Dear Mr. President:

I was so afraid yesterday that I was trespassing upon your time that I am afraid my suggestions to you about a certain important Judicial appointment were not of much value. I have been thinking over the situation as we discussed it since then and I am offering this suggestion for what you may think it worth.

I agree with you absolutely as to the outstanding qualifications of Felix Frankfurter and I am settled in the opinion that he ought to be appointed to the Supreme Court in the near future, but the thought has occurred to me that if there is to be another vacancy within a few months, it would be better to appoint the Western man, assuming you can find one who is satisfactory, and then give Frankfurter the next vacancy. It does not seem to me that Justice Brandies could postpone retirement very long and there may be others who will retire. You will know more than I can suggest to you whether there will be an early retirement by Justice Brandies or any other Member of the Court. If Brandies should retire at the end of the present term of Court, Frankfurter could be easily fitted into the situation as his successor, as Brandies was appointed from Massachusetts and Frankfurter comes from that State also.

If you appoint Frankfurter to the present vacancy you will almost be compelled to fill the next one from the West and you will have no better material within six months or a year than you have now; therefore, nothing can be gained in the way of improving an eligible panel by waiting to give the West an appointment within six months or a year. If you appointed a Western man now, the West would be satisfied and would not expect the next appointment to be filled from that territory, and Frankfurter could be appointed with no objection or serious criticism from any source.

I also agree with you in your estimate on some of those whose names were discussed. I am not well acquainted with the background of the Iowa man, but the name sounds well and I do not believe it is essential that a man should have had long and wide experience as a Trial Lawyer in order to make a good Justice of the Supreme Court. If he
is well grounded in the law and the philosophy of law and of Government, and holds the attitude toward their interpretation which will assure a liberal viewpoint, he can soon become acquainted with those matters of procedure, the knowledge of which is acquired in the trial of cases. I have often contended that it is much easier to be a good Judge than to be a good Trial Lawyer, especially where the Judge has all the time he needs to find out what the law is and all the help that both sides in every case are willing to give him. Therefore, if your suggestion possesses these qualifications, his deficiency in actual matters of procedure in the Courthouse would not offer a serious objection to his appointment.

Those suggestions have been based upon the belief that you will in the near future have two appointments to make, to wit: the one to fill the present vacancy, and another one within a few months. If I am wrong in this assumption, then the suggestion is not as legitimate as it would otherwise be. I cannot escape the conclusion that within the next year you may have at least two more vacancies besides the one that now exists. If this turns out to be the case, the Western appointment now would pave the way for an appointment of the outstanding man whom we discussed on yesterday without serious question as to its propriety.

Cordially yours,

[Signature]

The Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.
United States Senate
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

THE WHITE HOUSE
January 17, 1939

His Excellency Franklin D. Roosevelt,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

I am very glad indeed to have your letter of January 16th this morning.

Please permit me to say that as Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I shall always be happy to receive suggestions from you and will give to them the utmost consideration. I hope to pursue a policy as Chairman of the Committee constructive and forward-looking, and amongst other things, I hope to place new emphasis upon the promotion of our commerce.

As for the Florida Ship Canal, I may say that I voted for it in the Senate, but did so to some degree, at any rate, out of deference to my dear friend, Senator Fletcher. Very recently, General Markham came to see me and made a powerful argument for the Canal. My mind is open on the subject, and I may add that General Markham did much to convince me that the building of the Canal is justified, not only by commercial, but also by military needs. He had quite an argument to the effect that the Canal would be self-liquidating.

As for the Passamaquoddy project, I think I am safe in saying that at present a considerable number of Senators consider it quite impracticable. However, this will not prevent us from fully investigating the merits of the project and we shall give great weight to your recommendation.

It is a rule of the Commerce Committee to refer all engineering projects to the Board of Engineers of the War Department, and rarely have we approved a project
The President of the United States.

unless it shall have been found by that Board to be economically sound and desirable. This rule is of the utmost value as a self-imposed restraint upon the Congress. I assume that no objection will be made to having these projects passed upon according to the established rule in view of either bills or resolutions.

Let me give you my very best wishes and assure you of my desire to cooperate with you.

With great respect,

Most sincerely,

[Signature]

JWB/9
VISIT FROM SENATOR ADAMS
Wednesday, January 18th - 5 P.M.

Subject: Reduction of WPA from $825,000,000 to $725,000,000.

I showed him Colonel Harrington's figures showing February reduction 200,000; March, 200,000 more; April 200,000 more; May 250,000 more; June, 220,000 more and June employment 1,930,000 from present 3,000,000.

I asked Senator Adams if he thought these figures correct. He replied "Colonel Harrington is the only man who has any figures". I said "Have you any reason to doubt them"? He said "I have no reason to doubt them".
Employment Schedule with Deficiency Appropriation of $725,000,000 to the WPA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employment (thousands)</th>
<th>Cost at $61 per worker (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>$1.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>$1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>$1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>$1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>$1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>$725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He is only wise who has the firmness to doubt himself.

January 10, 1939.
Dear Mr. Vice President:

In my letter of January 19, 1939, I wrote to you of the need for extending the Stabilization Fund and the power to fix the metallic content of the dollar. Since that time the House of Representatives has passed a bill (H.R. 3325) extending these powers until June 30, 1941. That bill has been reported out by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and is now before the Senate for consideration.

As you know, under the existing Silver Proclamation, which expires on June 30, 1939, the Government is paying 64.544 cents an ounce for newly-mined domestic silver, as compared to 45 cents for silver of foreign origin. I am informed that a small group of Senators is preventing any vote being taken on H.R. 3325 and on the proposed amendments to the bill until a commitment is made that the Government will pay an even higher price for domestic silver mined after June 30.

I have given the matter careful consideration and it is my considered judgment that in the present situation a higher price for domestic silver is not warranted and that I would not be justified in yielding to this demand. Of course, the situation would be different if Congress by legislation should fix the price to be returned for domestic silver. Congress has the opportunity to express its views as to whether a price higher than the prevailing price should be returned for domestic silver by voting on the amendments which have been offered by Senators McCarran, Thomas and Pittman.
Whatever may be the decision of the Congress on this question, however, I feel that I should be remiss if I failed to point out the serious consequences that would flow from a failure to extend before June 30, 1939, the Stabilization Fund and the power to fix the metallic content of the dollar.

The need for the continuation of the Stabilization Fund has been recognized by the Congress and the public. Failure to renew the Stabilization Fund powers would deal a serious blow to international monetary stability and to the protection and advancement of American agricultural and commercial interests. Only one group would profit by the termination of these powers, namely, international currency speculators. The powerful weapon which this country, in conjunction with other democratic countries, has been developing for more than five years to help maintain some measure of stability in international exchange and to check the predatory tactics of foreign exchange speculators would be gone overnight. The resulting monetary uncertainty, with its threat of increased currency fluctuations, would greatly hamper American and international commerce and industry.

In September, 1936, amidst universal acclaims in democratic countries, Great Britain and France joined us in the Tripartite Declaration. Soon thereafter Belgium, Holland and Switzerland declared their adherence to it. No one can question the great contribution which this Accord has made to stability and equilibrium in the international economic and monetary fields. The possession of these
powers made possible the negotiation of the Tripartite Accord and the failure to renew them would inevitably menace the monetary equilibrium to which the Accord has contributed so powerfully. This would occur at the very time when, because of the condition of international affairs, there is an even greater need for an arrangement of this sort between the great commercial countries.

I am convinced that the existing power to change the gold content of the dollar is essential to the proper protection of American domestic and foreign trade against the danger of depreciation of important foreign currencies. The views of this Administration on this matter have been fully presented to the Senate through the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury and similar conclusions were voiced by Senator Wagner in his speech on the floor of the Senate on June 19.

It is urgent that Congress express its views on these matters on or before June 30. It seems too clear for argument that to obstruct a vote on the monetary bill now before the Senate does not promote the orderly process of democratic government.

For the foregoing reasons I urge most earnestly that the Senate act before June 30 on the monetary powers bill (H.R. 3325) now pending before it.

Very truly yours,

Honorable John N. Garner,
President of the United States Senate.
Dear Bill:--

This appealed to me so much that I wish it could be read to the Senate -- and no one could make it effective as you could. It is not only a fine piece of writing but it tells the truth.

It makes little difference where it came from -- but it happens to be New York Evening Post, Saturday, January 21, 1939.

As ever yours,

(Signed) Franklin D. Roosevelt

Senator Borah
United States Senate
WASHINGTON, D.C.

January twenty-third
1939

Dear Mr. President:

Thank you for the editorial.
And thank you for the suggestion.

Very respectfully,

[Signature]

To The President,
The White House,
Dear Mr. President:

I was greatly chagrined the way matters turned out about the letter.

