

CONFIDENTIAL

Press Conference #183,
Executive Offices of the White House,
February 13, 1935, 10.47 A. M.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think there is any special news this morning. The loss of the Macon, of course, is a terrible shock. We feel awfully badly about it and especially the men who were lost with her. The Navy seems to have done a pretty good job in rescuing the men.

I signed this morning, the resolution, the Joint Resolution, making appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission, which also sets forward the date on which Government employees shall receive full salary, setting it forward from July 1 to April 1.

This decision of the Congress, it is estimated will constitute an additional charge on the Government of about \$16,000,000. I think it is fair to note that this sum was not contained in the Budget estimates and, therefore, that consideration should properly be given to methods by which Government revenues can be increased to meet this and any other new appropriations that tend to throw the regular budget out of balance.

So much for that.

Q Are you asking for state NRA legislation at this time?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q Mr. President, are you giving that statement out?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

Q Does that mean new taxes to meet this?

THE PRESIDENT: All it means is just what it says. (Laughter)

Q Do you care to comment on Secretary Morgenthau's statement that the country can go ahead with business with the assurance that the Administration is prepared to manage the external value of the dollar?

THE PRESIDENT: I think somebody asked that question and he said it had taken him a long time to write it out in just that language.

Q Would you favor the idea of the Federal Government purchasing the entire East Texas oil field by condemnation?

THE PRESIDENT: By what?

Q By condemnation and running it for --

THE PRESIDENT (interposing) That is awfully early in the morning to bring a thing like that on me. (Laughter)

Q Representative Dies introduced a bill to that effect?

Q There was a story that General Wood, head of Sears Roebuck, has been invited or will be invited to head the NRA as a single administrator like General Johnson.

THE PRESIDENT: What was that, U. P. or A. P.?

Q U. P.

Q We are raising the ante, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: The first time that the A. P. carried that I said it was 100 per cent fake and the next time it was 110 per cent fake and this time it was 120 per cent fake and I think that Eddie Roddan (representing the International News Service) scores.

Q (Mr. Roddan) We are both wrong.

THE PRESIDENT: That is off the record, for the Press Associations. It is all right -- just information.

Q Mr. President, do you favor Federal control of the bituminous coal industry?

THE PRESIDENT: That is another early-morning question and, of course, the real answer is this: That the whole coal problem has been an awfully difficult one for a great many years. We have probably, for the last twenty years at least, had altogether too many people engaged in the coal mining industry and we are trying to work things out so that the industry

can be stabilized.

As a matter of fact, this particular code they are working under now seems to be fulfilling the requirement of giving people steady work through the year and I see no reason at the present time to change, if the present method will continue to work. If it does not continue to work, we will have to try something else.

Q If I may be permitted to return to that pay (question): That \$16,000,000 you speak of, that is new pay between April first and July first, but you had made provision from July first?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, that is in the Budget.

Q Are you ready with the NRA Message?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q How about the steamship and ocean mail?

THE PRESIDENT: To tell you the honest truth, I haven't got to it. I have a very rough draft. I hope to have them in a few days but I could not tell you which.

Q Are you considering George Berry for an executive job under the \$4,000,000,000 program?

THE PRESIDENT: That must be an INS story. We have got to have something on them. (Laughter)

Q Do you care to comment on Senator Bankhead's bill proposing to set up a billion-dollar corporation to loan money for purchasing farms?

THE PRESIDENT: No. I read about it in the paper.

Q Mr. President, does the Macon disaster, will that make any change in your policy toward airships?

THE PRESIDENT: No. On the question of airships, I think we all have to be a little careful not to overstep one way or the other. The rigid type of airship first came into war use fairly early in the World War. Some

of you may have been in London or Paris when the Zeppelins were dropping things. It was not a pleasant experience at all. I was in London when one of the Zeppelins happened to go by at night. They served in 1916, 1917 and 1918, a very definite war function and naturally, people went on with the development of them. In those days, during that development period, from the Navy point of view, they were considered useful for scouting over large sea areas, not useful for attacking ships but primarily for scouting purposes.

Of course, we have had some awfully hard luck with our Navy dirigibles. So did Great Britain and so did France and so did Italy and, incidentally, during the war the Germans lost an awful large number of airships, not from attack by the enemy but caused by the weather.

The Macon is a very good example of a ship on which we learned a great deal. You might check up with the Navy and find out how many miles she flew. She flew a great many thousands of miles without disaster.

I was talking to the "three musketeers" this morning about the time when we were about half way between the Panama Canal and Hawaii, which is about as far as you can get off the beaten track, last July and suddenly, without any warning -- I think we were 1500 miles from Los Angeles -- about six or seven o'clock in the morning there comes a radio out of the air that says, "Please give us your position."

We had no idea that the Macon was anywhere near us. A couple of hours later she appeared out of the sky, 1500 miles from land. It was just a little practice trip. She was up in the air for perhaps three or four days and probably covered between 3,000 and 4,000 miles on that one trip but it was such an ordinary, normal occurrence that if she had happened to be down in the vicinity of the Houston, the papers would not have carried even a story about that little 3,000 or 4,000 mile trip she

was making.

In other words, she did succeed in covering a great deal of territory and getting a lot of experience and data on that type of scouting at sea.

There is no thought at the present time of asking Congress for an appropriation for another ship. We have to think about dollars and cents and I think most of us feel that if we can afford the cost of a new ship at this time, we would like to put that money into long-range scouting planes. Roughly, you can get about 50 long-range scouting planes for the cost of a new dirigible. It does not mean, of necessity, that the development of lighter-than-air craft is finished in the world's history. You cannot tell. But we are not asking for the building of new ships in this Congress. That, literally, is about all there is to be said about it.

Q Would this make any difference in the policy of getting and storing helium?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't believe so, because helium is being used commercially in other things. We get a good many requests from scientists all over the world for the release of Government helium. We export Government helium in small tanks to them for experimental work on entirely different lines of science having nothing to do with aviation.

Q You discussed the military uses of airships. How about the commercial uses?

THE PRESIDENT: The commercial uses?

Q Is that a different category?

THE PRESIDENT: Of course, that is a different category and we are not asking Congress for anything at this time. What the next development will be, again, I don't know. The Germans are building a new commercial carrier to come over here this coming summer and the Navy is letting them use the New Jersey hangar.

Q Mr. President, you speak of 50 scouting planes as something you might do if you had the money?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

Q Do you consider that the combined Naval and Army air forces are now adequate, or is the program adequate?

THE PRESIDENT: It is going ahead about as fast as it can. That is the best answer.

Q Thank you, Mr. President.

CONFIDENTIAL

Press Conference #184

Executive Offices of the White House,
February 15, 1935

THE PRESIDENT: The only important news is that Steve is back. He is trying to hide. You might interview him.

Q Is that tan only external?

MR. EARLY: That tan is not only external.

Q Mr. President, have you any doubt that you can spend four billion dollars of public works funds in one year?

THE PRESIDENT: What do you mean any doubt? We are going to do the best we can.

Q In view of the continued decline in cotton exports in January, and Mr. Jennings's (?) trip to Europe is there any question of re-opening the cotton program, or part of it?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q Not even after this year?

