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Day vs. Stenger case. The survey line on Main Street was not drawn exactly north and south, and the variance increased as the addition went east. Steele ruled that the line had to be redrawn, but Orland (with Mr. Goff also working on the case) won an appeal from the state supreme court, which ruled that the lines recognized for more than fifty years would be law.

Enforcing the state prohibition act as prosecuting attorney. Process of marketing moonshine. Italians made wine in Potlatch. A man arrested for possession drank the liquor before it was confiscated and couldn't be convicted. He delayed arriving at dinner parties when violation of the law became socially acceptable. In instructions to the jury he stressed the responsibility of Moscow to the parents of university students throughout Idaho to keep liquor away from their sons and daughters. Those in possession got fined, while commercial producers got sentenced. He enjoyed working with Pat Malone, Albert Strom (Troy) and Harry Gleave (Potlatch).

Potlatch was a company town, substantial and well-behaved during prohibition, while Onaway was not as good.

He accompanied officers to the scene of serious crimes, which greatly assisted him in prosecuting the cases. Apprehending the prohibition violators; runners from out of the area were very difficult to catch.

After dropping charges against a suspected cattle rustler for lack of evidence, additional work clinches the case. (continued)
Evidence included testimony of Carl Jochkheck Elk River butcher, and proof of felony.

Indian cases were tried at Moscow. Kinds of cases he tried. He sued the Northern Pacific for killing a young boy on the tracks, finding a 1906 Moscow ordinance that set the maximum speed at twelve miles per hour.

Working for and against Potlatch Lumber Company. Coming of Potlatch Lumber Company interests; Deary rejects Moscow for millsite.

Post World War I depression. The 1930's depression was not Hoover's fault. Crash of wheat market hit this area hard. Bank troubles; when the Old National Bank in Spokane closed down, he drew up a document which the mayor signed, declaring a holiday in Moscow, preventing a panic.

National Recovery Administration developed codes for industry; locally, Mr. Goff was secretary and Burton French director of the voluntary organization which urged patriotic compliance. Depression ended with World War II. People didn't suffer much around here because life was far simpler than now. Prosperity of the twenties.

State legislator from Latah County: his major achievement was a bill permitting courts to set their own procedures. Retirement for judges. Social life in Boise: Mrs. Goff's popularity.

Army duty during World War II. Elected to Congress in 1946, defeating Comp White. He was elected president of the freshmen Republicans, Richard Nixon secretary. Introduced and passed Forest Pest Controls Act, largely to combat tussock moth. Introduction and defense of Air Supremacy Act. (continued)
The Armed Services Committee essentially followed his recommendation, although the bill was defeated. He was only freshman named to Republican steering committee, and a member of agriculture committee. He lost in Democratic landslide in 1948, and lost in Republican senatorial primary in 1950. Named general counsel to the post office department by Eisenhower. Named to Interstate Commerce Commission in 1958, later elected chairman, serving for nine years. Speech at Valley Forge, speech for Air Supremacy Act, and Speech by Mrs. Goff on social life in Washington, D.C. (see Museum files).
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II. Transcript
ABE GOFF: I think one of the most importtnt cases historically that's been decided in the courts here in Moscow was the case of Day versus Stanger. Now this is a case that most people have forgotten about. It involved the property lines on the properties on the east side of Main Street. Now Jerry Day then lived in his big house—big, wooden house—up in the east part of Moscow on the hill. And his neighbor was a fine enough man by the name of Stanger. Now they got into a dispute about the boundary line. And in order to settle it Jerry Day brought an action against Stanger to establish his boundary line. Now it developed in the trial of the case that when Moscow was first surveyed the main township line ran down Main Street, supposedly north and south. But it developed later that it wasn't on a true north and south; it was a little bit off. And of course all the property lines and for all the additions for all the east side of Moscow were drawn at right angles to the center line down Main Street. Well, of course if it was a little bit off it would gradually, the further you got east the rate of the divergence would be from the true ninety degree angle from what was north and south. Well, the controversy between Day and Stanger was the result of that. And the case was tried out in the district court before Judge Steele without a jury because there was little dispute of the facts. Now Mr. Orin was the attourney for Stanger and I was then practicing with him although we had not yet become partners. I worked hard on the case with him and he tried the case. I helped collect some of the evidence and as it resolved
down from many old settlers' testimony, the location of the old fences, the property lines, there were still some of the old wooden fences between property out here on the east side of Moscow. And of course there was a divergent from the true line, what would be the true right angles from the north and south line. Well, the case was tried out and Judge Steele decided that the accurate survey must govern, that the lines when properly drawn—the true north and south line—that that was the true line that had been established, all the descriptions were based on that. And that would have to govern what the true line would be. But of course naturally it would make a considerable confusion out with these people that for fifty years had built their fences and sidewalks and everything based upon the original line as then laid out on the original survey. Well Mr. Orin took the case or we took the case though it was his case but I had worked on it. He took it to the supreme court but the supreme court held that when these old lines had been established by the earliest pioneers, when they built their houses, built their fences, built their sidewalks on what was the recognized line, that these lines had been recognized for more than fifty years, that the court would not disturb them. And the lines that had been accepted by everybody from the very beginning would have to govern. And so that's the reason that there's some confusion about the lines here. But there's no question where the old lines were that surveyors followed those out. It does make some difference the further you get east but it would have made tremendous confusion if they'd followed the technically accurate line. And the court said, "No, when you build a whole side of town and people have recognized it all these years, that's the line that governs" and that can be easily followed by an engineer. Now, the engineers didn't like it very well
but the fact remains that that's the reason that we've had some differences out in the east part of town.

