000 a year; that that only meant that the annual income of no man should be more than \$1,000,000 a year; and that has been advertised as a highly socialistic proposition, a terribly communistic proposal. It must be so in the mind of the Senator from Arkansas.

EVIL INFLUENCES

Talleyrand tells us that it is difficult for one to see the evil of the way by which he profits. The Bible tells us that wherever a man's treasure is there is his heart also, and I say to the Senators on this side of the Chamber that when a man comes into the United States Senate without enough clients as a lawyer to make a corporal's guard and winds up representing every big corporate interest in this country—if that does not mean something, what does? Why do they not hire me? I have tried lawsuits in Arkansas, and have never lost one there in my lifetime. I am not asking for law business, but I should like to have something like that attached to my name, if I could. Why do they not hire some one else? Why is it that this monstrous practice has grown around this man since he is supposed to be representing the common people's interests in this country? Is he going to sit here and tell the people back home that this thing is an accident? How many of them are going to believe it? Why is it, except that he be the leader of the Democratic Party in the United States Senate? He has no clients, but when he becomes the leader of the people's party in the United States Senate he represents every nefarious corporate interest on the living face of the globe? You do not have to eat a whole beef to tell that it is tainted. Where do the clients come from?

Men sit around here in the United States Senate and in Congress and try to tell somebody, "Oh, no, the mere fact that this man represents the Standard Oil Co. or rather the Texas Co., which is a coworking ally of the Standard Oil Co., that will not affect his vote in the United States Senate; oh, no. The mere fact that as a lawyer he represents the chain store companies, that will not affect him in the United States Senate; oh, no; not a bit."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator is violating Rule XIX of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana will take his seat.

Mr. LONG resumed his seat.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is now in order to make a motion that the Senator from Louisiana be allowed to proceed in order if any Senator desires to make that motion.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator himself can not make that motion. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to the pending bank bill.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I can not sit idly by and see a Senator compelled to remain in his seat, no matter what my own individual opinion may be respecting his attitude or his beliefs. Therefore I move that the Senator from Louisiana be permitted to proceed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In order?

Mr. BLAINE. In order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana asks for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask what is the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is that the Senator from Louisiana be permitted to proceed in order.

Mr. WATSON. In order. I wanted to have the motion understood.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a second to the demand for the yeas and nays?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TRAMMELL. The motion means that, if agreed to, the Senator will be permitted to continue his address if he confines himself to the rules of the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; if he confines himself to the rules of the Senate.

Mr. TRAMMELL. And does not breach the parliamentary rules with regard to statements relative to another Senator?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I should like to know just wherein the Senator did violate the rule and what rule was violated. I was not paying close attention to what the Senator said, but I should like to know what we are voting on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read paragraph 2 of Rule XIX.

The legislative clerk read paragraph 2 of Rule XIX, as follows:

No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana demands the yeas and nays on the motion that the Senator from Louisiana may be permitted to proceed in order. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, that I may not contravene the rule of the Senate again, as the Chair sees it, I should like to have read the particular statement to which the Senator from Pennsylvania excepts. Being new in the body, I naturally want to comply with the rules and I want to find out what it is to which exception is taken. I should like to have that portion of what I said read, if the Senator does not mind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reporter will read the statement made by the Senator from Louisiana.

The Official Reporter (James W. Murphy) read as follows:

Men sit around here in the United States Senate and in Congress and try to tell somebody, "Oh, no; the mere fact that this man represents the Standard Oil Co. or, rather, the Texas Co., which is a cowering ally of the Standard Oil Co., that will not affect his vote in the United States Senate; oh, no. The mere fact that as a lawyer he represents the chain-store companies, that will not affect him in the United States Senate; oh, no; not a bit."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am undertaking to find out from the Senator from Pennsylvania just what he excepts to, because I do not want to make the mistake again.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. REED. It seems to me that the Senator's remarks were capable of no interpretation but that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] would be influenced in his vote by the fact that his firm had been retained by the companies the Senator mentioned.

