

Congressional Record

SEVENTY-THIRD CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

VICTORY OVER THE HELPLESS

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUEY P. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

June 15, 1933

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the very peculiar situation with which we are presented. I would hesitate to offer parliamentary advice to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who has been connected with the Congress for so many years, or to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, but they tell us we are confronted with a situation in which we can do no better for the veterans. They tell us that unless we get two thirds of the votes of both Houses we cannot accomplish anything against the President.

Mr. President, I assume the responsibility of saying that a majority of the Senate can have its way in this matter. I say that a majority of the Senate can put the Steiwer amendment in the law and keep it there if we have the manhood and the stamina and the courage of our convictions to stand where we ought to stand tonight. All we have to do is to put the amendment back onto this bill, and when the bill comes back with it taken out put it back on the bill, and every time the House of Representatives takes it off, yielding to the demands of the administration, all we have to do is to have a majority of the votes and again put it back on the bill. If the Government is to run, this amendment should go in the bill and become the law.

Mr. President, why did we suspend the rules here on motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL]? In order to put legislation on an appropriation bill. Let us be fair about it. We did it because we knew the United States Government had to have money with which to run the Government. The only reason for putting this amendment on the appropriation bill was that we knew it was necessary that the administration get money enough to run the Government. When we put the Trammell amendment on the bill, we thought it would ride through and become a law, and it will, unless we consent that it be taken off.

Gentlemen argue that the President has such authority that he can veto action of the Senate of the United States, just or unjust, and that therefore we have to yield. I ask whether it is just, under the circumstances, with the enormous whip that has been placed in the hands of the administration, that we should see the widows, and the orphans, and the disabled veterans of the World War; the blind, the crippled, the armless, the legless, imposed upon because we have gone to the unlimited extent, to the unconscionable distance, of granting authority to an Executive against which we can now interpose no bar?

It is said that we made a mistake when we did that. It is said that the President makes a mistake when he uses the power. If the Senators of the United States intend to stand as I will stand, this legislation will be put into the law. We have 96 members here. If 48 out of the 96 will stand as I will stand, I will take the responsibility of saying that the Steiwer amendment will become the law, or I will

walk out of the Senate and never try to hold another public office. Let 48 Senators vote as I am going to vote on this matter, and it will be the law, and stay the law, after we have voted it.

The Senator from Missouri intimates it is time to stop fighting, and I have every regard for the Senator from Missouri; he feels as I do about this matter. Many feel that it is time to quit fighting. We fought last night, it is said, we stayed up at night and got up early in the morning, and missed our dinner engagements, and missed everything in the way of entertainment that Washington affords, and therefore we ought to be willing now to give up this terrible fight.

Mr. President, there was once a fight made for America. Twice there was a fight made for America. When soldiers stood in the mud of the trenches up to their waists, and sometimes up to their shoulders, in the World War they were tired, bleeding, wounded, crippled, hungry. But suppose they had given up because they were tired and hungry, bleeding and wounded; where would the Senate of the United States have been tonight? We would not have been sitting here under the Stars and Stripes, Mr. President, if those men had given up because they were tired; yet we are told to give up their fight tonight because we are tired.

Mr. President, I have a very pitiful group of correspondence here from which I want to read just a few lines. I am not going to take up much time tonight. One of them comes here from Washington; and I want to say that I do not take the responsibility for one of these letters; but I will read from them briefly to indicate the temper of the people. This one [exhibiting] comes from my own city of New Orleans:

NEW ORLEANS, April 13.

I am a veteran at said hospital as a patient. I am James V. Kennedy, C 1-975-357, who lives at 5328 Laurel Street, city of New Orleans, La. I read in the papers that one of my buddies sent you his teeth.

And I want to state they were contained in a package which I received here, which at the time, was the object of some laughter among us. One of the veterans wrote in and said, "since they passed this legislation, I will not need my teeth," and sent me a package containing his teeth, which was a joke, and we all laughed at it. But imagine the serious side of it. Here is a poor fellow who read about my having that set of teeth, and let me read you, who laughed at it, what he writes. Let me show you the serious side of it.

This is the third time I have been a patient here. The first time they extracted 23 of my teeth from November 9 to November 26, 1931; broke a plate I had and never did give me any back.

