

Congressional Record

SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SHARE OUR WEALTH

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUEY P. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15, 1935

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, about 4 weeks ago—will the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] give me his attention just a moment and then he can leave the Chamber if he wishes—about 4 weeks ago the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] made speeches over the radio in which they referred to the program and the plan which I have supported since I have been in Congress—the problem and the proposition to limit the wealth of the large fortune holders and to guarantee something to the smaller people.

The Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Kentucky both stated, as I read their remarks, that it would be impossible for me to draw legislation to cover the propositions I have submitted. Unfortunately both those Senators have not kept up with the proceedings of this body. Legislation had been drawn in the last session of Congress to cover practically everything proposed by this plan, but it has not been seen by the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Arkansas, or else they would not have asked the questions they did ask.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Kentucky saw the bill or resolution referred to by the Senator as having been introduced in the last Congress, which has not been introduced in this Congress, but, very far from setting out any plan, it was merely a resolution or a bill requesting the Finance Committee to do what he evidently could not do—draw a bill along the lines of his discussion. Moreover, neither then nor since did the Senator himself furnish the Finance Committee any draft of a measure from which the Finance Committee could begin to work, or, if it desired itself to initiate legislation on the subject, from which it might obtain any idea as to the Senator's proposition.

Mr. LONG. The Senator did not look far enough because there were bills drawn, as well as a resolution. There were bills drawn covering most of the things I have advocated. However, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] have rather sneeringly referred to the phrase "Share our Wealth." The Senator from North Carolina, amidst the smiles of the Senators from Kentucky and Arkansas, referred to the "share-our-wealth dog."

I desire to give them to understand where the "share-our-wealth" phrase was first used. I want them to understand that that "share-our-wealth" phrase did not come from the senior Senator from Louisiana, but was the phrase and promise of the present President of the United States in his acceptance speech delivered at the Chicago convention; and

now, in order that I may start out right so that the Senators will understand what this whole thing is intended to effect, I will read from the President's acceptance speech at Chicago, page 333 of the Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention of 1932—and I am quoting Mr. Roosevelt:

Throughout the Nation—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask for order. I am very anxious to hear what the Senator from Louisiana has to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Chamber.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is so seldom that we hear the Senator from Louisiana that I do not wish to miss anything.

Mr. LONG. I do not mind conversation, but I do not want my colleagues to go to the point in their conversation where I cannot hear myself talk. I talked so much on yesterday that I cannot talk very loud today.

Throughout the Nation, men and women, forgotten in the political philosophy of the Government of the last years look to us here for guidance and for more equitable opportunity to share—

S-h-a-r-e—

in the distribution of national wealth. [Applause and cheering.]

My friend from Kentucky was the keynoter of that convention. He forgot all about it and went on the radio to denounce "share-our-wealth" the other night. He has become disloyal to the party. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. LONG. No; not now.

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

Mr. LONG. I will yield in just a minute.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be too late for me to answer what the Senator is saying now.

Mr. LONG. All right; go ahead, since I have been interrupted.

Mr. BARKLEY. I not only did not depart from the speech which I had the honor to make as temporary chairman of the convention, but I did not depart from the language of the President in accepting the nomination. I challenge the Senator from Louisiana or anybody else to place any such interpretation on that language as is indicated by his proposition about which he speaks so often and so vociferously.

Mr. LONG. I am coming to that!

"Share our wealth", "share our national wealth", "share in the distribution of wealth", were the phrases of Franklin D. Roosevelt when he accepted the nomination in Chicago. I want my friend from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], my friend from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and my friend from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]—and I have sent for the Senator from Arkansas, because I am replying to the charge he made against me in his radio speech at some gathering or some club or chamber of commerce or some other something where they send for Senators to speak to them and give some sum somewhere between \$50 and \$150 to listen to us. I want these friends of mine to realize when I first adopted that phrase for our organization. It is a pretty big organization in this country, Mr. President. It is in every State in the Union. It has thousands of members in every State. It has probably millions in some States, not count-

ing, of course, that they may not all be voters. There may be many below the voting age. But the "share our wealth" phrase was the promise—yes; I said the "promise"—the "share our wealth" phrase was the promise of Franklin D. Roosevelt in the Chicago convention when he accepted the nomination.

It is true that men like the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from North Carolina have been denouncing everybody in the Senate and everywhere else who still advocates what the people were led to believe they were going to get by the promise made at the Chicago convention. Nonetheless there are a few of us who are still clinging to the tenets of that platform and the pledges made in that convention, beginning with the promise made by Franklin D. Roosevelt at that convention.

What is a platform for? What is a party promise for? What the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] ought to be out here doing, what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] ought to be out here doing, is apologizing to the people for not having carried out that promise made at that convention, instead of trying to ridicule somebody because he is insisting upon that promise being carried out as made at that convention. Instead of doing that they are speaking over the radio, talking, I understand, in terms of denunciation of the proposal to redistribute wealth in this country, saying that it is dishonorable, praising the President with one breath and condemning with the next breath someone who insists upon the thing being done and the promise being kept, and at the same time condemning again someone who does not agree with them and the President for failing to keep the pledge made to the people at the Chicago convention.

There is the "share-our-wealth" declaration. So much for that.

A short time ago a New York daily newspaper decided it was going to prove that all these statements I had been making about the concentration of wealth in the hands of the few were not true; so they sent a man to Washington to investigate and see whether or not there was any need to redistribute wealth in the United States. The New York Daily News, I understand, has the largest circulation of any paper in the United States. I do not know whether that is true or not. I am told by some of my newspaper friends that the paper which I hold in my hand has the largest circulation of any paper in New York, this Daily News. It is owned by men who come from the millionaire and multimillionaire ranks. It is owned by the multimillionaire families.