Mr. LONG. I said, "Oh, no." [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. There must be no demonstration of any kind in the galleries.

Mr. REED. The Senator's words and the Senator's manner combined clearly reflected upon the motives and the integrity of the Senator from Arkansas.

CORPORATE AFFILIATIONS SHOULD NOT INFLUENCE VOTES

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I think it is due me that I say further that the language does not import that. Not the sound of the voice, but if the words themselves would carry that impression, I certainly would say that it would probably be a violation of the essence of the rules of the Senate; but, on the contrary, I was undertaking to say, and I thought I had said, and it is due me, I think, and due the Senator from Pennsylvania that I should say that if every interest affected by this surtax amendment might be represented by

121700—8269

the distinguished Senator from Arkansas it should not and would not influence his vote; and the Democratic Party, for whom I am a spokesman—and that right can not be taken from me, because I am going to speak for it—is not influenced by the fact that its leader in the Senate represents the Oil Trust and the Banking Trust and the Tobacco Trust and the Chain Store Trust, including the Power Trust. I think I have made myself clear.

Branching, however, from that subject, feeling that I have explained it, Talleyrand says it is difficult for a man to see the evil of the way by which he profits. That is what Talleyrand says. So I warn myself—if there are to be any motives to be impugned I impugn my own—that I should be careful in whatsoever I accept so that I, with a conscience frail, with a mentality subnormal, with a physique which can not resist, may preserve myself as national committeeman of the Democratic Party against unfortunate associations and always and at all times understand that my weaknesses are not weaknesses of my fellow men, including men sitting in the United States Senate.

THE BLACK SUNRISE

I have not undertaken to persecute the rich, but, on the contrary, I have sought to favor them. Their policy is to load the top until the bottom caves in. They are the everyday working partners of communism; they are leaving to the American people to-day only one of two choices—distress and impoverishment on the one hand or overloaded plutocracy on the other. They are powerful with their wealth, and I believe their wealth means their peril. There is a black sunrise awaiting that situation. I am not the only one who sees it in that way. Here is a book just out called "The Epic of America," written by an author whom I have never seen. I want to read you a quotation found in that book from the Wall Street Journal, something which in this situation is not going to be allowed to be said now:

Yet more menacing was the concentration of power proceeding in the banking world, which even the conservative, capitalistic Wall Street Journal described in 1903 as "not merely a normal growth, but concentration that comes from combination, consolidation, and other methods employed to secure monopolistic power. Not only this, but this concentration has not been along the lines of commercial banking. The great banks of concentration are in close alliance with financial interests intimately connected with promotion of immense enterprises, many of them being largely speculative."

I read further—and here is a statement that has not been disputed—

Mr. REED moved toward the door of the Chamber.

Mr. LONG. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will not leave, because I want him to keep me within the rules of the Senate if I depart from them.

Mr. REED. I will.

Mr. LONG. The quotation I was about to read is as follows:

The members of the Morgan and Rockefeller groups together held 341 directorships in 112 banks, railroads, insurance, and other corporations, having aggregate resources under their control of \$22,245,000,000. In an after-dinner speech one of the group made the tactical mistake of declaring that it had been said that the business of the United States was then controlled by 12 men, of whom he was 1, and that the statement was true. This remark, made among friends, was deleted from the printed report of the speech when given to the public, but the public was well enough aware of the general situation without such admission.

I will read about two more lines from this book.

After having quoted from the realms of master finance itself, and after having taken particular pains to say that no man representing those interests would be influenced by them in his vote here, I want again to say that if there be anyone here in the United States employed by the Power Trust or by the Oil Trust or by the Banking Trust or by the Chain Store Trust or by other affiliated combines of bloated plutocratic interests, if there be anyone else here present who represents all or some or one of those interests, I want now to disclaim that I have the slightest motive of saying, or that in my heart I believe, that such a man could to the slightest degree be influenced in any vote which he casts in this body by the fact that that association might mean hun-

dreds of thousands and millions of dollars to him in the way of lucrative fees. [Laughter.]