It was my plan to make use of it in the thirty minutes which I was supposed to have toward closing the debate. But that all went awry, so all I could do was to put it in the Record.

I was very sorry.

Most Respectfully,

To The President,
The White House.
Mr. President. Thank you so much for your note of sympathy. I appreciate it more than I ever told you.

The greatest thrill my father ever had was when he met you in the White House a couple of years ago.

In his humble way, he was as devoted to your cause as any more Could ever have been, and the
Greatest pride of his life was that
his son never fainted.
Again my thanks and appreciation.
Very sincerely yours,
Thurman McLean

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt
Washington, D.C.
FROM THE PRESIDENT
TO WASHINGTON

MSG SENATOR BYRNES SINCERELY HOPE NRY VAN DENBERG AND BORAH WILL NOT FORCE US INTO WAR BEFORE I GET BACK PERIOD CHARLESTON NAVY YARD NEEDS THREE OR FOUR DAYS NOTICE BEFORE ANY ACTUAL DECLARATION PERIOD SEE YOU SOON PERIOD

BEST WISHES FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT
CLAS OF SERVICE.

This is a full-rate
Telegram or Cable-
gram unless its de-
Terred character! is in-
cluded by a suitable
sign above or preced-
ing the address.

R. R. WHITE
President.

STICH

A. M. W. Lewis
President.

The time as shown in the date line on full-rate telegrams, and the letter, and the time of receipt as indicated on all remittances, is SHAKEDAY TIME.

Received at

GFA175 77 BOYT=SN WASHINGTON DC 3 1049A

HONORABLE FRANK D ROOSEVELT=

CHARLESTON SOCAR=

REGRET I CANNOT BE CHARLESTON TO WELCOME YOU TO A GOOD
STATE AND A GOOD CITY. FOR TEN DAYS THE SENATE HAS BEEN
DEBATING WAR BUT EARLIER DECLARATION HAS BEEN WITHHELD
BECAUSE OF INABILITY TO AGREE UPON WHOM WE WILL FIGHT. I
KNOW YOU HAVE NOT SPENT TWO WEEKS STUDYING WAR TACTICS
JUST FOR NOTHING AND POSSIBLY YOUR RETURN MAY SOLVE THE
QUESTION AND AVOID A FOREIGN WAR. HEARTIEST CONGRATULATIONS
UPON THE SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF YOUR INAUGURATION=

JAMES E BYRNEs
Memorandum For Colonel Watson

Mr. McIntyre gave me this to look over and then to discuss with him. It is rather complicated, and is purely patronage.

In the meantime he was taken sick and I did not want to bother him with this sort of thing.

I don't know how far the President would care to go along with Senator Allender on this sort of thing, but I think we should do something affirmative to intimate to the Senator that the problem is not dead. On the other hand we have a perfectly good alibi with Mr. McIntyre's absence.

[Signature]

Ned Hoar, Jr.

My not say that I believed that he would like to go there with the President himself to return to duty.

[Signature]

5/20 - This has been discussed with the President. He told me what he thought was best.
February 7, 1939

MEMORANDUM FOR:  Mr. McIntyre.

Re Ellender's memorandum, do we play ball with Ellender, or Maestri and Weiss?

J.R.H.

2/21 Ellender with X. Wallace at Aetna's request to Walter, I agree would suit to Walter.
MEMORANDUM FOR JIM ROWE:

Will you either talk to me about this or go through it and see if there's any of it you can straighten out.

Confidentially, he doesn't want much, does he?

M.H.M.
February 2, 1939

My dear Senator:

I have your letter of January twenty-fifth, with enclosures, and will follow up just as fast as I can.

I will be in touch with you in the very near future.

Sincerely yours,

M. H. MoINTYRE
Secretary to the President

Honorable Allen J. Ellender,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.
November 8, 1938

Mr. Marvin H. McIntyre
Secretary to the President
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. McIntyre:

I am attaching hereto a memorandum with reference to the various subjects that I discussed with the President last week. I am very anxious that something be done at once, particularly with reference to the sugar question.

I would be happy indeed if I could have a little more time to discuss these and other matters with the Chief. I have done quite a lot of traveling throughout the country during the past two years, and I feel that I could impart to him quite a lot of information which would be of benefit to the party.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Enclosure]
LOUISIANA PERSONNEL.

As I pointed out, practically all key positions in Louisiana are in the hands of persons who have opposed our organization. With some hesitancy, we have agreed to accept Rufus Fontenot, Collector of Internal Revenue; Paul Habana, head of Home Owners' Loan Corporation; J. H. Crutcher, head of Works Progress Administration; and Rene Viosca, United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

JOHN N. SANDLIN. My opponent, John N. Sandlin, was given a job over my protest. He is now employed in Washington. I have positive information to the effect that he obtained a 90-day furlough during the last Congressional election and was instrumental in bringing out a candidate against Overton Brooks, Congressman from the Fourth District of Louisiana. He was very active and solicited funds for Mr. Brooks' opponent. The man he trotted out against Mr. Brooks was his former secretary, a Mr. Frank Colbert. In company with his former secretary, Sandlin solicited funds from several sources in Shreveport. He should be dismissed at once.
I have tried for the past two years to replace Mr. McInnis. He is a protege of Pat Harrison and hails from Mississippi. He knows nothing about sugar cane culture and I have been told the only way by which I can have him dismissed is to show his unfitness. Personally, I don't believe in investigations of this nature. I am told that Mr. McInnis is very fond of the bottle, and, also, of the ladies and spends much of his time with them. Why he should have been sent to Louisiana is a mystery to me, except that it was to please Senator Harrison. I sincerely hope that Mr. McInnis will be dismissed and a good Louisianian appointed in his stead.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY COUNCIL. When I took this matter up with the President almost two years ago, it was my understanding that the National Emergency Council would be disbanded as there was no longer any use for it. At the time I was anxious to displace Mr. Edward J. Gay, the Louisiana Director. What happened was that Mr. Gay was dismissed, but the National Emergency Council is still in existence, and Louisiana has no State Director. If the Council is necessary, I can see no reason why Louisiana should not have a Director.

PROCUREMENT DIVISION. Mr. W. B. Edgar is State Procurement Officer, and when he was appointed, I protested the appointment and suggested the name of a very good man from Louisiana. Mr. Edgar was in the opposite camp, but he was selected over my protest.
RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION. The Louisiana manager, Mr. George F. Buskie, hails from New York. It is my information that few Louisianians are employed except in very minor positions. There are quite a few from Mississippi and other surrounding states.

NEW ORLEANS BANK FOR COOPERATIVES. Dr. J. J. Watson, head of the Bank in New Orleans, hails from Georgia.

FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION. H. H. Montgomery, President, hails from Alabama.

FEDERAL INTERMEDIATE CREDIT BANK OF NEW ORLEANS. J. M. Magruder, President, hails from Mississippi.

PRODUCTION CREDIT CORPORATION OF NEW ORLEANS. Jesse B. Hearn, President, hails from Alabama. Practically all of his appointments have been made from the opposition camp in my State.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS FOR TWENTIETH DISTRICT. This position is held by John J. Kennedy. That position was consistently held by a Louisianian, although the district comprises portions of the states of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico and Arizona. Mr. Kennedy hails from Mississippi, and Senator Pat Harrison is responsible for his appointment.
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE. Mr. Guy Fletcher is now serving as State Coordinator. We have been unable to obtain any cooperation from Mr. Fletcher except occasional visits to our office requesting us to visit his various projects throughout the State. His personnel consists for the most part of those who have been arrayed against us politically and in making new appointments and changes in personnel, he never consults us, but we are advised cooperates with the political opposition.

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION. We have tried consistently to get Louisianians appointed to serve on projects within our State, but my records indicate that many out-of-state men are presently working within Louisiana. Also, very few Louisianians are employed in the regional office at Fort Worth, which serves our State.

EMERGENCY CROP AND FEED LOAN SECTION. I do not consider this a major position, but would like to call your attention to the fact that Mr. D. R. Morrow, who I understand is from North Carolina, is in charge of this organization's operations in Louisiana. Senator Overton and I have recommended that Mr. Dewey McKnight, of Colfax, Louisiana, be placed in charge of this work, but up to this time Mr. Morrow is still in command. Mr. McKnight is presently working with the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section and has a fine record.
The above-named persons constitute the major Federal office holders in Louisiana who are in key positions. We have quite a few minor officers and it isn't my purpose to bring them to your attention at this time. It strikes me very forcibly that some changes should be made at once, particularly with reference to Mr. McInnis, Mr. Hearin and John Sandlin. I realize that some of these positions include districts wherein several states are covered, and of course I do not expect Louisianians to be appointed in all of these key positions.
RICE.