The Daily News said that having heard a speech which I delivered in reply to Gen. Hugh Johnson, in which I said that 4 percent of the people owned 85 percent of the wealth and that 96 percent of the people of America live below the poverty line—this newspaper said that having heard that statement by me it was going to send its investigators to Washington, D. C., to prove that the statements I had made were false and untrue, and, like the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said, like the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] said, and like the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] intimates, this newspaper was going to prove that this talk of HUEY P. LONG about the concentration of wealth and the necessity for the redistribution of wealth was untrue and impossible. So they sent their man down here. They say they sent one of the best economists and investigators there was in the United States. What did he do?

Here is the New York News and I am going to read from it. They made the investigation as they announced, to prove that what I said was untrue, to prove that such men as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] knew what he was talking about, and to prove that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] knew what he was talking about. They had some help and here is the help they got from the biggest paper in America.

I read from the New York Daily News of April 11, 1935. Here is the headline of this editorial.

This is an important editorial, especially for newspaper editors.
137050—11469

That is the headline.

When HUEY LONG in his "share-the-wealth" reply to General Johnson said that 1 percent of Americans own 59 percent of America's wealth, while 4 percent own between 85 percent and 95 percent of the wealth, we knew he was a liar.

They are using the President's word! [Laughter.]

In other words, said this newspaper, when I said that 1 percent owned 59 percent of the wealth, and 4 percent owned 85 percent, "We knew he was a liar."

I read on:

We intimated as much, and added that somebody ought to look into this question and get the true figures on American wealth distribution in order to refute this demagogue, LONG.

The News then assigned one of its most competent investigators, Lowell Limpus, to the job of digging up the figures. About Limpus' character and qualifications for such a job it should be recorded that he is not a sentimentalist, is not suffused, for instance, with the conviction that when a white-collar person loses his job he should be taken by the hand by a paternalistic government and taught eurythmic dancing. Limpus is a realist. He was a West Pointer, in fact, and West Pointers are not noted for their sentimentality toward the poor, the rich, or anybody else.

And so Lowell Limpus went to Washington and worked for weeks in the Library of Congress and elsewhere to root up the true figures with which to confound LONG.

The results of that research are now being published in the News. And to the consternation of many people (including ourselves when we first heard of them), the results of that research show that LONG had essentially the correct dope.

Now, get that. After all the cartoons you have been seeing, all the ridicule you have been seeing, all the calumny you have been seeing, and all the flannel-mouthed speeches over the radio by these distinguished men all over the country that all that HUEY P. LONG was saying was untrue, false, and ridiculous, and an appeal to passion and prejudice—after all that, here comes the biggest newspaper in the United States and says, "After weeks and months of investigation, we find that every living word that he says is correct."

Of course this is not going to convince the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. It would not do him any good. We do not expect it to do him any good. We have other ways of getting these reforms. If we waited for votes to come from men of conservative leaning, who never have been able to see the truth until it was too late, we should never hope for these reforms to come.

But I read further.

The results of that research show that LONG had essentially the correct dope. He was wrong in some details.

They say:

He was wrong in some details, and we still think HUEY LONG a dangerous little demagogue—

They say, "He has the facts all right. What he says is essentially true, but we are still afraid of him, because he is telling the truth about the thing"; but, none the less, they say it is so.

Now, wait until I go a little further:

But his assertions about where the money power is lodged in this country are substantially borne out by figures compiled and buried away from McKinley's time till now.

In other words, this paper wants it understood that it does not want to claim to be kinfolks with me, and I do not need to claim to be kinfolks with them. I do not need any newspaper myself. I can stay in office or out of office without one. Now, here is what they say:

The gist of the Limpus findings is this:

And they quote Limpus' findings:

More than 96 percent of the workers in the United States receive less than the \$2,000 a year which is regarded as "sufficient only for basic necessities."

According to the United States Federal Trade Commission, in 1926, 1 percent of the people dying did own 59 percent of the wealth reported; and since that time the rich—

Get this:

And since that time—

Since 1926, when 1 percent of the people owned 59 percent of the wealth—since that time, says this paper—

Since that time the rich have been getting richer in proportion, and the poor poorer.

In other words, I have understated the truth. I have not stated it as bad as it is, according to this newspaper. My statement that 1 percent owned 59 percent of the wealth is not accurate. On the contrary, 1 percent own a great deal more than 59 percent; and still the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] have not yet seen the light. They have been in the Congress of the United States for 20 years—about that long, I guess—and if they were kept here 20 more years, until 15 men owned 99 percent, they never would be able to see what this thing is all about. They just simply were not brought up right to this kind of politics, and they never will be.

Mr. BARKLEY. Thank God! [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. I thank God for that myself. It has been my good political fortune to have blind men like these in politics. I have gone as far as I have, with my limited ability, due to the fact that my enemies had less foresight than I had. I have very little foresight, and they have less; but they are worse off than I am, for they have not even got hindsight. [Laughter.] They cannot see something after it has passed over them, and they have been knocked down by it half a dozen times.

I read on from this editorial:

When Limpus discovered that such was the picture of wealth distribution in the United States, he wired the News that his data would prove very startling, and that probably his findings could not be published.

