

# Congressional Record

SEVENTY-SECOND CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

## PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO FULFILLMENT

### SPEECH

OF

HON. HUEY P. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 6, 1932

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if I thought the chief issue of the last presidential campaign was receiving consideration from the present party leaders to the extent to which it was considered by the people, I should feel it entirely unnecessary and out of order to say anything here to-day.

I am afraid that the real issue that concerned the nomination of the successful candidate, and which I think prompted his election, is being lost sight of in our discussions and negotiations. Naturally we have patronage to dispense. We are all interested in the positions which we want to secure for our friends. There is a great deal of bank trouble. These things substantially divert attention away from anything else; and for those reasons the chief issue of the campaign appears not to be receiving very much attention, particularly as it concerns our immediate case.

The President, in his message this morning, again recommends a sales tax. There seems to be quite a little effort to roll this issue along in an easy-coasting way as a means of solving the Government's difficulties in failing to balance the Budget.

### PROMISE TO DECENTRALIZE WEALTH

The main issue, Mr. President and Senators, upon which President-elect Roosevelt was nominated for the office of President of the United States, was the decentralization of wealth. The most noticed issue upon which he was elected was the abolition of concentration of the fortunes and wealth of this country in the hands of a few people. That issue attracted such favorable notice among the American people that the present President of the United States, in the closing days of the campaign, was tempted himself to announce against the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few people. In his Madison Square Garden speech even our present President, Mr. Hoover, said:

My conception of America is a land where men and women may walk in ordered liberty, where they may enjoy the advantages of

wealth, not concentrated in the hands of a few but diffused through the lives of all.

A great deal has been said by the Republican press, and some by the Democratic press, as to what the President elect was going to do with the roughly styled "red," radical, progressive, or whatever other termed class of Senators there were, who assisted materially in the nomination of President-elect Roosevelt. A great deal is said about the Dill-Wheeler-Long and other senatorial blocs, of which I know nothing except what I read in the papers.

### THE SENATE BLOC

I can say, in defense of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL], that they are not to be mired and found at fault for any such combination, because I know nothing of it myself, although I would consider it much to my aggravated honor, if such a thing could be possible, in the calculations of myself and some of my friends, if I were a member of any such bloc.

The question is, however, What is going to be done with those composing the supposed-to-be progressive bloc of this Chamber, who, so the publications tell us, were so necessary to the nomination of the President elect, but perhaps not so necessary to the election of the President elect?

If the Senate and the Congress interpret the will of the people of America, as expressed in the last election, even through the votes cast for the Republican presidential candidate, as well as those cast for the Democratic candidate, the first thing with which this Congress must concern itself is organizing along the lines to decentralize wealth in the United States.

### WILL SUPPORT ROOSEVELT'S PROMISES

I expect to give our President elect the kind of support which I would expect if I were in his shoes and he were in my place. I have had the fortune or misfortune to have been a governor once in my lifetime, and I know the trials and tribulations and the lack of time which one occupying the position of Chief Executive meets in his desire to formulate the legislation necessary to carry out a platform. It is necessary that such legislation be to a large extent formulated, planned, executed by the men in this legislative Chamber and in that at the other end of the Capitol.

What did President-elect Roosevelt say? I want it understood in the beginning, and at all times, that I am now

undertaking, and will hereafter undertake, to in no wise frustrate, hamper, hinder, or otherwise place any obstacle in the way of carrying out the platform and purposes of our President elect; that I am first and foremost, and here this morning, undertaking to make easy the task, and to write into accomplishment what our President elect undertook to give to this country.

#### THE WORDS OF THE PRESIDENT ELECT

I read, Mr. President, from the speech of Governor Roosevelt delivered at the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, Calif., on September 23, 1932. This is what he said dealing with the philosophy of government:

Just as freedom to farm has ceased—

And he tells why—

Just as freedom to farm has ceased, so also the opportunity in business has narrowed. It still is true that men can start small enterprises, trusting to native shrewdness and ability to keep abreast of competitors; but area after area has been preempted altogether by the great corporations, and even in the fields which still have no great concerns the small man starts under a handicap.

The unfeeling statistics of the past three decades show that the independent business man is running a losing race. Perhaps he is forced to the wall; perhaps he can not command credit; perhaps he is "squeezed out," in Mr. Wilson's words, by highly organized corporate competitors, as your corner grocery man can tell you.