In trading with Cuba, it strikes me that some effort should be made to further help the rice farmers. Cuba produces only five per cent of the rice it consumes. Our rice-producing states produce that commodity far in excess of our requirements. Since we are helping Cuba to the extent of absorbing almost sixty per cent of her sugar production, why wouldn't it be fair and just for Cuba to take more of our rice? There is no American industry that needs more help than does agriculture. The folks who feed and clothe us should be taken care of, and it strikes me that in entering into these trade agreements, more of our agricultural products should be benefited than manufactured products.
JOE FISHER.

For the past 18 months I have tried to obtain for Joe Fisher a pardon to restore civil rights. All necessary documents have been filed months ago and his pardon has been recommended by Governor Leche and other prominent citizens of Louisiana. To my way of thinking, he was a victim of circumstances and he suffered punishment that should have probably been imposed on others in the State. In any event, he has served his sentence, has a good record, and I will appreciate early action.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Sen. Ellender 'phoned and said that there were two more names --

Sen. Pittman and Sen. Lundeen

who should be reached with respect to the present bill.

"Sen. Pittman seems to be waiving, also Sen. Lundeen though he has appeared to be on our side right along."

3/20
Dear Mr. President:

The following are the names we suggest to you, following our conversation, and a notation on three of the Members.

1. Harry Truman - says he has voted 100% for the Administration and yet his colleague, who has not, is allowed to control patronage.

2. James Murray - said Wheeler is controlling patronage and even seeking to have W. P. A. investigated because the Director is Murray's friend.

3. Richard Russell - said Attorney General would give him some assurance that he would have a voice in naming U. S. Marshals and Federal judge it would greatly help.

4. Scott Lucas -
5. D. Worth Clark -
6. Ed Johnson -
7. Bob Reynolds -
8. William Salow -
9. Francis Maloney - said Wheeler knew
10. Clyde Herring -

[Signatures]

Joesph J. Maney
Harry S. Truman
Allen J. Ellender
Josh Lee
Sen. Byrnes:

"Tell the President I have introduced that resolution making reorganization plans July 1st. Barkley told me about what Sam Rayburn and Bankhead said yesterday morning about difficulties in the House, but I had a talk with Warren, who assured me that in his opinion there would not be 30 votes against it and Joe Martin, Republican leader, told me he would not oppose it.

"I know Warren has lived closer to the thing than anybody and I have introduced it because if we don't do it it will leave a whole lot of legal questions up in the air whereas, if we put this thing through, it will ratify everything the President put in his order. If we don't do this, we would have to introduce legislation about salaries and other things and we would have a time getting them through. On the other hand, we can get
this through because it gives hope of an early adjournment.

"I told Barkley this afternoon, when he mentioned it, that I have gone fully into it with Warren and Warren guarantees that it can go through."

K
Memo to Senator O'Mahoney
From the President
May 17th 1939

In re-O'Mahoney's plans on taking of testimony on the Insurance phase of TNEC

Memo to Leon Henderson attached--May 19, 1939

Also attached memo to the President--April 12, 1939
From William O. Douglas
Re-Insurance Investigation

See: TNEC folder-Drawer 2-1939 for the above correspondence and other correspondence relating to the Temporary Nat'l Economic Committee.
My dear Mr. President:

Referring to my letter to you of May 23rd, in which I enclosed a souvenir piece of currency of Japan, in looking at the copy of the letter I find that I stated that it was a 2½ cent piece. The fact is, it is a one-half cent piece.

If it takes 200 of these half-cent pieces to equal 16 cents in our money, and as the Chinese get only from 10 to 20 cents a day for their work, it is easy to realize how impossible it would be for us to compete with Japan in controlling Chinese labor and Chinese currency.

Sincerely,

The President,
The White House.
Six photos -
- Photo File.

"Louisiana
...appears to be usual
amidst growing out of
the poorest neighborhoods.
Sugar cane!"
June 7, 1937

Confidential

Dear Allen:

The enclosed was not written for your eyes and therefore should not be used by you in any way. However, it shows that there is another side to the picture and I know the difficulty of your problem and mine.

Will you send this back to me for my files.

Very sincerely yours,

Honorable Allen J. Ellender,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Enclosure.  Sery, Wallace's letter to Pres. under date of June 5th, returning photographs of sugar cane ploughing left with Pres. by Sen. Ellender. Says it would be unfortunate if it could be shown that good sugar cane had to be destroyed because of unexpected federal regulations.

FDR/41
June 5, 1939.

The President,

The White House,

Dear Mr. President:

In accordance with your note of May 20, 1939, we are returning photographs of sugarcane ploughing left with you by Senator Elender. I appreciate the opportunity to see these photographs and the memorandums which the Senator seems to have attached.

It would be unfortunate if it could be shown that good sugarcane had to be destroyed because of unexpected federal regulations. However, some of the photographs show what appears to be the usual annual ploughing out of the poorer ratoons. Moreover, after the Supreme Court on January 9, 1936, declared crop control unconstitutional, sugar production in Florida and Louisiana increased sharply. Consequently, producers in the mainland cane area were placed "on notice" as far back as September 1937, when the Sugar Act was passed, that reduction in new plantings would be required. Growers were advised specifically last September, during the last planting season, what the acreages should be to qualify for payments. Unless some producers followed advice to disregard the law and regulations issued thereunder, pending action on Senator Elender's proposed legislation to cut the Cuban quota, nothing more than the usual annual "ploughing up" of poor ratoons would have been required.

Several of these photographs have the stamp of the Publicity Committee of the Louisiana sugar lobbying organization which has operated so successfully for many years in whipping the Louisiana Democratic senators and congressmen into line for high sugar tariffs. This Committee is naturally using every possible device to compel a cut in the Cuban quota in order that Louisiana may further expand its own sugarcane production under heavy federal subsidy.
Of course, we fully appreciate the Senator's difficult position. He is confronted with a highly organized group of constituents who are fighting for unlimited expansion of production under federal benefit payments, tariff and quota protection, but are out of sympathy with the child labor and wage provisions of the Sugar Act. Our investigators have found a substantial degree of non-compliance with the child labor provisions and a wage determination of between $1.25 to $1.50 per day for agricultural labor, the lowest rate established for any of the domestic areas under the Act.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Secretary

Enclosure
United States Senate

MEMORANDUM

Flowing up of Sugar Cane:

78,000 acres of sugar cane to be plowed up in 1939, if growers take straight 25% cut.

36,500 acres of sugar cane to be plowed up in 1939, if growers avail themselves of the options provided in the Secretary's ruling.

91,180 acres of sugar cane to be plowed up in 1940, if growers avail themselves in 1939 of the options provided in Secretary's ruling, as above.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT:

Senator Ellender did not have an opportunity this morning to present this to you. He says this is the stuff that the opposition is now photographing for use in their campaign in 1940. I thought you would be interested in seeing this.

E.M.W.
Letter from James F. Byrnes—dated June 19, 1939 to the President and the President's reply of June 21, 1939.

In re-Work Relief and Public Works Appropriation Act of 1939.

See-lending Program—Sidney Byrnes—1939—

OF 1935-E
July 1, 1939

Dear Mr. President:

For your week-end Brentano's recommends "Joseph Caffey on Franklin D. Roosevelt and a Third Term", by Jay Franklin.

A complimentary copy is enclosed herewith.

A.C.

This is the advertised Caffey speech over a national hook-up on July 3rd.

The President
The White House
Fellow-Americans:

My name is Joseph F. Guffey. I’m a life-long Democrat and I come from Pittsburgh. I’ve been United States Senator from Pennsylvania since 1934 - the first Democratic Senator to be elected from the Keystone State in more than sixty years - and next year I’m going to run for reelection, on my record, as a one hundred per cent Pro-Roosevelt New Deal Democrat.

Tonight I’m speaking in answer to Senator Burke of Nebraska who was also elected to the Senate as a New Deal Democrat in 1934. He recently attacked the rising popular demand that Franklin Delano Roosevelt shall run for a third term in 1940.

Now I am for Roosevelt and I want him to have a third term. As a matter of cold political fact, if Franklin Delano Roosevelt is elected to the Presidency again it will be his first real term of office. When you elected Roosevelt in 1932, his first term was canceled, vetoed, by the Supreme Court. When you re-elected Roosevelt in 1936, his second term was stolen by Tories and political ingrates.

I’m for a third term for Roosevelt for four reasons: Because I am a Democrat, because I am a practical politician, because I am a liberal...
and because I am an American.

I'm for Roosevelt as a Democrat because it's the way to win the next election, hands-down, no "ifs", "ands" or "buts", no alibis and no double-crossing. As a life-long member of the Democratic Party, I want my Party to win, and Roosevelt is the only man strong enough to unite behind the Party the elements necessary to make it possible for the Party to win.