Honorable sir, will you please send me those teeth of my buddy's.

[Laughter.]

This is a terrible thing, Mr. President, if I do say it:

Honorable sir, will you please send me those teeth of my buddy's and let me file and fit them for my mouth, as I know I am going out of here and will need teeth to get along with.

Here is a man, a veteran of the World War, who has been in a hospital as the result of his injuries; they have had to extract every tooth he had in his mouth, and he is being turned out today, by the mercies of the Honorable Lewis Douglas and of one of the former employees of Bernard M.

Baruch, without anything in his mouth to eat with, if he could get anything to eat; and the Senate of the United States is told to hurry, hurry, hurry, and get away in time. God help you to get away in time. Turn these veterans out on the mercies of the world! There is no time to talk; no time to help! We are called upon to hurry, because the administration demands it. Suppose they had been in a hurry, this man and others of his soldier comrades?

I have another letter, which is directed to a colleague of mine, and I have not as yet received his permission to use it, so I will not read it. However, here is one from Durant, Okla., dated June 7, 1933:

The ex-soldiers, farmers, and workers feel that you are one of the ones in the United States Senate that has humanity's interest at heart. The people are getting blood in their eyes. I was at an American Legion meeting last night in Durant. Believe me, they were plenty tough. If some of the Morgan and Mellon men would have been there, they might have spit out a few of their jaw teeth. They are mad over the way Congress and the Senate has done about these compensations and bonus. We are now sorry we fought to make the world safe for democracy. It means this to me: After I spend my last little compensation check, which will be July 1, I will have to take my three little girls, the oldest 12 and the youngest 8 years old, and hitch-hike it up and down the highways, stealing and bumming food, sleeping under Mr. Morgan's, Mellon's, and President Roosevelt's shade trees that they are having set out. I am not the only one that feels that way. Why should we have any respect for them? They do not care if we starve.

Part of this letter, Mr. President, is such that I cannot read any further, I am afraid. I have read a part of it just to show the sentiment. And I can only read a few of these letters without taking too much of the Senate's valuable time.

Here is one from Brooklyn, dated June 14, 1933:

DEAR SENATOR LONG: I am writing you this letter, Senator, as I must thank you for always fighting hard for us crippled vets and also for the workingman—

And so forth—

Honest, Senator, the Democratic Party ought to get rid of Frank Hines, director of the vets affairs. He is too hard boiled and unjust to the vets who were injured in military service.

Men that were injured in France or became ill while serving in Europe get very little because they are always given fake diagnosis by the doctors of years ago. I myself was sent back from Europe a physical and half-blind wreck. I was given medical discharge and sent home to shift for myself. I was ignorant of my rights; I did not know where to appeal for help until another crippled veteran took me to the Vets' Bureau 2 years after I was discharged and put in a claim for my eyes and nervous trouble. I was paid for a while, then when I became totally blind in 1923, was told that my eyes were not of service origin, that they only made a mistake in diagnosis. Yet in 1918 they called it corneal-opacity.

God Almighty, Senator, do you see how the blind and crippled vets are humbugged by the likes of Frank Hines office boys? Get rid of Hines and put a man there who is human and just. I am useless now for 15 years. I won't live long, but I don't want to be aggravated into death before my time, the way I have been. What I get really amounts to almost nothing.

The following letter is from Jetmore, Kans., and is dated June 5, 1933:

DEAR SENATOR: As a poor disabled veteran of the World War, I and my wife and seven children want to thank you—

And so forth—

I lost an arm and leg in the war, and I know what it is to suffer.

The people of this section of the United States are not going to forget, and we are not going to see our children and our women starve when there are other ways to get it. I and more than 20 of my friends have armed ourselves and our homes to be prepared for what we know is coming. We gave all we had for our country when she called us, and now our country owes us something to feed our babies on.

Mr. President, without in any respect approving such sentiments, this will give you a cross section of how the veterans of the World War feel, veterans who are crippled, who are blind, who are disabled, who have wives and children to feed and their own maimed, disabled bodies to care for, who are deprived of everything upon which they have been accustomed to depend for sustenance and a living.

