

Congressional Record

SEVENTY-SECOND CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

LOUISIANA'S DEFENSE

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUEY P. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21, 1933

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I had intended to have something to say on yesterday as a matter of personal privilege relative to a few statements which have been issued by a gentleman who styles himself "General" Ansell relative to the Louisiana so-called-to-be election probe. I could not see my way clear to interfere with the relief legislation which was being considered yesterday, and for that reason I waited until I could secure recognition on the floor to-day to discuss these matters.

Mr. President, the Senate adopted a resolution providing for the appointment of a committee to investigate expenditures and irregularities in primary and general elections of last fall, and I think I voted for that resolution. I conceded that under the resolution a committee of the Senate had a right to investigate expenditures and irregularities in the primary and general election occurring in all States. The committee was called upon to go into several States, but went into the State of Louisiana only.

When the subcommittee first went there I asked that some showing of irregularity be required. The campaign opposition insisted that it could not make any showing of irregularity at the time, but that the Senate would have to send investigators there to prove the charges that they were willing to swear to, but which they could not offer one line to prove themselves.

NO PROOF OF FRAUD DEVELOPED

That was back in the month of October, 1932. Before that time a horde of investigators was sent to Louisiana, several of them, I understand seven in number. They investigated in the State of Louisiana through the months of October, November, December, January, and February—five months—and then another hearing was called. At the end of five months I asked, as a Member of the Senate and as a representative of the Senator elect—and the Senator elect, the Hon. John H. Overton, made the same request—that if the hearing was going to be held in Louisiana we be given the report and the charges which we were supposed to face. I was informed by the chairman of the committee that the committee had decided not to make the report accessible to any one. I, therefore, requested that we be given a bill of particulars and specifications showing what was charged (as a result of the five months' investigation with the people's money) to have been developed in the State of Louisiana. I was informed again that none such would be forthcoming. So I yielded to that position.

I was told by one or two members of the committee that they saw no reason why we should not be furnished with such report. I was told by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] that in his contest he was given the reports. I was assured by others that they would undertake to secure the same consideration for us as has been given in the Alabama and other cases. But I did not want to use my friends to the point where I thought it might be embarrassing to

them, and I made no further request and yielded to the stand of the chairman of the subcommittee that no such information would be forthcoming.

So we went down to Louisiana, gentlemen of the Senate, after the State had been raked from center to circumference for five months, after every roll had been checked with Government money, after the State for five months had had from one to five newspaper reports in it every day that fraud was being discovered by leaps and bounds and merely awaited the coming of a senatorial committee to prove the disastrous calamity with which the investigation was then struggling.

RESCUED BY A BURGLAR

We waited five months. The committee saw fit to employ an attorney to assist it in developing the facts. They employed General Ansell, against whom no less report has been made than was made against Benedict Arnold the night he sold out West Point. They saw fit to authorize the chairman of the committee to employ an attorney, and I assume and believe the chairman acted in good faith and in good conscience in employing an attorney. The chairman sought assistance and rescue in the employment of his counsel. He might as well have prayed for a burglar to have delivered him from a holdup on the highway at night as to have employed the Hon. "Gen." Samuel Tilden Ansell, concerning whom I will give some belated information as to his career.

The lately designated Samuel Ansell is the famous Grover Cleveland Bergdoll pot-of-gold attorney. He was the gentleman who practically forged his own appointment as Judge Advocate General in 1917. We have it here from the files of the Government that in the year 1917 this man Ansell went to the then Judge Advocate General, Mr. Crowder, and asked, in view of the very heavy work that General Crowder was having to do, if he (Crowder) would not recommend him (Ansell) to be appointed Acting Judge Advocate General. The War Department records show that General Crowder told him that he would have to make that application to the Secretary of War.

The next record of the War Department shows that this man Ansell went to the Chief of Staff and told the Chief of Staff that General Crowder had ordered him to issue an order naming him (Ansell) Acting Judge Advocate General of the Army, and that the Chief of Staff actually ordered such an order to be issued, which was discovered by General Crowder, Judge Advocate General, and the Secretary of War ordered it stricken from the file and not to be published, and demoted Ansell back to brigadier general, and there was no trial, for later he resigned from the Army.

Mr. President, Grover Cleveland Bergdoll was a draft evader of the World War, a very rich young man, the son of very wealthy parents, living in Philadelphia, or near Philadelphia. He was of German-born parentage, I believe, at least on the father's side.

Near the close of the war this draft evader was apprehended and arrested. He was found shielded with considerable artillery in his own house, and it was after considerable risk and effort that he was arrested. He was tried and imprisoned as a military prisoner at Governors Island, N. Y., and while he was in the military prison many efforts were made to secure his release through the courts and by various other processes.

It was along about that time that "General" Ansell, as he calls himself—and the Senator from Missouri [Mr.

CLARK] disputes his right to that title—it was along about that time that Mr. Ansell was employed in the case.

Mr. Ansell had been in the War Department. He had been in intimate contact and close association with the War Department generals and subordinates who would have had the right to grant release to the prisoner if release could have been granted for any temporary purpose. It was through Mr. Ansell's connections with the men in the War Department, with whom he had been in close daily association, that Mr. Ansell, upon resigning from the Army, was able again to contact them so as to secure the release of the prisoner, George Cleveland Bergdoll, from Governors Island, for the purpose of his escape, as Congress so saw it through its committee.

THE "POT-OF-GOLD" ESCAPE

While General Ansell was in the Army he would have been subject to court-martial for his conduct, so the congressional committee reported, but he resigned and took the Bergdoll case, putting himself outside of court-martial before the "pot-of-gold" scheme was advanced by him.

Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, it was through General Ansell that there was hatched up the pot-of-gold story, the story that Bergdoll, who was a prisoner at Governors Island, had hidden \$150,000 in gold in the mountains of Maryland, and they wanted his release in order that he might go out and find the gold and bring it back, and it was stated that he would be returned to Governors Island.

The prisoner's release was secured through Mr. Ansell and the contacts which he had with men in the Army; and through the efforts of Mr. Ansell, under promises which he made but did not keep and did not intend to keep, so the committee says, Bergdoll was allowed to escape. He never went within hailing distance of any mountains where he was supposed to have hidden the gold, but he found his way into Canada and then found his way to Germany.

Mr. President, as the last part of the history, as the report which will be appended to my remarks will show, Bergdoll's escape was investigated by a committee of Congress, and they found and reported, as will be seen from the report which will be printed to-morrow morning at the conclusion of my remarks, that the master mind of the conspiracy and of the escape was Mr.—or "General"—Ansell, as he calls himself; and they found that the conspiracy was such that, while no punishment by court-martial could be meted out to Ansell for the hatched-up scheme and efforts which resulted in the escape of this prisoner, none the less, said the congressional committee, he ought never to be allowed to practice before a court or to appear before a committee of Congress or of the United States again. That is the report of the Congress I have submitted, which in detail goes further than I care to go at this time.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LONG. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator will recall that General Ansell's title is simply a courtesy title; that he was actually retired as lieutenant colonel in the Army.

Mr. LONG. He gives himself that title. I say that he has as much right to that as any other title. He has as much right to that title as he has to the title of honorable citizen. He has as much right to be called "General" as he has to be sent to the State of Louisiana, and I will show that in a minute. I will read the record, if that is disputed. He has been sent down to Louisiana. I will show in a moment what part his nefarious record has to do with what happened down in that State.

First I will read from the Literary Digest. They usually have pretty good logic when they are writing about me, my enemies will admit.

The Literary Digest's review of public act in Bergdoll case, September 3, 1921. Quoting from the Literary Digest, headed:

THE WIDENING BERGDOLL SCANDAL

More malodorous than ever, many papers agree, is the case of the notorious draft dodger, Grover Cleveland Bergdoll, as illumined

by the investigation of a congressional committee, the majority of which report finds that his escape was made possible by a conspiracy of Army officers, of which Brig. Gen. Samuel Tilden Ansell was the "master mind." As the case stands now, remarks the Houston Chronicle, "the country is disgraced not so much by the way Bergdoll flouted its authority, but because there were so many pretended patriots willing to help him."

Quoting the Literary Digest further—

Both the majority and minority reports, the one signed by three members, of whom two are Democrats and the other by two Republicans, "support the reported boast of that fugitive that 'he made the Americans look like a bunch of boobs,'" says the Pittsburgh Gazette Times, "the Americans referred to being those who should have kept him safely in custody."

Quoting the Literary Digest further—

While "there are many who participated in the conspiracy leading to Bergdoll's escape and the acquittal of those who brought it about," says the majority report, according to press quotations, "there are three who are more culpable than the rest." In this connection are named General Ansell, who was one of the draft dodger's counsel, Col. John R. Hunt, commander at Fort Jay where Bergdoll was confined, and Col. Charles C. Cresson, who prosecuted Colonel Hunt when that officer was court-martialed. As for General Ansell, "he is now out of the Army," runs the report.

Then follows the report in these words:

He (Ansell) is beyond the jurisdiction of court-martial proceedings, but provision should be made against his future practice before any of the departments, before any court-martial, or in the courts of the District of Columbia, or the Nation above whose safety and integrity he has placed gold.

Instead of that, things lay quiet a while, and this year Mr. Ansell was called upon to go down to see if there were irregularities in the election of John H. Overton. This man Ansell, recommended for disbarment, a scoundrel and a thief of the deepest dye and lowest order of crookdom, according to a committee of Congress, was sent down to investigate the private life, not of Overton, not of Broussard, but, as he construed his job, of a man who had been elected to every office within the gift of the people of the State of Louisiana—if it did happen to be me.

I want to give the Senate, before I go a little further into the conduct of this scoundrel, the advisor of the chairman, the select counsel of the chairman, picked by the chairman, condemned by the Government as a thief and a scoundrel and a crook—

The VICE PRESIDENT (rapping with his gavel). The Senator from Louisiana must not reflect upon a Senator.

Mr. LONG. I am not reflecting on the Senator. I am trying to tell the Senator who he picked and who guided him. He might as well have gone to the galleys.

Thereupon this investigation recessed, or rather proceeded into Louisiana under the guidance of Mr. Ansell. The chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL], and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] were the only members of the subcommittee present. The ruling of the Chair was, therefore, final. Nothing that he did could be undone. I, as a colleague in the Senate, approached the chairman, and I approached the Senator from Wyoming. I was told by the chairman that regardless of whatever anybody else thought, he was absolute in the premises. I thereupon knew that that meant that Mr. Ansell was absolute in the premises.

For many years, Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, the conflicts that I have had in the State of Louisiana have been known to the world. They are as well known, I hope, as almost any other ordinary political matters. In those conflicts, if I may call them such—and they are scarcely less than that—when I have managed to be affiliated with men and with women who were able to put out certain opposing candidates and to elect others, I have had to wake up in the morning to find that my enemies made dextrous moves.

CAN NOT REPLY TO OR ATTACK OWN BLOOD

I have had, Mr. President, a rather unfortunate political career. If I had my political career to start over again, with the disappointments I have had, I never would start it. I had to wake up in the morning at times and find my blood brother on the ticket of the opposition unless I was willing to support him myself. This record again tells the story

that unless I was willing to go out and try to elect the members of my family to certain public offices, I had to be faced with every kind of a charge on earth made against me by my own blood.

I have never replied to those charges, Mr. President; I have never had to. In no campaign have I ever denied a charge they ever made, and in no campaign, public or private, have I ever made a charge against one of them, and if my public career depends upon making any answer, direct or indirect, to a charge that is made against me by one of my own blood, or depends upon my making a countercharge, I can go out of politics as quickly as I came into it, and probably would be better off by so doing. I can not attack my own blood.

But I had managed to keep the newspapers from printing those canards they would tell. Why? Because if the newspapers printed them, they were on their face libelous, and I would not have had to draw an issue between me and one of my own blood in a public court to have received vindication from it.

But oh, no; when Ansell came down there he brought my brothers into the senatorial inquiry and he put them on the witness stand under privilege where they could tell the damnable tales they had been telling, so that the newspapers could print them, and I was without the slightest opportunity of relief and could not go anywhere to obtain any vindication of any kind. It was not relevant to the hearing. They went back 15 years to permit these men to take the stand and swear to canards they had told the electorate of that State in order that they could be printed in the newspapers of this country, and I would be remediless against that kind of attack.

SENATOR HOWELL'S MISTAKE

What did that have to do with this case? Do not think I am misstating the issue. I am ready to prove what I say from this record. I do not blame the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL]. He is a layman; he is not a lawyer; and when he got in the hands of Ansell, if he ended with any less results than Bergdoll did he was fortunate. If Bergdoll, through Ansell, put out that pot-of-gold story and left this country through that device, then the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] has exhibited an unusual and cold intelligence not to have done as badly as Bergdoll did, having been under this man's tutelage for 14 days while they were away from home.