I'm for Roosevelt as a practical politician because anti-Third Term talk is bad politics. A quarter of the Senate has served more than two terms, and another quarter of the Senators are serving their second term and hoping for a third. Three-fourths of the members of the House of Representatives are in the same position, and of course we appoint our judges to serve all their lives. That's all right. I believe in experience. How stupid it is for such men to say that a third term is wrong, that there must be rotation in office. In every State and in every Congressional District there are young, able men, just aching for an excuse to run for office, and they'll go to town if Congress starts talking about two terms being enough for an elected official. Who are the men who are talking against a third term for Roosevelt? Senator Burke says he's in favor of one term
of six years. Then there are other elderly members of the Democratic Party
who say that they have such high regard for President Roosevelt that they
just feel sure that he won't challenge the third term myth. These men have
had such high regard for Mr. Roosevelt that they have balked, filibustered
or mutilated every one of the President's measures for the last two years
and have recently condemned a million American families on WPA to beg or
starve. If I were President Roosevelt I'd rather not have the high regard
of men like these. We love him for the enemies he has made and can get along
without their advice.

I'm for a third term for Roosevelt because I am a liberal and I
believe in democracy. The judges and the lawyers cheated the people out
of President Roosevelt's first term. The ingrates and the middle-of-the
roaders robbed the people of President Roosevelt's second term. If the Tory
politicians and the Big Business magnates succeed in bamboozling the
American people for a third time, in 1940, then there's going to be an up-
heaval which will sweep away all politicians and all big business. I don't
kid myself that the American people love their politicians. As I study the
election returns, I see the American people getting sick and tired of political
machines and political wire-pulling. It's time for all politicians to take notice when a serious historian like Herbert Agar of the Louisville Courier-Journal tells an audience in Massachusetts that, as now run, our political conventions are large-scale vaudeville shows which breed cynicism and contempt for the democratic system of government. If the people are short-changed again by the politicians in 1940, then there won't be any 1944, politically speaking. There will be dictatorship or civil war to take the place of shell-game elections between a Republican Tweedle dum and a Democratic Tweedledee, or perhaps I should say between a Republican Tweedle dum and a Democratic Tweedleumber.

I'm for Roosevelt for a third term in 1940, as an American, because I know what he has done to save America - our people, our peace, our free institutions and our faith in God and man. When the worst that can be said of Roosevelt's WPA is that perhaps the New Deal relief-system gave hardworking decent Americans jobs which could have been done cheaper by machinery or by sweated labor, then I know that Roosevelt has been everlastingly right and that the opposition has been and is everlastingly cheap, timid, mean-spirited and small of soul. And I know that the love and the trust of
millions of loyal Americans for that stout-hearted, loyal man in the White House is a national asset worth countless billions of dollars. For if we do not despair of the Republic, we can face any calamity which may befell us. But if we lose our trust in each other, our faith in democracy, we have nothing left but brute force and brute necessity to hold our society together. That's a job for a butcher, not one for a free man. And if the Tories and the ingrates succeed in breaking the people's faith in Roosevelt, I tell you that America, as we know and love it, will be done for.

Our people recognize this issue. They want our liberal democracy to continue. They know that Roosevelt alone can ensure its safety.

Throughout the country the tide for the third term has set in. Now it is running strongly. It is irresistible and will calmly push back all the King Canutes of Big Business and Fat Banking who try to order it not to obey the laws which govern the political universe. Only in the last few days, two of the greatest liberals of our time, Senator Norris and Secretary Ickes, have declared in favor of the third term for Roosevelt.

These and similar forward-looking progressives have long been contemptuous of party lines in their long devotion to the liberal cause. They
represent the millions of Americans who owe no Party allegiance and who
decide the outcome of national elections. Americans who are neither
Republican nor Democrat, but who have the welfare of this country at heart,
and who want the best and most effective government they can get. Because
millions of Americans think as he does, we must pay great attention to Secretary
Ike's when he says:

"Liberals who left the Republican Party and who have followed
Franklin D. Roosevelt from 1932 to 1939 will not astultify themselves by
voting for a reactionary Democrat. They will not take any too kindly to a
Republican reactionary, but if they have no other choice they will prefer a
Republican to a Democratic reactionary."

Every member of the Democratic Party ought to remember these words.
For they express the attitude of millions of American voters whose support
we may lose more easily than we think. The New Deal Solicitor General, Robert
Jackson, reminded us bluntly of this in his speech in Kansas last February:

"The plain lesson of history," Bob Jackson said, "is that when the
country wants reaction, it will take it from Republicans who are experts in
reactionism, and when it wants liberalism, and only then, will it turn to the
Democrats. The Democratic Party will either be a liberal party or a minority party. If Democrats join Republicans in helping turn the people against the
New Deal, they will find that they have also turned them against the Democratic
Party and are authors of a ruin in which they will have to share."

As I said, I am a life-long Democrat and I want the Democratic Party
to win the next election. It is the liberal group, the non-party group, the
group represented by men like Harold Ickes and Senator George Norris, which
will hold the balance of power in 1940. So as Democrats, we must pay attention
when they say that Roosevelt is the only man who commands their enthusiasm
and enlists their support.

The American people don't like quitters. They admire men who go
down fighting for their principles, even when they don't agree with those
principles. Back in 1934, when Senator Burke was running for election on
Franklin D. Roosevelt's ticket, he praised the New Deal to the skies. He
said: "It voices the deathless cry of good men and good women for the
opportunity to live and work in freedom, the right to be secure in their
homes and in the fruits of their labor, the power to protect themselves
against the ruthless and the cunning." He said that the New Deal "seeks
to cement our society — rich and poor, manual workers and brain workers — into a voluntary brotherhood of free men, standing together, striving together, for the common good of all." As Mr. Dooley might have said, "Ye can
waltz to it!" And Senator Burke waltzed into office as a result of this lip-service to the New Deal. Now it is Senator Burke who rises to tell the radio audience what's what in the third term tradition.

A few minutes ago I spoke of the practical politics of the third term fight. Will Senators who have served ten, twenty and over thirty years in the Senate, argue that it is morally wrong for a President to serve more than eight elected years? Can Senators who have been in the Senate since the World War convince us that we must get rid of Roosevelt just because he has been in the White House since 1933?

As a practical politician I tell you — and particularly those persons who quote Thomas Jefferson at you the way the Devil quotes Scripture — that this anti-Third-Term nonsense is political dynamite.

Jefferson, we must remember, supported the principle of rotation in office, not for the Presidency alone but for the Congress as well. He believed that Members of Congress should not be reelected after two years.
office. When members of the Senate quote Jefferson, they had better remember that some young man may rise in their own bailiwick when they are running for a third, a fifth or a seventh term, and quote their own words out of their own mouths, as a reason why the young man should unhorse them.

No one who believed in a third term for Theodore Roosevelt, or Coolidge — yes, even Coolidge and the powerful Wall Street interests behind him, who maneuvered him for a third term — none of these, nor any Senator who has served two terms or more and wants to run again, can safely oppose the third term for the President. For example, Senator Vandenberg, in the hope of setting himself up in the role of Harding — as an imaginary point in the center of the Republican Party — assures us that if he is elected he will not encumber this country for more than one term. What a revelation in self-appraisal by a candidate for the Presidency! The best argument that he can give to our people to elect him is his personal guarantee that they will have him around their neck for the shortest time possible.

But the desire of Senator Vandenberg to relinquish power is somewhat clouded over by the announcement that he is hedging his candidacy for a first and only term in the White House by a simultaneous candidacy for a third term in the Senate.
No. These are dangerous times. We can afford nothing less than our very best man in the White House. What other man than Roosevelt could match the dignity of a King and Queen, and handle them in a way that made this whole country proud of him, and at the same time know and feel the problems of the unemployed miners of Pennsylvania, and the struggling farmers of the middlewest. In these times of real danger to America -- danger from within and from without -- we need a real leader, someone who can really represent our democratic will to survive. And we know that we have such a leader in the White House now -- Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Just suppose a few fixers conspire to thwart our democratic will. Suppose they force upon this country a figure-head, a stuffed shirt, an incompetent middle-of-the-roader, or a young and inexperienced man, when everyone knows that we need a man with knowledge of the world, knowledge of America, determination and courage. Can these political fixers seriously believe that they will not be instantly branded throughout this country as the professional embezzlers of the rights of a free democratic people?

Can they seriously believe that the anger of the American people at this betrayal in their hour of need would stop short at them?
I tell you that the disgust of the American people would reach not only to the dummy given the leadership of our country but to the whole system of democratic institutions which can be captured and misused by selfish and scheming men. And who could blame our people for such a revolt in their hour of anger? Not they, but the schemers, the fixers, the old political bands, would be responsible for the death of one of the last, great free democracies in the world.