THE PRESIDENT: No. No change is contemplated. It is merely, as I told you -- merely an exploratory trip to talk with people and to see if we can try to work out something on the world cotton surplus problem. That is all. It has no relationship to future problems or anything else, or whether we keep them or not.

Q There is considerable agitation now for the repeal of publicity on the Federal Income Tax law. Do you mind telling us your views as to the advisability of that legislation?

THE PRESIDENT: The only thing I can tell you is that the matter has not come before me.

Q Will this Nye-McCarran resolution for an NRA investigation affect your plans for sending up legislation?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know. I can't discuss any pending legislation in Congress.

Q It might delay you?

THE PRESIDENT: No, it is going up very soon.

Q Is there anything you can tell us about the visit of the New York Legislative Committee today with reference to improvement of the Western end of the canal? Did you have a conference today with them?

THE PRESIDENT: No, -- the western end of the barge canal? No, I haven't seen them at all. Have they been down there?

Q They were down for a hearing. Can you tell us anything about the visit of Mr. George Harrison?

THE PRESIDENT: Is he here?

Q I understood he was seen emerging from the White House.

THE PRESIDENT: No, I haven't seen him.

Q Has Dr. Millis resigned from the National Labor Relations Board?

THE PRESIDENT: I have his resignation, submitted some time ago, but no action has been taken yet.

Q Was that submitted before your letter in the Jennings case?

THE PRESIDENT: I couldn't tell you. I don't know what the date was.

Q I heard it was.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know.

Q There is a story in the New York Times to the effect that he resigned on account of the Jennings case.

THE PRESIDENT: His letter didn't say so.

Q You haven't acted on it?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q Can you tell us anything about the possibility of the Pure Food and Drug legislation passing? They say Senator Copeland has a bill. Has it been

introduced yet?

THE PRESIDENT: A subcommittee has been appointed to help hearings on it.

Q Will that be an Administration bill?

THE PRESIDENT: The Administration would like to have a bill to tie up with the Pure Food and Drug Act, which has not been touched since 1906 -- that's all.

Q Is Mr. Smith of the Labor Board resigning?

THE PRESIDENT: Not that I know of. I haven't seen his resignation.

Q There seems to be some little difficulty between points of view taken by the Labor Relations Board and the Automobile Board and other special boards. Will you comment on that? -- majority rule, for instance?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know what the difficulties are.

Q Would you care to state your attitude on the Rayburn and Wheeler holding company bill?

THE PRESIDENT: I have never seen it. This is the same old thing. There isn't a story. When I say I haven't seen a thing you can't write a story that the President discussed the paternity of this, that or the other thing. I don't comment on pending legislation one way or the other, and no deductions are to be made from that statement one way or the other. I don't comment on pending legislation. Lots of things happen to legislation on the way through the two Houses, and if I start commenting, as I have said two or three times before, on legislation as it comes through, there being every day committee problems, debates on the floor, etc., there would be no end to it. I am apt to comment on it when it comes to me but not until then, and therefore, please don't make deductions, because during the past week or two there were a number of deductions made which, frankly, were not exactly correct. I say what is a perfectly simple rule, and it is no different this year from last. I said it last

year and the year before -- deductions are probably 99 per cent wrong.

Q How are the business papers acting?

THE PRESIDENT: On the whole they are making a little better showing. You have a terrible problem -- I don't know how you can write when things change so from day to day.

Q Do you care to comment on the holding company legislation?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I will talk entirely off the record about it. Here is the thing in the problem that we run into -- well, just for example, and this is not politics, one of the steamship companies which has, I don't know, about forty or fifty sub-companies, and a little group on the inside there control those through a holding company and through that particular holding company and these forty or fifty sub-corporations this little inside group acts as officers on those forty or fifty companies with the result that some of the people are drawing down \$200,000 and \$300,000 a year. The thing is disguised and people don't know it. Of course, we all know the way holding companies were financing -- putting in a whole lot of equity stock -- sometimes bankers got fifty per cent of it and the insiders got the other fifty. Sometimes it was sold to the public at more or less fictitious figures -- might have been ten, twenty or thirty a share -- you buying a pig-in-a-poke.

A fellow in New York, a friend of mine who is very well off, saved a couple of thousand a year and, starting about 1925 or '26, he went to one of the very finest banks in the City, to their trust officer and he said, "I want to invest where I will get a good return," and the trust officer said, "Well, I can recommend several bonds to you that will yield you about four per cent."

"No," he said, "if I want to take four per cent I can get that in a savings bank." "Well, I have some other bonds here" -- listing them off --

"yielding you seven per cent." "They are utility company bonds?" "Yes." The result was that year after year he bought one or two bonds yielding seven per cent and they were gold bonds. Of course, today he knows that they were not bonds -- that the security behind the bonds was common stock equity, that's all. They were just gold bonds and as a result his \$20,000 he managed to save during those years now is worth about \$7,000 and that's all, -- nothing behind it.

Then, of course, there were a great many other businesses that could form holding companies and the general thought is that we want to protect any actual equities that are in holding companies. They should be protected. But the fundamental theory of the holding company should dissolve itself into two factors: One is management, which is a perfectly harmless function if it is on a cash service fee basis. If you have ten or fifteen plants in one section of the country it is perfectly all right for them to hire a service company to run them. They should get the best experience they can, for a fee.

The other function of a holding company which is perfectly legitimate is the investment trust feature.

Story: A fellow came in to see me a couple of weeks ago -- a Scotsman who is over here, president of one of the very big Scotch investment trust companies. I had never seen him before and I asked him how big his trust was. He said, "About \$450,000." Their headquarters are in Dundee.

"What are you invested in?", I asked him. "We have investments of about 40% in England and Scotland and the other 60% in other parts of the world." He came over to look into the American investments. "What do you do when it comes to investing in companies with voting stock?"

"We have a perfectly simple rule -- if there is no question in the

management of the company we just turn our proxies in to the management but if there is a single question in dispute when a vote comes up at the annual meeting we don't vote -- we keep our hands out of it."

"In other words, you don't participate in management at all in any of the companies you have invested in?"

"That's right -- we would not think of doing that. Our conception is that we are an investment trust."

"What happens in case one of the companies you have invested in requires reorganization? Do you participate in that?"

"No, we have nothing to do with management."

Now, that is the idea of an investment trust on the other side and they have never had any trouble at all. Those two functions of holding companies are perfectly legitimate -- the investment trust end and the service end, perfectly all right.

Meanwhile, we have to eliminate other functions of holding companies, trying to take care of any genuine equity that there may be in the holding company. A practical example is the Commonwealth & Southern. They would have outstanding fifty millions of so-called bonds -- they are not bonds at all. It was the terminology of the day. When they got them out it was all right. I am not blaming them. Today we know that the terminology was wrong. Suppose Commonwealth & Southern seeks to dissolve itself -- it is going to cause a hardship.

I was talking with the present^{ide} of the company last week. The preferred stock holders and the common stock holders on present values would be squashed out by going into a receivership. Is not there some way we can devise to give to the bond holders not of law but of equity, and to give to the preferred stock holders something and give to the common stock holders a piece of paper which a few years from now might have some

value? They would not get very much as market value but some future equity possibly that would give them a little back.