I want to read to the Senate how this proceeding went on. Here [indicating] is the testimony of a witness called to testify, Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, about an election that occurred in September, 1932. Here is testimony relative to that election as the committee received it after they had been proceeding for about 9 or 10 days. Speaking about me, the witness says—and I quote from his testimony:

I had him to move to Shreveport in the fall of 1918 for the purpose of establishing a law practice—

Speaking about me—

He did not establish it until I went there and practiced with him in December 1, 1920.

That was just 12 years ago. They are getting up rather close to the election.

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

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Is that part of the examination in chief or cross-examination?

Mr. LONG. It is the examination in chief. I was told not to interrupt this testimony. This is one part of it. Wait until I get down to the hard-boiled goods in this thing. [Laughter.]

I am going to read again from this testimony. This is the trial of the Overton-Broussard election as it has been conducted at an expense of \$25,000 and five months' investigation in Louisiana:

I had him to move to Shreveport in the fall of 1918 for the purpose of establishing a law practice. He did not establish until I went there to practice with him, December 1, 1920.

162001—9149

If I am not talking loud enough for the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] I will move closer.

The first month we took in \$7.50.

“He and I practicing law,” that is a part of the Overton contest, and the committee are getting up to within 12 years of the time when the election occurred, and that is closer than they got most of the time.

After I got there the practice grew rapidly, but no more so than Huey's chest. The result was we had to dissolve.

This testimony occurred while the committee was investigating the election contest of John H. Overton, who was elected in September, 1932.

A few months after that dissolution I became the most active attorney in defending him against charges of slander and libel in Baton Rouge, La., sworn out by Governor Parker.

When he ran for governor in 1924 I supported him.

I will now skip about seven pages and see then how the committee are getting along. I read again from the testimony of the same witness.

On his platform for governor he promised the laboring people of this State a reasonable workman's compensation act. He did not do anything of the kind. He absolutely ignored that.

We are now up to 1923; we are getting along better; we are within nine and a half years of the day the election took place.

Mr. CLARK. Is that still the examination in chief?

Mr. LONG. This is the examination in chief, and no interruptions were allowed. I did not interrupt the witness nor cross-examine him.

I seen telegram after telegram. We wrote him and never a response to that firm, sound pledge he had made to the laboring people of this State.

IRRELEVANT ATTACKS

I skip now about 10 more pages to see how far the committee have gotten in the direction of the Overton campaign in the Broussard race. The newspapers were taking it all down and printing every word of it. The committee took one day to a witness. “Great fraud developed,” said the newspapers, that I had fought down there for 20 years and beaten them practically solidly for 20 years. Then the witness goes on, the testimony still being under examination in chief.

He took—

That is when I was governor; the committee finally got up, on page 2010, to when I was governor—

He took \$1,800,000 at one time out of the highway fund illegally and bought a piece of land worth about \$200,000 in order to give them that money—

Referring to the Louisiana State University—

He used most of that money in building a competing medical college. * * * He had no word of law or no letter of law. He went in there and took that \$1,800,000 of the people's highway commission fund and gave it to the school in order to promote himself to that extent.

The committee are now getting up to within three or four years of the Senate race. The testimony was given notwithstanding the fact that the matter had gone to court and that the courts of the State had adjudicated it legally, without appeal. I will not read further from the testimony of this witness, but practically not a word of such a thing as evidence was even undertaken by that witness in his testimony, a witness who was brought on to the witness stand for no other reason on earth than that he happened to be a brother of mine.

Now I come to the Ku-Klux Klan part of it. The attorney, Mr. Ansell, decided he would go into the Ku-Klux Klan. I quote from the testimony:

Mr. ANSELL. Do you know whether Senator LONG is a K. K. K. man?

That, gentlemen of the Senate, was the question of the attorney of the committee in the Overton-Broussard contest down in Louisiana.

A Ku-Klux Klanner or not.

The witness answered:

I do not think he was a K. K. man; that is my idea; he was not. Mr. ANSELL. Did he represent himself as being such?

He was talking about 1923, 10 years before the election.

Mr. LONG. He did at one time.

Mr. ANSELL. How did he so represent himself?

The witness answered:

In his campaign for governor in 1924 he sent out quite a lot of bogus information showing that HUEY LONG was a cyclops or something else.

[Laughter.]

The chairman became interested and examined the witness a little bit along that line.

Here is another one of the main witnesses. This gentleman had run for mayor and been beaten, and he had been beaten for chairman of the public service commission. He was called to the witness stand, so the record shows, and he testified for nearly one whole day, or at least the better part of a day. Finally I said to the chairman:

Mr. Chairman—

This is the substance of my remark—

are we not ever going to try the Overton-Broussard election contest? This is not according to my idea of matter which is material.

Mr. Ansell got up then and said:

In view of those facts—and they are facts—shall I be required to measure up to any requirement as to materiality—legal materiality—any technical rule as to pertinency? If so, this investigation in this atmosphere with this machine in control ought never to have been started. The money would be wasted.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARK. Is it a fact, as reported in the public press, that public funds appropriated by the Senate for the use of this committee were actually expended by Mr. Ansell in pursuing an inquiry on the question of whether or not the junior Senator from Louisiana had Indian blood in him?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir. Oh, yes; I will get to the Indians. They took time to chase that down. Yes; they investigated whether I was a member of the Ku-Klux Klan, whether I had Indian blood, what I promised when I ran for governor, and went back to the railroad commission rates of 1918. Oh, yes; the whole thing, you know, had to be gone into.

SUPREME COURT RULING DEFIED

This man Ansell actually got up and said that if he had to measure up to any such thing as a rule that the testimony had to be either material or pertinent, the investigation ought never to have been started; that the money had been wasted.

We thereupon read from the Supreme Court of the United States. It did not do any good. It was useless to read it. We might just as well have thrown water on a duck's back in the springtime. We read this in view of this statement of this pot-of-gold attorney of Bergdoll, who was recommended for disbarment, who was found by the congressional committee to be a thief and a crook and a scoundrel, who had practically forged a commission in the Army and had to get out for doing it, who had put up that story, Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate. This man Ansell wrote a letter in which he said that Grover Cleveland Bergdoll, at that time incarcerated in the United States jail, had hidden \$150,000 in gold in the side of a mountain over in Maryland, and that if they would turn him out of the Army Bergdoll would go over there and get the gold that he had hidden, that nobody knew where this pot of gold was but Mr. Bergdoll, and that he would be responsible for his safe custody, and would go himself, or would have another lawyer go, with a guard, and get the gold and bring Bergdoll back to jail.

According to this pot-of-gold tale of Ansell, in his letter quoted by the House investigating committee, this \$150,000 was supposed to have been hidden in one iron chest. According to the United States Bureau of Standards, it would

162001—9149

have weighed about 550 pounds. This chest of gold Mr. Bergdoll was supposed to have taken his lone self and hidden in the mountains, and he was the only man who knew where it was; and Mr. Ansell, who had been in this office, according to this committee, schemed around and lied around and crooked around until he actually got Bergdoll out of that jail and then he got him into Germany!

This man Ansell, by reason of such Bergdoll fame as he had acquired, said to the chairman of this Louisiana proceeding:

If I have got to live up to any such requirement as materiality and pertinency, this investigation ought never to have started. The money would be wasted.

He was listened to a great deal more than the United States Supreme Court when it said this:

By our opinion—

Said the Supreme Court—

decided since the indictment now before us was found, two propositions are definitely laid down: "One, that the two Houses of Congress, in their separate relations, possess not only such powers as are expressly granted to them by the Constitution, but such auxiliary powers as are necessary and appropriate to make the express powers effective; and, the other, that neither House is invested with "general" power to inquire into private affairs and compel disclosures, but only with such limited power of inquiry as is shown to exist when the rule of constitutional interpretation just stated is rightly applied." And that case shows that, while the power of inquiry is an essential and appropriate auxiliary, to the legislative function, it must be exerted with due regard for the rights of witnesses, and that a witness rightfully may refuse to answer where the bounds of the power are exceeded or where the questions asked are not pertinent to the matter under inquiry.

And that case shows that while the power of inquiry is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function, it must be exerted with due regard for the rights of witnesses, and that a witness rightfully may refuse to answer where the bounds of the power are exceeded or where the questions asked are not pertinent or relevant to the matter under inquiry; but that rule did not apply. The counsel stated that he could not comply with any such thing as the testimony being either relevant, material, or pertinent to the cause under inquiry; and, despite the ruling of the United States Supreme Court, they went again into the inquiry into the private life of a man who was not a candidate in the election that was under investigation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATFIELD in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARK. Is this the same Ansell who abused such public servants as William H. Taft and Newton D. Baker and Enoch H. Crowder like horse thieves, and who was scathingly rebuked by a committee of the American Bar Association for his conduct?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; he is the same bird. [Laughter.] After he had been practically run out of the Army for fraud, when Judge William H. Taft saw a charge made against the administration of Newton D. Baker in the Democratic administration, Judge Taft, who had been Secretary of War, thinking it was his duty to do so as a good citizen, in the interest of this country, gave information to show that the scoundrel was an infamous liar; and he came out and denounced Judge Taft and everybody else within range. He was hiding his tracks then, as he is now.

Then he went down in Louisiana to investigate me, with \$25,000 placed at his disposal. He came back up here the other day and issued a statement and said that he had quit. He issued a statement containing all kinds of attacks, so I understand—I have not the right to use the statement—all kinds of attacks.

CHARACTERS REBUKED BY THE PEOPLE

In order that I may show this thing up a little differently, he put on the stand this man who had run for mayor, a man by the name of Williams. He had run for mayor of New Orleans, and he had been beaten for mayor. He had lately been deposed as the chairman of the public-service

commission. He claimed to be a campaign manager for the opposition in a number of wards in the city. He was called to the stand. He testified that they beat up men by the score on the day of election; that they arrested them by the score; that they stole votes by the thousands; that they bought the commissioners, and paid them money. Oh, he testified to a list of crimes that would have been sufficient to put all the 2,000,000 people in Louisiana in the penitentiary if one-tenth of it was true. Then, after all of his testimony he was allowed to testify not only what somebody had told him but what somebody told somebody that told him, what he believed, what his opinion was—then, after he had gotten through with nearly a day's testimony, he was asked these questions, but meanwhile all he had said had all gone out in the newspapers. It had been read all over the United States under a privilege given to him by Ansell, through this committee. Then, after being asked all those questions—the day's testimony was gone, and the newspapers were out in which he had charged thievery, banditry, stealing, robbing—I was given about 20 minutes of the afternoon of the day. This was on cross-examination:

Senator LONG. How many people did you see arrested on the day of the Broussard-Overton election?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was in charge of the—

Senator LONG. Wait a minute. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that this witness answer the question, How many people he saw arrested? I do not want anything but that. I will ask him how many people he personally saw arrested and that is all. That is all I am asking him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not testify I saw anybody arrested.

Senator LONG. Did you see anybody arrested?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I did not.

Senator LONG. Did you see anybody paid any money?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not. I got an affidavit of a man who does say so.

Senator LONG. Now, I am asking this witness if he saw anybody paid. That is all I want him to answer.

None of those things that you testified to as to people who were arrested or people who were paid money did you see yourself?

Mr. WILLIAMS. None of what things?

Senator LONG. None of those things about people who were arrested or people who were bought. None of those things you saw yourself, did you?

Mr. WILLIAMS. You mean, did I see anybody get arrested?

Senator LONG. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. Did I see anybody get any money? No.

Senator LONG. Then, all of those things you have previously testified to as having seen done as to people being arrested and people being bought, those are not of your own personal knowledge?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have on file affidavits which are the basis of my statement.

And, Mr. President, they were allowed to put on the witness stand this man Williams, who, at the conclusion of his testimony, swore that he had not seen anything, that he had not heard anything, that he did not know anything; but that was after they had given a privilege to the newspapers of this country to print one volume of testimony that I will now show you was as false as the coinage of hell itself, and everybody knew it at the time. Here is the proof of that:

UNFOUNDED PERJURY

This man would swear to anything on God's earth. He did not have anything to hold him. He was swearing that he did not see it. He was swearing that he did not know it. He was swearing that there was nothing that he saw, heard, or by any sense of understanding or knowledge could possibly give before that committee or before anybody else; but he was given a day's time in which to do that, and in a few moments in the afternoon, though as to his testimony in chief no one has ever seen it denied up this way, at least, he said that he knew nothing about it, and made no denial of the fact that it was false, as I will now prove by the record.