Get that! When he found out that he was going to have to say to the Daily News, "Instead of my reporting back to you that the figures of HUEY LONG are incorrect, I am going to have to give you figures showing that he is not only telling the truth, but that the times in this country are a good deal worse than even he said they were", he wired to the paper and said: "Probably you do not want my figures, because they are going to be very startling"; and this paper says so. But, says this paper:

It was decided, after some deliberation, to publish them nevertheless. That decision was made on the ground that the ostrich act of sticking our heads in the sand, blinding ourselves to facts, will only do us harm in the long run. To suppress these facts might damper down some unrest for a while. But it is these facts which are causing the unrest.

And even then they are 18 years in finding it out. Eighteen years ago the Industrial Relations Committee reported to the Congress of the United States that it was the distribution of the wealth to such a large extent into the hands of the few that was causing the trouble in America.

The eventual kick-back would be much more serious if the facts continued to be kept under cover.

And they are ominous facts. It has happened time and again that when a nation's wealth has become concentrated in too few hands, and ways of redistributing part of it peaceably have not been worked out, ways of redistributing it by violence have been adopted in time, as in France and Russia.

Get this, now, will you? Listen to me, you so-called "conservatives." Listen to me, you so-called "defenders of truth." Listen to me, you who have stood on this floor and said that your father was a Baptist minister. Since you want to be concerned with truth, perhaps the Baptist minister was not the only man who ought to have told the truth. The son of the Baptist minister might want to tell the truth sometimes himself. Who knows but that he would? Now, listen to me while I give you the figures:

And they are ominous facts. It has happened time and again that when a nation's wealth has become concentrated in too few hands, and ways of redistributing part of it peaceably have not been worked out, ways of redistributing it by violence have been adopted in time, as in France and Russia.

Says this biggest newspaper of the United States:

America has got to redistribute the wealth of this country into the hands of the people, one way or the other.

Says this newspaper:

If you do not redistribute the wealth that is in the hands of the few people, and put this money into the hands of people who need it, it will either be done by peaceable means or it will be done by bloodshed, as it was in France and Russia.

And this is the biggest newspaper owned by multimillionaire families in the United States of America.

And as long as mass purchasing power stays down and continues to shrink there will be overproduction of the bathtubs, cars,

137050—11469

radios, etc., which we like to think are elements in the American standard of living.

Mr. President, I am not going to read more of these newspaper editorials and articles, but there are some several of them here. Here is one, for instance, published on the 8th day of April, which says:

Four percent own 87 percent of the United States, news survey shows.

I shall now go to something else. Somebody says that they are trying to defend the farm folks. I am not one who objects to farmers coming to Washington, D. C. I am only sorry that more of them could not come, and that so few of them have ever been here. It is a sad thing that, even with the few who did come here this time, according to my understanding, in the various communities the neighbors had to chip in so that they could pay the way of one man to Washington.

In a little community near where I live the farmers wanted one of their number to come. It cost \$48.75 for a round-trip ticket, and the whole community chipped in two or three dollars apiece so that one farmer out of the whole community might come on this train here to Washington and see Congress and see the President of the United States.

Somebody says they brought 400 of them from Louisiana. According to a Washington newspaper, when President Roosevelt, on the White House lawn, was denouncing people who criticized his program, someone spoke up and mentioned my name. That might have been true, but out of the 400 farmers they brought from Louisiana I would not have any trouble getting my part of the votes.

Now, let us get along. We have more business to talk about than this matter. I said I was only too sorry that more of these farmers could not come, and I said that all these farmers were not able to pay their own way, but that their communities wanted someone to come, down in my section of the country, and they chipped in—in lots of cases—two or three dollars apiece—so that someone of their neighbors might come here and present their views, and go back home and tell them what they found out.

I rather approved that. The only objection I have is that instead of only 400 farmers being able to come here from Louisiana, I wish they could have brought several thousand. But they were not able to come, or no doubt they would have come. I do not see any objection to it.

I was talking about the concentration of wealth. I come back to where I was before being interrupted. Farmers have come here on a farm program. They have been told, and I have been told, we have all been told, that there is need to decrease the amount of farm products in this country. The Senator from Michigan made a speech the other day, but did not entirely catch the point. He and the Senator from Tennessee did not see the proposition I was trying to get to their minds at all. Now, I want to tell both of those Senators, and all the Senators, what it was.

There is not any overproduction in the United States—I hope Senators will hear what I am saying—there is not any overproduction in the United States of cotton or of corn or of wheat. There is not any overproduction of rice or beans or cattle. There is an underproduction of those products. However, the farmers of Louisiana, of Iowa, and of Texas, and all other States, are gradually being stamped out of existence, they are being fed by means of the dole, they are having to receive a subsidy called a process tax in order to live. They are being told to plow under their cotton, they are being told to kill their hogs, they are being told to shoot the cows, they are being told to pour the milk into the river. Why? Is it because there is an overproduction? No. It is because the people have not the money with which to buy the things they need and must consume if they are to live in a reasonable or respectable way. Farmers are not overproducing. Yet those poor farmers are being told that, "Next year you will not be able to get 11 or 12 cents for your cotton unless you decrease the amount of cotton you raise; you will not be able to sell your hogs unless you teach them to follow

birth control; you will not be able to sell your cows unless you keep from raising many of them."

What is the condition? I will read it to the Senate. I have in my hand the Liberty Magazine. Members of the White House family are contributors to this magazine. The President's own daughter is one of the writers for this magazine. It is a magazine friendly to them. I will read to the Senate what it says:

The simplest way to come at them is to consult the table of per-capita food requirements of the American people under American standards of living as set forth in Circular 296, issued by the Department of Agriculture.

That circular is issued by the Government. Not only that, it is issued by the Department of Agriculture.