Recently a careful study was made of the concentration of business in the United States.

It showed that our economic life was dominated by some six hundred and odd corporations, who controlled two-thirds of American industry. Ten million small business men divided the other third.

More striking still, it appeared that, if the process of concentration goes on at the same rate, at the end of another century we shall have all American industry controlled by a dozen corporations and run by perhaps a hundred men.

Put plainly, we are steering a steady course toward economic oligarchy, if we are not there already.

I now read again from the speech of the President elect from which I have just quoted:

The day of the great promoter or the financial titan, to whom we granted anything if only he would build or develop, is over. Our task now is not discovery or exploitation of natural resources or necessarily producing more goods.

It is the soberer, less dramatic business of administering resources and plants already in hand, of seeking to reestablish foreign markets for our surplus production, of meeting the problem of underconsumption, of adjusting production to consumption, of distributing wealth and products more equitably, of adapting existing economic organizations to the service of the people.

The day of enlightened administration has come.

Just as in older times the central government was first a haven of refuge and then a threat, so now in a closer economic system the central and ambitious financial unit is no longer a servant of national desire but a danger. I would draw the parallel one step farther. We did not think because national government had become a threat in the eighteenth century that therefore we should abandon the principle of national government.

So that there may be no mistake, Mr. President, I read two more excerpts on the issue which elected a President of the United States on the 8th day of November:

They must, where necessary, sacrifice this or that private advantage, and in reciprocal self-denial must seek a general advantage. It is here that formal government—political government, if you choose—comes in.

150056—8923

I skip a few paragraphs and quote again:

As yet there has been no final failure, because there has been no attempt; and I decline to assume that this Nation is unable to meet the situation.

The final term of the high contract was for liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

We have learned a great deal of both in the past century. We know that individual liberty and individual happiness mean nothing unless both are ordered in the sense that one man's meat is not another man's poison.

I want to read one further excerpt from a speech delivered by our President elect, Governor Roosevelt, at Columbus, Ohio, on the 20th day of August, 1932. I quote as follows:

We find fewer than 3 dozen private banking houses, and stock-selling adjuncts in the commercial banks, directing the flow of American capital within the country and to those "backward or crippled nations" on which the President built so heavily.

In other words, we find concentrated economic power in a few hands, the precise opposite of the individualism of which the President speaks.

We find a great part of our working population with no chance of earning a living except by grace of this concentrated industrial machinery; and we find that millions and millions of Americans are out of work, throwing upon the already burdened Government the necessity of relief.

I skip and quote again from the speech at Columbus of our President elect, Governor Roosevelt:

I, too, believe in individualism; but I mean it in everything that the word implies. I believe that our industrial and economic system is made for individual men and women; and not individual men and women for the benefit of the system. I believe that the individual should have full liberty of action to make the most of himself; but I do not believe that in the name of that sacred word a few powerful interests should be permitted to make industrial cannon fodder of the lives of half of the population of the United States.

#### SILENCE OF PARTY LEADERS

Mr. President, we do not hear a word out of the party leaders on the Republican side or on the Democratic side of this Chamber along this line to show that they are undertaking to carry out the mandate of the people of the United States to decentralize wealth. We do not hear it from the Republican side—I mean from the leadership proper on the Republican side—notwithstanding the fact that it was embraced in the Madison Square Garden speech of President Hoover.

We do not hear it from the leaders on the Democratic side. We do not expect to hear it from the present leaders on the Democratic side, unless a change has occurred since Congress last met.

We are all subject to change. I am, and so is everybody else. I am not prepared to say that there has not been some change. Some of us have changed our position on prohibition because our constituents, and the other people of the country, have announced themselves in favor of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, and, yielding to the greater virtue and wisdom of 120,000,000 people, no Senator, no Representative, is to be censured for changing his view and his purpose, to accord with the wishes of the American people. And now, as the people of the United States have

expressed themselves, through their nominee and through their actions, having grasped the one hope for the decentralization of wealth, they have justified any man and any leader sitting in this Congress, in the Senate, aye, more, they have instructed him, and all of us, in the purpose and the will and the desires of 120,000,000 American people.