Now, I am reading from the same book again:

While we were willing to stretch economic change to the breaking point—

Am I still within the rules?

Mr. REED. I will tell the Senator when he breaks them. Mr. LONG. I want to say, Mr. President, that it is not often that men trained as I have been have the opportunity of choosing, by personal selection, such eminent guides as I have the right to choose in this instance, which I most highly appreciate.

I am reading from this book again:

While we were willing to stretch economic change to the breaking point, we were unwilling—or those at the head of our great economic enterprises were unwilling—to alter in the slightest our social and political arrangements to correspond with the new economic ones.

If the American dream is to come true and to abide with us, it will, at bottom, depend on the people themselves. If we are to achieve a richer and fuller life for all, they have got to know what such an achievement implies. In a modern industrial State, an economic base is essential for all. We point with pride to our "national income," but the nation is only an aggregate of individual men and women, and when we turn from the single figure of total income to the incomes of individuals, we find a very marked injustice in its distribution. There is no reason why wealth, which is a social product, should not be more equitably controlled and distributed in the interests of society.

This is a book that has the stamp of approval of a large body of political commentators among the American people to-day. I have advocated no more than this.

I want to read one more line, and then my reading is through, from another modern book, published by a former operator of a banking house in New York City. This man is named Mr. Lawrence Dennis, formerly a member of the United States Diplomatic Service, and connected with J. & W. Seligman & Co., of New York City. He says this:

Analysis of the absurdity of compound interest over a long period shows why large sums can not go on compounding indefinitely. It shows further why a concentration of wealth in the hands of a few people, yielding them an income in excess of their consumptive needs, constitutes a mathematical as well as an economic absurdity, which reason abhors and events conspire to terminate. The rich, as a class, who try to grow richer by the play of compound interest present exactly the same phenomena as the one cent after a few hundred years of compounding.

NOT A LONE WOLF

So that I am apparently not alone, in the minds of the political economy writers of this country, in regard to the necessity for having a more equal distribution of the profits of this land and the wealth which we have already accumulated.

WHY FIGHT AGAINST LIMITING INCOME TO NOT OVER \$1,000,000 PER YEAR?

But the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] some days ago, when I proposed my resolution to limit the income of every man to not more than \$1,000,000 a year, arose on this floor and said that there was not any need of that kind of legislation; that if the Finance Committee went along as it was then going there would not be anybody in the United States earning \$1,000,000 a year. That was the remark of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania at the time.

All right. Then I ask him now, if under the chaotic conditions of the Government and society, if under what the Finance Committee is going to bring in here, or has already brought in here, there is not going to be anybody earning more than \$1,000,000 a year anyway, what is the reason for opposing a tax to prevent the income of any one man from being above \$1,000,000 a year? Nobody is going to be hurt. If he can not make more than \$1,000,000 a year under the present system, as apparently is the case under what is supposed to have come out of the Finance Committee, what is the reason for opposing a limitation in the income-tax schedule that will limit incomes in this country to \$1,000,000 apiece? Why oppose it? And what is anyone going to do with more than \$1,000,000 if he does make more

than \$1,000,000 in a year? Why should there be opposition to it?

I did not understand any remarks to come from the Senator about inheritances at that time; but why oppose a limitation on inheritances in the amount of \$5,000,000 to a person if it is not going seriously to affect the fortune of anyone that these statutes are supposed to regulate? What would be the harm? I see none—none at all.

REMAINING A REAL DEMOCRAT

I understand, Mr. President, that the newspaper from which I have sent up this political cartoon, if you call it that, and others of its kind, have taken occasion to say that I have read myself out of the Democratic Party.