Twelve days elapsed. I will discuss in just a minute other things in this record which could be said to be relevant to this case. There was a little stuff that would have been perfectly all right and legitimate inquiry. We indulged this thing, hoping that he was coming around that way. The thing went so far that citizens of that country went in to see judges of the United States court to ask what they ought to do, and I am informed, though I do not know it of

my own knowledge, that those judges went out of their way, because the circumstances required it, to suggest that such persons tell the United States attorney about it, and that he ventured to tell the chairman of that committee in there that he could not put that kind of a thing over in a civilized community, and he did not pay any more attention to it than if he had not been told at all.

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

Mr. LONG. Yes; I will yield to the Senator. What does he want to know?

Mr. HOWELL. I want to state that no judge in Louisiana called upon me to go into conference with him, and that the statement which has now been made by the Senator is absolutely without foundation.

Mr. LONG. I said the district attorney told the Senator.

Mr. HOWELL. The district attorney?

Mr. LONG. Yes; Mr. Edwin E. Talbot, the district attorney, told me he told the Senator, and I believe he told the Senator.

Mr. HOWELL. The United States district attorney sent word that he would like to see me. He said that he had been called upon by Senator Long and several others for an opinion; that he did not want to get into this matter, and he wanted me to understand that he did not want to have any part in this matter. That was my understanding of all that he said to me, and I told him that I thought it was perfectly proper if Senator Long wanted to talk with him; but he gave me no admonition whatever, nor did he state to me that I should not do this or that I should not do that.

Mr. LONG. Did he not tell the Senator that he could not have him or anybody else put a man in jail for not answering irrelevant and impertinent questions there, and that he could not be expected to do anything of that kind? Did he not tell the Senator that?

Mr. HOWELL. He said, "I have been asked if this committee could put anyone in jail," and he said, "What is your view about it?" I understood it was an inquiry. I said, "This committee has absolutely no authority of that kind." I said, "All this committee can do is to report to the main committee in Washington, and that main committee would report and recommend to the United States Senate; that the United States Senate is the only body that might act to have some one prosecuted even for perjury, before the committee."

Mr. LONG. The Senator has not answered the question. Did he not tell the Senator that the inquiry had to be on pertinent and material matters?

Mr. HOWELL. He did not say so. He did not advise me as to how the inquiry should be conducted. He simply called me in there to assure me that whereas he had been importuned for opinions, he wanted me to understand that he was not interfering with this committee.

Mr. LONG. That is not the information I got. Of course, I take the Senator's word. The information I got was that the district attorney was asked by other authorities than me to call in the chairman and to tell him that he could not call those witnesses there and ask them to go back 18 years into their private records and into their private life and into the private life of somebody else and expect to have any court on earth stand behind that, and that he had no such authority under the law. That is what I was told the Senator was told.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HOWELL. I want to make it very clear again that I received no admonition whatever from the United States district attorney or from anyone else while I was in New Orleans.

Mr. LONG. Did the Senator receive the statement from the United States Supreme Court that it had to be material and pertinent? The Senator got that from me, did he not?

Mr. HOWELL. A statement was handed to the chairman during one of the sessions of the committee.

Mr. LONG. Did the Senator read that?

Mr. HOWELL. I have it now, at present.

Mr. LONG. Did the Senator ever read it?

Mr. HOWELL. I read a portion of it.

Mr. LONG. Read a portion of it! At any rate, Mr. President, I have the highest respect for the intellect and good motives of the junior Senator from Nebraska. He has shown a motive that is very high and an intellect that is above that of any test. He has shown the power to come out of this situation with Ansell much better than Mr. Bergdoll did and with a more reasonable story. [Manifestations of laughter among the occupants of the gallery.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will proceed in order.

Mr. LONG. I have the highest praise for the Senator. I credit him with every motive pure, and I am confident that had the Senator had any counsel who would have advised him the same as any other layman in his condition, that the Senator's attitude would have been entirely opposite to what it was. I do not blame the Senator. With Ansell running the legal side of the matter and advising a layman what to do, I do not blame the Senator for it. With Ansell assuring him that he was leading up to something all the time, I can see how the Senator was beguiled. If Ansell was able to put over that pot-of-gold story, and make somebody believe that a man had hidden \$150,000 in gold, and that he was getting him out of the "pen" so that he could go over and get the gold and then put him over in Germany—if Ansell could do that, what could he do with somebody out of the United States Senate under such circumstances, anybody, whether it is the Senator from Nebraska or myself, or anyone else?

Along what lines did this matter proceed? I hope I have not gone too far quoting the facts about the things of which I have been reading—that is, that we inquired into the railroad commission race of 1918, into the governor's race of 1923 and 1924, into the governor's race of 1928, and into my race of 1930.

OUTSIDE QUESTIONS

That is not all. I am not going to read all of it, because what I state now is not nearly so far-fetched as what I have already read. They went into a trial of the session of the legislature of 1930. They went into a trial of the impeachment of 1929, when I was summoned up for impeachment as governor. They went into a trial of the legislature of 1926. They went so far as to try to prove that laws had not been passed on elections, and that the responsibility for laws not having been passed fell upon the governor because the legislature did not do it; and because the legislature did not do it, that the governor was responsible; and because the governor was responsible, that I was responsible; and because I was responsible, that the Senator elect was responsible. They tried to prove as a fact that a bill had been introduced in the Legislature of Louisiana which had failed to pass.

That is not all. Let me tell the Senate what they tried out for three days, and if I make any misstatement of the facts I want to be corrected. Let me tell the Senate what they tried out for three days.

In the year 1929 a constitutional amendment had been adopted by the electorate of the State of Louisiana providing that bonds could be issued to build eight bridges across navigable rivers in Louisiana. That was in 1929.

It was subsequently found that an amendment had been made to that bill between the two houses. It passed both houses by the two-thirds majority requisite before the people could vote on it, but an amendment was made in the house bill in the senate, and when it came back to the house for concurrence only 59 members were present, all of whom voted for the amendment. But there were not 67 men there, and the question arose as to whether or not the amendment was valid, inasmuch as there were not two-thirds of the members of the house of representatives present when the senate amendment was concurred in in the house. Therefore, the validity of the act, though it was ratified by the people 30 to 1, was somewhat in doubt. I am telling the Senate what they tried out.

162001—9149

This amendment was adopted in 1928. It had happened that while I was governor of the State Senator-elect John H. Overton had submitted a bridge proposal to build those bridges in the form of toll bridges until we could get through an amendment to buy them, agreeing to build them for less than our estimate was. After they had made their proposal for these bridges to be built as toll bridges until we bought them, the provision was that whatever they bid would be advertised to the public, and the contract would be awarded to the lowest bidder.

It happened that that contract never was consummated, not because I did not favor it—because I did—but because the highway commissioners did not want a toll bridge to be built State owned—private owned, whether it was to be taken over or not, they were against the policy altogether.

Three days' time of this hearing was taken up going into the matter of whether or not in 1929, three and a half years before the election, there had not been a toll bridge proposition submitted, what the details were, and what was my attitude on it, and what was everybody else's attitude on it, notwithstanding the fact that the toll bridge contract was not even finally let. That thing was advertised all over the country as though it was a terrible calamity, and this is what they did. They waited until the very eleventh hour, until finally, by accident, one of their own witnesses read the letter that the contract had to be advertised and let to the low bidder, and the right given to purchase it from the low bidder for the cost of construction plus 6 per cent interest per annum. Three days of the \$25,000 time was taken up with that.

What was the balance of this case? The balance of this case was this: They went into a trial of the campaign of 1930 when I was a candidate against Senator Ransdell. They went into a trial of dummy candidates. We thought that matter would be very quickly disposed of and tried to admit anything on earth they wanted to put out about the system of dummy candidates. We tried to admit that they had voted them, that we had voted them, and proved they had filed them, but I want to read what their arbitrator swore after we had gotten to the matter of the dummies.

BROUSSARD'S REPRESENTATIVE'S TESTIMONY

I want to read the testimony of Mr. Viosca, the arbitrator of the opposition. After 12 days had been consumed, we were given two hours. We want to thank the chairman for that two hours. They did not have to give it to us, and we appreciate the two hours we were given. It was rather generous, and we realize that it was strictly within the discretion of the Chair whether we were to be given any time at all or not.

This is the testimony of the arbitrator, Mr. Viosca, a partner of J. Y. Sanders, who was the gentleman who led the opposition at the Chicago convention to unseat me and the delegation of which I formed a part at the time when we nominated Roosevelt for President. He said:

I served as a member—in fact, the chairman—of the arbitration election committee.

I want the Senate to notice this in connection with the hearsay testimony of the witness, Williams, that I told about a moment ago.

Senator LONG. I will ask you to please state if you had the assistance of the police force of the city of New Orleans and others cooperating with you on that day.

This is the opposition arbitration commissioner who was made chairman of the election arbitration committee in the senate election that day.

Yes. On that day we had several problems that came up that required communication with the polling places, and the only means of communication we had with those places was through the police department. Chief Reyer was telephoned to on a number of occasions by a member of the committee.

He went on to state they got good cooperation, and that so far as he knew all of their messages were delivered to the various polling places.

I shall not read the testimony of this witness. This man swore that he had been the opposition arbitration commis-

sioner in that city in many elections before that time. He swore that on that day they put them in the mayor's parlors at the city hall; that they gave them absolute, complete cooperation and conformed to every request that was made; and that everything he wanted to do had the unanimous backing of all the other arbitrators. He said it was the quietest election that was ever held, and that there were no arrests made or any disturbances on the day that were reported in the newspapers the next day, or to the police headquarters, that they did not handle in accordance with what they thought to have been fair to the candidates on that day.

But they put this man Williams on the witness stand, who swore that he did not even know there was an arbitration commission in the city hall. In order to show how far the arbitration committee went, I put into the record there that this arbitration committee had gone far enough in other elections, even to take boxes out of the hands of the commissioners and promulgate the election over in the police station and count the ballots themselves, and that they had been upheld in that kind of a proposition when there was danger of the thing not going right. Mr. Viosca, the Broussard arbitrator, testified there page after page that there had not been 10 per cent of the complaints in the Broussard-Overton election that had ever occurred in any other election held in the city of New Orleans within his memory; that there had not been 10 per cent of the complaints made that day that had been made in any other election before that time.

Yet the testimony of this fellow Williams, and of many other witnesses like him, hearsay, double hearsay, and opinion from beginning to end, was offered in the record of that case by the page and by the volume, notwithstanding the fact that the arbitrator who had absolute personal knowledge of the entire matter and was handling it on that day, who was serving in the cause of the opposition to our forces, testified leaf by leaf and page by page that none of that double hearsay opinion testimony was worth the air that it had taken to breathe it into the election probe.

FIGHTING THE DEVIL WITH FIRE

The next thing I want to discuss is the matter of dummy candidates. One of my good friends in the Senate may have said—I doubt if he said it—that probably I had done good work with bad instruments, rather indicating perhaps that some of the good we had done had been done with the weapons of the devil. I do not think any direct statement like that was made, but at least somewhere in the air I got the intimation that maybe we had done the work of the Lord, but with the instruments of the devil. I want to show where the instruments came from.

Mr. President, I got interested in the politics of that State many, many years ago. I got beaten a good many times. I took my beatings. Whichever side I was on was the side that was bound to be beaten. If a man wanted to know who was going to be beaten, all he had to do was to find out who I was supporting and he would know.

Two things have been brought up in this election probe, and I now revert to the only thing that, topside or bottom, touches within 14,000 cubic feet of the matter of inquiry. Two things were brought up—the matter of election expenses and the matter of commissioners of the polls. Under the heading of commissioners of the polls was brought up the question of what are known as dummy candidates.

There were no such things as dummy candidates for the United States Senate. A dummy candidate is this: A system has developed in that State going back so long that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, by which opposing factions have entered candidates for various offices that they knew were not going to participate really in the election. This was done for years before anybody here ever heard about Louisiana politics.

We do not have the commissioners appointed by the State authority. If we did, our faction would appoint them all, and the other faction would appoint them all when they

were in office. That is the system in use in most States, I believe. A state-wide board of appointed election commissioners, and they appoint commissioners for the election. But our State abolished that system. It was done by men who thought more about it than I have ever thought about it. We have there this other system. Every man who is a candidate for a local office can put up the name of a prospective commissioner of election to be drawn out of the hat. If there are 16 candidates, and only 1 for the school board or 2 for the school board, then the school board should draw them all because they are local. But if there is no school board candidate, then there would be a congressional or railroad commission candidate or some senatorial candidates, and they would put in the names for the prospective list of commissioners.

For more than 30 or 40 years that has been done. Opposing factions have gone out and gotten 3 or 4 men to file for the school board, 3 or 4 men or even 10 men to file for Congress, and they would put names in the hat from all the candidates, and draw for the commissioners of election. Those not commissioned as election commissioners were commissioned as watchers at the polls to see that things went right.