The Liberal Diet prescribed in that circular is based on food standards recommended by our most eminent authorities on nutrition.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. From what is the Senator reading? I know he is reading from a magazine, but what is the article and who wrote it?

Mr. LONG. It was written by Charles W. Burkett in Liberty Magazine of April 13, 1935.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is he discussing?

Mr. LONG. He is discussing the food supply of America. Now he is quoting a circular of the Agricultural Department, No. 296.

The Liberal Diet prescribed in that circular is based on food standards recommended by our most eminent authorities on nutrition. Such a diet would promote national health and well-being to the highest degree. At present we don't even come within sight of it.

Here is the Liberal Diet, showing the amounts and kinds of food which should be annually consumed per capita:

Remember this comes from the Department of Agriculture.

Food	Pounds
Flour and other cereals.....	100
Milk, fresh and evaporated.....	656
Irish and sweet potatoes.....	155
Dried beans, peas, and nuts.....	7
Tomatoes and citrus fruits.....	110
Leafy, green, and other vegetables.....	135
Dried fruits, raisins, prunes, etc.....	20
Other vegetables and fresh fruits.....	325
Butter.....	35
Other fats, bacon, and salt pork.....	17
Sugar, molasses, and other sweets.....	60
Lean meats, poultry, and fish.....	165
Eggs (360 individual) in pounds.....	34

That means less than one egg per day.

Total, annual poundage..... 1,819

One thousand eight hundred and nineteen pounds of food for every one person every year.

The right of every American citizen to such a diet as that should be undoubted. It is basic. And the only reason the American people have not demanded and bought from the farmers all the farmers could produce is simply that the prices have been too high relative to city incomes. * * *

The year 1929 was one of relatively large agricultural production.

I hope Senators get these figures. In 1929, the very year when we were supposed to have so much agricultural production, this very year when we had too much, and I thought we had too much at that time myself—

The year 1929 was one of relatively large agricultural production, or of "over-production" according to the food destructionists. And yet a comparison of the 1929 production figures with those called for by the Liberal Diet makes it evident at a glance how far short we fell of our real necessities.

In other words if we take everything we raised in 1929 and compare that as against what the Department of Agriculture said we ought to have eaten we will find what?

Such a comparison reveals a production shortage—

That is in 1929, the year when we were supposed to produce so much that we never could consume it, and yet according to the table of the Department of Agriculture of 1929, if the people could have bought what they wanted

to eat, how much overproduction would we have had? None! On the contrary:

Such a comparison reveals a production shortage in fruit of 39 percent; in vegetables, 10 percent; dried fruits, 69 percent.

Think of it, Senators! Let the Senator from Florida think of it; let the Senator from California think of it; let Senators who come from Mississippi and from the Rio Grande Valley of the State of Texas—Senators who saw their dried fruit products dumped into the Mississippi and into the Rio Grande and into the Gulf of Mexico and into the Pacific Ocean—let them think of that year 1929 when that was done, that there then was an actual food shortage of dried fruits of 69 percent. There was only 31 percent of the Nation's requirement of dried fruits produced that year. There was a shortage of 69 percent of dried fruits, according to the United States table of standards, and yet none the less, a large part of that 31 percent of dried fruits produced was not sold on the market.

Milk. How much overproduction in milk? Why, there was a shortage of milk, according to what the people ought to have had. It says in this article:

Milk, exclusive of that used for butter, 33 percent.

There was too little of milk; not too much!

Butter. Was it overproduced? Why, it went to waste. The farmers held up one another's wagons to keep them from bringing it into town, because they were flooding the market, but milk was underproduced, and butter was underproduced 51 percent. And then sugar products were underproduced 30 percent. Beef, pork, mutton, poultry, and fish, 9 percent underproduced; and eggs 27 percent underproduced.

It got down to the point where you could not give eggs away. You could not sell them, you could not give them away; you could not sell milk, butter, rice, potatoes; you could not give cotton away. Notwithstanding that fact, according to the United States Government, there was a shortage in production of every one of those things.

What did Roosevelt say? He said there is no overproduction. He said we have got to give a purchasing power to the masses. Then is when Franklin Delano Roosevelt announced that he was in favor of the share-our-wealth platform. Then is when he got up in the Chicago convention, when a man was supposed to be a man, and stood on his hind legs and said that "the crying need of the country is for more and equitable opportunity to share in the distribution of wealth", and our report says "applause and cheers" when he made that statement on the floor of the convention.

What did we do through the leadership of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], to whose speech I am now replying, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], to whom I am still replying? What did we do? Did we come into the United States Senate and provide that we would give the people more money so they could buy the things which the United States Government said they had to have in order to live? Did we come here and provide that they could buy more and provide that instead of the farmer continuing underproduction he might produce what was expected to be consumed by the people?

No! We did not. I say "we" did not. I have to include myself in it, thought I tried to do the contrary. We did not provide to "share the wealth." We did not provide to produce up to what standard statistics said the human family had to have to live on. On the contrary, what did we do? We allowed the rich to become richer and the poor to become poorer, according to this big newspaper which was going to disprove the statements I made, but which it admits now to be true. We allowed the rich to become richer and the poor to become poorer. We gave the masses less with which to buy.

What was the remedy finally followed? The remedy was that since the people could not buy we had to burn up what we could not sell, and plow under what nobody would have any money to buy. We adopted that expedient, and that has been all we have ever done.