Here is one from Harrisburg, Pa.:

I beg your pardon for writing these few lines, but if I did not write you, I won't have no other way of thanking some of you

181003—9554

for the good fight you are putting up for the soldier boys on their pensions. I feel very sorry I won't be able to write thanks to the Senators of my own State, but you know they failed us—

He is somewhat mistaken; the Senators voted with him last night—

so I want to thank you and Senator ROBINSON of Indiana and all the other good Senators. You will never know how much your human heartedness is appreciated. In this city now what do you think the boys are talking about? It is just this, that they will have another party to vote for by the next election.

I have a letter from Pocatello, Idaho, but there is nothing of particular importance in it.

Here is another letter from New Orleans, which is not out the ordinary, and I can avoid reading it.

I will now read one from Key West, Fla., dated June 5, 1933, and addressed to me.

Unfortunately I am forced to continue in physical torture the rest of my life from a disability brought on by poison gas and exposure. You may learn from my Veterans' Bureau record I have spent 8 or 9 years in hospitals, and a greater part of that time choking half to death, never able to lie down day or night. No one can even imagine this terrible torture I have to endure.

I hope Senators will notice that here is a man who is disabled so badly that he can neither go to bed in the daytime nor in the nighttime.

Hardly a day passes that I do not have to take hypodermics for this condition. Never able to associate with my friends in any gathering for any purpose without bringing on more suffering. One by one I have watched my buddies suffering with this same disease choke to death, and always thinking surely my time will be next, but still they are more fortunate than I, because they will not be here to depend on charity after July 1.

Last week I received a notice from the Veterans' Administration I would be cut from \$100 to \$20 monthly. I cannot hope to live on this amount without depending on charity. I should think that all Senators and Congressmen who voted for this bill to bring on this condition would bow their heads in shame when they return to their homes and see these disabled men line up in bread lines.

That is a typical case, Mr. President, the case of a man injured in the line of duty, poisoned by gas, who for a period of 9 years has never been able to go to bed during the daytime or during the nighttime, who has had his compensation cut from \$100 a month to \$20 a month. We know he cannot live on it, and yet we are called upon to go away and leave that kind of thing existing, as it will exist during the months to come. We are told that we cannot do any better. I tell you, Mr. President, that we can.

Here is another letter sent to me by the agent of a life-insurance company:

Last July I brought Schwam to his home here at Shreveport, placed him in his aunt's home here and she has been taking care of him with the assistance of a day and a night attendant. About 2 months ago, his aunt, who is 63 years of age, was stricken with rheumatism in addition to her high-blood pressure and the situation is such that I have no place to put Schwam. The general hospitals here will not take a neurotic case.

Schwam's pay is being discontinued June 30 under the recent legislation.

His pay is being entirely discontinued—a man who has a day and a night nurse to take care of him, who has to have two assistants to take care of him while he is existing practically in a living hell, whose compensation is going to be entirely discontinued on the 30th day of this month, provided we get the Congress away from here! Hasten the adjournment of Congress that the pillage and murder and misery and destruction may continue to be inflicted on people whom the Congress sent away to fight the war for Democracy and who were brought back to this country to suffer under administrative rules prescribed under the heels of Veterans' Bureau autocracy! I will read the remainder of the letter:

And I made application with S. T. Taylor, acting manager of the Veterans' Administration facility at Alexandria, La., for hospitalization of Schwam. Mr. Taylor immediately advised me that due to the fact that Schwam receives his pay for 2 months longer he cannot be placed in a Government hospital.

I have a letter sent to me by the Service Commissioner of the American Legion of Louisiana. He said:

Frank Louis Roux, of Luling, La., called at our office a few days ago requesting our assistance in having his compensation restored,

which was reduced from \$67 to \$8 a month under the provisions of the Economy Act.

I am advised by Comrade Roux that he received a gunshot wound on the Verdun sector on October 15, 1918, when he and six other members of his company were in a shell hole.

He encloses a photograph, which I am going to ask my friend the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND], a distinguished surgeon, to examine. I want him to look at that picture. Here is another picture, and I would like to have him examine it while I read the balance of the letter.

A German shell exploded killing his six comrades and injuring him. Fortunately, he was lying on his stomach at the time of the explosion. He was in the hospital 7 months and was operated on eight times.