In this last senatorial contest, Broussard against Overton, we were opposed by the Sullivan-Williams faction. The Sullivan-Williams faction was behind the Broussard campaign and we were behind the Overton campaign.

Mr. President and gentlemen, I read this to the committee down there. In 1922 this matter went to court. The Senate has been told by this man Ansell that the whole judicial structure of Louisiana is rotten from top to bottom. He has come back here and said that the courts of Louisiana are in the hands of HUEY P. LONG; that it is a rotten, damnable controlled corrupt polluted condition of the judiciary from top to bottom, particularly the supreme court. They make no more bones about saying that every man sitting on that court is rotten, crooked, and corrupt than they do about taking a drink of water in the spring time—boldly and openly, and the people have to stand for it. They could not help themselves down there. They had to stand it for a while.

Mr. President, seven members of that supreme court, all of them elected for terms of 14 years apiece, were elected before I became anything like a political factor in Louisiana, all except one, and I helped to elect him, and he is the one that decided against me. The only one that was ever elected after I was a political power at all in the State of Louisiana was Justice Odom himself, and he decided against me one time, and when I was on the other side he decided against me the next time. He decided in favor of dummies when I was trying to keep them out, and against dummies when my side was trying to put them in. That is the only one I had anything to do with since I became governor, and certainly they will not complain about him. He was the judge to change his mind in the case. The judges of the supreme court of that bench are elected for a period of 14 years. Ansell says they are in the control of myself and my friends. They were elected to the supreme court before I was ever heard of as a general political factor in the State of Louisiana. They will go off of the bench on a pension for life when they get ready to retire. I do not think there is more than one man on the bench who went on there before I was elected governor that does not go off the court on his retired pay whenever he gets ready to go and does not have to fear any man on God's living earth. He does not have to fear us anyway, because we have stood for the reelection of every judge on every court in that State. We have never opposed a judge on the bench. We have stood for the reelection of school boards and of the courts, and never allowed them to get into politics; but if we had, they would have been safe anyway.

In 1922 this dummy candidate matter went to court. Who carried it there? It was the Sullivan faction that helped to oppose us in the last election. Here is a quotation from the newspapers. The Sullivan faction, in charge of the

Broussard campaign in 1932, is the outfit that won this lawsuit in 1922. Here it is:

Dummy case goes to high court. August 17, 1922. Supreme tribunal to pass on Judge Skinner's jurisdiction.

The case went to the high court. The report goes on to say that the Sullivan faction which supported Broussard won, Williams himself on the witness stand admitting that he, having testified that the dummy candidate business was a malicious practice, admitted that he was a candidate in 1922 when his crowd put these dummies in and won out in court. Williams testified that he was good at that dummy business himself. This holier-than-thou gang they had up there, that we have put out of every office that they ever held or ever will hold, is a gang that this Senate could not elect to office if it tried—and nothing that can be done here in Washington can restore that gang. You could not do it, Members of the Senate, to save your lives.

Williams was asked the question, "You have admitted that you put in some twenty-odd dummies in the last election?" and he said, "Yes; self-defense dummies."

He filed 20, but back in 1922—this was in 1931 and 1932 he is talking about—when they filed dummy candidates the anti-Sullivan crowd, what would have been called the regular crowd which is with us now, went to court to get the court to disqualify those dummy candidates on the ground that men had filed as candidates for office that did not intend to run in order that they might participate in the drawing of election commissioners. But the supreme court said "no." It said the court was without jurisdiction, that it could not meddle or intervene. That was the decision of the supreme court. Who was the organ of the court? Judge Ben C. Dawkins, whom President Coolidge appointed United States district judge for the western district of Louisiana, confirmed by this Senate. They brought in the fact that the Senator elect had a brother on the Supreme Court of Louisiana, Judge Winston Overton. The Senator elect did have a brother on that court. That brother was on the court in 1922, and was one of the seven judges who decided that they could not disqualify dummy candidates; that the court did not have jurisdiction of the election question. That is not the only time he was on the bench.

In 1927 I went to court—I say "I went to court"—my little crowd went to court; we went to court to try to disqualify a man by the name of Melerine, and again the court said that the court could not take jurisdiction of that question at all; that it had to be placed before the committee and that the committee controlled it. In 1931 I was one of those who went to the court again, and again the Supreme Court of Louisiana, in the case of Hinyub against the Parish Democratic Executive Committee for the Parish of Jefferson, laid down the law, and I lost the case by a vote of 5 to 2 in the supreme court. In 1931 the supreme court, speaking through Justice Odom as the organ of the court—the only judge who was elected to the supreme court since I have been Governor of Louisiana who was not a member of the court previously—said, "It is not a matter that can be brought to the court." I lost that case by a vote of 5 to 2. I lost the Melerine case by a vote of 6 to 1. In 1922 the case grew out of a writ granted by Judge Ben C. Dawkins, without any dissent at all; and in 1932 what were we to do? Were we to sit down with that gang of scalawags that had beaten us in three lawsuits and not "fight the devil with fire"? Were we to go down there, with Sullivan winning in 1922, winning in 1927, and winning in 1931, beating us in three straight lawsuits, the court holding that nobody on the living earth could question those candidates; that once they filed and paid their filing fee they had a right to participate in drawing those commissioners—when we had tried to beat them in three lawsuits and had lost out in the three lawsuits, were we supposed to stand there and not abide by that ruling of the court and "fight the devil with fire"? Yet that is the big point that they have made in this case.

Yes; the candidates on both sides filed dummy candidates. There was not any dummy candidate filed for the United States Senate; no; but there were dummy candidates filed

for the school board and there were dummy candidates filed for Congress and there were dummy candidates filed for railroad commissioner. However, we did not lead in it. They filed as many as we did. We have photostatic copies of the filings, and they are in the record in this case, showing that they filed as many as 19 candidates in one little ward at one time for the school board where but one man was going to be elected; and they kept those candidates in the race until the time for drawing the election commissioners was over, and then they withdrew them and they got their money back. We have proved that they had a dummy candidate for railroad commissioner; we proved that they always had dummy candidates there; we proved that we had gone into court, and in each one of those cases Judge Winston Overton, the brother of Senator-elect John H. Overton, had decided against his brother's faction every time in favor of the dummy candidate ticket. Every time we went to court the judges of the supreme court, including Justice Winston Overton, decided that the court did not have jurisdiction to contest the right of the dummy candidate to file and participate in drawing the election commissioners, and Judge Winston Overton stood up with them and decided against his brother's side of the case in 1922, in 1927, and in 1931; and yet in the year 1932 this pot-of-gold character named Ansell has tried to make a veritable lion of skulduggery out of Justice Winston Overton because he decided the same way in 1932 that he did in 1931 and 1927 and 1922. He did not say anything against the only justice of the supreme court who changed his viewpoint about the case. There was only one, and that was Judge Fred M. Odom. He did not say anything about him because, when he contested the dummies in 1931, Judge Odom decided in favor of the dummies; and when they contested the dummies against us in 1932, Judge Odom decided against the dummies. He did not say anything about the only judge that I had anything to do with electing since I have been Governor of the State of Louisiana because he decided against us and every time, regardless of what the question was, he had been found deciding opposite to the factions rather than on the law. He had a right to change his opinion; I do not condemn him; it is very likely he saw it differently; that is his business. So much for the dummy-candidate question.

NO CORRUPTION EVEN MENTIONED

There is one thing, gentlemen of the Senate, that I want the Senate to note, and I hope I will have particular attention in what I am going to now state. There is not a line of evidence—top, side, nor bottom—reaching one single act of misconduct against John H. Overton, Senator elect. There is not a line of pretended evidence which has been written into this record undertaking to show the slightest misconduct of action or inaction on the part of Senator-elect John H. Overton—not a line. I challenge anyone to produce one line of such proof that was ever offered in this record.

However, before I go into that there is one point that has been mentioned. You have been told by the newspapers that one witness by the name of Weiss declined to answer questions of counsel for the committee. You have not been told the truth by the newspapers. The newspapers had to take what they got from the reports down there in New Orleans, and I know the kind of reports which were sent out. I remember when they were trying to impeach me down there; they tried me for murder for one week, to show that I had hired a man to go and kill another man, and at the end of the week's testimony they just dropped the case entirely and never did vote on it. But one week's testimony had gone into the newspapers of this country, under a privileged hearing, undertaking to show that I had been implicated in a charge of murder when there was not enough to it even to cause a single one of the members of the House of Representatives of Louisiana to propose a vote on that charge.

What did they do in this matter? We had a bank situation in New Orleans. I received some cooperation from the committee in that situation, particularly from the Senator

from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY]. I called the Senator from Wyoming to my house at night and I told him that there would not be a bank, perhaps, which would open in my town the next day if I did not get some help. I knew I could get it from nobody but him, and I had to have a day in which to work. We sat up in my room on Friday night on the day selected to start this hearing and we drafted a proclamation for a holiday, because we knew the banks could not open up the next day. I can say that much here now, but I can only say here now what I think is discreet.

In order to find a ground upon which to declare the holiday, we spent the night looking up things that might have happened on the 4th of February, but could not find anything. About 1 o'clock in the morning somebody phoned that diplomatic relations with Germany had terminated on the night of February 3. Well, I was not very strong, as Senators perhaps know, for the war; I had been making some pretty recent remarks that I was not strong for America having to pitch into that war in Europe; but a holiday had to be a holiday. The 3d of February was not the 4th, so we drew on our imagination and decided that the proclamation severing diplomatic relations was drawn in the nighttime between February 3 and 4, and we declared a holiday for the 4th day of February in order to get a Saturday holiday. We worked all day and all night Saturday; we worked all day and night Sunday; we worked night and day; there was no such thing as anybody sleeping an hour all day Saturday and all Saturday night and all day Sunday and Sunday night. We received wonderful help from the authorities here in Washington, particularly the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The banks opened up on Monday morning. One or two of the banks were crowded, the line reaching away out into the street. I would have to go down there and argue with the crowd and then go back to the hearing and then go from the hearing back to the crowd and then from the crowd back to the hearing and go into conference through the night and then go back to the dad-gummed hearing the next morning and back into conference all night, working night and day and day and night trying to keep that community from a calamity that had practically come on us and that we could not avoid.

DOG SON OF A WOLF

In the midst of it was this gentleman by the name of Ansell, whom I can never describe except as Victor Hugo described some individuals. Hugo said, there is an animal for every human; there is not a human that you can not look at long enough, if you know animal life, without finding his counterpart among the animal kingdom. There is an old fable, Hugo says, that with the birth of every litter of wolves there is one dog born, and the mother immediately devours the dog that is born with the litter of wolves for fear that he will be vicious enough to eat up the balance of the litter—the dog son of a wolf. Put the face on Ansell and you have got the dog son of a wolf. That rascal, so found by the committee of the House, was allowed the next day to ask the witness Weiss about this banking situation. And Weiss refused to answer. I instructed him not to answer. We had all the trouble on earth that we could possibly handle. He was asked why he had not deposited certain accounts, and I called the gentlemen aside and told them why we could not afford to answer that kind of a question. I will say that the committee was kind enough to understand, at least for the time, and immediately resumed the hearing without asking the witness to testify any more about any banking situation, direct or indirect. Lo and behold! On the last day of the hearing the same question was asked again, and the witness was told to answer it; and the witness said:

I will answer any question on earth regarding a campaign fund of Overton or Broussard, directly or indirectly relating to it, but I will not answer any other question of any kind regarding a deposit made in a bank, or money kept anywhere else, unless it is a question affecting the Overton and Broussard campaign.

The witness was clearly within his rights.

Then Ansell was not satisfied with that. Why, nothing on God's earth would have pleased that man Ansell like closing

up New Orleans. Nothing on God's earth would have been so pleasing to this scoundrel, who had got Bergdoll out of jail and sent him to Germany on the pot-of-gold tale, as congressional committee reports. He would have had something to his renown if a cluster of stagnation, rampant ruin, and squander could have blazed the trail of this scoundrel, who imposed himself on the chairman of this committee, because the chairman of this committee is too honorable a man to have hired this rascal if he had known that the House committee said he ought to be disbarred. The chairman of this committee would not have hired him if he had known that.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir. I should like to know about that, if you would have hired him if you had known that.

Mr. HOWELL. Certainly the Senator does not want to have this banking matter misunderstood. His memory is at fault.

Mr. LONG. Mine is at fault? Not a bit on earth.

Mr. HOWELL. I will simply make a statement now which the Senator can correct if I am wrong.

Mr. LONG. I am going to read it now.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Weiss testified that he was the clearing house for the Democratic association in Louisiana of which Senator LONG was the head; that he received the moneys that were paid in on account of campaign matters, and that he paid them out, but that he was not an officer of any committee or of any association. He said that he received money only in cash and he paid it out only in cash.