Why, Gentlemen of the Senate, some one has said I am at war with the President. With which President am I at war? Am I at war with the President who took the nomination of the Democratic convention in Chicago in 1932? No! That man is my brother. Is he demised? Has there been a funeral and another one born since then? Whether he has gone through the stages necessary to come into new life, physically or spiritually speaking, is not the question. I mean as a matter of political advocacy, as a matter of political thought, is that man to whom we gave the nomination and who uttered those words at the Chicago convention in 1932 still alive? If he is alive, he is a boon companion of mine because I am standing where he stood in 1932. Yea, more, I am standing where I stood before he took that stand.

And now, when we have gotten into the calamitous condition where we are legislating in the Congress of the United States to keep from producing because the people cannot buy, when we have turned the horse around the other way and said to the people, "We are not able to give you the purchasing power and therefore we have to reduce the producing power", we have done what? We have opened up the country to the stagnation and calamities with which we were threatened when man was first placed on earth. We have brought on the dust storm. Yea, we brought on the dust storm! We brought on the shortages. We brought on the poverty. We aggravated the misery. We promoted the rich to become richer and the poor to become poorer, and today what is before the American Congress?

We have reduced the purchasing power of the masses in the last 3 years, and the figures here show it. We have 22,000,000 on the relief dole and 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 more people trying to get on it. The United States Relief Department says that \$8 is enough for one family to eat on, and, therefore, with that starvation diet we have prescribed under the dole they have forgotten the diet the health authorities of the Department of Agriculture, in 1929, and up to now, said was necessary for the human family, and have decided to reduce the people to where it is a breadline proposition of getting a cup of soup for supper and some little hand-cut for breakfast in the morning.

I come back now to my friends from Arkansas and Kentucky. I come back to this radio address.

Mr. President, there is more joy in Heaven over one lost soul that is saved than over a thousand that are already saved.

Mr. BARKLEY rose.

Mr. LONG. Just a moment!

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. In a moment!

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to express the belief that when the Senator finally is saved there will be such great rejoicing that it will create more than a dust storm in those regions. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. I am talking about political salvation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not so much interested in that as I am in the Senator's soul.

Mr. LONG. I fear I should admit there will be a dust storm when the announcement is made in heaven that I have been saved, and I would like the Senator's help. The Senator from Kentucky reminds me of old Deacon Jones. When Deacon Jones got sick the people were prevented from talking over the telephone by their putting up a blackboard for announcements about his condition:

One o'clock: Deacon Jones very sick.

Two o'clock: Deacon Jones grows worse.

Three o'clock: Deacon Jones gone to heaven.

Four o'clock came around and some fellow went there and put up the following announcement:

Four o'clock: Great excitement in heaven. Deacon Jones has not yet arrived.

[Laughter.]

There may be that much excitement in my case. I am afraid there will be that much excitement up there, too, if

137050—11469

the Senator from Kentucky is allowed to enter the pearly gates. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator might bear in mind the prayer delivered at the revival services in which the man prayed fervently that Deacon Jones might be sent to hell. When the services were over he was asked why he offered such a prayer. He said:

Well, Deacon Jones had broken up the Methodist Church, he had broken up the Baptist Church, he had broken up the Campbellite Church, he had broken up the Presbyterian Church, he had broken up everything he had ever got into, and I am just in hopes that if the Lord sends him to hell he might break that up, too.

[Laughter.]

That might be the situation in which the Senator from Louisiana would find himself if he ever got there.

Mr. LONG. I appreciate that joke! [Laughter.] The trouble is it takes my kind to bring the Senator from Kentucky into the majority. If it had not been for a few of my kind he would still be sitting on the mourners' bench. [Laughter.] We might have broken up the country when we did it, too. [Laughter.]

There is more joy in heaven for one soul that is saved than for a thousand that are already saved. If I could convince the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Arkansas of the error of their understanding, if I could convince them that 2 and 2 make 4, if I could convince them that an elephant cannot be put through a keyhole, if I could convince them that water will not run up hill, if I could convince them of these simple axiomatic rules of mathematics, I would have more joy in my heart than I have had in the advocacy of these principles for years.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The trouble is that the Senator is trying to teach us that 2 and 2 do not make 4, that an elephant can go through the eye of a needle, and that water can run up hill; and I cannot be convinced of that.

Mr. LONG. That just shows how blind the Senator from Kentucky is.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I may be blind, but I can see the Senator from Louisiana, and see through him.

Mr. LONG. Here are these multimillionaire families that found out the truth, and they admitted the truth; but with all that the Senator from Kentucky cannot see it. He is like the rich man who allowed Lazarus to stay outside the gate, with the dogs licking his sores, begging for the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table. When Lazarus had died and the rich man had died, and the rich man looked afar off and saw Abraham with Lazarus in his bosom, the rich man cried and said, "Father Abraham, send Lazarus that he may pour water and cool my tongue!" Abraham said, "It cannot be done." The rich man said, "Then send Lazarus back to earth that he may tell my four brothers there of the torments with which I am afflicted, that they may avoid this place." Abraham said, "There is not a bit of use. They have Moses and the prophets back there, and if they will not believe Moses and the prophets they will not believe one who has risen from the dead and has come back to earth."

The Senator from Kentucky stands here today, with far less food than is needed in some instances being produced in the United States—a three-fourths food shortage in dried fruit, a 39-percent shortage in butter, a 40-percent shortage in eggs—and with all the shortages in dried fruits and these other things, the Senator from Kentucky has his eyes blinded. "None so blind as those having eyes that see not; none so deaf as those having ears that hear not." He is so blind that he has it in his head that when you have too little food, and still the people cannot buy it, the only remedy is to go and burn up some more of the food that you have.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. LONG. Just one word. It makes me think of a man who seized the 140-acre farm of a man for a debt he owed to the store. The old man went off, and a few years later he came back, and meanwhile the other man has discovered oil on the land. The old man went in and said,

"Mr. So-and-so, you seized that 140 acres of land for a \$100 debt, and you have got \$1,000,000 of oil off it. Don't you think you ought to help me out and give me a little something?" The man said, "Why, certainly my friend. I think I owe you something." He called his clerk and he said, "Come here, Jim. Go back of that counter and get this man a bottle of Sloan's liniment. He may have the rheumatism for all I know." [Laughter.]