It is a problem of reorganization on an equitable basis and the removal of certain parts. I think it can be worked out but we have not found a way yet.

Q Apart from holding companies -- is there some feeling that bigness of business is of itself undesirable?

THE PRESIDENT: I should say yes. I think there is. And one reason for that is that you are very much apt to get a business which is so large that the men at the top do not know enough about it. When Gene Grace came in last year I told him about some of the conditions in the Bethlehem Steel Company and he never had heard of them. It was not organized so that a knowledge could come through to the central source and he was astonished when I told him some of the things that had happened in his own company.

The question of mere bigness is not as important as the control of business. If you center in the hands of a very small number of people a great many inter-locking companies, you get a control of industry of the nation in too few hands. We are a great deal better off if we can disseminate both the control and the actual industrial set up as a whole.

And you have the problem when you do control things too much from one source in a small number of hands of uneconomic concentration. You have Pittsburgh going over to nothing but steel -- another city going over to nothing but automobiles. What do you have in Detroit today? A good illustration, automobiles far and away the major factor, the major industry in Detroit and if you strike a bad year or two or three the town is flat on its back. Today Detroit has a boom because of the automobile business. They would be much better off if they had a group of industries.

Q If business papers knew how they could help in this limitation of size they

would be very glad to help.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think you can set any rule of thumb on size. Of course, we went back in the Sherman Anti-Trust days to something about 40% of an industry can be in control of one. You can help a lot on these things. Take, for instance, Kendall who was here with this committee in Commerce. He has gone to a great many company heads and asked them to help to distribute business and put it out into different communities. We are getting real help from them.

CONFIDENTIAL

Press Conference #185,
Executive Offices of the White House,
February 20, 1935, 10.45 A.M.

THE PRESIDENT: I win my bet with Gus (Mr. Gennerich). I told him we would have another snowstorm.

Q It is not quite a storm yet.

Q It will be nice and deep up at Hyde Park.

THE PRESIDENT: They will have good sleighing there over the week end. Bring your skis.

Q I think the poker room in the Nelson House will get a big play this time, Mr. President.

MR. DONALDSON: All in.

THE PRESIDENT: I think you have all got a copy of the message that is going up at noon today on the extension of N.R.A. I think it sort of speaks for itself. It covers the principles. It is about all one can say about it -- the principles are all right. Have you got any thoughts on it?

Q Mr. President, in that connection, it was suggested that it would not be necessary to put violators in jail; that there were better methods of taking care of that situation. What methods?

THE PRESIDENT: Court methods, provided you can get quick action on that. The problem with certain forms of court procedure is that -- well, for example, a firm which is trying to chisel to complete an order in thirty days and could get the order and process it and put it right through within the thirty days. Obviously, if you cannot get an injunction or whatever remedy is available until after thirty days are over, the man has made his profit and has got

away with it. What we are working on is a court procedure but of the kind which will immediately stop the practice if it is discovered and is found to be an unfair practice.

Q Another question which comes to mind, you mentioned regulation of coal, oil, gas, et cetera. Isn't that practically tantamount to making them public utilities?

THE PRESIDENT: That is an awfully difficult question to answer because the lawyers will say "Yes", some of them, and some will say "No." It depends entirely on the way you construe the original law on public utilities. Of course the original public utility was the ferry crossing the Thames and all of our laws are really based on the fellow crossing the Thames with regard to present public utilities. Other lawyers have said, "It has gone beyond that, it should go not only to the crossing of the river but also for any other natural products besides rivers."

Steve (Mr. Early) suggests that we hold everything I say on N.R.A. until the message is released.

Q Is this principle of the construction of a network of superhighways deserving of serious consideration?

THE PRESIDENT: That story in the paper this morning?

Q It is in the paper again this morning.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know. It is difficult to answer that question. It is one of so many projects that have been talked about and studied. I have no idea what is ahead on it.

There is a general tendency, of course, to have all the highway money spent in accordance with state plans. Whether such state plans would develop into a new type of highway, that is rather a

question which is up in the air just now. Nobody knows.

The general thought lying behind the people who suggested it was the principle that has been used -- I think I have talked to you about it before -- what is called excess condemnation. For instance, in London they extended -- I think it was Oxford Street but I am a little uncertain on that -- they extended streets through London where what was a main street ended up in a network of merely lanes or passageways through slums, et cetera. They have carried the street through and instead of condemning just the street itself, 150 or 200 feet, they have condemned 300 or 400 feet on each side at the values of the property as they were before the improvement commenced. Then, after the street was finished, they sold off the property at a great profit. In some cases they have been able to pay for the entire cost of the project by the profit they make on the adjoining property which they had bought.

The same principle has been suggested to be applied to what might be called "superhighways" going through the country so as to avoid allowing a fellow who just had the pure luck to be left with his land on both sides of the highway to make a very large profit because the highway happened to come through his farm. The question is whether the principle of excess condemnation should not be applied in a case of that kind and if there is any profit accruing to the abutting property owner, it ought to be the state government or the local government that builds the road.

The same idea has been suggested in regard to things like lakes. For instance, those of you who were with us on the Upper

Mississippi trip last year will recall this: The Federal Government comes along and builds a dam and creates a 15-mile long lake. The people who, by pure chance, happen to have land above the new high-water mark, because it is a new high-water mark, can make a great deal of money by selling off the land for summer cottages, et cetera, at about \$1,000. an acre. The question is whether or not the Government should not condemn further back than the high-water mark of the lake and make that profit itself.

It is a well-established principle on the other side and it has been done on a small scale in this country. It was done in New York City about four or five years ago on that Cherry Street condemnation.

Q Mr. President, in carrying out the road program, will there be a maximum amount of common labor used in this program, or will there be use of machinery?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we will try not to be wasteful. In other words, we will try not to have the road cost more than it would otherwise, but we will try to employ as many people as we can.

Q Has the Federal Government now the power of excess condemnation or will there have to be legislation?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know. I have never looked into it.

Q Can you tell us when your shipping Message will be going up?

THE PRESIDENT: I cannot give you the exact date. It might possibly go up Friday. Is Congress going to sit Friday? Does anybody know? I have not finished it. It is only about half done. If I get around to it and Congress is sitting, it will go up this week. If it is not finished or Congress does not sit, it will go

up next week.

Q Is the general transportation Message going up soon?

THE PRESIDENT: Not until about a week after that.

Q Does that cover Mr. Eastman's program?

THE PRESIDENT: That is a very tall order; he has got a very large program. I should say it relates to the principle of coordinating all transportation in one body, as I said before, instead of going into details on the various reports Mr. Eastman has made.

Q In connection with N.R.A., do you wish to make any comment on the desirability of state enabling Acts?