I am enclosing an actual photograph of the wound for the reason that a good many Members of Congress were no doubt of the opinion that the Economy Act would not reduce the compensation of those men who received gunshot wounds in service. The veteran advises me that you can show this photograph to as many Members of Congress as you desire.

Assuring you that the veterans appreciate your efforts in their behalf, with kindest regards and best wishes, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

LINDEN DALFERES,
State Service Commissioner.

Mr. President, I am not going to read from anything else I have here nor from any other letters. I would like to ask my friend the Senator from New York if he has had sufficient opportunity to examine the pictures to tell us what he thinks of the compensation of this man having been reduced from \$67 a month to \$8 a month?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I should say it was very cruel indeed.

Mr. LONG. I have the pictures here and anyone else can see them who may desire. Here is a photograph of a man cut all over the back, operated on eight times, and his compensation is cut from \$67 to \$8 a month. The Senator from New York, a distinguished surgeon of this country, gives the answer that it is indeed very cruel to have this man's compensation reduced in the way it has been.

But we are told to go right ahead. My friend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] said we went up the hill and now we have to come down the hill. I am not one of those who are coming down the hill. I am going to vote to send this thing back to conference again. I am going to vote to reject the conference report. If the bill is taken back to conference and comes back here again, I am going to vote again to reject it. Then if it does pass and the President vetoes the bill, I am going to vote to override the veto.

If we do not succeed in overriding the veto, and he comes here with a joint resolution to continue last year's appropriations, I am going to vote to tack this thing on to the joint resolution, too. Never by my vote will any government get what it wants until it does justice to the veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War veterans.

Let me call attention to another thing that has been done: Last night when we voted 51 to 39, there was a Dill amendment in the bill proposing to give better treatment to the Spanish-American War veterans. My friend from Kansas [Mr. MCGILL], I understood, voted for the proposal simply because the Dill amendment was attached to it. Tonight they come with the Dill amendment out of it that we voted into it last night; that is, we would not accept it last night without the Dill amendment. Last night we were unwilling to accept it even with the Dill amendment in it, and tonight they have taken the Dill amendment out of it.

Last night we were not even willing to accept the Byrnes amendment with the Black provision attached to it. The Black amendment provided that in the empty beds in the Government hospitals the veterans of the World War should be treated who now are without hospital treatment. But even that provision has been taken out.

Now, we have the bare proposition, with nothing in the way of compulsion, allowing the veterans of the World War to be subjected to the same treatment that they are now, and practically taking the Spanish-American War veterans off the rolls. Lo and behold, regardless of all that was said here yesterday, they have the temerity to come back with a pauper's oath attached to the Spanish-American War vet-

erans' claims for compensation! They have actually had the courage, they have actually had the fortitude, to come back here with a nefarious, obnoxious, inhuman provision that before a member of the Spanish-American War Army can get compensation up to as much as \$15 a month he must take a pauper's oath and swear he is absolutely destitute and in need, and he has to prove it. That is what we are called upon to assent to here tonight, and to let this thing go hurly-burly on the wings of speed in order that we can get Congress out of the way.

Why does Congress have to adjourn? What is the hurry? Senators had better stay here if they know how the folks feel back home. [Laughter.] The best thing they can ever do in their lives is to stay right here. They will wish they were back here when they go home. What is the hurry? Why the great hurry? Why should anyone want to leave here? It is not hard for us to stay here. It is not hurting us a bit. We can stick it out here. A few more days will not hurt us. Someone has said that it is not desired to have any discussion of the war debts in Congress. It has been said that the economic conference over there might be disturbed. That is not going to hurt anything. They are not paying much attention to the delegates we sent over there, anyway. [Laughter.] They did not even send a hack down to meet them at the water front when they got there. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING in the chair). The Chair must again admonish occupants of the galleries that they are here as guests of the Senate and that the rule of the Senate prohibits any demonstrations of approval or disapproval among the occupants of the galleries. The rule will be strictly enforced.

Mr. LONG. Our delegates went over there. One of them is even considered the prime minister of America—and that would have been his job if he had been in England. He got up early in the morning and dressed himself in morning clothes, with striped pants, and a high standing collar that he had to get on a stump to spit over, and if he walked off the side of the boat and thought "Where is the band", he would have been informed that unless he had a brass band inside, there was not a band within 10 miles of where he was standing; so he got in a hack and went up to a boarding house.