The great trouble with the Senator from Kentucky and those like him is that they imagine they are liberal to the American people, who are entitled to live in decency and respectability, and they think they have done those people a great favor when they hand them a little six- or eight-dollar dole by which they can live and barely exist in poverty and in misery; and still the Senator from Kentucky thinks he has brought blessings to his soul, and glorified the administration in Washington, and placed a crown of glory on the head of the chieftain, as long as he doles out a little money to allow a man to live on earth in misery, and below the line of any such thing as a respectable standard of poverty.

You can convince some people but you cannot convince the case-hardened politician. When they get those ideas in their minds they will not see the facts. They cannot be made to see them. The President saw them. He said he saw them. But has he forgotten? We thought the Federal Trade Commission saw them. The Industrial Relations Commission saw them. The multimillionaires say they saw them. What do they say? I am reading from the biggest newspaper in the United States, owned by multimillionaire families. What does it say? It says this:

It has happened time and again that when a nation's wealth has become concentrated in too few hands, and ways of redistributing part of it peaceably have not been worked out, ways of redistributing it by violence have been adopted in time—as in France and in Russia.

And this paper says that the wealth is concentrated into the hands of the few far more than I said it was, and that something has to be done about it.

Congress is going to adjourn, they say. I guess it will. It would have been better if it never had met. Congress is going to adjourn with nothing whatever done to increase the purchasing power of the masses. The only reform that is urged is to destroy a little more cotton, and a little more pork, and a little more sugar, and a little more molasses, and teach the hens not to lay eggs, and give lessons of birth-control to the swine and to the cattle, so that they will not raise too much of those products to flood the market for a public that has not the money with which to buy!

I was hoping that would convince these Senators so that now I could talk to them about the proposed legislation. If they will read what I have said, they will be convinced.

Perhaps these Senators think that what I have said is just a mistake. I should be glad if they would read what James Madison said. You have all heard of James Madison writing most of the Constitution of the United States.

Do you know what he said, Mr. President? He said, along about the time when the Constitution was being written, before it was written or shortly after it was written, according to an excerpt which I clipped out of a New York newspaper a few days ago, that the time would come when the wealth of America would get into the hands of the few, and that the only way in which the Constitution could exist and the Republic could exist would be for the American people to be farsighted and broad-minded enough to know that they had to redistribute the wealth into the hands of the masses, in order that the people could live in something like a decent, respectable status. That is what he said. He said that if they did not do it, the country would never survive. That was said not only by him, but by others. Daniel Webster, who was a great follower of James Madison, came along, and when he delivered his famous speech at Plymouth he made exactly the same statement.

Senators talk about the faith of the founders. I was amazed to read the remarks by the Senator from Arkansas

[Mr. ROBINSON], about the faith of the founders of this country. The Senator from Arkansas failed to remember something he read long ago. Who were the founders of this country?

Does the Senator refer to the Pilgrims who landed at Plymouth in the year 1620? If he does, he has only to turn back and look to the law under which the Pilgrims settled this country.

In the year 1620, on July 1, when the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, they displayed a compact that was to be the law of the country under which they were to live. It had been signed by every man on board the *Mayflower*, and article five of that compact of the Pilgrims provided that at the end of every seventh year they would wipe out every debt and redistribute the property equally among all the people who lived in this country at that time.

My friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, may never have read that, but that is how they settled the State from which he comes. When those people landed at Plymouth in the year 1620 their plan was not the conservative rule I am undertaking to bring about; it was the rule prescribed in the Bible absolutely, that at the end of every seventh year they should remit debts. They went the Bible one better, and provided that at the end of every seventh year they would redistribute all the property into the hands of all the people.

Why did they enter into any such compact? Because they knew they had to fight the Indians. They knew they had to develop the country. They knew they had to establish a new frontier every year, and they knew that the only way by which they would ever succeed was through the understanding of one for the other, and that each and every one of them would travel along under a plan of mutual assistance.

When the forefathers came to write the Constitution of the United States, and even before that time, when they came to write the Declaration of Independence, in July 1776, the one thing about which they were careful above all things was to write in their words and symbols which meant that the wealth of this country should always be kept reasonably distributed in the hands of the people.

I shall not read all that Madison said; I shall not read what Ralph Waldo Emerson said; I shall not read what that famous son of New Hampshire, and who adopted Massachusetts as his State, said; but I have all those various and sundry declarations here, and if anyone wishes to see them, I shall be pleased to give him whatever information along that line he may request.

Mr. President, the Senators from Arkansas and Kentucky want me to tell them how I would draw the legislation. I do not have to have a pencil and a piece of paper. I have drawn it up many times, and I will give it to them without a pencil and paper. These remarks will be down in writing, and they can be read tomorrow by whoever wishes to read them. I could dictate them without having to change a word if I had plenty of time just to stand here and outline it to the reporter. I will not take the time necessary to do that, but will state what the plan is.

First, I would guarantee that there would be no such thing in the United States as a man possessing more than somewhere around from 100 to 200 times the average family wealth. What would that mean in the United States today? It would mean that there would be nobody in the United States who could own more than between a million and a half and three million dollars as a fortune. I might get it down a little below that.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the resolution which the Senator offered on January 4, 1934, he provided that each person might own \$50,000,000.