THE PRESIDENT: Only off the record. Who was it -- I think it was good old Mark Sullivan, or it may have been Ted Wallen, one or the other (laughter), who has been writing what they call pieces about the Indianapolis episode. I will read you what Mark says because it is a good illustration -- wait a minute, I have got the story here -- it might have been Ted. As a matter of fact, I checked up on this thing in the Press Conference. Two weeks ago somebody asked a question as to when the N.R.A. Message was going up and I said it was going up probably the following week. That was last week. I did not get around to it and then somebody said last week, at the Conference, "Are you asking for state legislation?" and I said, "No." Of course I was stupid. I should have explained that I am not asking for it at this time. I said, "No," to it and that was my mistake. Immediately, however, two Indianapolis papers that are fighting McNutt on this whole subject proceeded to carry a large-sized story that I was not going to ask for any state legislation. Of course, the obvious fact was that

I could not ask for state legislation until I sent an N.R.A. Message to the Congress. So McNutt called me up and said, "Is the story in the Indianapolis papers true?" And I said, "No, of course not; not the way we put it. We do want legislation but I cannot ask for it until I send a Message to the Congress." So Mark (Mr. Sullivan) says:

"In a mid-western state the Democratic legislature was considering enactment of a baby N.R.A., that is, a duplicate of the National N.R.A., designed to cover industries and businesses wholly within the state. The Democratic Governor was urging the measure. The legislature was reluctant. The point came at which there was an inquiry whether Mr. Roosevelt wished the baby N.R.A. enacted. The Governor got the White House on the long-distance phone for the apparent purpose, in effect, of soliciting pressure from a President on a state legislature a thousand miles away."

Well, I guess this wasn't the one. It must have been Ted's story. (Laughter) Anyway, the implication was that there was an awful row between McNutt and myself. And then it was followed up -- let's go through with this particular story because it is rather amusing -- then there followed up a story again, that was Ted's, in which there was a large headline in the Herald-Tribune that I had been compelled and forced to send up the N.R.A. Message because of, I don't know, some kind of investigation by McCarran or somebody on the Hill.

Of course, as you know, the actual fact was that I did not get around to it and, as I told you last week, I intended to send it up on Monday and I would have sent it up on Monday if the Supreme Court had not jumped me and got in the gold cases first. I wanted the play on the gold cases to get to those papers, so

the Message is going up today.

Let us keep on with it. (Laughter) In this morning's papers, "Roosevelt to Seek Bar to Gold Clause Suits for Damages." That is a statement of fact and it is not true. "The Roosevelt Administration Today Decided to Terminate the Treasury's Liability on the Supreme Court's Decision on the Bond Case." That is a statement of fact and it is not true. There has been absolutely no decision on this thing. I think it will take another week before the lawyers have completely read all those decisions, the whole thing and not just individual paragraphs out of it. And, after they have all read them, there will be various conferences and eventually it will get to me. There has been nothing decided on and those decisions -- the Lord knows they are pretty difficult for a layman and pretty darned difficult for a lawyer. Another one says that following a meeting of President Roosevelt with his Council it was decided that the curtain should be run down on all uncertainty. Of course, that says in effect that the Executive Council took the subject up yesterday. I can assure you that it did not. I did congratulate the Attorney General and I told the story about four down and five to go.

Q What is that story, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: That is a pretty good story. It appeared in the paper this morning. You will get it.

How about Friday's Press Conference?

Q We will take a holiday too.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not think there is going to be any news at all.

The only other possible news that I know of today is this seed

loan bill and there will be either a statement or a Message to the Congress or a letter on it. Of course the chief problem there is where the \$60,000,000. is coming from. That may come up this afternoon or tomorrow morning. Outside of that I haven't got a thing.

Q Does that mean you will or will not sign it?

THE PRESIDENT: I am going to sign it.

Q Getting back to the N.R.A. Message, "Monopolies and Private Price-Fixing Within Industry Must Not Be Allowed Nor Condoned." That means all forms of price-fixing with the exception of the natural resources?

THE PRESIDENT: In general, yes.

Q How do you propose to go about it, that applying of anti-trust laws to the N.R.A.?

THE PRESIDENT: That I am not saying; I do not know.

Q That is up to the Congress?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

Q Any attention been paid to our obligation to pay \$250,000. to Panama?

THE PRESIDENT: I do not know. The Secretary of State and Panama have been talking about that for nearly a year and trying to come to some kind of an arrangement.

Q You said you were going to Boston Saturday morning?

THE PRESIDENT: I am going to leave sometime on Saturday morning and spend about six hours in Boston and get back on the train and get to Hyde Park Sunday morning and stay there two days, three days, four days -- I don't know. We will stay as long as we can.

Q If you stay long enough, we can all go to the Correspondents' Dinner

in Albany -- that is Thursday night.

THE PRESIDENT: I cannot; I have got a Reception on.

MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you, Mr. President.

CONFIDENTIAL

Press Conference #186,
In the President's Study at Hyde Park, N.Y.,
February 27, 1935, 11.10 A.M.

Q It is cold out in these parts.

THE PRESIDENT: Who has been doing the winning?

Q Well, it is about even, I think.

MR. McINTYRE: No, it is not. They got me way down low.

THE PRESIDENT: It is a bad month.

MR. McINTYRE: I started a bad streak, a few nights ago.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think there is a blessed bit of news; I have
not heard anything.

Q Have you been reading our stories?

THE PRESIDENT: No, as a matter of fact I have not. I have been read-
ing old magazines.

Q You probably got a great deal more out of the old magazines.

(Laughter)

Q Going back tonight?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. What I have been trying to do is catch up on a
huge pile of old magazines last night and yesterday afternoon.
There hasn't been any news in that. Two or three months' worth.

Q Do you save back numbers of the serials?

THE PRESIDENT: No. (Laughter)

I have been doing a lot of reading of reports too. That
(indicating) is this morning's mail and that (indicating) is all
I am behind. That is pretty good. You know the usual size of my
basket? That is mostly dead stuff anyway.

Q Stories from Washington say that the Senators are looking to you to

see what to do on this work relief. Do you care to say anything on that?

THE PRESIDENT: Stevie (Mr. Stephenson), I wish I could but I have had literally no communication with Washington. Since I have been here I have talked to only one man in Washington and he was in the State Department.

Q Eddie Roddan wrote a story today. (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: Have you written a story that I was in constant communication with Washington, Eddie?

Q (Mr. Roddan) Oh, no. (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: Literally and truly, from the time I got here until the present moment I talked just once to Washington and that was with the State Department. I hope it goes with your stories all right.

Q We have been burning up the wires.

MR. McINTYRE: That last statement is off the record, gentlemen. (Addressing the President) You have got to protect them. You have been in close and intimate touch with Washington.

THE PRESIDENT: Mac (Mr. McIntyre), have you been giving that out?

MR. McINTYRE: No, I didn't have to. (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: That, literally, is true; I have not communicated with a soul. I haven't had any letters, just the usual run of mail.

Q How about the shipping Message?

THE PRESIDENT: That is all done and I am waiting until I get back tomorrow morning to check on figures. If I can check on the figures early enough and Congress is in session late enough, it will go up tomorrow, but if both those things do not happen, it

won't go up until Friday.

Q Are you going to have a conference with Congressional leaders?

THE PRESIDENT: No plan at all.

Q Have you been giving any consideration to going on the air?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q That was Eddie's story.

Q (Mr. Roddan) They pay no attention to the Hearst papers anyway.

THE PRESIDENT: It is awful to get out on the limb and then have to
saw it off himself.

Q He forgot that today was Wednesday.

Q Mr. President, is there anything of a general nature about your
plans or program for the next few days or week? After all, we
have to write what you plan to do when you get home.