We Americans know that to our people Roosevelt is not just a name in the papers, as the other candidates are. Almost every American old enough to walk, has by this time actually seen President Roosevelt. He has seen and been seen by more of our people than has any other man in our history. They don't want shadow candidates now. They want Roosevelt, because they trust him, as they trust nothing else in our political and economic life. They know that for the last seven years, Roosevelt has been in there, fighting for them, as no other President has fought for them.

In 1932, Roosevelt began his fight to transform this country from disorganized, uncontrolled anarchy, to a nation in which, by Government cooperation our resources could be conserved, our level of production main-
tained, our people made secure. In 1936, the people of this country gave an overwhelming mandate to see the fight that Roosevelt had begun carried on. In 1939 that fight is not yet over. Our people demand that, under Roosevelt's leadership, it shall be carried through.

As Jay Franklin said in a recent broadcast discussion of the third term issue, Roosevelt is more than a man, more than a politician, he is the people's President, their representative. "There is your Roosevelt," etc. 3 paragraphs.

That is the story. You have heard of me as a practical politician and I am proud to be one. And I tell you that this third term demand for Roosevelt is the most remarkable development I have experienced in my forty years of practical politics. It is not a led or manufactured movement.

No group of politicians has met in a back room to discuss putting Roosevelt over in 1940. Most of the papers are not only against it but have refused even to print news about it. When Secretary Ickes first came out at a press conference with a demand that Roosevelt run again, the papers did not print it. Instead they published a story about his private life and killed his most important public utterance. And when he wrote a magazine article to
express the same idea, the magazine edited his remarks so that they sounded like an attack on other Democratic leaders. No, this third term for Roosevelt movement is of the people, by the people, for the people. All that liberals, New Dealers, Democrats and practical politicians can do about it, is to jump aboard and go where the instinct of America tells me we will find peace, dignity and security - in the victorious completion of the New Deal under Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

All they can say against it is that it has never been done before.

Well, we never had all the banks closed before. We never had Hoover's fifteen million men in breadlines before. We never had mass foreclosures before. We never had such great floods or such dangerous dust storms before. We never faced such a challenge to democracy before. We never had to move the government in to save business and labor and farmers and miners before. And we never had a Franklin Delano Roosevelt as President of the United States before. So what?

I, Joseph F. Guffey, am for Franklin D. Roosevelt for a third term.
July 8, 1939.

Dear, old dears:

What is this I hear about your going home ahead of time? Do please don't! I need you here on lots of things, including the next big thing on the calendar -- the Neutrality Bill -- and I do hope you will help to get it out on Saturday and put it through.

As ever yours,

Honorable Pat Harrison,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.
This is for your file. The President signed the original statement and gave them to Senator Buckley.

Statement written by the President in his own hand and issued to the Press at 11:45 P.M.
July 19, 1937, following discussion with the Democratic and Republican Leaders of the Senate on neutrality legislation.
The President said: E
The House of Representatives esulted in the Senate by a majority of the Senate voting on this view. Smitten by the Navy, he declared the same opinion. They agreed that a majority of the Senate would proceed to consider neutrality legislation at the beginning of the next session.

Statemenet written by the President in his own hand and issued to the Press at 11:45 P.M. July 18, 1939, following discussion with the Democratic and Republican leaders of the Senate on neutrality legislation.
July 25, 1939

Memo to Pres
From Watson

In re-telephone conversation (conf) with Barkley about public statement on Rivers and Harbors Bill.

See Watson folder-Drawer 2--1939
Dear George:

I think your note to me raises certain problems of importance to our country which go a good deal deeper than you and I as individuals.

For you, an old friend, I have had and continue to have an affectionate regard.

But you and I, whether we like it or not, are living in a period of great change. You and I are in one sense merely actors in a great company. You and I, because of our positions as government servants, contribute of necessity to this unfolding drama of change.

Whether you and I like it or not, the old days when we worked together in the F. & D. are gone — and this country, as well as many other countries in the world, is deciding between those who want to return to the old conditions, even though they may not acknowledge that, and those who recognize the change and want it to proceed in an orderly way.

If you will translate the general principles involved to terms of individuals holding public office under our government, you will, I know, realize that I cannot conscientiously appoint as a government servant any
individual who, for political reasons or by personal conviction, adheres publicly or within his own conscience to that school of thought which seeks a return to "the good old days."

Believing as I do that the only hope for this country and for the world is to maintain a forward-looking and liberal democracy, I must in every case where I have appointments to make seek to look into the souls of those who are candidates for office.

As I suggested above, both you and I are very temporarily in positions of responsibility, yet what we say and do may very greatly help or harm our nation's future.

Always sincerely,

Honorable George L. Radcliffe,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.
July 28, 1939

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:-

The attitude of your administration to me during the last three or four years has been a matter of surprise and keen regret to me. Certainly it seems to me at variance with the nature of my contacts and experience with you throughout many years.

Of course I realize that although this matter is one which deeply concerns me, it is relatively of slight importance to you in comparison with the serious problems of almost unprecedented gravity with which you have had to contend during your administration.

Very respectfully yours,

George L. Radcliffe.
August 1, 1909.

Dear Joe—

Isn’t it a pity! Why is it that Democrats have to hook up with reactionary Republicans?

As ever yours,

Honorable Joseph P. Gaffey,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.
To the President,

The White House

My dear Mr. President:

Yesterday, I met on the floor of the Senate a Congressman from Texas who has been my friend for many years. After berating him for leaving the Democratic Party on the Hatch Bill, he admitted to me that he was very sorry and had made a great mistake in voting for it; at the same time, implying that the passage of that bill was part of the Garner agreement with the Republicans and the reactionary Democrats. The other things that were to be defeated were the Stabilization Act and the Spending and Lending Bill to pieces. I thought you might be interested in knowing this.

At this time, I would not care to disclose in writing the name of the Texas Congressman because it would mean his defeat for renomination next year.

Faithfully yours,
August 2, 1939.

Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The President of the United States,
the White House.

My dear Mr. President:

THANK YOU!

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Note: The signature appears to be 'Carroll Hatch']
My dear Mr. President:

While it would have afforded me pleasure to have called upon you and bid you good-bye and a pleasant summer, I realized the burdens that were upon you. I sincerely hope that you get some rest during the vacation of Congress.

No President, unless it may have been Washington, Lincoln, or Woodrow Wilson, ever had thrust upon him any more crucial problems than you have struggled under the most adverse circumstances during six long years. I marvel at your great mental and physical strength that has sustained you in the heart-rending fight.

Mrs. Pittman has not been well lately, so we will abandon our custom of motoring West, and will leave by train next Wednesday.

With expressions of warm regard and esteem, I beg to remain,

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

The President,
 Hyde Park, New York.
Honorable Claude Pepper  
United States Senate  
Washington, D. C.  

Dear Senator:  

I have just read your letter of August 28. I have also read the speech which you made in the Senate on August 5, which you enclosed. I had read this speech before, as it was printed in the public press, but I have reread it today, not only with great admiration, but with great benefit to myself. I think it will do a great deal of good in the country.

As I wrote you before, I doubt the wisdom of trying in any way to influence the coming democratic national convention in the nomination of a candidate for the presidency. I thank you sincerely for the opinion you have expressed as to the influence I might have on that question, if I should take an active stand now. I believe, however, you have greatly over-estimated the influence I possess. I know there are many democrats, prominent in their party and personal friends of mine, who, moved by a spirit of righteousness, would nevertheless look with varying degrees of dissatisfaction, which might even border upon contempt, upon the activities of anyone who should attempt to influence the action of a political party, when he is himself not a member of that political party. My active support, prior to the convention, of a third term for Mr. Roosevelt would, I fear, influence many of these people, both in the Senate and out of it, to a feeling that the right over the nominee in the democratic party is not my fight, and that I should keep entirely out of it.

It is needless for me to say I do not agree with this sentiment. I think it is entirely wrong. As I see it, members of a political party ought to look with a degree of satisfaction, even with favor, upon an expression of opinion upon such a question as that of a third term, coming from any source, if we assume that such source is conscientious and well-intended. However, getting my opinion from many years of experience, I believe such a sentiment as I have mentioned does exist and that regardless of anything I may say or do it will still exist long after I have made any attempt in any direction to control my fellow citizens on such an important question.

On previous occasions I have expressed my opposition to a third consecutive term for any President. The reasons for such an opinion I think are obvious. A man who is President has it within his power to build up a personal political machine, and to carry that powerful machine to such an extent that it would be harmful to the country. It might tend to set up a precedent which I think could be dangerous. Yet, when I consider the conditions which confront our country at this time, and admitting the things I have above enumerated, I think we ought, in passing upon the question, take into consideration the condition in which the country finds itself. If there seems to be no other man of sufficient prominence who
is capable of carrying on what we believe to be a progressive form of government, of bringing relief to the under-privileged classes of our citizens, then this also ought to be weighed in the balance, in considering the objections to a third-term. If we made our objections to a third-term absolute, without any exception whatsoever, we would be in considerable danger on some occasions, of which I believe the present is one, of injuring, if not ruining, our country.