Mr. LONG. As a limit.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a limit; yes.

Mr. LONG. And in the one before that, a hundred million.

Mr. BARKLEY. So the Senator is now getting down to about five or six million, as he stated in the last speech he made.

Mr. LONG. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the speech the Senator made in Des Moines a few days ago, he said he would let each man own as much as five or six million.

Mr. LONG. Somewhere around that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Prior to that he had said three or four million.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, there is not much difference between three or four and five or six million.

Mr. LONG. And before that, \$50,000,000; and before that, \$100,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. So the Senator is gradually coming down—

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Until he may after a while get to a point where there would be a division of wealth which might be regarded as a sharing of the wealth.

Mr. LONG. I will answer the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Inasmuch as in 1909 there were only 1,700 people who owned as much as \$400,000,000 worth of property, and the aggregate wealth was only \$20,000,000,000, and inasmuch as in 1932 there were only 800 who owned more than \$400,000,000, and the aggregate wealth was about fifty billion, how does the Senator figure that any such division as could be regarded as a sharing of the wealth program which would only divide or share the wealth of some 800 or at most 1,700 people with one hundred and twenty-five or one hundred and thirty million, would be such a sharing of wealth as would produce the results to which he refers?

Mr. LONG. First, the figures of the Senator from Kentucky are not at all correct, not half correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the Senator's authority for that?

Mr. LONG. The figures of the United States Census as to the United States wealth and income; the figures of the United States Federal Trade Commission—

Mr. BARKLEY. The figures I have quoted are taken from the official reports of the United States—

Mr. LONG. What reports?

Mr. BARKLEY. As accurately as they can be obtained through the Treasury Department.

Mr. LONG. Oh, my! They must be some Mellon figures.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the nearest to an accurate census of property in the United States, the census for taxing purposes.

Mr. LONG. No, Mr. President; the United States wealth is in the shape I have previously indicated, as the figures have been examined by the New York Daily News here with a corps of experts. They found my figures to be very conservative; they say it is more concentrated than I figured. They reviewed the tables I gave beginning in 1916, going as far as 1930, and there is no question about it.

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

Mr. LONG. No; just let me answer the last question. I want to get through with the last question. The Senator asked me three questions.

No. 1. More than 59 percent of the wealth of this country is in the hands of 1 percent of the people, and according to the News' survey on a readjustment, 63 percent of the wealth is owned by one-half percent of the people at this date. That is the report based on their survey.

No. 2. The Senator's question was as to why I started in limiting fortunes at \$100,000,000, then \$50,000,000, then \$10,000,000, then \$5,000,000, then \$3,000,000. I undertook to get any kind of a limit before the Senate. I tried to drive through the policy that there had to be some kind of a limit on fortunes of some kind or other set up as a policy of the Congress of the United States. I was trying to get a principle vindicated, so I mentioned \$100,000,000, then \$50,000,000, until I drove it into the minds and into the consciences

of a number of people of the United States that there had to be some kind of a limitation of fortunes. Then when people noticed it, I came down to an amount and to a set plan, which I am now setting out. I never have been able to pass any kind of such law establishing any limit as yet. I will, though, if any country is left here.

I am stating how the legislation would be drawn, since the Senator from Kentucky wants to know. Now I have to start all over again. I ask the Senator to let me complete just this statement, and then I will yield for questions.

Section 1: No person shall own or possess wealth or property in the United States of America beyond an amount in excess of 200 times the average family fortune.

This means that we would limit fortunes tomorrow to somewhere around \$3,000,000.

Section 2: There shall be guaranteed a homestead to every family in the United States of America.

This is nothing new.

The goods and properties hereinafter enumerated are not to be alienated without the consent of a court, and then only for the purpose of reinvestment in another homestead, under authority of law, which said homestead itself shall not be worth less than one-third the wealth of the average family in the United States of America.

That is just as simple as falling off a log. It fixes a limit. It is nothing new. Louisiana has such a law, as have Texas and Florida. The homestead cannot be seized for debt, and in Louisiana it cannot be seized for taxes to some extent. That is nothing new.

No one should have a homestead worth less than one-third the average family fortune. How much would that have been, according to the United States estimates, in the prosperous days, and if my plan were adopted you would not find a record of a time in the past when our people were as prosperous as they would then be.

There was national wealth amounting to around \$421,000,000,000 at one time, according to the estimates. Take that \$421,000,000,000 and divide it into 24,000,000 families in the United States, and you have an average wealth of \$17,000 to the family.

Guarantee to every family a homestead of one-third that amount, somewhere between five and six thousand dollars, and that will mean that every family of an average of four and a half to five people, according to the figures—the number varies depending on whether times are good or bad—would have a shelter under which to live, and would have those things necessary to enable them to live in respectable comfort and happiness. They would be able to have a home in which to live, land to till if they were farmers, and the furniture and the accoutrements of a house up to the value of \$5,000, free of debt, and there would be no trouble about it. Each family might have some kind of automobile and radio. All free of debt.

No. 3. Listen to this. It will make the Senator from Kentucky shudder to hear how simple it is.

The income of every family of America shall not be less than from one-third to one-half the average family income of the particular year. The income of no one person shall be more than 100 times the income of the average family for that year.

What does that mean? Now I have to refer to some books, so that the Senator from Kentucky will know I am telling him the truth. Here is one of the books. Awhile back, when this share-our-wealth movement got so strong in the United States that societies were being formed everywhere, the departments of this Government thought they would have to do something to show how ridiculous the whole scheme of things was.