I have not read myself out of any party. I came up as a Democrat properly through birth. I have always been such since. I do not suppose there is any party loyalty much above the party loyalty that we inherit down in my part of the country or in any other part of the country. I believe in the Democratic principles of Jackson and of Jefferson and of Bryan. I believe in the Democratic principles; but when William Jennings Bryan, the torchbearer of our Democracy in three separate political campaigns, said that we had allowed the Supreme Court of the United States to be loaded down with lawyers representing the wealthy and big interests of this country, and that if we allowed the courts to be loaded down with attorneys representing these interests we could not expect anything whatever except the line of jurisprudence that was going to mean wiping out whatever safeguards the law had ever given to the people, I say now in the Senate that I am still for that kind of leadership.

FOR A PEOPLE'S LEADERSHIP

I am for leadership of the Bryan type, the Jackson type, and the Jefferson type. I am for everything that has ever been made a cardinal principle of the Democracy of this country, and I intend so to remain. But, Mr. President, whenever I am caricatured by a Republican press—the Chicago Tribune and others of its kind—I am reminded that for a number of years through the publications and inciting of that nefarious paper they undertook to create race riots in the South. They undertook to set the black race in infuriated rebellion at times, when we were doing everything we could possibly do in that country to educate them and to eradicate the condition of illiteracy. They undertook by that spurious and designed propaganda to create race strife in the South, and finally the creation which they did so much to develop broke out in the city of Chicago and in East St. Louis. The hundreds and thousands of lives that were destroyed and blotted out in those race riots in the State of Illinois, in East St. Louis and in Chicago, owe their beginning and their incipency and their encouragement and everything that happened to the fusillades and publications of this sheet, of this nefarious publication that undertakes now to put under the flag of communism any man in the United States who advocates a redistribution, or rather a fair sharing, of the profits of this land.

DEMOCRATS WILL BE DEMOCRATIC

I want to say further that the Democratic Party in the United States and in the convention to be assembled in Chicago in the coming month is not going to nominate anybody for President of the United States who advocates the type of doctrine that is now advocated by the Senator from the State of Arkansas. The Democratic Party is hearing from the people of the United States. The delegates to the Democratic convention are renouncing the leadership of Baruchism and of Morganism; and I might go a little bit further and cover one or two more that it is renouncing. [Laughter.]

UNRECOGNIZED

The Democratic Party is not going to be bound or tied. I may have to sit here and recognize the distinguished Senator as my leader in the democracy or not be recognized as a true working Democrat on this side of the Chamber. I may have to do that; but I will certainly be perfectly willing to have this side of the Chamber consider me not in the Democratic

working party if you see it that way. That is solely up to you [pointing to the Democratic side]. It does not make any difference to me. I can sit here on the floor of the Senate, I hope, and be a committee of one. [Laughter.] I hope I can sit here as long as I am backed by the great State of Louisiana.

I may not at all times suit all the Democracy of that State, but I am going to remain on this side of the Chamber, propounding what I conceive and what Bryan conceived and what Jackson conceived and what Jefferson thought to be the ideals of the Democratic Party. I am not going to sit here and accept as my leadership in any party in this country, in the United States or in any other place, the leadership that tells you that it is communism when you undertake to give a fair distribution of the profits of this land to the people. I am not going to sit here when the leader on this side of the Chamber makes his various and sundry concessions, or when Hoover makes his various and sundry concessions, when they come out under one banner and one shining emblem, and regardless of how bright it shines and how much publication ink is spread to give it a glow, notwithstanding it all, it represents a banner of pestilence and starvation. It represents human misery. It represents unemployment. It represents a demoralization that has begun at the bottom and gradually worked itself up to where it is now threatening the very existence of the top. I am not going to sit here and recognize that condition as my part of the Hoover wreckage that has been done.

Here we get these messages that come from the White House. "Mr. Hoover speaks." He administers a "verbal spanking" to the Democrats and the Republicans. The public press plays up that the President of the United States has rebuked them, has delivered a verbal spanking, has demanded that they get up and do something, has demanded that they must get up and save the country.