Our delegates need not worry about what is going to be the outcome of the conference. Those fellows over there had it all written out before our fellows got there. It is just taking a little time for our fellows to swallow it, because they have got to learn how to swallow. Does anyone need to tell me that our representatives can get over there one day and settle \$75,000,000 worth of debts for 8 cents on the dollar the next day? Nothing of the kind.

They are doing business too fast. We had better remain in session here long enough so they will hesitate and think things over a little bit. Why be afraid of staying here a little while longer? If we will stay here until the President has time to investigate, assuming that he is the kindhearted man we say he is and that I say he is, if we will stay here until that kind heart has a knowledge and an understanding of what is going on in this country, he will listen to somebody except the chief executioners of the Veterans' Administration, and he is bound to come to a realization that these infamous practices should be discontinued and such rules and regulations as are now being followed should be done away with and put out of existence by the Veterans' Administration.

We probably will be beaten on this matter tonight. I have heard it said on the floor of the Senate that all the Democrats have been called up from the White House and asked to vote against the veterans. They may have called up all the balance of them, but they did not call me. [Laughter.] When they call me up, Mr. President—well, I have not been called up today. It makes no difference whether I was called or not, I know these veterans a great deal better than the White House knows them. I know if we are called on as a party matter we are supposed to bow to it as a party matter. We are told the Republicans are practically solid one

way and that the Democrats must stand the other way to keep the party from being embarrassed.

I do not look upon it that way. I am fighting for the preservation of the party. I am fighting for the standing of the party. I am fighting to keep the party from making a mistake, and even if I were not I am not going to allow my hatred for Republicans or my liking for Democrats or anything of the kind to send the citizens of this country who are wounded and disabled and blind, I am not going to send the widows and orphans whose husbands and fathers have left this earth by reason of wounds they received in defense of this country, out into the highways and byways and to the charity bureaus. No one can talk Democracy or Republicanism to me, and they cannot talk party regularity or protecting the party from this great embarrassment, and expect me to take part in driving out upon the streets of the country the orphans of the World War veterans, their widows, nor any of the blind or disabled men who fought the battles of this great country of ours in the World War. It is above Democracy. It is above party.

If Senators will hear me now they will not put the cudgels in the Republican Party's hands to go out into the country and give us a Republican House by about 100 majority. Remember these words. They will not be taken out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Remember these words. If this travesty and this disgraceful thing is put over on the veterans here tonight, we will have a Republican House or some other opposition kind if we have any Congress left in November, 1934. That is what is being done here tonight.

I am standing for the party, because I know the party can never forget its obligations to humanity and to the soldiers who have defended us. It was not the Republicans who declared the war. They declared one war, the Spanish-American War, but the Democrats declared the World War. Now we are called upon to participate in a great victory. We are called upon to join our party tonight in a great victory. It will be a great victory. It will be a victory by which the dominant party will triumph over the man who was thrown out of his bed and who has no place to go. That is the great victory we are called upon to share tonight.

Will it be a great victory, Mr. President, when we bring to tears the orphans and children of the veterans in this country, the widows whose husbands and children whose fathers gave all they had in the defense of their country? We are called upon to share with the party this great victory against the men who have no bed in which to sleep, a victory against the starving men with not a bite to eat, a victory against our disabled and destitute veterans, a victory against the widows and orphans of the Spanish-American War veterans, many of whom died like flies in Florida and others of whom lost their lives in Cuba. That is the great victory we are called upon to participate in tonight.

Some men are great in victory. If I participate in that kind of a victory, then I feel that I shall be in the position of the famous old general who said, "One more victory like this and it will be the end of my regime." Another victory like this will be the end of our Democratic regime.

As a Democrat and as an American I cannot vote like some of my friends say. I would feel like I was not a Senator. I would feel like I was not anything like a representative. Shall I stand here and say, "The President will not let me do anything else? I know it is right that we should do this for the veterans, but the President will not let me? I know that we ought to take care of the blind and suffering veterans, but the President will not let me? I know that we ought to do this, yet I am going to vote the other way?" Shall I say we ought to do something that is different, something that is merciful, something that is kind, something that is honorable, but we cannot do it because we do not think the President wants the Congress to stay here any longer? I say to you that if there is a majority of only 1, if there are 49 Senators in this body—and I pause for any Senator to controvert what I am about to say—those 49 Senators in this body can guarantee this legislation.