So they got some experts, and they put them in the Interior Department, I am told, to gather up the statistics to show that there could not be enough earned in this country to do such a thing as I was advocating. So, I am told, they called in a number of men and they went to work to get up the figures, and they got up the figures and laid them on the desks of the chieftains, figures which the chieftains expected

to use to show that there could not be such incomes to distribute so as to make every family in America affluent and independent. But what happened? When the investigators got ready to lay these charts on the doorsteps of those men who were going to use this information in order to send it to the college professors and the school teachers so that their learning might be diffused down to the lowest strata, and their scholars would learn from their lips and from their pens that what I was advocating and what others like me were advocating was ridiculous and absurd—when they laid their data down the result was that everyone of those who had done that work was fired. When the data was laid down, those who received it did not do what the Daily News did, which, when it found the true facts, did not hesitate to publish them. The newspapers said, "We are surprised", but nevertheless it published the facts. Not so with the Government.

Here are the facts. They fired every dad-gummed one of the investigators. However, those investigators took the data out with them. This is the information given to me. What I have stated may not be correct. It is the information, however, given to me by some of these gentlemen. I understood the document was coming out in a few days. Lo and behold, the next thing I heard about this document which was going to come out and the figures which were going to confound the figures I was giving was one day when I was called out into the reception room, and a young man said, "Senator Long, I wish to give you a book", and he gave me this book on which was inscribed:

To Senator LONG, with my heartiest compliments. Samuel Willig, 1907 North American Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

Another gentleman, not so closely connected with the matters I have just mentioned, came to me a few days later and handed me another book, an entirely private publication.

However, here is the book which this young man handed me in the reception room. It is, "The Chart of Plenty." It is published by Harold Loeb and Associates. In it he gives a chart and every data that could possibly be required, and shows that without the least trouble at all there can be at least an average family income of around \$5,000 a year in America if wealth and income are reasonably distributed, so that people can purchase, and mechanical appliances can be used, rather than prohibited because of a lack of distribution of income and capital.

Therefore if it can be guaranteed that a family will never be below the poverty line of somewhere around \$2,000 in annual income, it would still leave somewhere around one-half of the income of the head of such a family, if not more—perhaps two-thirds of it—to be used and to be garnered by the man with better intellect and by the financial masters who weave not, but who nevertheless are arrayed in such manner that not even Solomon in all his glory appears as one of them.

How would this be done? What will we do with the hours of labor?

Mr. President, I am an advocate of short working hours, and the short working week, and the short working year, but I am not so sure that we would reduce the hours of labor nearly so much as I originally advocated, because the day we begin to diffuse these products to be consumed among the people we have a great amount of work to do. Why? Because, according to this book entitled "The Chart of Plenty", the colleges of the United States would have to be five times their present size. Imagine such a thing! According to this book, the day that plan would be put into

137050—11469

effect, or some plan which would guarantee the diffusion of the wealth of this country, the colleges of the United States would have to be five times their present size.

According to these statistics, we would have every reason in the world to expand. We would have a flood-control program. We would not be fighting the flood waters in Louisiana and Missouri and Mississippi and Arkansas and Tennessee. We would have a quarrel in this country over where we would get water enough to supply the various needs. We would have, in effect, that plan which has been worked out by the United States Army, to the point where there would never be a dust storm, to the point where there would never be a desert, to where there would never be any flood, or any season of the year when there was not water enough for year-around navigation. There would not be any drought then. That is the condition we would have. We would have a country here where mankind could enjoy these things rather than to be penalized without them.

How are we going to get this money? That is very simple. It is very simple how we are going to get the money. The Lord tells us how to get it. The Lord says how—and He was pretty smart. The great trouble is most of our Senators and Representatives refuse to abide by the laws which are propounded in the Scriptures. Those laws are not dead. I desire to tell the Members of the Senate that, in my opinion—and I am like Daniel Webster was about that—the same law which allows the sun to rise in the morning, which allows the moon to shine at night, the same law which allows the earth to turn around on its axis, the same law which allows the stars to shine, is the divine law of our Creator, the same divine Creator who said that wealth had to be redistributed every 49 years, and who said that debts had to be remitted every 7 years.

I say, Mr. President, that the law is just as compulsory to a nation and a people, a law which says that we have to remit debts every 7 years and says we have to redistribute wealth—that law is just as compulsory as the law which allows the stars to shine and allows the sun to rise. The Creator is as much the controller of one natural law as He is the controller of another natural law, and the only way you can keep the people of any country from becoming cannibals is to see that what is on earth for mankind is consumed and shared by mankind, and so long as we allow one man to have 10,000—yea, 100,000 times more than the average man has, so long as we allow 600 families in the United States of America to have three or four times as much as 123,000,000 people have, just so certain are we to send the people to the demnition bowwows of eternity as we are, Mr. President, doing this very day, because we undertake to contravene the laws of God.

Mr. President, how are we going to get this money? We are going to take into the ownership of the United States of America every dollar, every bit of property that anybody owns above a few million dollars, and we are going to distribute that property, either by selling it and distributing it or otherwise, to those who have less than a homestead, of around \$5,000. That is how we are going to get it.

It is said that cannot be done. It has been done. The Bible says it has been done. The Bible says it can be done. The Bible says that every man will rest under his own vine and under his own tree, and that they who have houses, goods, and things of which they have no need, will bring them in to those who rule, and those who rule will distribute them out to those who have need of them. That is what is said in the Bible. You do not have to go very far to find out how it is all going to be done, or how it must be done.