THE PRESIDENT: As soon as I get in, there are two things: one is the
Army and Navy Reception tomorrow night.

Q That is a sentence.

THE PRESIDENT: And the other one is a luncheon on Saturday for the
Governor General of the Philippines. That is in honor of the
Governor General of the Philippines who is just back.

Q That leaves us nothing but S. C. S. stories.

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, no, that is not S. C. S. That is very good social
column stuff.

Q That is all we have got to do, though. (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't think I have any appointments. I don't
have anybody down for tomorrow or Friday.

MR. McINTYRE: One or two of the Cabinet Officers.

Q Have you had a good visit?

THE PRESIDENT: Grand.

Q Have you made any summer plans yet?

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, no. (Laughter)

Q Have you any estimate when Congress will adjourn?

THE PRESIDENT: No. (Laughter) As you know, I like hot weather.

Q I have already published that the last few days.

Q We know where we can find a lot of it. (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: I think we will have to get off, even if the Congress is in session, in July and August and take some little trip down to warm weather, just to keep away from the colder Washington. Don't you think so, Fred (Mr. Storm)?

Q (Mr. Storm) I think so.

Q Anything you would like to say about the Hyde Park Association, this new association which has been formed and in which Mrs. Roosevelt is interested for the economic improvement of the town?

THE PRESIDENT: I do not know much about it except I think it should be made perfectly clear that this is not, in any way, a plan being submitted by Mrs. Roosevelt or by me. It simply is -- you can't call it even an offer, but to give information to the people of the town so that if they want to go in for something that will create work, they will know where and how they can get information and help from the Government, just as every other community can. But it is wholly, 100 per cent, up to them. So many communities do not know what help they can get in the way of suggestions or information or figures from the Government. We will have to let them know what they can get.

Q Mr. President, as things stand now most of these state legislatures are going to adjourn before the economic security bill is acted upon.

THE PRESIDENT: Is that a statement or a guess?

Q Most of them have 60-day sessions. Does that in any way revise your attitude concerning the necessity of getting that bill through?

THE PRESIDENT: Why should it?

Q You can't get state legislation unless you call special sessions.

THE PRESIDENT: That is true but why should it revise the attitude?

Q It is merely a question on my part as to whether, in view of the fact --

THE PRESIDENT: (interposing) No. After all, here is the simple fact: The recommendation has gone to the Congress and they are drawing a bill and if and when it goes through and the legislatures are still in session, it is up to them. And, if they are not in session, it is up to them whether they will call extra sessions this year. There isn't a story you can write on that; it is a question of fact and a question of dates. The thing has gone to the Congress to go through in some form and, as to the time, you know just as much about it as I do.

Some (state legislatures) will be in session; for instance, Illinois, which sits most of the year, will be in session.

Q You don't think it might reduce the movement to postpone the date of effectiveness of the tax under the unemployment insurance provisions?

THE PRESIDENT: I have not thought of it. I do not know the date --

has it been reported out?

Q But they have changed that, the inauguration of the tax. They have made it two per cent the first of 1937.

Q That is not old-age pension tax; that is unemployment insurance.

Q You do not need legislation for the compulsory old-age system.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not know what date they have in there.

Q Originally it started January 1, 1936 and that is just unemployment insurance.

THE PRESIDENT: Of course there are some legislatures that do not meet in 1936. I really do not know anything about it. I do not know as much about it as you do what the situation is at the present time.

Q Mr. President, they seem to be in difficulties up at Albany regarding the child labor amendment as to whether it is going to be ratified. Is there anything you want to say on that? Does that fall into the class of pending legislation?

THE PRESIDENT: You know what I have said on that. It is simple. I expressed the hope for all forty-eight states, not just one, the specific hope that they would ratify. There is nothing else. I cannot say it specifically for Albany (New York) any more than I could for any other state.

Q Mr. President, in our absence they elected Al Warner as president of the White House Correspondents' Association.

Q Russell telephoned down.

THE PRESIDENT: Stevie (Mr. Stephenson), they threw you out.

Q (Mr. Stephenson) Just the very minute I left town.

Q Mark Sullivan and Ted had an election.

THE PRESIDENT: Lovely. I think that is grand. "Truly" Warner will

make a very, very dignified presiding officer. It will be all right.

Q (Mr. Stephenson) He will have it all over me.

THE PRESIDENT: You will have to preside at this dinner.

Q (Mr. Stephenson) I will start it off.

Q He has been rehearsing his speech during his visit up here.

THE PRESIDENT: Is that why he is late, or is there some other reason?

Q I have another reason.

Q (Mr. Stephenson) You know too much. (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: That is all right; that is the first thing I got on the telephone. I keep in very close touch with the Poughkeepsie office.

Q I had a very good breakfast.

THE PRESIDENT: Who was it ran against you last year in that hot contest? Was it "Truly" Warner?

Q Yes, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Then it is a matter of justice.

Q This is the consolation prize.

Q We are going to come out for Hoover, then, in 1936. (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: Succeeding Francis M. Stephenson, retired. Do you get a pension?

Q (Mr. Stephenson) I am going to take that up.

Q He has made enough.

MR. McINTYRE: That is all right for a morning paper, but you could not say "Francis M. Stephenson, retired" any other time.

Q The election was unanimous, Russ Young carrying it. (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: This is perfectly grand. I did not know that Warner

was an Amherst graduate. He belongs to that wicked crowd of brain-trusters.

Gosh, they put Fred (Storm) and Charlie Hurd on the Executive Committee. (Laughter)

Q I am against the whole ticket.

THE PRESIDENT: How come you are on the Executive Committee?

Q (Fred Storm) I was out of town and could not do anything about it.

THE PRESIDENT: The Executive Committee really runs it, don't they?

Q I don't know.

Q We have not had a meeting yet.

Q They are thinking of asking Russ Young if they may have a meeting.

(Laughter)

Q You know, it has never met yet, Mr. President. (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know; I think that our gang still controls.

It is all right. We still have a majority vote in there.

Q If they would only let them vote. You can come in in the morning and find a ukase that has been issued during the night by Senator Young. (Laughter)

Q He is the little father of all the Russians in a big way.

THE PRESIDENT: I wish I could invent something for you but, gosh, there is no interpretive story I could write if I wanted to myself. I am going out for a drive this afternoon -- not on a sleigh ride.

Q We will have to work on Monday's story. We will have you going back to Washington very confident.

Q Let us write a story that you are not going back but will stay here. That would get action.

THE PRESIDENT: I believe it would. If it were not for the Army and

Navy Reception.

MR. McINTYRE: What reason would you give?

Q Tired of them; let them squabble.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, they have got a lot of time yet. This is only February. Do you remember last year we had certain troubles and managed to get away around the end of June or the beginning of July?

Q There is a story this morning --

THE PRESIDENT: (interposing) That is off the record there.

Q The bets are between mid-May and mid-June on adjournment.

Q Possibly they are a little optimistic.

THE PRESIDENT: Let us get up a pool. There is something for you to do! Get up a dollar pool on the date of adjournment. I will put in a dollar too. Sealed bets.

Q Not to be opened until Christmas?

Q Unless the Congress adjourns before then.