I do not care what the House does. We have all read of the gag rule under which they have operated. They have a rule over there under which they come in and allow 1 hour for debate—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that he may not comment upon the proceedings in the other House or their rules.

Mr. LONG. I cannot talk about the rule of the House?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not disadvantageously to the rule of the House.

Mr. LONG. I cannot even mention it? I do not want to speak disrespectfully of them. I just want to state what is the fact. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will proceed. The Chair has reminded him of the rule.

Mr. LONG. At any rate, we will say that in this body, the Senate, if we were operating here under some kind of a proposition by which something is brought out, and we are told to swallow it, and we have 1 hour to prepare to swallow it, if we were to render judgment in that kind of a fashion, it would remind me of the old justice of the peace deciding a case. He heard the evidence, and he heard the arguments of counsel, and he said, "Now, gentlemen, the court is going to consider the evidence, and the court is going to consider the law and the arguments of counsel. Now the court is going to adjourn, and the court is going fishing. Then I am coming back here on Thursday 2 weeks from now; and the court, after consideration of the law and the evidence will render judgment in favor of the plaintiff." [Laughter.]

But we are not deliberating that way, gentlemen of the Senate. We have our own time; we have our own course, and the responsibility is ours. We have our own minds to make up. There is not any rule of expediency calling upon us to leave here tonight. Ordinarily I should like to leave myself, but not now. I should like to leave as much as you, maybe; but there is no rule calling upon us to leave here. This can be the law. It ought to be the law, we all admit. I have not heard anyone in the Senate who voted with us to start with who says that he did not vote right so far as the substantive law was concerned. Of all those who voted 3 to 1 to suspend the rules, none has yet gainsaid his vote. Of all those who stood here to suspend the rules in order that legislation might go on an appropriation bill, not one here tonight or at any other time has once said that he did not vote the right way.

Well, why quit now? Why quit tonight? Why quit? Why have it said that last night we voted the right way, being told that we were going to have the bill vetoed, and tonight we floundered and voted the other way? If we were going to change tonight, we could have changed last night. We started out here by saying that we were going to keep this thing on an appropriation bill in order that by that extraordinary process we could make it law. If that was a proper thing to do in the beginning, it is a good thing to do now.

I hope we will be men enough to stand here tonight. I hope we will stand where we stood last night. I hope we will not go back upon the people who sent us here. I hope we will remember the veterans. I hope we will remember the orphans of those veterans and the widows of those veterans. I hope we will not be led aside, thinking that our own circumstances are such that we must impose upon the veterans something that we are unwilling to impose upon ourselves.

Now, just a word about ourselves and I am through.

We voted to reduce our own salaries 15 percent. Now, remember, gentlemen of the Senate, it makes no difference how long we stay here, the Government is paying us. As long as we have a duty to perform, the Government is paying us, anyway. We are getting just as much money for every day we spend at home as we are getting here; and every hour that we ought to be giving to the relief of anybody in this country we owe it to the people to stay right here and give.

We voted to decrease Government salaries. The President of the United States set a good example. He cut his own

salary. He cut his own salary from \$75,000 a year to 15 percent less than \$75,000 a year, and we cut our own salaries from \$10,000 a year to 15 percent below \$10,000 a year. That was a gracious thing for us to do. That was a gracious thing for the President to do. It is a gracious thing for the President and for Congress voluntarily, by their own actions and by their own votes, to cut their own salaries 15 percent. It left the President with 15 percent less than \$75,000. He gets only about sixty-six or sixty-seven thousand dollars and we get only about \$8,500 under this reduction.

But we are called upon now to cut the compensation of men who are wounded, who are hungry, who are disabled. We are called upon to take away the pitiful compensation that is being drawn by widows and by orphans. We are called upon to say whether or not we are going to take our own \$10,000 salary, that we would not reduce more than 15 percent, and whether or not the President is going to take his own \$75,000 salary, that he would not reduce more than 15 percent, and then take the little widow and two orphan children, who are getting \$40 a month, and cut it 65 percent; and take the poor blind man, who is getting \$100 a month, and cut that 80 percent; and take the poor devil here who was wounded all over the back, and operated on eight times, and reduce him from \$67 to \$8 a month. We are called upon to say whether or not it is justice and right under the living, shining stars of heaven to sit here tonight and take away 65, 75, 80, and sometimes 100 percent of the amount that some poor little widow or orphan or wounded veteran is drawing when we are not willing to take away

more than 15 percent from our own salaries of \$10,000 a year.