#### ARE LEADERS WILLING TO FOLLOW PEOPLE'S MANDATE?

I am not prepared to say that the leaders on the Republican side or the leaders on the Democratic side have not adopted the view of the people in the matter of decentralizing wealth. I am not prepared to say but that the expression of the people on the question of feeding the people and clothing them has not struck just as responsive a chord in the hearts and minds of the leaders on this side and the other side of the Chamber as it has on the prohibition question. But if it has, it is time we are finding out something. It is time we are learning something. We want to know something.

I only have the word of the same press which fought the nomination of President-elect Roosevelt and fought the election of President-elect Roosevelt—I only have the information of the element that did everything it could to prevent the nomination and election of Roosevelt, at least the nomination, as to my status in the Democratic Party at this time. I only have the words of the element that would have kept the President elect from getting within gunshot distance of the nomination at Chicago that there is any such thing as a dangerous, needed-to-be-ousted element of a Long-Dill-Wheeler bloc—and I say that in the presence of those gentlemen. They were not here when I began. I have already apologized for them. I have denied that they have been mired in any fashion through any such combination with me. I have only the word of the element who willed it that the man who has been elected President of the United States should neither be nominated nor elected, that those of us who so prominently participated in the nomination are what might be described in French as the *bête noir*, the black beast, and they are afraid to turn us out and afraid not to do so.

I do not know why such has been said even by our opposition. Certainly some of the principles upon which we compromised in the Democratic platform were not entirely to my 100 per cent satisfaction. There are some of them I would not have written had it been solely my own mind to frame them. It was in the spirit of compromise that they were written. Certain it is that Senators sitting in this body might not have gone so far in the decentralization of wealth as our President elect has gone. But viewing the situation as I do myself, it is the spirit of compromise from the necessities as viewed by the American people that compelled it.

150056—8922

Now we come to find out something. Is there anybody in the party who does not want those of my kind because we undertook to nominate the President elect of the United States on the principles for which he stood? Is there anybody who thinks the President elect is going to try to turn somebody out of the house because he insists upon carrying out the platform and the principles enunciated by the President elect and having them written into law? On behalf of the President elect I resent such an imputation; I resent such a threat on his good purpose. I resent it because the President elect has not only been nominated, has not only been elected, but he has assumed the leadership of this Nation in order that he might carry out the one great fundamental, necessary principle of the decentralization of wealth in America.

That is not in my words.

I read in some of the publications that when I came to the United States Senate I announced that I did not think Mr. Roosevelt was the candidate to be nominated. That is true. I did not think so. But it is said that later on I announced that I thought Roosevelt was the man to nominate. That is true, too. And why? No one need be surprised why.

#### WHY DEMOCRACY NAMED ROOSEVELT

Here is the reason, long before the Chicago convention met, it may be found why votes went into the Chicago convention for Mr. Roosevelt that would not otherwise have gone there. I read from a speech delivered by President-elect Roosevelt which I offered and had published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the 23d day of last May. I read from the speech which he delivered in Atlanta, Ga., on May 22. I only read two short excerpts. They may be found by any Senator wishing to review them at page 10873 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the last Congress. I quote from that speech:

The country needs, and unless I mistake its temper, the country demands, bold, persistent, experimentation. It is common sense to take a method and try it; if it fails, admit it frankly and try another. But, above all, try something. The millions who are in want will not stand by silently forever while the things to satisfy their needs are within easy reach.

In other words, our great President elect saw the hunger marchers coming long before they came to Washington. He told us away back last May in language and in terms so certain that the blind could see and the deaf could hear that we had the hunger marchers on the way to Washington.

I read further. This is a newspaper account and I am quoting from it as it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. Roosevelt said that "Many of those whose primary solicitude is confined to the welfare of what they call capital have failed to read the lessons of the last few years and have been moved less by calm analysis of the needs of the Nation as a whole than by a blind determination to preserve their own special stakes in the economic disorder."

"While capital will continue to be needed," said the Governor, "it is probable that our physical plant will not expand in the future at the same rate at which it has expanded in the past."

"We may build more factories," he said, "but the fact remains that we have enough now to supply all our domestic needs and more, if they are used. No; our basic trouble was not an insufficiency of capital; it was an insufficient distribution of buying power coupled with an oversufficient speculation in production."

When the President elect loomed as the hope, and the sole hope for those of us in the Senate and in political life, when he pronounced himself, not only publicly but privately, to many of us along lines that struck a responsive chord, then is when the President elect found votes enough to nominate him as the Democratic standard bearer for the office of President of the United States.