THE PRESIDENT: I think it is a good idea -- let us get up a pool.

MR. McINTYRE: We will work it up on the train.

Q You will have to do it now.

MR. McINTYRE: That is what I mean -- collect it now. I want everybody together.

Q Everybody still on the expense account. (Laughter)

Q Who is going to hold this money until the end of June?

Q I think it ought to be deposited in the savings bank.

Q I am treasurer of the Association.

Q How big is the pool going to be?

Q The Times got scooped on the story.

THE PRESIDENT: Did they?

Q I did not see it but they finally picked it up for the final edition.

Q They are great pickers-up.

MR. McINTYRE: They probably used Charlie's (Mr. Hurd's) story.

THE PRESIDENT: I have forgotten -- one day last week the Times had two full pages, the first and last, reprinted from the late edition of the previous day.

Didn't you notice that they had an awful lot of it one day?

Q There is a good reason. The Times used to pay members of the staff \$8.00 a column to write feature stuff and they quit paying for it and now they do not have a reservoir to fall back on, so they have to use reprint.

Q Any other plans for today -- anybody to see?

THE PRESIDENT: Nobody coming near the place as far as I know. I am going out for a drive.

Q What kind of a drive?

THE PRESIDENT: Automobile -- all around the place. You can say that I am looking over my land that is to be planted this year -- more trees.

Q Whereabouts, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you wouldn't know if I told you. It is on the other side of the creek, at the back of what I call the Tompkins farm. It is way back, an old pasture that is grown over with white birch. I am cleaning off about six acres and going to plant it in the spring.

Q What is Farmer Gennerich doing in the way of reforestation?

THE PRESIDENT: We are having a serious conference on what he is going to do. He is thinking of planting blueberries. Why blueberries, I don't know, except that he likes them. (Laughter)

Q What kind of trees are you planting down there?

THE PRESIDENT: Whatever the State College of Forestry recommends.

You see, we are using this as an experimental plot and it may be anything -- European larch, Norway spruce, native red pine, poplar, any one of half a dozen things they have been working on.

Q How many acres of your farm are planted according to this scientific formula, or can it be measured definitely?

THE PRESIDENT: I should say there are probably about 300 acres of old woodland which have been, over a period of twenty-five years, improved each year, and about 100 acres that I planted myself for the State College -- took it over for experimental work, and about 60 acres that they have done. You see, they have only been doing their experimental planting now since 1926 or 1927 and they do about eight or ten acres a year. We have tried all sorts of things, even Douglas fir from the West Coast. That takes a thousand years to grow.

Q Is it growing?

THE PRESIDENT: It is growing up awfully slowly.

Then we are carrying out other experiments with the planting of acorns, different types of oaks, and then I started another experiment to see whether the acorns from very old trees gave a better tree than the acorns from young or middle-aged trees. In other words, I have forgotten what the technical word is, but genetics of various kinds.

Q What is the test on that?

THE PRESIDENT: What?

Q What is the test on that? Have they shown anything?

THE PRESIDENT: They haven't gone far enough -- haven't gone up.

Q I wonder if the same thing is true for human beings?

THE PRESIDENT: It might be. Nobody has ever studied that phase of the question at all. It is a very interesting thing. There is a foundation out on the West Coast that is working on it. I got the Department of Agriculture to look into it two years ago -- the Government has just started it. I started my first experiment four years ago.

Q That was on the acorns?

THE PRESIDENT: It looks -- as a matter of fact, it is much too early to tell -- as if the middle-aged and older trees give you a better growth than the very young trees.

Q That is encouraging. (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: Do you know anything else?

Q We don't know a thing.

Q We have exhausted our supply, Mr. President.

Q We have had a good visit.

THE PRESIDENT: I am sorry I cannot tell you anything but I really don't know anything. I will see you all tonight. What time do we pull out?

Q Eleven o'clock.

MR. McINTYRE: We are all going aboard at Hyde Park.

Q Have Missy and Grace been behaving?

THE PRESIDENT: Not so well. You know, I am a little worried about it.
(Laughter)

MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you, Mr. President.

CONFIDENTIAL

Press Conference #187,
Executive Offices of the White House,
March 1, 1935, 4.15 P.M.

Q (Mr. Storm) They stuffed the ballot boxes while we were gone,
Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: I heard that. It is true that the Senate is the sole
judge of its own membership, isn't it? (Laughter) That is a
good line.

Q (Mr. J. Russell Young) I will remember it.

Q Not many here, are there?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

MR. DONALDSON: All in.

THE PRESIDENT: I hope you have all bought baby bonds.

Q With what? (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that raises the story the A. P. gave the other
day that the president of the White House Correspondents' Asso-
ciation bought two for his children.

Q (Mr. Stephenson, president of the White House Correspondents' Asso-
ciation -- not married) What is that? (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: What did you say, Stevie?

Q (Mr. Stephenson) That is a children's story.

Q Mr. President, would you care to comment on Wallace's (Secretary of
Agriculture) speech yesterday in which he said that capitalism
was nearing the end of the road?

THE PRESIDENT: I have not read it.

I do not think there is any particular news. I have been
trying to catch up.

Q Can you tell us anything of your conference with Secretary Wallace?

THE PRESIDENT: No, there wasn't any news out of it at all. It was just one of our usual conferences covering many, many subjects.

Q It is reported that a number of governments are going to join in giving financial aid to China. Is there any such project under way with this Government or has any consideration been given to that?

THE PRESIDENT: I have not heard about it at all.

Q Do you have any other conferences scheduled with Congressional leaders today or tomorrow?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think there is anybody. Let us see: the Governor General of the Philippines tomorrow, before lunch and during lunch.

Q Would you care to comment or advise on the Congressional situation on the work relief bill?

THE PRESIDENT: I wish I could.

Q Either off the record or in any other way?

THE PRESIDENT: I do not think there is anything that I can say because, frankly, I do not know very much about it. I know very little more than when Charlie Hurd and I were up at Hyde Park and we, neither of us, knew anything about it then. Right, Charlie?

Q (Mr. Hurd) I am afraid so.

Q This is the last time we have an opportunity to see you before you celebrate your second anniversary in office at the dinner tomorrow night. Have you any comment you would like to make on your two years in the Presidency?

THE PRESIDENT: I do not think so. That sort of catches me cold.

I have not thought about it before. I think we are all going to church at the Cathedral on Sunday, just the way we did last year. Monday evening is the Cabinet Dinner. I have been too busy to work out any kind of a statement.

Q There is a rumor you are going on the radio Monday night. Is there anything in that?

THE PRESIDENT: S. C. S. That is the new radio station. (Laughter)

Q Mr. President, we have got a new president now. He has some children -- Mr. Al Warner.

THE PRESIDENT: I know but I am not forgetting that "Truly" does not actually preside at this dinner. At the next dinner you (Mr. Warner) do. Do you remember, you did not take the gavel until the very end of the dinner and I said that it was not fair? I am going to watch you preside at that dinner and then, after that, we will have "Truly."

Q Mr. President, there were some reports that Murphy (Honorable Frank Murphy) may be offered something in the Federal Government here in Washington instead of going back to the Philippines?