HOOVER RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL

If there is anybody who is responsible for the country not having been saved, it is nobody but the President of the United States. Congress has done everything he tells them to do. He has had his way. He has had his boards, he has had his commissions, he has had his appropriations. I do not know a thing that has been done in the Congress that has not been done at the request, practically, or with the approval, of the President of the United States, since I have been here. I know of nothing he has requested of Congress that has not been done. We have, without knowing what it was all about, done these things. One night I received a telegram, "I have to declare a moratorium," and I did not know what "moratorium" meant. [Laughter.] I had to go look it up. I had never heard of it. I thought he was talking about a dead man. [Laughter.]

He said he had to declare a moratorium, and I acquiesced, without knowing what it meant, spurred on by the kind of leadership which I thought was the best we could get. I wired back, "It is all right with me; slap it in." Then there was some other bill, and I was for it. I was for anything under the sun, because we were in the midst of chaos, my friends were starving, my people were homeless, some of them were hungry, many of them were naked, and I was willing to give the President of the United States any kind of leeway on earth to prevent pestilence and starvation among the people of this land. I was told that was the thing to do, and I accepted it from the leadership of this side of the Chamber, and went right down the line with it.

What has been the result? We have gone down and down and down until what little prosperity there was left in this land at the time we declared the moratorium has been gradually wiped out.

Oh, he can get his appropriations. He can demand billions of dollars for the European powers. He can demand billions of dollars for the banking interests and for the railroad interests and for the power interests. I am sure they are not going to be left out under the benevolent guidance of this administration.

121700—8269

ALAS FOR THE PEOPLE

He can demand and he can receive, but whenever there has come up a proposition that we ought to begin at the top and reorganize this condition of society so that it can stand upon a firm foundation and exist along stable lines, we not only have the opposition that comes from the Republican side, but we have the coworking alignment which seems to spring up on the part of the leadership on the Democratic side of the Chamber.

Mr. President, I am not accepting the dictation or the verbal spankings that come here from the White House, and while I have been nominated by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for the leadership of the Democratic side of this Chamber, which, in my opinion, I have never sponsored and do not intend to sponsor, I will say one thing: That if the President of the United States, after I had been up to the White House and asked the President for orders, and we had gotten together and had put things across as he wanted them, if he were to send me the kind of message he has sent to Congress, I would tell him where he could go — with the next bill. No; I did not say what you thought at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. Mills comes in with his recommendations. What are we going to do with the tax bill? Mr. Mills says that it is very important that we should have certain provisions in the tax bill. He is very solicitous that we must not take too much money off the heads at the top, because if we do, he says, it is going to stop industry.

There is no industry left now. The trouble is there is no purchasing power in the hands of the masses, and the only way by which business can ever be reorganized is to put purchasing power in the hands of the people.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, I have spoken a great deal longer than I expected to speak, and longer than I would have spoken had I not been required to vindicate my stand that I was within the rules, which I still contend, and which I think the senior Senator from Pennsylvania will now concede, so far as the words are concerned, unless he has gleaned from my looks and expressions something which I can not see myself; unless he has gleaned something like that, I think he will admit that I have been within the rules. But I have undertaken, in a speech which is rather lengthy compared with what I had intended to say, to state that I am still in the Democratic Party of this country, that I am still on the Democratic side of this Chamber, that it does not make any difference to me whether the Democratic caucus assigns me to any committees or not, that I am still a Democratic Member of the United States Senate; that I will not, have not, and do not agree for the future to accept any orders that come through the White House, whether they are handed to me by a party leader or not.