The only reference to the banking situation that was made at this hearing, as I recall, was this: The question was put to Mr. Weiss why he did not deposit these large sums of money in a bank, and have a bank account, and have some accounts of these receipts and expenditures.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. HOWELL. He said it was because he did not want to.

Mr. LONG. That is right; yes, sir.

Mr. HOWELL. Then the question was asked, "Why did you not want to?" I think I am correct in that.

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOWELL. And he answered, "I refuse to answer."

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. HOWELL. That was the only reference made to banking at that time.

Mr. LONG. Oh, no, it was not! Oh, no, it was not, any such thing! That is the last day you are quoting now.

Mr. HOWELL. No; I am quoting the first day.

Mr. LONG. Oh, no! I have it here.

Mr. HOWELL. I am quoting the first day, and I think if you will look at the testimony you will find that my memory is in accord with the facts.

Mr. LONG. All right.

Mr. HOWELL. When he refused to answer as to why he did not, I notified him that he should understand that no one could protect him from the results of refusing to answer. Then it was suggested that he would be willing to tell the committee in confidence why he did not deposit his funds in a bank. I was reluctant to receive any information from a witness in confidence, because I recognized the fact that I was merely acting for the Senate of the United States. However, upon the urging of Senator LONG, Senator CAREY and myself took a recess and went into a room, and there Mr. Weiss gave his reason. I did not think it was a valid reason, and, as a consequence, Mr. Weiss was subsequently questioned, and again he refused to tell us why he did not keep accounts and did not deposit the political funds in his hands in a bank.

Mr. LONG. That is not the correct statement, Senator. The facts are that we went into the room, and I related to the Senator myself, in Mr. Weiss's presence, the circumstance that he would require that witness to tell, and we went back, and the witness was then excused from answering the question, and I will show it here by the record. You did not mention that again for 12 days, when you came back on the closing afternoon and tried to do what you had excused

him from doing 10 days before. Now, if your mind has failed you, I will read it to you.

Mr. HOWELL. True.

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; true. I know it is true, and so do you know it is true.

Mr. HOWELL. Just a moment.

Mr. LONG. Wait just a moment. I am not through yet. I am going to read the record. Your memory can not fail you at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Louisiana—

Mr. LONG. I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; but the Chair is making a statement. No Senator can refer to another Senator in the second person.

Mr. LONG. All right, sir; I beg pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Instead of saying "you," the Senator should say, "The Senator from Nebraska."

Mr. LONG. I will say, then, "The Senator from Nebraska." I will get it back in whatever person it means. It has to be right because I am going to read from it.

Here is what happened, Mr. President. The Senator from Nebraska will know the circumstance that I told him in that room:

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is a perfectly proper question.

Then we rowed around.

The CHAIRMAN. We will take a recess for five minutes.

(At this point a recess was taken, after which proceedings were resumed, as follows:)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. Counsel for the committee will proceed.

And thereupon, in accordance with the proceeding in private, Mr. Ansell propounded a brand new question and left the subject:

Mr. ANSELL. Mr. Weiss, were you also the clearing house for the Louisiana Democratic Association?

And the question was never asked any longer.

This was on the 7th day of February, 1933. The time when Ansell finally came back and asked the witness to answer that question was on the 17th day of February, 1933. The witness did not say on the 7th day of February, 1933, "I do not want to." It was on the 17th day of February that he said, "I do not want to." And here is the question. This was on the 17th:

Mr. WEISS. I have also testified, your honor, I have no bank account in which I kept any political funds; that I kept no books. I do not know that that is any more of his business—I do not care what he makes, but suppose I would ask him if he was getting \$10 a day. That would be overpaying him; but suppose I did ask him that—

Mr. ANSELL. Let us examine this witness and let him decline to answer or not, as he sees fit.

Then we had a row over the conference. No; this is not the place. If the Chair will bear with me just a moment, what happened was this. I will read the record here to prove it, Mr. President, because I remember it very well:

On the day of the 7th, when Mr. Weiss was on the witness stand, and declined to answer these questions, we asked for a recess. The recess was given. We came back to decide whether or not the witness would be made to answer the question, and instead of being asked the question the witness was asked a brand new question a million miles away, so that nothing would be noticed about it; and I remember what happened in the room. I told the chairman myself of an incident that had occurred there in New Orleans, and I told him he would not want to bring that matter out, and they did not, and we left the matter on the 7th.

Then on the 17th we came back, and Ansell came back with the same question he had asked before, and then is when the witness said he would answer any question on earth about the Overton-Broussard political campaign funds, directly, indirectly, remotely, or otherwise affecting them, but that he would not answer any questions outside of that scope; and that is the question that I will read here in a moment.

162001—9149

I will put these questions and answers in the RECORD, Mr. President. There are over 2,000 pages of this testimony, 2,200 or 2,400 pages. I will put in the RECORD to-night the questions and answers of the two days. I ask that I be given permission to put the questions and answers at the conclusion of my remarks, to show what happened on the 7th and what happened on the 17th.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that order will be made.

(See Exhibit B.)

Mr. LONG. Now, that is not all this man Ansell asked the witness. I want to read you something else. Mr. Ansell said to Mr. Weiss:

How much property, real and personal, do you yourself own? Mr. WEISS. Not 5 cents' worth.

Mr. ANSELL. You own nothing now?

Mr. WEISS. I said I own nothing.

Mr. ANSELL. What property did you personally own in the year 1932?

Mr. WEISS. None.

Mr. ANSELL. My question said properties, which includes both personal and real property.

Mr. WEISS. You mean personal; a suit of clothes?

Mr. ANSELL. Personal and real property.

He was asking Mr. Weiss what he owned, now, back in 1932.

Mr. WEISS. Explain it.

Mr. ANSELL. Did you have any personal and real property in the year 1932? If so, of what did that property consist?

Mr. WEISS. I am not quite as smart as you are. What is personal property?

Mr. ANSELL. You know what it is.

Mr. WEISS. I am asking you to explain it.

Mr. ANSELL. Money, checks, stocks, bonds, notes, clothing, neckties—

Think of calling upon a man to go back a year or two and say how many neckties he had, how many suits of clothes he had, how many this, and how many that.

Mr. WEISS. That is none of your business.

Mr. ANSELL. Pocketbooks or what not.

Mr. WEISS. If that is what it means, that is none of your business.

I do not think there is a court or a committee or a chamber on the civilized earth that would stand for that kind of a battering and kangaroo proceeding that man tried to pull off down in that country.

That was not all. He had already asked about what he had no right to ask about. He did not fail to get any information, as Senators may have been led to believe. Nothing of the kind occurred. I will show Senators that the first day they had Weiss on the stand, Ansell asked him all about that. This is what he said. He said to him, "Can you tell this committee what moneys you received on account of Long's political organization during that political campaign?" These are the questions he subsequently asked him, after the meeting in the room.

He said: "As well as I could remember, I received just enough to defray the expenses of Senator Overton's campaign."

Mr. ANSELL. Did you keep any record of the moneys received for that purpose?

Mr. WEISS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANSELL. Have you that record with you?

Mr. WEISS. No, sir.

Mr. ANSELL. Where is the record?

Mr. WEISS. I dictated the record to Mr. Peltier and Mr. Ellender when they made up the record for the committee, sir.

Mr. ANSELL. What did you dictate from?

Mr. WEISS. From my memoranda on my desk.

Mr. ANSELL. Have you those memoranda?

Mr. WEISS. I have not, sir.

Mr. ANSELL. What became of them afterwards?

Mr. WEISS. I destroyed them.

Mr. ANSELL. How long after your dictation did you destroy your memoranda?

Mr. WEISS. When I gave them the information I had no further use for them.

Mr. ANSELL. Did you think you would need those memoranda up to that time?

Mr. WEISS. I did not.

Mr. ANSELL. Were those memoranda kept in the due course of business?

Mr. WEISS. No, sir; they were not.

He asked all about the bank business, about which he had no right to ask, after the whole thing had been asked and answered.

He said to Mr. Weiss, "What is your salary?" I do not know where they got the right to ask a man what he was making, but when he got Mr. Shushan on the stand he said, "What is your business?"

"My business is the wholesale dry-goods business."

"How much is your concern worth?"

"It is rated from \$350,000 to \$500,000."

"How much money did your business make last year?"

"We lost \$7,500 last year."

"How much money did your business make the year before?"

"It lost \$12,000 the year before."

"Well," he said, "that does not seem to be much of a business. How much money did you make out of the State?"

"I did not make any money at all."

"Is it not a fact that you have been selling the State a lot of goods?"

"No. Whatever I sold the State I had to bid low to get it."

"When did you start bidding on contracts?"

"When I was working under Gov. John M. Parker they did not have any bids for the purchase of goods, but since the Long administration in 1928 we had to have bids submitted, and I had to be the low bidder, and before I sold the State of Louisiana I got it on my low bid."

He went into that man's business from top to bottom, asking him what he made, whom he worked for, who his customers were, and Mr. Shushan went on through his private business.

Then he got Mr. Weiss on the stand and asked him what his salary was.

Mr. Weiss said that was a hard question to answer. He said, "I do not think I can answer the question." I then said to Mr. Weiss, "I want to ask the witness to go on and tell him. Tell him what you get."

Mr. WEISS. It is a very hard thing to determine my salary. I get my rooms, my food, my garage, and my pressing.

Mr. ANSELL. In money?

Mr. WEISS. \$10,000.

Mr. ANSELL. Is your salary paid by check or in cash?

Mr. WEISS. In checks.

Mr. ANSELL. Do you deposit your salary in any bank?

Mr. WEISS. I do not.

Mr. ANSELL. You keep it in cash?

Mr. WEISS. Yes, sir; part of it.

Mr. ANSELL. Do you receive any salary from any sources other than that from the hotel?

Mr. WEISS. None at all, sir.

DEFENSE FOR SENATOR HOWELL

He did not have anybody to put on the stand to prove anything by. In the case of every witness he called there, he took the liberty of going into their personal and private accounts, to make himself as obnoxious as his general demeanor would indicate, conducting a regular kangaroo outlawry proceeding, going into every irrelevant hearsay proposition he could think of. That is the kind of testimony to be found in this record. He asked this man all about his bank account in this hearing, asked him where he kept his bank account. The witness told him of every bank account he had, told him everything he ever kept, told him everything from the height and color of the kitchen stove to the description of the cradle in which he was rocked when he was a baby. And still this scoundrel, as the congressional committee found him to be, came back there day after day, this Bergdoll man. By the way, a few minutes ago I said that if the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] had known what the congressional report had been regarding Mr. Samuel Tilden Ansell, he would not have had him down there advising him as to his conduct in those proceedings. Thereupon the Senator from Nebraska rose, and I thought he was about to enter what I had already entered for him—a disclaimer for inflicting on the people of that State the conduct of a rascal who had been impeached by the House of Representatives because of his low-down effort to deprive the country and when the Senator from Nebraska rose, I thought he was going to confirm what I had thought—that

if he had known these things he would not have employed him to browbeat the people of that section of the country—good, honorable citizens.

I know too much about the Senator from Nebraska to think that he would have taken this man down there as counsel of the committee if he had known he was one who was guilty of a misrepresentation in an effort to make himself Judge Advocate General and who dug up that pot-of-gold story, the story that Grover Cleveland Bergdoll had buried over in Maryland a pot of gold and got him loose and sent him to Germany. I know that if the Senator from Nebraska had known that a committee had said that he never ought to have been allowed to go before any civilized court, he never would have picked an outlaw of that character and carried him to Louisiana.

It is necessary that I make this defense of my colleague. It is necessary that we get this thing straight.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield. I want the Senator to tell us about it this time, whether he would or would not have taken this man.

Mr. HOWELL. I had never met General Ansell until the matter of his employment arose. And I want to say this for General Ansell: He is a very able man. He served the committee and gave the best that was in him. He is learned in the law. I know nothing about the matters to which the Senator from Louisiana refers.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just a moment?

Mr. HOWELL. In just a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I want to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he considers it was an evidence of great ability for Colonel Ansell to be spending public funds in going into such irrelevant matters as the question of whether or not the junior Senator from Louisiana had Indian blood in his veins and into the feuds of the Long family?

SENATOR HOWELL EXPRESSES REGRET

Mr. HOWELL. Let me say this: General Ansell spent no public funds afforded by the United States Senate except what he was entitled to have, and his per diem.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. HOWELL. It has been suggested that General Ansell had money with which to accomplish this and accomplish that in New Orleans. He had no money from the committee whatever.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOWELL. I merely want to say respecting General Ansell, as I have stated before, that I had never met him prior to that time, but I was greatly impressed with his ability as an attorney, and his industry and fidelity to the work he had in hand.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he approved of the unprecedented conduct of the counsel of his committee, a servant of the United States Senate, in the middle of an investigation giving out a statement attacking a Member of the United States Senate and a Senator elect, so vicious in its insinuations and so scurrilous and libelous in its assertions that it was not carried by the great press associations of the United States?