I am a firm believer in the principles of government for which President Roosevelt has stood and for which he has fought, and, admitting that he has made mistakes, something which is common to all humanity, I have nevertheless never doubted his sincerity, his wisdom, or his courage. The cry that is being made by his enemies that he is trying to set himself up as a "dictator" to my mind is entirely without foundation, and under all the circumstances seems to me to be utterly foolish.

When I weigh this third-term in the balance, admitting the dangers that might apply under any ordinary circumstances, and when I realize that there seems to be no other man in any party capable of carrying out these principles of progressive government, the third-term "danger" fades into insignificance. Admitting that there are many other men who could carry out these principles, if given the power and authority to do so, and admitting, also, that there are many men who you know and I know who, according to our ideas, would do as well as, if not better than, President Roosevelt himself has done, yet we know with absolute certainty these men have no such standing before the people of America as would enable them to lead the forces of human progress in the coming battle, which will follow upon the action of the two great political parties in their next national conventions. So that it diminishes down to a question of getting behind Roosevelt, or taking a chance. And can we afford to take that chance?

When we see the wonderful power of combined wealth and monopoly, the combination of that monopoly with special privilege and their terrible influence and power in controlling and influencing conventions, I say, without any hesitation, we cannot afford to take that chance.

Moreover, this opposition to President Roosevelt comes from several sources. One is partisan, entirely partisan, moved by a sincere desire to overthrow Roosevelt because he is a democrat, and to place the control of our government in the hands of a republican. And when we look over the ranks of the republican party and single out the men who are prominent
enough that under any ordinary circumstances they might be expected to get the republican nomination, what a dire condition we find ourselves in! There is not one of these who is prominent in the coming political right. The condition in that party seems to be confined to those who are under the influence, some honestly, some otherwise, of great combinations of wealth and power which can mean nothing except the further misery of that part of our population who, because of the influences of monopoly, are not receiving their fair share of freedom and opportunity. Some of these men are so partisan and so anxious for the success of their particular presidential nominee, whoever he may be, that they disregard entirely the welfare and well-being of the country and the millions of common citizens which comprise it. So that this partisan element, as I see it, to begin with, ought to be entirely set aside and disregarded, in the selection of a candidate for the presidency.

I do not believe I am partisan in this respect. I have long been a member of the republican party, but with humiliation and regret I have to admit that most of the leaders of that party are under the control and domination of special privilege and organized monopoly, and I do not look for any relief in that direction. I do not mean to imply that this applies to all members of the republican party, of course. There are men in that party, many of them, who would rise above such classification, but alas, none of them are even remotely under consideration for the nomination.

In the democratic party there is only one possibility, and that is Roosevelt himself.

I do not believe I am moved in any degree by a feeling either of partisanship or of animosity. I have absolutely no ambitions of my own. So far as I personally am concerned, the result of the next presidential election will not affect me in any way. I have reached a time in my life when I know, without any uncertainty, without any doubt, and, I think, without any sorrow, that regardless of what may happen in the coming presidential right my personal fortunes and condition will not be influenced or affected in any degree. I am moved by only one desire, and that is, I do not want to see my country take a backward step. I want to see the wheels of human progress still turning in the direction of more progress, more liberty, more blessings to humanity, and when I look the ground all over and sum it all up, I return inevitably to the conclusion that Roosevelt seems to be the only man in sight who can bring those things about. And while I have great affection for him personally, while I love him for what I believe he stands for in government, yet my desire to see him nominated and re-elected comes not from any personal feeling or from my affection for him. I am looking at the problem from the viewpoint of one who desires only the upbuilding of humanity and the enlargement of the liberties of my countrymen.

There is another group of people who are opposed to the renomination of President Roosevelt. This group, in my judgment, is made up for the most part of democrats who have a personal feeling against Roosevelt, a
feeling of varying degrees, extending even to the point of a personal hatred for him. To me, this condition is something new. I have never seen it exercised to such a degree in all my public service. Various reasons are given for these opponents of President Roosevelt taking the position they do. None of these reasons, in my judgment, can ever be defended upon any ground of justice or patriotism. This is a cruel situation, one that has caused me much agony and sorrow. I have personal friends who, I believe, would go against anything Roosevelt proposes, simply and solely because they do not like Roosevelt.

I have no doubt that none of these men are perfectly conscious in the action they take, but such action, if carried to its logical conclusion, must in the end ruin any enterprise, any government, or any country. That it exists now in regard to the President, I have no doubt, and that it will be a power that must be reckoned with in the coming contest, it seems to me is a certainty. However much we may regret it, however illogical it may seem to us to be, however unjust it may be, it is there, just the same, and it is going to have its influence. I can easily see how there might be personal differences between Roosevelt and members of his party who have heretofore been his supporters. Yet the man who is moved by a desire to help uphold humanity, to be of assistance to his fellow men, ought in no case permit such a feeling to carry him to the point where he would inflict injury upon our people, even risk the destruction of our government, in order to give vent to his feelings of hatred and animosity.

I have often said I do not believe the rank and file of our people care very much for the partisan appellation which is attached to any man who is running for office. I think what the candidate thinks, what he stands for, particularly what the leader stands for, far outshines in importance any partisan appellation which may be applied to any candidate. The people do not care very much about the politics or the political name attached to the candidate, if they know the man and know what he stands for, if they believe in him and the things he represents. The most intelligent voters of this country are going to support him, regardless of the political party he represents, and the number of such voters is increasing daily, hourly. And it is the intelligent voter who thinks of the good of his country, rather than the success of a political party. I hail this sentiment, increasing as I believe it is, with a great deal of joy, feeling as I do that increasing intelligence will enable our people more properly to decide what candidates to elect and what candidate to defeat. It is immaterial to the rank and file of the country what may be the political beliefs, for instance, of a postmaster in Florida, a collector of internal revenue in Colorado, or a United States marshal in California, whether the man be a democrat or republican. The people want efficient men, whatever may be the politics, and wherever the office may be located.

The people want honest men, intelligent men, patriotic men, who think more of the good of their country than they do of any political party, and who would not hesitate to condemn a political party, if they thought it was wrong, and who would as soon convict a rascal who was a democrat, as they would if he were a republican. Good government demands that this enlightened attitude be upheld, increased, and, if possible, made permanent.
the political beliefs, for instance, of a postmaster in Florida, a collector of internal revenue in Colorado, or a United States marshal in California, whether the man be a democrat or republican. The people want efficient men, whatever may be the position, and wherever the office may be located.

The people want honest men, intelligent men, patriotic men, who think more of the good of their country than they do of any political party, and who would not hesitate to condemn a political party, if they thought it was wrong, and who would as soon convict a republican who was a democrat, as they would if he were a republican. Good government demands that this enlightened attitude be upheld, increased, and, if possible, made permanent.

So that, after all, the president we are going to elect in 1940 will be a president of all the people, and not of a political party. I would carry this doctrine much farther than President Roosevelt has carried it, although I think it is unquestioned that he has carried the banner farther in advance than any man has carried it, who ever preceded him in this office. I think he has made mistakes. Some of the things he has done, I thought were mistakes when he did them, but having in mind the eventual good of all our people, it seems to me it is the duty of every patriot to help him, to stand behind him, and to stay with him, in the leadership he has given our country. We cannot get a man who is perfect—we cannot pick a perfect man out of a group of men, all of whom must, being human, be more or less imperfect. Such a leader should not be condemned, even when we know he has made mistakes, when the course to pursue is doubtful and it is difficult to know the road to take, and when an honest, intelligent, patriotic leader chooses the road, as I see it, it is the duty of every patriotic soldier to follow him on that road, even though personally we might have taken a different one.

I do not know what the outcome is going to be. The wave of reaction, bitterness, hatred, and animosity has been great indeed, and it may be that our people will be moved by the powerful influences of greed and selfishness to take a misstep in the next presidential election, but I still have faith in the people and I do not believe they will take such a course unless they are honestly mistaken.

It is the duty of such men as you, young, vigorous, able, patriotic, and courageous, to take the lead in this fight, and to fight on every day, to do everything humanly possible to bring about the victory that shall mean the continuation of liberty, the upholding of the rights of the common people, and the destruction and dissolution of organized monopoly and greed.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

/s/ G.W. Norris
TELEGRAM

The White House
Washington

SALEM, Oregon, Sept. 7, 1939.

HON. STEPHEN T. EARLY,

Please tell my friend, the President, that disclosure telephone message to me caused by inadvertance of clerk in Salem office. Am sorry. Best wishes.

CHARLES L. McNARY.