SAM SCHRAGER: Which side of the case was the side that you were representing?

A G: Oh, I was representing Stanger. Stanger held to the old lines, the accepted lines. And Day sought to establish the technically accurate lines. And so of course there was no particular hard feeling about it. It was established and the case was returned and that's the way we stand.

SAM: Did you argue, incidentally, that the ramifications of changing...?

A G: Oh everything, we argued. Oh, everything was argued. That was a very carefully tried case. And there's a tremendous record up in the courthouse now; it'll be found up there of, oh a number of witnesses from the earlier days. You must remember that back in the twenties most of the early settlers or a large part of 'em were still alive and could come and testify about where they built their lines and fences and so on. And it was a very interesting case. It's a long case but that's why we have had this difference about property lines. Now, next you asked me to say something about prohibition cases.

Well, of course, I was concerned as prosecuting attorney only with the prosecutions under the state prohibition law. There was a federal prohibition act and a state prohibition act. The offenses under the state prohibition act were directed against the manufacture, the sale, or the possession of intoxicating liquor. Now we had quite a few moonshiners out in the back woods in the area of Troy and Bovill and out there. Of course the Potlatch Lumber Company would not willingly permit anybody to establish any still on their forest lands, but there were lots of little property owners and of course the usual way that it was handled was the moonshiner would bring his liquor to someone who would convey it to the town and the town, they'd convey it to
to the bootlegger. And then the bootlegger would either bottle it or sell it by the jug to the ultimate consumer. And of course we had quite a few cases. Most of the stills were located, as I remember, in Clearwater County and down along the Snake River up above Lewiston where there was wild country. We had a few cases for manufacture here. The usual defense was that though it was on the fellah's property that he didn't know it was there, that somebody else must have had the still. And when they found cracked corn up at his place he said that was for the purpose of feeding his chickens. And of course often though he'd forgotten and added sugar. And he couldn't explain why there was sugar in it or why it was wet sometimes. The runners ordinarily had nothing to do with the manufacture. They operated by automobile, they'd come into a town and deliver it to somebody who was the real bootlegger, that sold it to the often respected citizen who got it. We tried a lot of cases around for sales of liquor around the dances and where the lumberjacks were. A lot of these cases were sales to informers who went out and made the buy under the eyes of the sheriff who was watching. And we didn't have so many cases for the manufacture of liquor here, but there were quite a lot of 'em for the sale of liquor. We had quite a lot of wine made over in the Potlatch area. There was a group of Italians lived there, mostly pretty good people. But they had made wine. They used wine all their lives. They couldn't see anything wrong with makin' a little wine and making a little money by selling it to thirsty native American citizens. There was a law in addition that provided that when a man was more than twice—if he'd been convicted twice—the third time he could be charged with being a persistent violator of the state prohibition act. And that was a penitentiary offense. And we, as I remember, there was only one man that we convicted of being a persistet violator of all the time. Usually they got out of the business before they had a chance of
going to the penitentiary. But jail sentences were handed out pretty regularly for the bootlegging. And seldom was, a mere purchaser was charged with possession, very seldom was he given a jail sentence. Given a substantial fine for having liquor in his possession. I can remember one of the interesting cases that arose about a man that had bought some liquor. He was charged with liquor in his possession before he was arrested for the possession of the liquor and while they were busy with arresting the bootlegger he drank the liquor. And he was charged with the possession of liquor. But the court rightly held that when he swallowed the liquor it became part of his body and we didn't have any evidence. Now I think that's all I'll say about the prohibition cases. Of course it was repealed. The difficulty was that gradually drinking became the accepted thing in society. I know it reached the stage when I was prosecuting attorney that when I'd be invited out to a dinner, I didn't drink and never took any illegal liquor. But I would simply notify the hostess that I would be half or three-quarters of an hour late. And it was well understood that no liquor could be served in my presence and I would just arrive after the other got to because it'd be a common thing to serve liquor. But I can say that it was never in my presence because it was against the law and I couldn't understand prosecuting some poor lumberjack for taking a drink and then letting people get away—substantial citizens—get away with it. So I just preferred to have nothing to do with it. Did you want to ask some questions about the prohibition?