LEADERS CAN NOT BIND US TO MAMMON

Further, I conceive it to the welfare and interest of my party, the Senate, and the Nation that we can not, we should not, we will not accept a working partnership with the Hoover administration, whether it comes through Baruch or of Morgan or whatnot. Further, that the Republican Party of the United States, at this late date, whether it is recognized by the Democratic leader here in the Senate or not, whether the Senator from Arkansas says so or not—that the Republican Party can not deed us Bernard M. Baruch for the next six months. We will not take him. You can not hand him to us, whether he is sponsored here on this side of the Chamber or not. As far as I am concerned, the nefarious editorials, the nefarious cartoons, the various and sundry comments undertaking to paint any man who dares to try to take one single dollar away from the powerful, bloated, wealthy fortunes of this country, the way he is painted by these sinister publications, will not influence me to disregard the duty I conceive I owe the people of this country. If the men on this side of the Chamber or on the other side of the Chamber allow the people to be taxed under any kind of a bill that does not sweat down these swollen fortunes, they will not be

doing their duty and fulfilling the obligation they owe the people to relieve this kind of distress.

The only way that can be accomplished is by putting purchasing power into the hands of the people of the United States. If we have a barrel with 100 apples in it, and a hundred people to give apples to, if one man steps up and takes 59 apples out of the barrel, there would be only 41 left; 58 would have nothing. There is just that condition in America to-day. There is so much in the basket, and 59 per cent of it is taken by 1 per cent of the people. There is nothing left to provide for the masses of the people any purchasing power, and then there is no middle class left.

EXHIBIT A

Whereas the misery and privation of the common people, due to the existing business depression and its attendant evil of enforced unemployment, is growing more unendurable with each passing day; and

Whereas under the smoke screen of the maintenance of two allegedly sacred American principles—the rights of personal liberty and the rights of private property—Federal legislation is sought that would add materially to the tax burden of the poor while favoring the rich in direct proportion to their wealth; and

Whereas this form of deliberate discrimination prompted Senator HUEY P. LONG, of Louisiana, to offer an amendment to the tax bill making it illegal for any person to retain an annual income of more than a million dollars and forbidding the inheritance of a fortune of more than five millions; and

Whereas this justified limitation on the power of predatory wealth menaced the plans and purposes of the political representatives of big business, the Long resolution and its sponsor were both ridiculed and denounced in unmeasured terms on the floor of the Senate; and

Whereas Senator LONG, despite the deliberate distortion of the kept trust press throughout the country regarding his statements, proved the sincerity of his honest resentment of the cheap political trickery being indulged in at the expense of the poverty-

121700—8269

stricken and starving people by voluntarily severing all personal connection with whatever committee he had been assigned to by a legislative body that served not the Nation as a whole but only the wealthy section thereof; and

Whereas Senator LONG, in his denunciation, clearly voiced the prevailing suspicion that both the major political parties are dedicated to the protection of the rich and mighty at the expense of the humbler divisions of society; and

Whereas this sentiment finds an answering echo in the heart of every unemployed and every overworked and underpaid toiler throughout this Nation, who owe their present sad plight to the unchecked exploitation of big business, which constitutes the invisible director of the visible Government agencies that deplore confiscation of predatory wealth, but are willing to strip the already poverty-stricken populace of the little they so desperately cling to: Therefore be it

Resolved, By the delegates to the Chicago Federation of Labor in regular session assembled on this date, May 1, 1932, representing over 300,000 organized men and women wage earners, the vast majority of whom are unemployed at present, that the attitude assumed by Senator HUEY P. LONG is expressive of the sentiments of the people in general and of organized labor in particular, and labor unqualifiedly approves of Senator LONG's defense of the common people's rights, in spite of the opposition of the entrenched battalions of political Hessians defending predatory wealth, and that the presentation of this senatorial incident is indicative of the slavish devotion of the kept trust press to the cause of big business, regardless of the common people's rights as specified in the American Declaration of Independence; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator HUEY P. LONG with the request that he have the resolution read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully submitted.

[SEAL.]

JOHN FITZPATRICK,
President Chicago Federation of Labor.

This resolution was presented to the regular meeting of the Chicago Federation of Labor Sunday, May 1, 1932, and adopted by unanimous vote.