I was one of them.

#### THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO PERFORMANCE

Mr. President, the people of the country have a right, as President-elect Roosevelt has said, to demand action by their representatives. The people of the country, in the words of President-elect Roosevelt, will not stand in the sight of things they need, the food they need to eat, the clothes they need to wear, and not demand action.

A radio address has just been delivered of which some of us might take a little notice. Our President elect and those of us here are not alone in this crusade by any means. Some of the leading newspapers of the country naturally expected not to favor Mr. Roosevelt supported him in this issue.

#### WEALTH INCREASES FOR FEW, WHILE WAGES DECREASE

Rev. Charles E. Coughlin, in a sermon which he delivered Sunday, November 27, 1932, practically quotes from the President elect on this issue, stating the situation a little more vividly in some particulars, and I shall read briefly from him:

The wealth being produced by agriculture and industry was being siphoned off and retained by a comparative few.

Although the true function of the machine is to spread leisure and opportunity for mental and spiritual development, its use has been increasingly perverted. Not only has there been a steady arithmetical increase in unemployment; it has been accompanied by a steady increase of wealth in the hands of the few. The wealth created by the machines has gone in appalling disproportion to the owners of the machines.

In 1922 the total dividends paid by all corporations in the United States was \$930,648,000. In 1929 the dividends paid were \$3,478,000,000, an increase of 356 per cent.

Here, then, we have the third characteristic which is best expressed by the phrase: "Concentration of wealth in the hands of a few." The development of mass production is being accompanied by the destruction of mass consumption and mass purchasing power.

It is hoped that the inefficient laws of yesterday which permitted this unjust concentration of wealth and this unreasonable share of profits to fall into the hands of a few shall not be permitted to exist beyond the life of the next presidential term.

Just as we have been taught to look with disdain and contempt upon physical slavery, so future generations shall revert to the period which has just passed with similar feelings—an age of

150056—8923

Industrial and financial slavery which is more apparent when we consider that the annual income for all people in the United States increased from \$65,949,000,000 in the year 1919 to \$89,419,000,000 in 1928—an increase of approximately twenty-three and one-half billion dollars, despite the fact that the total volume of wages paid was \$649,000,000 less than in 1927. The greater the wealth of this Nation the less were its wages for the working man and the farmer.

I hope Senators present understood those statistics which show that notwithstanding the fact that the income of this country increased in nine years from \$65,000,000,000 to \$89,000,000,000, the working men got \$649,000,000 less than they got eight or nine years before.

What are we going to do about this? I say, Mr. President, gentlemen of the Senate, gentlemen on the Democratic side of the Senate, that if our leadership is attuned to the philosophy of government to correct such a situation, if the present leadership we have here is attuned to this philosophy, notwithstanding the fact that it was not so attuned a few months, then we ought to back it up and maintain it to the limit.

But if it is not so attuned, if it is out of step with the times and the needs and the demands of the people of the country, then we have a mandate from the people and a promise here upon which we have got to organize for the purpose of putting it into law.

#### LEADERS MUST HELP DECENTRALIZE WEALTH

Why was it that we did not have Mr. Shouse as permanent chairman at the Chicago Democratic Convention? Why was it? It is because of the fact that we knew if the opposition to Roosevelt had the power of the ringmaster of that performance, we would be very badly and probably fatally handicapped in our plans to nominate Mr. Roosevelt.

So it would be in this Congress. If we were to start out to transform into law the promise that has been made to the people of America, to carry out the mandate that has been given by those people, with a leadership on the other side of the aisle, or particularly on this side of the Chamber, that was opposed to it, we would be saddling ourselves with a burden in the inception of undertaking that task, a burden that may not be overcome.

As I say, I do not know. I rather would lean to believe and to expect that these words, terms, promises, platforms, pledges, mandates have found a responsive ear in court, in the mind and in the heart and in the political purpose of whoever is to lead this side of the Chamber and the other side of the Chamber.