SAM: Yes, there's one question that I was curious about and that you broached a little bit when we were first talking. And that was about the way that the prosecution handled the prohibition cases in general. You told me that you had a lot of set argument that you gave to the jury.

A G: Oh, yes. I will say that. First, that in Latah County and I'm quite sure we had the best record for the enforcement of the prohibition laws of any
countiy in the state. You can understand that around Wallace and Kellogg and down at Lewiston the ordinary citizen, a lot of em at least, regarded it as an infringement on his rights and there was nothin morally wrong about it. But here in Latah County we were quite successful because of the location of the university. And at that time \( \frac{1}{4} \) was the only state institution. And in trying these cases, in my argument to the jury, and in my questions to the jury. In my opening statement I always pointed out that here in Latah County we had a responsibility to the citizens of Idaho, the fathers and mothers who sent their sons and daughters here to the university. We had a special responsibility that I hoped that they, not to convict an innocent man, but to keep that in mind, whatever their views were about the prohibition law. The we owe to the fathers and mothers throughout the state to keep this county free of liquor and away from their sons and daughters? And it was very effective. They took it much more seriously than did the jurors in many other counties. In fact, I don't know whether I mentioned this but, up in Wallace and Kellogg speakeasies were in operation. In fact under the federal prohibition law they indicted the mayor of Wallace, the county commissioners, the sheriff and most of the county officials for a conspiracy to violate the national prohibition act because they condoned all this. Now is there anything further?

SAM: Was there a usual length of sentence, like for a first offense?

A G: Well, here in this county if the fellah was commercially engaged in selling or manufacturing he nearly always got a jail sentence. Judge Deatrich, who was the federal district judge here, he always gave the commercial violator a jail sentence. In fact the congestion got so bad back in New York City that they transferred Judge Deatrich back there to help get rid of the
backlog. And they said that some of these violators were brought in to be sentenced; they'd faint away. They'd never had such a thing because in many of the cities they were just given a fine which would amount to a good sized license fee and went right on again. But here and particularly in this county, I don't know about Judge Deatrich in other counties, but if they were in the commercial business of selling or manufacturing liquor they got a jail sentence and a good jail sentence.

SAM: Was Pat Malone involved in many of these cases?

A G: No, not so many. Pat was up there with the lumberjacks. He had to get along with em. He was quite popular and well-liked, a jolly old Irishman. Oh, sure he had a lot of smaller cases but we were not so concerned about the individual lumberjacks, sure if he was picked up he'd get a fine if he had some liquor in his possession. We were concerned with the bootlegger that was disposing of it. And it was a pretty tough case 'cause poor old Pat, everybody knew him so well, if he was anywhere in the offing they never had any liquor around. But we had little trouble with any place where they had a speakeasy. There wasn't any such thing much in Bovill. Oh, once or twice there was some liquor disposed of around some restaurant or somethin' in there, and not a restaurant as much as around, oh some fellah that operated a place for cigars and dance halls and things of that kind. But it wasn't a severe case up there, and old Pat was hard on the trail but we didn't have any really big cases that he was involved in. A very interesting old Irishman that I always look back with fondness as I do to Albert Strom, who was the marshall down at Troy. Now he had quite a few offenses down at Troy. There was always a Saturday night dance down there and there was always a little liquor disposed of. Strom was a fine, honorable, town marshall. Did a fine job, a lot of things besides just been town marshall. He had to look after the water
works and collecting the water bills. And Strom was a fine man and I
look back with pleasure to him and also to the constable over at Potlatch.
Now the constable was an Englishman by the name of Harry L. M. Gleave.
Now he was appointed constable and townsit superintendent by the
Potlatch Lumber Company because you see they had to have somebody in charge
of all the buildings in the town and the town buildings there because you
see Potlatch was built entirely by the Potlatch Lumber Company to house
their workers. Are there various buildings. There was a gymnasium
and a theater and so on. They were all built by the Potlatch Lumber Company.
The store at that time was run by a subsidiary of the Potlatch Lumber Company.
And in that store, for instance, a fellow could draw checks in advance,
slips on his pay if he ran out of money before the end of the month and
this script could be either cashed at the bank or given to the Potlatch Mercantile
store good for his family if he'd run out of money. Then it was charged
again him when his paycheck came in at the end of the month. Well, now Gleave
had charge of all these houses and seeing that they were kept repaired. He
didn't do the carpenter work himself but he was the general superintendent
of this whole establishment owned by the Potlatch. Now true, once in a while
he became involved in some case but he was too busy with his other work.
And I'll tell you Harry L. M. Gleave, now since deceased, was one of the
finest citizens we had here in Latah County. He did an excellent and
efficient job as the townsit superintendent. But he was also a constable
besides being the townsit superintendent. And he was responsible for, as
constable, for maintaining order in the community. But Potlatch itself was
a very law abiding community. You see, the major mill was located there.
The town was well run under constable and superintendent Gleave's direction
and supervision. Now there was a little town of Onaway up next to it; but
that wasn't owned by the Potlatch and there was considerably more difficulty and trouble about selling liquor an various crimes, not serious ones, out in Onaway which wasn't under the supervision of Glewve. He had nothing to do with that. That was up to the sheriff.