Mr. HOWELL. I presume the Senator refers to a statement issued by General Ansell—

Mr. CLARK. On Sunday; yes.

Mr. HOWELL. Which has not been published, as I understand.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has seen it, has he not?

Mr. HOWELL. I beg pardon?

Mr. CLARK. Did not the Senator from Nebraska see it?

Mr. HOWELL. I saw a copy of it.

Mr. CLARK. The only reason why it was not published was on account of its contents.

Mr. HOWELL. I regretted very much that General Ansell gave out a statement. It was wholly without my knowledge. It had not been discussed with me. But he did it, and it was his act, and, as I say, I regret that he did it.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator think that was proper conduct on the part of an employee of the Senate in the midst of an investigation?

Mr. HOWELL. So far as that is concerned, I have stated that I regretted his act.

Mr. CLARK. Was the Senator correctly quoted yesterday in the New York Herald Tribune, after reading that statement, when he said that there was no disagreement between the committee and counsel?

Mr. HOWELL. I made no such statement as that.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator was so quoted in the New York Herald Tribune of yesterday morning.

Mr. HOWELL. That there was no disagreement between committee and counsel?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; and that was after Colonel Ansell had given out this statement.

Mr. HOWELL. No; there was no such statement given out by me, that there was no disagreement between the committee and counsel.

Mr. CLARK. Then the Senator has been misquoted.

Mr. HOWELL. Unless it was in reference to what had taken place.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator seems to think he is very proud of his counsel. He is apparently very proud of the Bergdoll record of the counsel he has picked for the committee, from what he says, unless he means to disclaim it. I gave the Senator credit for better intentions than that.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield again?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Just for the purpose of the RECORD, I read from the New York Herald Tribune of Monday, February 20. After referring to the statement given out by Colonel Ansell and the statement jointly issued by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Wyoming, Colonel Ansell said:

"That is the way I feel about the matter," he said.

He added he had been retained for 30 days and that period was up. Senator HOWELL told newspaper men there was no disagreement between the counsel and the members.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HOWELL. I had two calls by telephone on Sunday. However it affects the situation, I want to state that, when I had the interview, as I recall, with the reporter representing the Herald Tribune, I had not seen General Ansell's statement.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, since the Senator from Nebraska says he is impressed with General Ansell, I want to read the Senator from Nebraska and the other Members of the Senate whom the Senator from Nebraska has picked for his charming angel of this inquisitorial kangaroo business of trying out the feuds of the Long family, the race of 1918 for railroad commissioner, the governor's race of 1924, the issue of the Ku-Klux Klan, the governor's race of 1928, the Long race of 1930, the legislative sessions from the time I was able to get to one to the time I was able to lead them, and various other things which are in this record—I want to read him what they said about this gentleman. I want to read him the record of the man he says he is impressed with.

Here is the report from the United States Congress, the majority report of the committee, and I want to say that the minority report does not do any credit to Mr. Ansell. The minority report differs in some respects, but it did not do any good to Mr. Ansell. It said his conduct was just about as bad as the other one said it was. Let me read what the House said about this man Ansell and about the pot-of-gold story he fixed up for the War Department.

It is interesting to know that General Ansell, until a short time before his employment in the Bergdoll case, had been

an officer in the regular Army of the United States for about twenty-five years, and that during the war he was the next officer in control to General Crowder, the Judge Advocate General. However, during the war General Crowder was more directly concerned and employed in preparing and executing the draft law, thus virtually leaving General Ansell as the Judge Advocate General.

They produced two letters that General Ansell wrote to the War Department for Bergdoll, the one he dictated and did not send, and the one he wrote with a pencil and did send, and they showed here, two Democrats and one Republican, from a comparison of those two letters, that there was nothing but a thief at the bottom of them both. Then they go on to say:

The conclusion is irresistible that General Ansell was then using with emphasis the name of Judge Westcott to bring influence to bear upon the Secretary of War should the communication ever reach him.

It never reached the Secretary of War, however.

General Ansell had said that he was going with this man, or else one of the other lawyers, under guard. Here is what the committee said:

General Ansell knew several days in advance that the expedition would start May 20; and he knew that Gibboney himself did not contemplate making more than a part, if any, of the journey. So, there is no escape from the conclusion that General Ansell knew, at least two days and two nights before the journey started, that his pledge made to General Harris in this respect was to be violated.

I wonder how that sounds to the Senator from Nebraska?

When General Ansell was on the witness stand the question was put to him a number of times, and by different members of the committee, to indicate at least one specific act done by him looking toward the redemption of the pledge. To each and every one of those questions he was either nonresponsive or evasive.

Quoting further:

The two letters—the one which was sent and the one which was not sent—when taken in connection with all the other happenings in the case, show that General Ansell was not only taking advantage of his long association in the Army with General Harris, but was actually misleading him into having Bergdoll released for the purpose of seeking the alleged hidden gold.

Quoting further:

The question naturally arises that if one or the other of them was to go—and Bailey admits that he had agreed to join the expedition at Hagerstown, Md.—why was there a change of mind, just following Bailey's return from a visit to Bergdoll, to the effect that neither was to go at all. And, further, why was not General Harris so advised? He was within a stone's throw of them during these two days and two nights. What happened between May 11 and May 17 that did away with the necessity of even Bailey's going? Was information received by either Ansell or Bailey at Governors Island, where Bergdoll was confined under Colonel Hunt that the gold was not buried at Hagerstown, or that the expedition would not proceed beyond Philadelphia, where Mrs. Bergdoll says the gold was buried, and at which point Bergdoll escaped?

Right here I want to pause to ask the junior Senator from Nebraska if he thinks there is one word of truth in the story of the pot of gold that Bergdoll had buried over here in Maryland? Does the junior Senator from Nebraska mean to say that he would believe there is one word of truth in it or that any sensible man believes such a cooked-up story that Ansell knew would put Bergdoll in Germany, or that there is a word of respectable truth in that pot-of-gold story? I have heard these old pot-of-gold stories ever since I was born, that there is a pot of gold over at the foot of the rainbow, and somebody, it was said, has ridden his life out hunting for the pot of gold. But here comes General Ansell and palms his way into the United States Senate and imposes himself on this good learned and conscientious Senator, after having defrauded the United States and put over that pot-of-gold story. If I had known this about that man when he left Washington with the junior Senator from Nebraska, I would have feared for the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] coming back with his shoes on, if that man could put that kind of a pot-of-gold story over on the United States Government.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. CAREY. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee that conducted the hearings. Before General Ansell was employed I was consulted by the Senator from Nebraska. General Ansell was employed on the recommendation of an old friend of the Senator in Nebraska, a man who had previously practiced law in Omaha and in whom the Senator from Nebraska had every confidence. It was through him that General Ansell was employed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question. Does the Senator realize that at least 80 per cent of the testimony taken in the hearing down there was wholly irrelevant?

Mr. CAREY. I would rather not discuss the case until we have reported.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has permitted his counsel to discuss it in the most public manner.

SENATOR CAREY SAYS TESTIMONY NOT RELEVANT

Mr. CAREY. I admit there was testimony that was not relevant.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I can not do the Senator from Wyoming too much honor in this matter. I want to say further that I agree that his statement, I think, clearly forces the conclusion that the Senator from Nebraska in good faith employed Ansell. I think the Senator was in good faith. I do not want him to make another similar mistake at least when I am to be the intended victim. If there is to be any operation performed on me, please do not go to the galleys to get the surgeon.

I read further about this Ansell:

On the 19th of April, 1920, General Ansell prepared a contract fixing the fee which the firm of Ansell & Bailey was to receive as attorneys for Bergdoll. That tentative contract was submitted by General Ansell to Mr. Gibboney for his approval, but Mr. Gibboney declined to approve it. Thereafter, on the 23d day of April, Mr. Gibboney himself, representing Bergdoll with carte blanche authority, submitted a counter, tentative contract to General Ansell.

Under the terms of the first tentative contract Ansell & Bailey, according to the construction put upon it by Mr. Bailey, could have received \$60,000.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Nebraska stated a moment ago that he did not know about the statement which Colonel Ansell had issued until after it had been issued, and he was not consulted about it, and, of course, everybody in the Senate will accept that statement. I ask the Senator from Nebraska if he considers it proper procedure for the committee counsel to be giving out statements of that sort in the midst of the investigation, and whether he had given Colonel Ansell any authority to make such a statement as that? I ask that question in view of the Senator's statement that he has very high admiration and regard for Colonel Ansell.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I will read from a copy of the statement signed by the subcommittee that conducted these hearings, composed of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] and myself. This was given out on February 19, 1933:

The undersigned, a subcommittee of the Senate appointed to investigate campaign expenditures and other matters in connection with the recent election, returned from New Orleans this morning after holding public hearings in that city covering a period of about two weeks. The subcommittee will report at an early date to the full committee and will subsequently report to the Senate. Other than this the committee has not or will not authorize any report or statement.

162001—9149

That answers the Senator's question. I read this statement in answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. CLARK. It is not in answer to my statement. The Senator said he had high admiration and respect for General Ansell. I am asking the Senator if he considers such conduct on the part of committee counsel as proper?

Mr. HOWELL. I have stated that I regretted that General Ansell issued a statement.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator think that the committee's counsel has been guilty of flagrantly improper conduct?

Mr. HOWELL. I have gone as far as I will in the statement I have made.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that that is one of the most civil acts he did in that whole matter; this statement was more civil than many other things he did.

I have clean hands in one part of my conduct in public life. I was once in a fight with the Fuqua administration in Louisiana, attacking the highway commission, when a brother of an important member of the highway commission came to me and wanted to volunteer a statement against his brother's conduct. I declined to receive the statement against my personal and political enemy coming from his brother, and I can give the names and dates and places.

And for a committee to have allowed this man Ansell to call brothers of a man who was not a party to the contest, who was not a candidate for office, to have allowed this scoundrel, condemned for every phase of crime that Congress could find in the career of a living human being, to have permitted him to call the brothers of a man to testify to irrelevant matters against a man not connected with the case in order that they might have the privilege under the law that what they said could be published without there being a remedy for anyone—I want to say that that was much more low down, and that the day of the cutthroat had come into its own when Ansell was in charge of the matter.

Now I want to read a little more about Brother Bergdoll in order that the Senator from Nebraska may slumber more soundly than he has been doing. Quoting:

Anybody who has seen or heard all of those associated, either directly or indirectly, with the plan or manner of Bergdoll's escape, not only must recognize General Ansell as the master mind of them all but also as their dominating and controlling spirit * * *

Bergdoll's escape was the direct result of the proposition submitted by General Ansell to General Harris. Even if General Ansell did not conceive the plan, he presented it and pursued it to its accomplishment. The others had exhausted all remedies known to them as attorneys practicing in the civil courts. It was General Ansell, resourceful and conversant with military possibilities, who must have conceived it.

Then I skip a little and get back to Brother Ansell again:

The broad, well-defined trail leading to the escape did not become unmistakably evident until General Ansell induced General Harris to authorize the expedition to search for the gold. There can be no doubt about General Ansell's ability and learning, but it is certain he did not get into the case because of that ability and learning alone. * * * The large fee contemplated by him evidently was based not only upon what he might accomplish through legal channels but, in addition, by exercised influence.

The many fees to be gotten from others, and the big one to be paid by Bergdoll, lured him into questionable paths.

While there are many who participated in the conspiracy leading to Bergdoll's escape and the acquittal of those who brought it about, there are three who are infinitely more culpable than the rest. Those three are General Ansell, Colonel Hunt, and Col. C. C. Cresson. * * *

General Ansell is now out of the Army. He is beyond the jurisdiction of court-martial proceedings, but provisions should be made against his future practice before any of the departments, before any court-martial, or in the courts of the District of Columbia or the Nation above whose safety and integrity he has placed gold.

And yet he is the bird who was sent down to Louisiana, who stood up before the chairman and invited one United States Senator out for a fist fight and who stood up and invited a Senator elect out for a fist fight.

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

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not familiar with the Ansell-Bergdoll case except very hazily, and I was wondering what action was finally taken in regard to General Ansell. Was he discharged from the Army or disbarred or censured or what was done to him?

Mr. LONG. He got out of the Army just in time to avoid it. The fact of the case is—I am not quite sure—that he took a position as Judge Advocate General and he got out of that and resigned from the Army. Then he got into this.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that prior to his resignation from the Army he had been demoted for misconduct by order of the Secretary of War from brigadier general to lieutenant colonel, which was his regular Army status.

Mr. TYDINGS. Was that the result of his conduct in the Bergdoll matter?