#### TIME FOR WAITING IS GONE

But, Mr. President, we can not sit here silently by and wait. We have waited until the time has come that waiting can no longer be indulged. We can not wait any longer; we can not carry any more load. The people are hungry;

the people are naked; the people are homeless. They are homeless in Louisiana; they are homeless in Arkansas; they are homeless in the Dakotas. With too much to eat, they are starving to death because the country has too much to eat. With too much to wear, they are naked because the country has too much to wear. With too many homes to live in, they are homeless because the country has them; and if this Congress is going to wait here and talk about compromising in order to balance the Budget and is going to go in a direction which will further concentrate wealth, instead of going in a direction which will decentralize it, we are going to lay down on the people and deal this country a body blow that it may not ever survive.

It is, therefore, up to us by some means, by some process, to obtain organized, concerted legislative effort in the Senate and in the other House to transfer into law this mandate to decentralize and spread the wealth of this country among the people.

We do not need to argue about it; we have got everything on earth we need except the matter of mechanics. It is merely a matter of mechanics.

How are we going to get legislative action here? I am talking as a politician. I have been styled a politician, as I think every other Senator has, but I am undertaking to talk in the true sense of the term "politician," as one to some extent experienced in the science of government. That is the definition I prefer to apply to the term when it is applied to me. How are we going to get action here? There is not any need of our fooling ourselves. Either we have got to have it sponsored through the leadership on this side of the Chamber or on the other side of the Chamber, or we have got to have a coalition or a bloc, or whatever one may want to call it, of those of us on both sides of the Chamber in order to get the essential legislation started through the two Houses. It is not up to us to wait for him who has given his word and given the people his promise to call us back. We have our own responsibility to carry out what he has promised, what we promised, and what the people have been pledged. It is not for us to wait to receive another message from somebody; it is up to us to carry out what we have promised the people that we would do if Mr. Roosevelt were elected on the platform adopted by the Democratic Convention at Chicago and principles enunciated by him as a basis for election.

#### GET LEADERS WHO WILL OBEY THE PEOPLE

Mr. President, the first thing we on the Democratic side ought to do is to find out if our leadership is in tune with the will of the people, and if it is, keep it; and if it is not, the next thing we ought to do is to remove the present leadership and provide a new leadership that is in favor

150056—8922

of what the people have said ought to be done by the Congress.

We owe that much to the Democratic Party and to the people of the United States. If our leader is in sympathy with this demand of the people—or our leaders, for there is more than one leader, probably—if they are in sympathy and want to carry along this effort, which should be the principal effort, then each and every one of us owes them every backing and all moral and legislative support that we can give them to carry out this program.

But if not, it is the duty of the Senators on this side of the Chamber to equip themselves with leadership that will bring about that purpose the quickest and best it can. Assuming we have no such change of leadership and no such conversion in leadership—none of which I admit—then, Mr. President, I now ask the Senators on this side of the Senate at a time when they can, to meet, if he will permit it, under the banner and under the leadership of the Senator here who took the lead in this fight throughout this country, whose word is respected, whose philosophy of government is understood.

If it becomes necessary—and I think probably it will not become necessary—to have a leadership such as we can not get on this side of the Chamber by reason of some Senator, perhaps, not wishing to have the country understand that there is any lack of harmony, then we on the two sides of this Chamber will have to undertake to secure an organization that will transfer our promises into law, as the people of this country have a right to expect.

I think I am speaking their wishes, and I understand, Mr. President, what the people of this country, or a certain part of them, want. I believe I know what the people of Louisiana expect, and I know what they have been promised. I have been there in the campaign, and the people of Louisiana have spoken very decisively on this issue in the election. I believe I know what the people throughout America want, particularly in the States which I have lately visited. I think I understand the people of North Dakota and South Dakota. I believe I understand some of the people of the State of Arkansas. They have passed on the matter.

I would not undertake to suggest to any man that he go in a direction opposite to the will of the people of his State; there may be occasions when that is justified and necessary; but I would never be willing to suggest to any man that he do it, because that certainly would be his own responsibility; but I, at least, can say to any man who comes from Louisiana or the Dakotas or even from Kansas or Arkansas that he need not worry himself at all about falling in line with the philosophy of government that

President-elect Roosevelt found to be necessary for this country.

Mr. President, I am not a member of any committee of the Senate, and I am not asking for membership on any committee. I have drafted very few bills that have ever been introduced in the Senate, though I have had the privilege of drafting some that were passed by the State legislature. However, what we should draft into law I can state in my crude and humble way.