SAM: In other words, during the period of prohibition Ptolatch was really, for being a lumber town was really quite a clean and...

A G: Quite a clean town. They had a pool hall there. But it was very...

Everything was clean. The company insisted on it. Now the individual lumberjack out in the woods that was a different situation because a large part of them were single men. But in Potlatch most of the mill workers were married men who rented homes there from the Potlatch. It was a very substantial community. There was a bank there that, stock was owned by the Potlatch Lumber Company. And we had little difficulty about Potlatch itself.

SAM: There's one more question I think I have about prohibition, and that is the way the cases were broken and the offenders were brought in. Did you as prosecuting attorney have much involvement with that part of the business or were you involved only after the case was broken? And how were cases broken generally? Were they broken by informers or were they broken by the sheriff's office or that just general?

A G: Well, generally I'd say that I had little to do with the actual apprehension of bootleggers and so on. My job was prosecution and I went out, my trips out through the county were usually involved more serious offenses because I had left word with the sheriff when there was any serious offense apparent to call me at once when he heard of it and take me along with him. So that if, you know, it was a manslaughter case, a bad assault case or a robbery, a burglary or anything of this kind, I was there with him on the ground where I could talk to the witnesses, where if he'd made an arrest I could talk to the accused. And it was a great help. If I do say, I had a
very good record for convictions because I was there right on the scene, right afterwards with the sheriff and we quickly made up our mind whether the man was guilty and next whether we had a case against him. Now, to the apprehension of these fellahs that were bootleggers, yes, there were some informers hired occasionally. Somebody that'd be a stranger, maybe somebody from another part of the county wouldn't be well-known, would try to make "buys" as we called it. And they'd try to make the buy where the sheriff would be watching and then if, you know, in a small county like this if somebody was in the liquor business locally the word got around and it'd get to the sheriff's office. And remember that there were plenty of good, sound citizens strongly in favor of the prohibition act who tip the sheriff off if there was word around that a fellah was manufacturing liquor. Usually the sheriff, if there were reports of manufacture he'd quietly slip out in the area, perhaps locate the still back in the woods if nobody was there, conceal himself, and when the fellah'd come to tend his still he'd be picked up. But the runners that came in from outside, they were seldom caught because they were strangers who would run a car in here. They'd be in touch with somebody locally who wanted the liquor. They'd meet someplace outside of town and it'd always be at night. They'd meet at some road corner at a certain time. And the next time it'd be changed to some other time. And it was pretty difficult to locate and apprehend them. And of course when some lumberjack bought a bottle and got drunk and was making a disturbance was picked up and had a bottle on him, why that was an easy thing to charge him and convict him. And they'd usually plead guilty and usually not be given a very severe fine if we were convinced that he had nothing to do with the financial gain in the thing.

SAM: When this law was repealed were you as prosecuting attorney sort of glad
to see it go and not have to deal with these kinds of cases.

A G: Well, yes, I would say I was. I can't remember when I went out as
prosecuting attorney. I think I went out in 1934 and it was over with
by then. But of course, oh I certainly was glad to get at some of these
fellahs that were selling rotten liquor that would blind people and so on.
Besides it was the law and it was for a worthy purpose and it was on the
books and it was my job to enforce it and I did the very best I could.

SMM: Okay, I'd like to ask you about a case that you mentioned just when we stopped
last time and that was the cattle rustling case involving the Galloway
brothers.