THE PRESIDENT: No, he is an exceedingly efficient and exceedingly successful Governor General of the Philippines. It is a very remarkable thing that Frank Murphy has done out there in a rather difficult -- what might be called a pre-transition period. He has run the kind of administration that I haven't had to give a single worry or single care to. He has run the Philippines with the cooperation of the Legislature and the Filipino officials and the Philippine people you might say almost 100%

without friction. Incidentally, on his finances he has done a lot better than we have. He found, when he went there, a four-year continuing deficit and most of that deficit has been paid off and his budget is balanced. That is a great tribute to any head of government.

The baby bonds are going so well I am told that the Bureau of Engraving and Printing has got to stay open all night to print some more because a lot of post offices are out of them already.

Q Give me a line on the denominations.

THE PRESIDENT: All kinds, big and little. As a matter of fact, the return on this issue of baby bonds is slightly higher than if you buy the old issues in the open market.

Q The Ways and Means Committee of the House today reported out a repeal of the pink slip. Is there anything you can tell us about that?

THE PRESIDENT: I do not think so at this stage.

Q You have never expressed any view about that, have you?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q Do you care to comment on the strike vote that they are now starting to take out in the automobile industry? Does that presage some more spring strikes?

THE PRESIDENT: No, I had not heard about it.

Q It came in this afternoon.

Q Do you care to comment on the 7-A decision by Judge Nields in Milwaukee (Wilmington, Delaware)?

THE PRESIDENT: No; I may say something about that next week. I have not had a chance to read it. That was Judge Nields?

Q Yes.

Q He wrote eighty-five pages of opinion.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not expect to read them all. I will read a
digest.

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. President.

CONFIDENTIAL
Press Conference #188,
Executive Offices of the White House,
March 6, 1935, 10.55 A.M.

Q Big crowd out there this morning, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not know what for; I do not know anything.

MR. DONALDSON: All in.

THE PRESIDENT: I have just been looking over the ladies. They seem to have reported for duty in good shape after their big night last night.

Q (Miss Craig) Thank you.

Q Mr. President, we enjoyed your Message very much.

THE PRESIDENT: Fine, fine; must have been a good party from all I hear.

I do not think I can give you any news at all. I saw a robin and the first crocus.

Q Croaker or crocus?

THE PRESIDENT: Crocus.

Q Did you think of General Johnson, Mr. President? (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: I do not think I have any news at all. There will be some other Message going to Congress next week, I do not know which one yet. I have not decided. I will write it over the week end. It is just a short one.

Q Has the commodity price lifted sufficiently to a point where stabilization would be desirable?

THE PRESIDENT: You mean domestic stabilization or foreign?

Q I mean domestic price stabilization.

THE PRESIDENT: I should say, off hand, the answer is "No" to that. I

don't think, in other words, that we have got the dollar back in relation to commodities as far as it ought to go. We have relieved the debt burden a great deal but we have not relieved it sufficiently yet. We have talked about this thing before, as you know, so you know what I mean when I am talking about the debt column. I don't think that the debt column of the nation has been sufficiently reduced yet.

Q Do you feel that the very sharp rise in retail food prices is justified?

THE PRESIDENT: It depends on your food price and your locality. It is too general a question.

Q In Washington?

THE PRESIDENT: (The President did not reply.)

Q Does that mean a further devaluation of the dollar?

THE PRESIDENT: No, hold on. (Laughter)

Q Have you finished your answer about food prices?

THE PRESIDENT: I think so, yes.

Q Did you finish your answer about devaluation?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Laughter)

Q Mr. President, have you any steps in mind to extend our foreign credit on these barter agreements?

THE PRESIDENT: Of course we are going right ahead. Each one of these barter agreements takes a long time to work out. I think they have five or six of them now.

Q I mean the two-country barter agreements, the ones that Peek had in mind?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, they practically dovetail into each other.

Just to be a little bit more explanatory on that, you take this Belgian agreement as an example: That is, theoretically, a reciprocating agreement. That is to say, we reduce certain of our tariffs in order to give the Belgians a chance to sell something more over here, and they reduce their tariffs in order to give us a chance to export some more to Belgium.

Now, it is experimental in this sense: It is directed primarily at the bilateral situation between Belgium and the United States. At the same time, under the most-favored-nation clauses, other nations -- not all other nations, it depends a little bit -- certain other nations have the right to take advantage of that lowered tariff. At the same time, in the Belgian agreement there is a clause that says, "If this results in the bringing into this country from other nations -- not Belgium -- imports which will hurt this country in the larger sense, then, within thirty days, we can stop the agreement." So it does not vary very much from the Peek theory. It comes pretty close to being a bilateral treaty but it does give us a little opening for other countries to see how it will affect them too and depending on the way it works out will determine the future continuation of that particular Belgium-United States agreement.

Q Of course, under the most-favored-nation clause, the other nations have to give us the same concessions. Do you think Belgium has come in in order to get advantage of this?

THE PRESIDENT: It depends a little bit on the clause of the individual nation. I don't think there is one rule that will tell. I think there are some treaties that will let them come in anyway,

most of them.

Q Will you comment on the British announcement of the increase in air force because of the rearming in the United States -- the McDonald White paper announced yesterday?

THE PRESIDENT: I have not read of it, have not heard of it. They are increasing their air force because of what we are doing?

Q They included the United States in the list of countries rearming and thereby necessitating their doing the same.

THE PRESIDENT: I would like to check the language. I hope you are not right.

Q It was broader than an airplane increase; it was a naval increase.

THE PRESIDENT: We might have been put in as a matter of politeness, you know.

Q Can you tell us whether any decision has been reached on the possibility of our participation in any international move to help China?

THE PRESIDENT: I do not know. You will have to ask the State Department because I have not heard a word about it for a week, not a word.

Q Are you going to give out the reports of the Federal Trade Commission and the N. R. A. on the basing point situation in the steel industry?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know why it should not be given out by them.

(Mr. Early spoke to the President.)

Steve (Mr. Early) says they are working on it now and one of the reports is eight volumes. If you want the eight volumes, you can have them. They are to be released simultaneously and

somebody is trying to save you work.

Q Somewhere there are some figures you asked for with relation to the taxes in the District of Columbia and you sent them back for more information to the Treasury. Do you recollect that?

THE PRESIDENT: I had not. I am glad you reminded me. I will check on that.

Q We were beginning to suspect that possibly you were going to keep them and not make them public.

THE PRESIDENT: No; I am glad you reminded me.

Q There were some statements on the Hill yesterday from Senator Harrison and others to the effect that there was to be a great reduction in the scope of the N. R. A., child legislation, Mr. Williams' resignation, et cetera. Can you discuss the plans with regard to N. R. A.?

THE PRESIDENT: Only exactly the language I used in my Message and that is as far as I have gone. Of course, as a matter of fact, in fairness to Mr. Williams, Mr. Williams did come in the first instance for sixty days and I have tried, successfully, to keep him on ever since. He wanted to get out in September and he has been coming to me every week, asking to be released so that he may go back to his private business.

Q Will you comment on the Weirton decision?

THE PRESIDENT: I guess I had better not. The more I read it the foggier I get.

Q Will you comment on the McSwain Bill to keep the profits out of war?

THE PRESIDENT: I have never read it, not yet. I suppose I will.