That is what we are called upon to say here tonight, gentlemen of the Senate. We are called upon to say whether or not there is such a thing as justice. Some poor little widow, some poor blind man, waiting on himself, waiting for the Reaper to come, and praying that he will come soon enough to relieve him of the distress that he is in; the poor blind devil who lies there, never to see the sun's light again, never to see the face of his child again, starving and hurt and bleeding, praying for the day when the Almighty will take him and relieve him from this distress—we are called upon to say tonight whether we will take \$80 out of the little \$100 he is getting, and will not take more than \$15 out of the hundred dollars we are getting ourselves.

That is what we are called upon to decide.

No; I will not participate in the Democratic victory tonight, Mr. President. I have participated in many Democratic victories and in many Democratic defeats. I have been a participant; but, so help me God, when we have won a victory it has been against strong and stalwart men. It has been against monopolies. It has been against giants of finance. We have grappled with them and won; but I do not care for my share in a victory that means that the poor and the downtrodden, the blind, the helpless, the orphaned, the bleeding, the wounded, the hungry, and the distressed, will be the victims of a victory in which I am to participate in the Senate.

OUR CONSTANT RULERS

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUEY P. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

May 26, 1933

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything about the publicity that is being given in the papers and in the congressional committees to the investigation of the house of Morgan; but such statements have gone into the papers, one of which I am going to refer to, that it seems as if someone from this side of the Chamber should say something on the subject.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. FRAZIER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following

Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Clark	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.
Ashurst	Costigan	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.
Austin	Couzens	King	Russell
Bachman	Dale	La Follette	Schall
Bailey	Dickinson	Lewis	Sheppard
Bankhead	Dieterich	Logan	Shipstead
Barbour	Dill	Loneragan	Smith
Barkley	Duffy	Long	Steiner
Black	Erickson	McAdoo	Stephens
Bone	Fletcher	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Frazier	McGill	Thomas, Utah
Bratton	George	McKellar	Thompson
Brown	Glass	McNary	Townsend
Bulkley	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Trammell
Bulow	Gore	Murphy	Tydings
Byrd	Hale	Neely	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harrison	Norris	Van Nuys
Capper	Hastings	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Hatfield	Overton	Walsh
Carey	Hayden	Patterson	Wheeler
Connally	Hebert	Pope	White
Coolidge	Johnson	Reed	
Copeland	Kean	Reynolds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I desire to send to the desk, with other exhibits, a clipping of which I ask the clerk to read the headline and the first paragraph only.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

ROOSEVELT SON BACKS MORGAN

Boston, May 25.—Beginning his address with the history of the Morgan family and its close relation with Boston and New England, James Roosevelt, son of the President, defended "the unquestioned honesty and integrity of the house of Morgan and its head" over the radio tonight.

Mr. LONG. At the conclusion of my remarks I shall ask that the entire article may be included in the RECORD, but I desire to have it back at this time in order to be able to refer to it.

Mr. President, I had not intended, and I had hoped that I would not, and that none of us on this side of the Chamber would be called on, to say anything with regard to the unsavory disclosures going on in the investigation of the house of Morgan. They were a source of considerable humiliation to the members of our party who fought for the success of the ticket in the last campaign. They were a source of even more humiliation to many of us who were actively engaged in the pre-convention work of nominating President Roosevelt. I feel that the publication of these disclosures is not only doing the party harm but it is unjustly reflecting upon the man who sits at the head of the executive department of this country.

The disclosure relative to the participation on the part of a Cabinet member; the disclosure of the participation on the part of the former chairman of the national Democratic committee, Mr. Raskob, and his apparent desire to "reciprocate" for the favors which he has received, followed by the very unfortunate statement, which I have sent to the desk, from the President's son that he considers the reputation and integrity of the house of Morgan and of Mr. J. P. Morgan to be above question, without some ex-