#### WHAT WE SHOULD DO

We should scale up the income taxes and the inheritance taxes. We should extend the income taxes so that when a man gets to the point where he is making anything like \$500,000 or a million dollars, or even before that, his income should be assessed much heavier than Woodrow Wilson recommended in the 1918 law.

We should scale up the inheritance taxes so that handing down from one to another a fortune in excess of a few million dollars would be an impossibility. We should take the Couzens's amendment and out-Couzens Couzens on the Couzens's amendment offered at the last session of Congress. That is the first sacramental necessity.

We should provide by law and, if it becomes necessary, by constitutional amendment, for working hours and a working day that will not produce more than the country can consume, so that every man needing work would have his share of it.

Next we should take the farm surplus of this country into the control and ownership of the United States, and then we should assist the farmers of the country by legislative action and by cooperation so as not to permit farm supplies to be greater than their consumption.

President Hoover says that inflation has no part in the program, but I say, as a fourth proposition, that we are going to have to provide a medium of exchange sufficient to carry on the business of the United States. We have not a sufficient medium of exchange to carry on the business of the country, and we all know it.

I have talked with some of the leading bankers of this country; I have talked with some of the great economists who have clung tenaciously to their opposition to any such thing as inflation or bimetalism or anything of the kind—some of the leading bankers of this country—and they now tell me that it is a paramount, actual necessity by either inflation or by bimetalism or by some other process to provide this country with a sufficient medium of exchange to carry on its business. It is needed in order to bring up commodity prices.

#### SENATOR NORRIS' STAND

What have we seen done about that? What is going to be done about it? I say, Mr. President, that this country

looks to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] more than any man sitting in the Senate. I say, Mr. President, that it was the Senator from Nebraska who did more to nominate the presidential candidate of the Democratic Party than anybody in the Democratic Party. I say that it was the belief of the people of America—Democrats, Republicans, and of no affiliation so far as parties are concerned—who believed in the words, in the philosophy, in the promises, and expectations of the Senator from Nebraska, that these reforms and these pledges and these mandates of the people were going to be carried out.

A lot of us can be painted up through the press. They can temporarily make a buffoon, or a "red" leader, or anything of the kind, out of some of us. We have not been here long enough for some of the people to know to the contrary. We are too young in political life. The people have not seen us charge back and forth across the field of battle enough to know that there is anything but truth in some of the various and sundry reports as to our philosophy and ideals.

That, however, is not the case with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. He has been here long enough so that enrolled under his leadership the people of this country will know that we are undertaking to carry out the mandates and the promises to feed the people and to clothe the people and to diffuse the wealth of this country, carrying out the promises of the President elect, and carrying out even the admission of the President who was defeated in the election of last November.

That may become the only means by which the people of this country can be given to understand that this Congress and the one to come are going to undertake to write into law what has been promised to these people.

That is not the air that surcharges this Chamber and the other one now. The talk is to "tread easily"; to be quiet. "Don't wake up the baby." "Nothing but harmony." What kind of harmony? Starvation harmony; nakedness harmony; homeless harmony. "Tread easily, tread lightly," and that is all you have to do if you want to see the American people starve to death. All you have to do to have that done is to tread easily and tread lightly.

#### PATH OF LEAST RESISTANCE

Oh, I know how the air feels. There never was a lethal chamber to which one felt like he should yield near so much as that air of so-called conservatism. That course of least resistance is so easy to walk. It is so easy to go, as long as it suits your own needs, that many of us can not feel the aches and pains of the people on the outside. But I told you nearly a year ago here that people were starving, and there would be more of them starving to-day than there were last year by a whole lot. It has come true. There are more of them hungry to-day.

We have permitted this country to be sapped out to where about 85 per cent of the wealth is in the hands of 4 or 5 or 6 per cent of the people.

We have permitted the income of the country to be concentrated until the top structure has nothing below upon which it can rest.

We have gone to the people in the campaign. We have made promises to them. We have told them what we are going to do.

150056—8922

Now it is up to the Democratic Party and to the other men of this Chamber as to whether they are going to sit here and have the people starving and homeless, or whether we are going to transform our promises into action, organize for action, decentralize the wealth of this country and diffuse it among the people. Will we feed the hungry while we have the food to feed them with, clothe them while we have the things to clothe them with, and have this land of homes not a land of the homeless?