Q In that connection, can you tell us what has become of the Johnson

and Baruch Committee or Commission to study the business of profits in war? Is that going on?

THE PRESIDENT: They have made a verbal report and they have a great deal of material. Whether they will make a written report or not, I do not know. They have collected a great deal of material which is in the State Department now ready for use any time I call for it.

Q They made the report to you?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, verbally.

Q You said that you had not heard anything on the China situation for a week. May I inquire whether, when it was called to your attention, there was something we might do to help China?

THE PRESIDENT: No. There was a big question mark at that time. Nothing specific at that time at all. The question was, "Is there something all the nations can do to help China?"

Q You are considering that still?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

Q Will you make any comment on the speech of General Johnson two weeks ago as to the foreign developments?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

MR. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. President.

CONFIDENTIAL
Press Conference #189,
Executive Offices of the White House,
March 8, 1935, 4.08 P.M.

MR. DONALDSON: All in.

THE PRESIDENT: We have been talking about Hawaii in the front row.

It is not printable. (Laughter)

I do not think there is a blessed bit of news. We will go off the air and put the lid on over Sunday, as far as I know.

Q You will be at the House tomorrow?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

Q Mr. President, you told us in the last Conference that you were going to prepare two Messages over the week end?

THE PRESIDENT: I am going to prepare one, anyway, and maybe the other. I cannot tell you which ones yet.

Q What is the other besides transportation? (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: Now, I have a field of five to choose from.

Q A field of five?

THE PRESIDENT: A field of five.

Q Does that pretty much wind up the legislative program then?

THE PRESIDENT: Just about.

Q Do you care to say what the five are?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q Do you care to say anything more about N.R.A.?

THE PRESIDENT: Any more about it? I do not think I have been very vocal about it lately, have I?

Q I thought you might elaborate on your Message?

THE PRESIDENT: No, I do not think so; I will just stand on the Message.

Q Mr. President, are you planning to send the ship subsidy bill up to the Congress?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q Will you comment on what type of direct subsidy you prefer?

THE PRESIDENT: Just read the Message.

Q Mr. President, Secretary Swanson said the other day that he was going to take up with you a problem involving General McCarl.

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, yes. We did. We talked about it in Cabinet meeting and ^I suppose the easiest way to explain it is to put it in the easiest terms. The question arises, as I understand it, on the payment of traveling expenses --

Q Of officers?

THE PRESIDENT: Of officers who retire when they are a long way off from home. In other words, to bring it down to a practical layman's point of view, if an officer on distant service, located in the Philippines or the Panama Canal or Hawaii, if he actually gets sent home, say two weeks or three weeks before the retirement day, he gets his transportation for himself and his family and his goods in the normal way. But if, because of Government necessities, he is kept on active duty at his post until the actual date of his retirement, according to the Comptroller General, he is out of luck and cannot have his way paid home. Now of course there is no question in my mind as to what the intention of Congress was. An officer does not actually, physically retire until the day he becomes, whatever it is, sixty-four. If the needs of the Government require him to stay at his post up to that date, it seems pretty hard on him under the McCarl ruling that he should have to

pay his way home, whereas if they had happened to send him home a month before, he would have been paid by the Government. Now, that is the practical end of it.

Now, on the legal end of it, this case was ruled on by Attorney General Stone, who ruled exactly as the Attorney General has ruled. Since then there have been one or two more cases decided in the courts with that ruling by the Court of Claims. And the Secretary of the Navy is following the ruling of two Attorneys General and of the only case that has come up in the Court of Claims.

Q May I ask at this point whether the Court of Claims ruled in favor of the payment?

THE PRESIDENT: In favor of the payment, yes.

Q Do you intend to issue an Executive Order?

THE PRESIDENT: No, there is no question of an Executive Order. We decided to do that on this case and the order of the Secretary of the Navy on these past cases will stand, that the officers shall be paid. But, in order to clear up the future, the Secretary of the Navy will suggest to the Naval Affairs Committee and the Naval Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that in future appropriations, the question be made absolutely definite and beyond peradventure of a doubt. So, that settles that.

Q Mr. President, a controversy has arisen between Mr. Eastman and Mr. [J.J. Pelley ?] Tulley over the continuation of the Railroad Coordinator's Office.

Will you touch on that in the Message on transportation?

THE PRESIDENT: I never heard of it.

Q The office expires on June fifteenth unless extended. Mr. [Pelley ?] Tulley came out last night in a speech and said that that Railroad Co-

ordinator's Office ought to be abolished.

THE PRESIDENT: I never heard about it.

Q If I can return to that Navy pay, will that take an Executive Order?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q What about the status of Mr. McCarl?

THE PRESIDENT: What do you mean, "What about his status?"

Q Does this case set any precedent?

THE PRESIDENT: He is a very, very old friend of mine for whom I have the highest regard and he has done a perfectly magnificent job, one of the very best servants that the Government has got.

Q Can he be reappointed?

THE PRESIDENT: I do not know what the law says.

Q There are some suggestions that he cannot be reappointed.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not know.

Q Mr. President, could you properly give us, as a very general idea, what fields are to be covered in the forthcoming Messages?

THE PRESIDENT: No, that was what Stevie (Mr. Stephenson) was trying to worm out of me, but unsuccessfully. I have a number of Messages in mind -- I am working on them. I have not actually picked out the one I am going to write over the week end -- the one or the ones. I really do not know and could not tell you.

Q Will there be some emphasis on farm-to-market roads in the work relief measure when it is passed?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that is a difficult question to put that way because farm-to-market roads depend a good deal on the individual state. Some states, for instance, with Federal money are still trying to emphasize their through roads. It depends entirely on

the state.

Q Mr. President, it seems to me that the Naval action on your statement about General McCarl is entirely unprecedented. Do you happen to know whether such a thing has ever happened to be brought before a President of the United States and settled in this way?

THE PRESIDENT: I imagine so from past experience in Washington and very often it used to get up before the White House. I do not think there is anything new in this. I think you will find it has come up before every Cabinet.

Q Chairman Biddle of the National Labor Relations Board said yesterday that enforcement of section 7-A had broken down and suggested that the Wagner Bill would correct the situation?

THE PRESIDENT: I could not comment on that unless I saw the whole of his statement.

Q Mr. President, have you decided yet who will take the place of Mr. Pecora on the Securities Commission?

THE PRESIDENT: Is there a vacancy there? I did not even know of it. I had forgotten it for the moment. It is probably on my list right here.

Q Mr. President, is Secretary Ickes resigning?

THE PRESIDENT: What did you say?

Q Is Secretary Ickes resigning?

THE PRESIDENT: Does he look resigned? (Laughter)

Q More resigned. (Laughter)

Q Mr. President, have you reached any agreement with him about Mr. Moses? (Laughter)

THE PRESIDENT: Now, that is putting us both on the spot. When is the

next Press Conference?

Q Tuesday, I think.

THE PRESIDENT: Maybe Tuesday I might have some news for you. I do not know.

Q Any change in the situation? (Laughter)

Q Any new R.F.C. directors, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: What?

Q Any new R.F.C. directors?

THE PRESIDENT: Not yet.

Q Thank you, Mr. President.