Mr. CLARK. That was prior to his conduct in the Bergdoll case.

Mr. LONG. He had misrepresented facts, and, as a result, he got a commission from the Chief of Staff.

Mr. TYDINGS. May I ask how long it was after the Bergdoll case that he resigned?

Mr. LONG. He resigned before that.

Mr. TYDINGS. He resigned before that?

Mr. LONG. Yes; he resigned before the Bergdoll case. Instead of being retired, he resigned and took the Bergdoll case.

Mr. TYDINGS. Did the bar associations in the locality in which he belonged take any action because of his conduct?

Mr. LONG. I do not know what the bar associations did, but I have just read excerpts from what the congressional committee said.

Mr. TYDINGS. Did anybody inflict any punishment upon him except what was said by the congressional committee?

Mr. LONG. No; he seems to have gone scot-free, and never bobbed up again until he bobbed up in the company of the Senator from Nebraska. [Laughter.] The next I heard of Ansell after the time he led the united army into Maryland searching for the pot of gold, when he was recommended for disbarment as a scoundrel and a thief, was when he bobbed up as the personal, political, and financial escort of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] to investigate me from the cradle to the grave in somebody else's election probe.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I have rarely, Mr. President, heard anyone so vituperated and abused anywhere as I have heard the counsel for the committee investigating the Louisiana election. It is ex parte; it is by a Senator under his privilege of immunity, I take it, and in his character as attorney in the case, as I understand.

Mr. LONG. I do not claim any privilege.

Mr. BAILEY. That is what I wish to ask.

Mr. LONG. No, sir; I do not claim any privilege from this scoundrel anywhere on earth under God's living sun.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator claims no privilege?

Mr. LONG. None at all.

Mr. BAILEY. And no immunity?

Mr. LONG. None at all.

Mr. BAILEY. And the Senator invites the man accused by him to test the truth of his accusations in the courts?

Mr. LONG. Anywhere on earth.

Mr. BAILEY. And the Senator agrees not to claim any immunity or any privilege?

Mr. LONG. Anywhere on earth. That is, however, I invite him to sue me in any court of competent jurisdiction, and I will not defend the suit except on the ground that he is a scoundrel and a thief and a rascal and a crook and has been determined to be such by an investigating committee of Congress. Does the Senator mean to say that the committee of Congress should be censured for its report on him?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, this Senator did not mean to say anything about any committee.

Mr. LONG. I am reading from the report. I will read the Senator what the Literary Digest said. Did the Senator hear what the Literary Digest said about him?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I might call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that these remarks of the Senator from Louisiana were preceded by a statement from Colonel Ansell in his capacity as counsel for the investigating committee which was so scurrilous and so libelous that the great press associations of the United States refused to carry it.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the Senator from Louisiana directed a question to me. What was the question?

Mr. LONG. Was the Senator here when I read from the report of the congressional committee?

Mr. BAILEY. I was.

Mr. LONG. Was the Senator here when I read from the Literary Digest?

Mr. BAILEY. I was.

Mr. LONG. I hope I have not said anything about him that is not contained in that report and in the Literary Digest.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say once more that I have heard a great many expressions of the personal opinion of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAILEY. I am content—

Mr. LONG. I think he is one of the lowest scoundrels that has ever been allowed immunity of law, and I have the authority of Congress to back me up in that statement.

Mr. BAILEY. I am content with the Senator's statement that he waives all privilege and immunity.

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; I invite that rascal to sue me in a court of competent jurisdiction; and I will tell you now that there is not any more danger of him suing me than there is of my being made Pope of Rome; and I am a Baptist. [Laughter.]

No, sir; he is not going back to Louisiana to sue anybody. He can sue me in a Federal court, but he is not going down there to sue anybody. He invited me out to a fist fight; he invited the Senator-elect Overton out of the room for a fist fight; but when the witness Weiss took the stand and told him he could invite him out to a fist fight he knew whom to invite out. He knew neither of us could afford it; so he did not ask the witness to go out. He made a great, big, hocus-pocus play there over a police officer coming in there with a gun. A terrible thing—a policeman had a gun on him! He hauled up witnesses and made one of the greatest plays, that an armed gunman had walked in; that his life was in danger!

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. LONG. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Would the Senator object to this investigation if counsel other than General Ansell were employed?

Mr. LONG. I did not object to the investigation at all within the limits of the law and what the Senate resolution says.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point I make is that evidently, assuming that what the Senator from Louisiana says is true—I have not read the testimony, and know nothing about it—assuming that it is true, the point is, the Senator feels that the counsel was incompetent and not wisely selected. I should like to elicit from the Senator whether or not he would object to a comprehensive investigation of the proper charges by another counsel whom the committee might or might not select.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LONG. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CLARK. In line with what the Senator from Maryland has suggested, I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana if it has occurred to him that having squandered \$25,000 of public funds in an investigation that is almost wholly irrelevant, it might now be the intention of the com-

mittee, if it could be voted another \$25,000, to devote it to the merits of the case, if any there be.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana that question.

Mr. LONG. I did not object to the investigation. They have investigated for 12 days. They have spent \$25,000. They have brought there every enemy I have had; and if the Senator from Maryland will read this record and say that there is any ground, after having squandered \$25,000, for squandering \$25,000 more, I shall be glad to answer the Senator.

I say this: I have not objected to any investigation—

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I do not want to inject myself into this matter, because I know nothing about it; but what interested me was this:

It seems, from the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, that the proper kind of an investigation was not made, and that it was made by the improper kind of an investigator. I am simply asking him, if the proper kind of an investigator is selected by the committee, as to whether or not he would have any objection to the proper kind of an investigation?

Mr. LONG. I say that everything that could have properly been brought out has already been brought out. They brought in every record, they brought in every archive, they brought in everything that could be brought in. Do you mean to ask whether I want another gang like that down there in Louisiana? No. There is not any more reason to investigate Louisiana than there is to investigate Maryland—not a bit on earth. Our man did not even have opposition at the general election. He was not even opposed. There was not a single contest filed before the State central committee—nothing at all. The arbitrators gave out a report saying that it was the fairest, the squarest election that was ever held in New Orleans. You have gone down there. You have produced everything you could. Take the report of every investigator you have, and see if you can find anything in it that justifies the spending of the funds. Oh, no! I think I understand things.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Understand, I have not read the testimony.

Mr. LONG. No; I know the Senator has not, and the Senator is not going to read the testimony.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, I will.

Mr. LONG. I hope the Senator does.

Mr. TYDINGS. But I was just trying to analyze what was the argument of the Senator from Louisiana—

Mr. LONG. I am arguing the facts.

Mr. TYDINGS. That he felt, first of all, that the investigator was not a proper investigator, and he seemed to make out a pretty fair case. Then he brought out the point that the investigation was not relevant, and he seemed to make out a pretty fair case.

Mr. LONG. All right.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want to pass upon that kind of investigation, and all I was hoping to do was to give the Senator the kind of an investigation that he wanted.

Mr. LONG. I never asked for any investigation. [Laughter.] I never asked for any. Was there anybody here in the Senate who asked the committee to investigate his State? I did not ask for it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LONG. I do.

Mr. CLARK. In answer to the Senator's question, I will say that I and another one of the leading candidates for the Democratic nomination in Missouri asked this committee to come into Missouri before the primary, at a time when there was evidence of the excessive use of money on every hand; and the committee replied that they would not come in unless we would get proof and send it to them, in which case we would not need the committee to come in. What

we needed was process. If we had had the process and had had the proof, of course we could have proceeded under the criminal laws of the State of Missouri.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LONG. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOWELL. A good deal has been said here about the large sums of money that have been spent upon this investigation. I desire to state that I am chairman of the committee to investigate campaign expenditures and other matters in the recent campaign; and all the expenditure that I have made, including this investigation—

Mr. LONG. You have not made any anywhere else.

Mr. HOWELL (continuing). Including this investigation—

Mr. LONG. That is all you have.

Mr. HOWELL (continuing). Amounts to \$12,000.

Now, Mr. President, I also want to make another statement. We received complaints from Missouri. All they urged was that sums of money were being spent down there; and they wanted us to come down and investigate. Of course that is claimed in every State. We asked them for some details that could justify an investigation—sworn complaints, details, something to investigate about.

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

Mr. HOWELL. Just a moment. We received no reply. I presented the matter to the full committee; and the full committee decided, as the minutes will show, that no investigator should be sent into that State.

Mr. CLARK. Now will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, of course if we had had the detailed proof in the form of affidavits, it would not have been necessary to have a Senatorial investigating committee come in. I take it that the purpose of creating this committee, in addition to the ordinary Committee on Privileges and Elections, is to serve particularly that purpose; to go into States and supply senatorial process to prevent violations of the law by the excessive use of money before the offense has been committed, instead of waiting until after the offense has been committed and then going in and going through the silly process of locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen.

The Senator's committee refused to come into Missouri in a case where two of the three leading candidates were joining in that request; and now it goes down here to Louisiana on a wild-goose chase in a contest in which the contestant himself stated on the floor of the Senate that he did not even contend that he had been elected.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana further yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have not time enough to yield for all this argument. It is now 5 o'clock. I want to wind up. As to the merits of the Missouri matter, and any controversy with the Senator's investigating committee, that can be argued out later. I want to complete my statement about this matter.

I want to find out, however, who has poured the holy oil to exculpate this thimble-rigging crook who has been denounced by the House of Representatives as a crook and a thief. I want to know who has poured the oil over this man that Congress says, through its committee, is a crook and a thief and a rascal. I want to know if he has been made holy by going down and pulling off a kangaroo court in Louisiana. I want to know if it makes one holy if he calls in the political opponents of HUEY P. LONG.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Do I understand the Senator from Louisiana to say that the investigating committee made up of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] have conducted a kangaroo court?

Mr. LONG. I did not say any such thing, and the Senator did not understand any such thing.

Mr. BAILEY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. LONG. All right. I said Maj. Gen. Samuel Tilden Ansell did that. The Senator did not understand me to say anything different than that. If he did, he is mistaken. I said, what had made this crook holy? Let him sue me. Go down there and bring suit. Let this crook bring suit—this man that Congress says is a thief, a crook of every kind, who has been so adjudicated after hearing by honorable men—and it has never been answered. It has never been denied. It has been published in the Literary Digest. It has been published in the public press that he had put up that pot-of-gold story, and sneaked this scoundrel Bergdoll over into Germany, and had received an immense amount of money to do it, and had resigned from the Army, and could no longer be served with process from it; yet he has been picked to go down there.

I did not complain against the investigation. I want the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to understand that. There is part of the investigation that was entirely relevant; and they went into everything they could get testimony on, that the investigators could find, so far as it was relevant, and I did not make any protest. They had the report of the investigators; and I want the Senator from Maryland to understand that the chairman of the committee announced that they had produced all the testimony they had there at the time. I did not object to that. I am not objecting to all that they went into; but after they had concluded that, and had no more evidence of that nature or description, to have gone in and put on the witness stand the men who had run against you for office, and have them repeat the old tales that they had told the people of that State for years, and have the privilege under law to compel your relatives that you could not support for public office to take the witness stand and remake the slanderous charges that they had made for years, that the people would not believe, and thereby make them whereby they could be published in newspapers, where you would be remediless—that is what I objected to; trying out the issue as to whether I was a member of the Ku-Klux Klan, back in 1923; going into the slander that they did not dare utter except under a privilege which would permit publication without a remedy to the man that was the victim of it. That is what this committee was used for.

I did not object. They had the report. For five months they had been in the State of Louisiana. After five months, and having a hearing there, without producing anybody to show anything at all, we are yet to have the kind of molestation we have had there, where they have brought in everybody they could.

Why, I will read you what the chairman of the committee said. Give me the last volume and I will read you what the chairman of the committee said. There is only one more matter. Here is what the chairman said:

This investigation by the Senate committee appointed to investigate campaign expenditures and other matters has been in progress since early in October, when a subcommittee composed of Senators CONNALLY and BRATTON recommended, after a preliminary hearing, that a full investigation be made. A corps of investigators has been in Louisiana since that time, and the present subcommittee has now completed 12 days of public hearings in New Orleans and has largely completed its work in this city. However, much data has been accumulated respecting out-State conditions, but hearings for the development of further facts must be deferred for the present.

But, Mr. President, this did not exactly state all the facts. They had brought witnesses there from Opelousas; they had brought witnesses there from Winnfield; they had brought witnesses there from Shreveport; they had brought witnesses there from Hammond; they had brought witnesses there on every point at all relevant and irrelevant from all over the State of Louisiana; and the Senator's statement there that they had not produced out-State testimony was not exactly according to what had been done, through an error of the Senator, which I know was made in good faith.