(Charged to Senator McNary's Senatorial Account.)
September 11, 1939

Dear Mr. President:

You will permit me to thank you for your note of the seventh.

I came to the Eye Institute, Presbyterian Medical Center two weeks ago today. I am pleased to say that an operation promises to be completely successful.

Thanking you for your very courteous and thoughtful note, I am

Cordially yours,

[Signature]

Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.
Letter to Gen. Nelson  
From Theodore Leroy  
September 13, 1939

Endorses memorandum which he hopes the General will bring to the attention of the President.

Memorandum relates to information which the late John Olan, friend of Mr. Leroy, told him about the activities of Senator Bush and Judge Daniel F. Cahalan regarding their pro-German relations during the World War.  
President sent to Pell to read and return—his memo is attached.  
See Pell folder—January 2-1939
MEMORANDUM

Mr. Edgar Dunlap spent the week-end with Senator George in New York. He advised by telephone this morning:

1) Senator George will vote to "bring out immediately the Administration's neutrality bill."

2) Senator George says that he was always opposed to the embargo; that he voted for the original provision because Joe Robinson told him the Administration was insisting on it.

3) The Senator says his dilemma is whether to go to international law or to "cash and carry."

   Dunlap says that his present opinion is that the Senator will be for "cash and carry."

4) Senator George will return here on Wednesday or Thursday and will make no statement before then.

5) Barney Baruch, Jesse Jones and others have called on the Senator. Mr. Farley was to call on him Sunday, but did not do so.

                           Lewis Johnson  DECLASSIFIED  SECRET
                           Franklin D. Roosevelt Library  DOD IH  5200.9 (5/26/61)
                           Date: 9/18/39  Signature: Carl A. Spieser
Memorandum for the President
From Watson
Sept 21, 1939

In re-conf conversation Louis Johnson had with
with Frank Kluckhorn of the N.Y. Times who
had had a conversation with Senator Borah
in relation to the President's Address before
the Congress on Repeal of the Neutrality Law-
Sept 21, 1939.

See: Gen Watson folder-Drawer 2-1939
MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT:

Jimmy Byrnes asked that the President confirm an invitation that Byrnes extended to Senator Bailey to appear on the radio in the name of the President. Bailey regretted on account of instructions from his doctor.

E.M.W.
Forsser Waterfront Apartments
Longshoremen's Union

Not signed as agreement

Definite and extending to agreement.

Signed autographically.

April 4, 1949.
Elly DeAr President Roosevelt
Elly express
to you and Mrs. Roosevelt
for your father Senator.
Elly my sincere
appreciation of yours
very precious thought of him. Your expenses
must keep being much.
cheer to his sick friends,
and seek beauty and
fragrance prove a tribute
to his recuperative
powers. He impresses
steadily, but also
slowly it list his
aggressive temperament.
With his kind regards,
Sincerely,
Henry Acker
Boatwright.

October, fourth.
October 4, 1939

His Excellency Franklin D. Roosevelt,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

Please accept my thanks for your letter of September 20th, with the valuable information, which I am returning as requested.

I regret that Germany has placed tobacco on the contraband list. Perhaps this action will hurt our exports. I am sure it will greatly stir many of the people of North Carolina. It is altogether unnecessary.

I do hope that we shall find ourselves able to induce the British buyers to return to our market, which will re-open October 10th. Otherwise, we will be put to the necessity of extraordinary measures. The statement by Mr. Secretary Wallace and the sympathetic attitude of yourself very greatly encouraged me, but I confess I have some reason to fear that the British Government may not change its attitude. However, this is more for you than Mr. Secretary Wallace, and I know you will do all that can be done.

There is no question of the passage of the pending measure in the Senate, and I think it will receive more support than is claimed for it. I have made a very careful study of it since I saw you and have prepared a letter to the people of North Carolina, which I intend to send to you also. I am very much inclined to take a hand in the debate, if I can feel vital enough, I shall do so. I must say that I am feeling better.

It was a great pleasure to see you and I have only one regret and that is that I stayed too long, I shall be coming again.

With all good wishes,

Cordially yours,

Josiah Van Bailey
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON  

September 29, 1939  

The President  
The White House  

Dear Mr. President:  

Enclosed are the tobacco figures for which you asked some time ago.  

Referring to the question of contraband which you mentioned in the presence of Senator Bailey yesterday, I can say that tobacco is listed as contraband by Germany but not by England.  

Respectfully yours,  

[A. Wallace]  
Secretary  

Enclosures
### Exhibit "A"

**UNITED KINGDOM: Unmanufactured tobacco, quantities imported and used by manufacturers; 1909-23, and average 1934-38**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Empire</th>
<th>Other countries</th>
<th>Total used by manufacturers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mil. lbs.</td>
<td>Mil. lbs.</td>
<td>Mil. lbs.</td>
<td>Mil. lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>114.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>126.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>111.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>118.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>121.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>157.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>142.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>162.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>188.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>184.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>202.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>152.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>164.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>162.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>171.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>515.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>548.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>177.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>213.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>214.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>227.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>166.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>184.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>154.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>173.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909-13</td>
<td>116.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>131.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-18</td>
<td>155.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>168.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-23</td>
<td>206.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>230.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-38</td>
<td>215.2</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>274.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/ Estimated.
FRANCE: Unmanufactured tobacco imports, home-grown crop, and consumption of manufactured tobacco products; 1909-1923 and average 1934-38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imports, unmanufactured, from -</th>
<th></th>
<th>Home manufactured products</th>
<th>Consumption of</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Grown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>128.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Averages</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909-13</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-18</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>117.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-23</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>109.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-28</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>122.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Crop beginning with 1920 includes Alsace Lorraine.
2/ Preliminary.
(Exhibit "C")

UNITED KINGDOM: Estimated quantities of principal tobacco products consumed, 5-year averages 1909-23 and 1934-38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Cigarettes</th>
<th>Smoking tobacco 1/</th>
<th>Cigars</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mil. lb.</td>
<td>Mil. lb.</td>
<td>Mil. lb.</td>
<td>Mil. lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909-14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923-26</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-38</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Including small quantities of chewing tobacco and snuff.

UNITED KINGDOM: Estimated quantities of several kinds of leaf used in manufacture for home consumption, 5-year averages 1909-23 and 1934-38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>United States leaf</th>
<th>British Empire leaf</th>
<th>From other sources</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mil. lb.</td>
<td>Mil. lb.</td>
<td>Mil. lb.</td>
<td>Mil. lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909-13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-18</td>
<td>471/2</td>
<td>1/</td>
<td>1/</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929-33</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-38</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1/</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMOKING TOBACCO 2/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mil. lb.</th>
<th>Mil. lb.</th>
<th>Mil. lb.</th>
<th>Mil. lb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1909-13</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923-26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Oriental or Turkish leaf.
2/ Includes chewing tobacco and snuff.
(Exhibit "D")

FRANCE: Consumption of Tobacco, by Products, Average by 5-year periods, 1909-23 and 1934-38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Smoking tobacco (Million pounds)</th>
<th>Cigarettes (Million pounds)</th>
<th>Cigars (Million pounds)</th>
<th>Snuff (Million pounds)</th>
<th>Chewing tobacco (Million pounds)</th>
<th>Total (Million pounds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1909-14</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-19</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>117.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923-28</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>109.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-38</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>112.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ Preliminary estimate.
October 13, 1939.

Memo for the President from Senator Byrnes—attaches 2 amendments to Neutrality Bill which Senator Bailey says he will propose to the Committee.

See: Neutrality folder—Drawer 2-1939
October 14, 1939.

Memorandum for the Secretary of State
From the President

Asking him to bring with him the enclosed letter of Oct 14th from Senator Bailey with attached revised amendments regarding Neutrality Legislation for the final recommendations.

See: Neutrality folder-Drawer 2-1939
October 18, 1939.

Memorandum for the President:
From General Watson

Re-telephone call from Leamon and his report on Senator Bridges on Neutrality; also his talk with Bruce Barton whom he thought was backsliding, so put Hillis on his trail. Regrets, too, that Al Smith is not amenable to the idea of speaking in Boston.

See: Neutrality folder-Drawer 2-1939
October 19, 1939.

Memorandum for the President from General Watson

Re: Frank Walker's message for the President from Pat Boland on Neutrality.

See: Neutrality folder-Drawer 2-1939.
Oct 26, 1939.

Jimmy Byrnes phoned General Watson that everything is all right and they think they can get vote by tomorrow night. Mentions see Wallace etc etc.

See: Neutrality folder-Drawer 2-1939
Col. Halsey sent the following message to the President:

"The conferences have agreed. The Senate met at 2 O'Clock and has taken a recess for two hours to let the Clerk prepare the report. It will begin consideration of the Conference Report at 4 O'Clock."

For original memo—See Neutrality folder—Drawer 2-1939
Nov 3, 1939,

Memorandum for Miss Le Hand

From Watson

Message from Col Halsey, Sec of Senate
Resolves of 45 to 26 to adjourn today.

See: Neutrality folder-Drawer 2-1939
November 10, 1939.

Senator King of Utah phoned that he was very happy to learn that the President was not opposed to transferring the Mercantile Marine to another flag to save it. He, Senator King, does not consider this an evasion of the law.

E.M.W.

(General Watson)

See: Watson folder-Drawer 2-1939 for original memo
November 21, 1939.

Personal and Confidential

Dear Harry:

It is good to get your letter and I fully and heartily concur in every word that you say about Jimmy Byrnes, who is one of the best. I won't make any decision immediately and, as you know, I am faced with a good many problems — geographic and otherwise.

My warm regards and I hope to see you one of these days soon.

As ever yours,

Honorable A. Harry Moore,
Governor of New Jersey,
Jersey City, New Jersey.
Texas Editors Toast Garner At ‘Sinfest’
Merry Party Inspired by Recent Lewis Criticism

DALLAS, Nov. 17.—Spittoons were placed 4 feet away from tobacco chasers and snuff dippers as a bunch of “vill old men and wicked old women” toasted Vice President Garner with milk.

But don’t be misled by the milk in their gobbled. It was no ramshackle party.

The vile occasion was “dedicated to sin and corruption by the friends of the Honorable John N. Garner of Texas, Vice President of the United States of America.”

The occasion was attended by a group of elderly members of the “old boys club.”

The event was inspired by an article in the “New York Times” which suggested that Garner was a “drunkard and a hypocrite.”

Mr. Garner wasn’t there. He was away in the back country hunting.

Through fire and brimstone and tears and broken glasses, the “old-timers” wept. They sang in a potbellied stove of cold and clammy air.

No casualties.

They packed their liquor bottles and took the guns to the barn.

The editor’s little girl, who had been sleeping in the barn, awoke and called out, “Daddy, what’s going on?”
Re-memo to the President from Steve Early-Nov 22, 1939
about phone call from Senator Glass who was greatly
concerned by the false headlines and vicious misrepresentations
of his position with reference to the Garner Presidential
Candidacy etc. etc.

See: Steve Early folder-Drawer 2-1939 for original memo
Dear "Booe":

Many thanks for your kind greetings on my birthday. It was mighty sweet and thoughtful of you to remember it.

I spent the entire day in the country. Looking for a buck was just incidental to getting out in the open, and 'look' was all I did because I didn't get even one chance to "pop a cap".

Mrs. Garner and I are well, and join in love to you and yours.

Sincerely,

President Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.
November 27, 1959.

Letter to Joe Guffey from Claude Bowers—Santiago.

See: Chile folder—Drawer 1-1959
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

12/8/39

MEMORANDUM FOR MISS LEOHAND

Senator Bulkley called and wanted a very cordial "thank you" conveyed to the President for his message to Mrs. Bulkley.

K.
Memorandum for Jim Rowe from the President—December 9, 1939.

Re: Dave Sholtz

Asks J. R. to talk with Senator Pepper about job which Dave Sholtz wants as Ambassador to Cuba. Attached is memo of Dec 13th from Rowe outlining Pepper's reply; also letters of Dec 7th and 13th from Sholtz to the President and one to Mr. McIntyre of Dec 14th. Attached also is Watson's reply to Sholtz of Dec 15, 1939. For memo from Rowe to President—Feb 6, 1940—Re—conversation with Sholtz who says he can beat Andrews for the Senate if the Pres keeps PWA out of Politics etc.

See: Sholtz—Gen Corres—Drawer 2—2940
December 12, 1939.

Dear Jimmy:

All the same Harry Moore was right in his suggestion and I had, of course, thought of it and approved it before. The only fly in the ointment is the one you mention, for I, too, think that for various reasons the appointee should be from the West and should be a Catholic.

I hope you will be coming back to Washington pretty soon because I want to talk with you before I close the budget figures and before I write the Annual Message.

As ever yours,

Honorable James P. Byrnes,  
Spartanburg,  
South Carolina.
Dear Mr. President:

Harry Moore recently came to Spartanburg to visit me for a few days and while here told me that shortly after the death of Justice Butler he had written you suggesting that I be appointed to succeed Butler upon the Supreme Court. I told Harry that if I were President I would appoint as a successor to Justice Butler some man possessing the qualifications of a Judge who resided in the West and who is a member of the Catholic Church.

While Governor Moore's intentions were good, I believe, for the reasons stated to him, that his advice was unwise and I do not want you to think it was offered upon my suggestion or with my knowledge.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNE.

Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.
Dec 13, 1939

To Hull
From the President
"Will you speak to me about this"

Re-Memo telephoned in by Senator Guffey for the President in regard to George Earle

See Hull folder-Drawer 1-1939
December 22, 1929.

Dear Jacki-

Merry Christmas.

We miss you much up here.

As ever yours,
Grace thinks they are referring to the Neutrality Bill.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Sen. Barkley:

"The Committee voted the Bill out 16 to 7, without material changes."
I believe that the best interests of the country and my state would be furthered by the nomination for President on the Democratic ticket of JOHN NANCE GARNER. I pledge my sincere efforts in his behalf.

Name: ..........................................................
Address: ................................................................
County: ........................................................ State: ..........
Dear Fellow Citizen:

As the course of time runs on, it has become evident that the people of the United States have tremendous confidence in the loyalty, integrity and high ideals of our great Texan, the Vice-President of the United States, John N. Garner. So general and widespread have been the expressions of friendship towards him that we of Texas who are his neighbors and friends of long standing have decided to act. We have, therefore, organized a general committee looking to the drafting of JOHN NANCE GARNER for PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The presidency of the United States is a solemn responsibility. And for it, we believe Mr. Garner is fitted, by character, by maturity and by experience. The Democratic nomination for President is in the hands of the citizens of the various states. Our sentiment in Texas is unanimous for our distinguished native son. We recognize that sentiment elsewhere, no matter how warm, means little unless it is organized. The friends of John Nance Garner are asked to join forces, and unite in a concerted show of strength, looking to his nomination by the Democratic party for the presidency of the United States.

Are you willing to help in this aim?

We are taking the liberty of enclosing two pledge forms, one for yourself, and another for some one loyal and trusted friend of yours. Read them carefully before you sign. Your sincerity and loyalty is all that is expected of you; no money is requested; no obligation of any other kind is wanted.

Sign one yourself—ONLY IF YOU BELIEVE IN JOHN NANCE GARNER AND HIS PROVEN RECORD and ask some friend to sign the other, some neighbor who is not a member of your own family.

Just drop them into the mail; no postage stamps necessary.

If you want a true, tried and trusted leader for the militant Democracy of this country, join with us to sponsor the leadership of John Nance Garner of Texas.

Sincerely Yours,

[Signature]

E. J. GERMANY, Chairman of State
Dem. Executive Committee,
Chairman

J. E. GLENN, Dallas, Secretary

MRS. CLARA DUCOY, Democratic
National Committeewoman,
Chairman

TEXAS
GARNER
FOR PRESIDENT
COMMITTEE

Vice-Chairman
MYRON G. LAFOY, Marshall, Tex.
J. F. RAY, Seabrook, Tex.
MAURY HUGHES, Dallas, Tex.

GULF STATES BLDG.
DALLAS, TEXAS
I believe our time is right. We have started very early because we have to build the person from the ground. Garner has no color; he cannot speak; he is quite old and cannot be shown.

We have to make an Andrew Jackson without Andrew Jackson’s force; we have to depend upon what we believe the American people are ready to do.

We believe the American people are tired and want to sit down. We feel that they want one of their own kind to sit in a rocking chair.

Our man cannot talk so he will stay in his small town and only talk in simple sentences when the opposition gives him a chance, like the Lewis attack. We will have the same general troubles as the Coolidge backers for his popular election.

We believe the attacks on Garner’s disloyalty can be overcome by Roosevelt’s attack and threat to become disloyal to the Democratic Party. We will say “Who is God, and who made Caesar?”

We will let him rail — all the fishermen will like that.

They attack him for whiskey-drinking; all of the whiskey-drinkers will have an excuse for their own weaknesses.

He will be attacked as too old to be any good; every man and woman over 60 will resent that.

He will be attacked as a Bourbon, and as too conservative; — every fellow that wants to sit down and is afraid to say he is a conservative will go ahead and vote for “Safe and Sane John”.

The appeal to all of these minorities makes necessary a long, slow and non-vigorous build-up where the person of Garner is built beautifully by the attacks on him. The American sense of fair play always goes to the rescue of the weak, the helpless and the smiling. John will do and be all those, as the young and vigorous take over him with ridicule and whips.