162001—9149

Now, here is what I said:

Counsel for Senator Overton was not given any particular notice that he would be permitted to produce witnesses to-day, but, having the opportunity for some two hours or more, has produced the testimony that has gone into the record, and counsel stands ready now to refute by competent testimony any charge of any irregularity that may be charged; and if the committee so desires, counsel for Mr. Overton will bring to Washington, D. C., public records of every kind, nature, and description and the witnesses that may be necessary at any time to show the falsity of any charge of irregularity or any other misconduct that may remotely be said to be connected with the Overton-Broussard campaign.

I ask the Senate this, when they have gone down there and received hearsay testimony for two weeks to prove nothing, if at the end of that time it is treating us exactly fair for them just to have pulled up stakes and left? It was just because there was nothing to be proven. With everything said there that could be said on these irrelevant and extraneous things, they were not able to prove anything.

(At this point Mr. LONG yielded the floor for the day.)

Wednesday, February 22, 1933

(Continuation from Tuesday, February 21, 1933)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have received a little note, which I shall send to the desk and ask the clerk to read. It has something to do with the length of the speech I delivered here yesterday and what I propose to say to-day. I ask that the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Horace says:

"Be brief, so that the thought does not stand in its own way, hindered by words that weigh down the tired ears."

Huey, I commend the above sentiment to your consideration.

WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, in view of the admonition which the distinguished Senator from Maine has seen fit to go back some two or three thousand years to get and give me, I shall undertake to condense my remarks into a very few minutes.

I wanted to read the majority report of the House on the escape of Grover Cleveland Bergdoll. Instead of reading that I send it to the desk and ask that it be incorporated at the conclusion of my remarks as Exhibit A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Further, Mr. President, I should have stated in the beginning of what I said yesterday some matters of fact which I presumed Members of the Senate and the public at large understood a great deal better than it appears they do understand them.

I ask leave of the Senate to insert what I say in these few words relative to the history of the Bergdoll case at an appropriate place in the beginning of my speech of yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I further wish to say, since the matter was mentioned by the Senator from Missouri, not by me, that the statement issued by Mr. Ansell upon his return from New Orleans, I am informed by a member of the subcommittee, was issued without any consultation with or notice to any member of the committee whatever. I am informed that "General" Ansell, as he calls himself, wired to Washington, D. C., stating to the press that he would give a conference, and that he had actually wired that before he left New Orleans, without mentioning it to any member of the committee whatever; that he came here on a Sunday and called in the newspaper reporters and handed out a prepared statement which, I am informed, was never mentioned and never read to any member of the committee, with no notice given in any way, shape, manner, or form to any member of the committee that he was going to issue it until he did it here in Washington, an act which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] has said he re-

grets, and an act which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has described as highly infamous, to say the least.

Mr. President, I should conclude what remarks I desire to make, because I have undertaken to discuss only what I have termed the irrelevant matters of this inquiry. I did not go into the matter of the expenditure of money or of any opprobrium on the part of the candidate Overton, because I conceived that those were legitimate matters of inquiry under the resolution. Therefore I have not, in advance of the committee reporting, undertaken to go into these matters at all, and I hope I will not. But I wish to say a word further, and I am required to take some few minutes of the Senate's time.

LOUISIANA ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. President, I do not conceive that the administration of Gov. O. K. Allen, of Louisiana, and of myself as Governor of Louisiana are appropriate objects of inquiry on the part of the Senate. I do not conceive that the merits or the demerits of our administrations as governors of that State are in any respect pertinent. But so much has been printed about these administrations of mine and my successor as governors that I am required to answer, hoping that some of the facts which I mention here may gain their way into the publications of this country to answer what was testified in the hearing and printed, but which was not, I contend, relevant.

Mr. President, I wish to say that when I became the Governor of Louisiana in 1928 the State was committed to a penitentiary losing some years to around a million dollars a year. At the conclusion of my administration and during the administration of Governor Allen that penitentiary, which had been losing a million dollars a year, is on a self-sustaining basis, and perhaps a paying and profitable basis.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that that penitentiary, along with the other penitentiaries of the United States, was investigated by a committee sent out by the N. E. A. newspaper services, and they reported on the penitentiary systems of the 48 States. When they reached Louisiana they stated that the penitentiary of Louisiana was the most ideal, from every standpoint, among all the penitentiaries of the United States. That was printed throughout the world in all newspapers, except in the newspapers of the State of Louisiana.

Mr. President, the next thing which I hope will find its way into print to counteract what has been printed as a result of this hearing, under privilege, is that when I became the governor of that State, Louisiana was at the bottom of the list as the most illiterate State in the United States, according to statistics of the census of the United States. When I left the governor's office, we had opened up night schools to educate the illiterate people who were 20 years old and older. We sent them to school when they were 20 years old, 40 years old, or 70 years old, and when I retired from the governor's office in 1932 to become a Member of the Senate, illiteracy in that State had been reduced to such a point that Louisiana was among the States recognized for the education of the people, from the top to the bottom, regardless of age. The educational system had been so improved that the illiterates had been reduced from 238,000 by 150,000 adults being educated in night schools.

Mr. President, that is not all I wish to say in order that my State and my administration may not be stabbed unfairly in this proceeding. There was an improvement among the Louisiana colleges. The Louisiana State University, particularly, was rated by the Intercollegiate Association of State Universities as a third-rate college, and when I retired from the office of governor of the State of Louisiana it was rated as an A No. 1 university of the United States, as good as Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, or any other university.

Criticism has been made in the record of the committee hearing of the fact that I built a medical college for the Louisiana State University. That is true. In 1905 a law had been passed providing that a medical college should be built. I completed that work, under that act, in 1931 or 1932, but I wish to say that, regardless of the criticism

that has been put into the record, that medical college only a few days ago was given the highest rating that can be given by the American Medical Association to a medical college.

Then, Mr. President, a great deal has been said about the highway work that has been done in Louisiana. When I became governor of that State we had just a few miles, perhaps 30 or 40 miles, of paved highways in Louisiana. Up until this day, as a result of what was done under my work as governor and under Gov. O. K. Allen, the State of Louisiana has about 2,000 miles of paved highways and about 9,000 or 10,000 miles of farmers' gravel road. The State of Louisiana stands out to-day when its program is completed, particularly, as the best State in America and the best community of the world for highways to accommodate its citizens, and no one has to go any further than the United States Bureau of Public Roads to find it out.

But that is not all. The roads built in the State of Louisiana, the concrete-paved highways of the best standard type, cost an average of \$27,000 a mile, including ordinary bridges, and we had to build many bridges in that low country. They not only were the standard construction, but, whereas the United States Bureau of Public Roads require a tensile strength of 3,500 pounds to the square inch, some of the highways of Louisiana developed from 8,000 to 12,000 pounds tensile strength per square inch, as shown by tests. The highways of Louisiana cost an average, including the bridges, of \$27,000 per mile, which is the lowest general average cost of highways in any of the 48 States of the American Union built at or before that time. They were built the least expensively, they were built the strongest, under the most adverse conditions of any State; they cost the least, the State has the most complete system, and yet that work has been marked as a matter of discredit and brought into an election investigation that had no more to do with it than the flowers that bloom in the springtime. So much for the highways.

In the matter of education, in order that the facts regarding my State may be known, we adopted the free school-book system in Louisiana, and under my administration I gave the schools, out of the State treasury, \$1,000,000 more than ever had been given them before, and Governor Allen has increased my allotment even in these hard times by appropriating out of the treasury \$1,500,000 a year to the school children more than I appropriated when I was governor, and I appropriated \$1,000,000 more than my predecessor.

Whence does the money come? An effort has been made to show that the State of Louisiana is overbonded. Mr. President, the State of Louisiana has never defaulted on a bond nor on a maturity nor on the interest on her bonds. The State of Louisiana is not half overbonded. It is said that we issued something like \$60,000,000 worth of highway bonds. North Carolina issued \$135,000,000 and we have a better road system than North Carolina. North Carolina has a good road system, but not as good as ours. Arkansas has a good one, too.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I rise to express profound gratitude for the Senator's confession. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. When I make such a confession it is a compliment. [Laughter.]

Not only that, Mr. President, but in Louisiana those waterways, which are streams in Nebraska and Michigan, are rivers. By the time they get to our part of the country, that which one may step across in Minnesota, is a mile wide in its ordinary stages. At flood stages it may be 10 miles wide. That means that we have to build a bridge by dumping out a certain length and then making a bridge that is 2 miles in length for a river 2 miles wide. That is what we have done down there in Louisiana that we are being criticized for and investigated because a man was elected on a ticket we happened to favor.

We are building to-day a bridge across the Mississippi River that has been promised the people for 40 years. We

are undertaking to start to build another bridge at Baton Rouge. We are building a big, but not so long bridge over the Red River at Shreveport. We have already built a bridge over the Red River at Moncla. We are building another one at Moncla. We are building another one at Alexandria, La., and another one over the Black River at Jonesville. We are building another one over the Ouachita River at Sterlington; another one over the Ouachita River at Monroe—that one has been completed, however. We are building another one over the Ouachita River at Harrisonburg, La.

We have built bridges and are building bridges the like of which can not be found in the length or breadth of this country, under soil conditions such as no other State has had to contend with. We have built the best in the world, we have built the strongest in the world, we have built them at the least cost, and yet all the condemnation that could be poured upon the State and upon her governors has been brought forth in this irrelevant fashion.

TAXES ON THOSE ABLE TO PAY

Where does our money come from? Much has been said about taxation in our State, and after this reference I shall conclude. Where does the money come from? It did not come off the backs of the little man, not a dime of it. We reduced the property assessment in that State. The total assessment of \$1,700,000,000 has been reduced to something like \$1,400,000,000, meaning that the ad valorem assessed basis of property was reduced in that State somewhere between 16 and 20 per cent, meaning that we were receiving that much less in taxes off of the physical property of the little homes of the State and other property, big and little.

But where did the money come from? Mr. President, we put a severance tax on oil. That is where a part of it came from. We put a manufacturers' tax on carbon black. That is where some more of the money came from. We put a tax on the sales of tobacco. That is where some of the money comes from. We put a tax on malt. That is where some of the money comes from. But, Mr. President, under Governor Allen we did the terrible thing of voting a corporation franchise tax to get \$1,000,000 or so, and the still worse thing of voting a tax on the manufacturer of electrical power and energy, which gives our State 2 per cent of the gross receipts derived from the manufacture of electricity and does not permit or allow it to be charged on the bills of the customers consuming it.

We also put a tax upon the natural gas severed from the soil of one-fifth of 1 cent per thousand cubic feet. As a result we have lowered the taxes on the little man, we have collected from the corporations, who should have paid and who are willing, I think, now to pay. They can not help themselves if they are not willing. Also, we have lowered

162001—9149

the taxes on the little man. We have put the taxes on the corporation franchises. We have put the taxes on electricity, which taxes we have not allowed to be charged upon the bills of the consumers. We have put the taxes upon the elements and interests that could best bear the taxes. We have taken the State out of illiteracy. We have raised the standards of its colleges. We have reformed the penitentiary to where it is on a self-sustaining basis. We have gone into the hospitals, where they were taking care of 1,600 patients a day in one hospital, and improved conditions so that to-day they are taking care of 3,800 patients in the same hospital. Where the death rate before I became governor was 4.1 per cent, the death rate has been reduced to 2.7 per cent, a reduction of 1.4 per cent that has been made in the death rate at that hospital.

JUSTICE FOR A STATE

Mr. President, I wish to say further, because I want my State to have the credit, that I am merely undertaking to erase the kind of publicity we have been given. We have built there a home for epileptics. There was no such thing in existence before I became governor of that State. When I became Governor of Louisiana our hospitals and asylums were treating the mentally sick, some of them in chairs in which they were locked, in strait-jackets; some of them had chains tied around their hands locking them to plow handles. We have abolished these barbarous practices in Louisiana under my administration and the administration of Governor Allen. There are three insane asylums in the world rated first class to-day that America knows of, and one of those is in the State of Louisiana.

Mr. President, with this statement I am not going to discuss the matter further unless occasion should arise. I am prepared, however, to discuss the matter in such other and further detail as may be made necessary. I wish to say only this further word. We have undertaken to keep our State from receiving the kind of unfair and unfavorable publicity. It is a known and open fact that certain of the newspapers of that State have tried to break the credit of that State. They have sent over their wires and printed in their publications every line of misinformation that could possibly be spread. The State has a balanced budget; it has every finished picture; its university, which had 1,500 students, has now between 4,000 and 5,000 students. We have built everything modern that a State could have. We have come out of it with a State that has less taxes, Mr. President, than any State in America to-day, taking it from one side of the country to the other, that has anything like the improvements that we have in the State of Louisiana with the property we have.

So, Mr. President, I want to thank the Members of the Senate for their attention and hope these remarks will be justified but, at least, will suffice.