A G: Well, that case, I wish I could look over the file and refresh my memory
but the Galloway brothers ran cattle down on the other side of Kendrick.
Some of their cattle were stolen. I can't even remember the name of the
defendant. And there were several circumstances that made them think that
he was guilty of it. And I don't remember the details, but anyway they filed
a complaint; we had this man arrested. He was brought in here. He was charged
with the offense, I don't remember whether he insisted on having a preliminary
hearing before the probate judge who was then magistrate. I really don't
member 'cause he had a right to just waive that and he was bound over to
to the district court. I filed information against him for grand larceny for
stealing the cattle. And I don't remember all the details in connection with
the case or just how much evidence they had against him. But when the case
came up for trial, that is the court term was coming up, I made up my mind
that we didn't have a sufficient case to convict him. And I thought it would
be a bad thing to bring him in here and if we once impressed a jury and he was
acquitted he was gone for good. He couldn't be prosecuted again. Then I'm
remembering now what evidence we had is not very strong, I presented a motion
to district Judge Steele to dismiss the case. Now the dismissal had no
affect on another prosecution. And upon the ground that I didn't consider
the evidence was sufficient to sustain a conviction. Well, the judge on my
motion dismissed the case. And the Galloway boys were certainly pretty hot
about it. I couldn't blame 'em. I was convinced of the fellah's guilt but I
just thought we didn't have the case and we hadn't had enough time to run it
down as fully as I thought we should. So I dismissed the case and they were
very much dissatisfied with it. And I had a lot of criticism from people
down there for doing it. But I did what I thought was the best thing.
Well, time went on and we worked on the case further, and the sheriff worked
on the case. And I opined, I said to the Galloway boys, "Now look, I think
the fellah's guilty too. Now you try to get me some more evidence and the
sheriff'll work on it. And let's get in touch with the sheriff down
at Clearwater County," because it was on the border of Clearwater County.
Now I don't remember the details, it's been so long ago. But I do remember
that we finally built up quite a case. The next thing was that this fellah
we let go and the case had been dismissed, went up to Spokane. And lo and
behold I read in the paper that he had been convicted of chicken stealing
over there, someplace out of Spokane. Well, now theft of chickens had been
made a felony by the Washington statute. It was a felony, a penitentiary offense
to steal chickens, they'd had so much troubled up there. So along before the
next term of court came up I had got Galloway doing, and him swear to another
complaint. And then we tried the case. Well, as a result of careful work
on the part of our sheriff and of others, and the work the Galloways
had done our first witness and strongest witness against him was
(End of Side A) — some of the cattle. Carl J...
got on the stand and told about a day or so after the alleged
that the defendant came to him and he bought the cattle and paid him for
em, and one or two of the hides had the Galloways brand on it. And we had
the hides here, we Carl Jockheck to identify them. And Jockheck identified
the accused as being the man that he purchased the Galloway cattle from.

In addition to that, and we had some other evidence, other original evidence
they'd had about his being in the presence and down in the area with his
horses and so on, some of the original evidence we had of Galloway. The
defendant took the stand in his own defense. And that's just what I'd been
waiting for. So when he took the stand and after he'd testified that he'd
had nothing to do it and that Carl Jockheck was mistaken, it wasn't him. And
that he'd had nothing to do with it. It was a mistaken identity. That he'd
had nothing to do with the case. And that Carl Jockheck was certainly mistaken
and he had witness or two to show that he was someplace else at the time,
an alibi that he couldn't have possibly been there. And why, he then, after
his examination, his witness' over and he'd given his testimony, then it
was time for cross-examination. And of course then I simply said to him,
"Have you ever been convicted of a felony?" And he didn't want to answer.
I insisted that he answer. And the judge said,"Yes, that's a proper question.
It's a means to test his credibility because under the law a conviction of
a felony is an impeachment of a man's integrity and it's a proper way to
impeach his testimony." So the accused said,"Yes, I was." And I said,"Where
was that?" And he said,"In Spokane, Washington." And I said, of course I
could ask leading questions, I had the certified copy from Spokane of
the judgement of conviction, the superior court there and of the sentence
given to him. And reading from that I asked him all these various questions
which he admitted. And then following that I submitted the judgement of the
Superior Court of Spokane County of his conviction of grand larceny. That
was the very thing that we'd charged him with here. We didn't know what it was, it was grand larceny, it was the conviction. Well, we had built up a strong case, particularly with Carl Jockheek's testimony. And then this was the clincher. And the judge, in compliance with my request instructed the jury that one of the ways to impeach the credibility of a witness either was by proof of contrary statements made at some other time or proof that he had been convicted of a felony. They had a right to consider that in going out to consider the story and the credibility of the defendant and the accused. The jury convicted him in a hurry and he was sentenced to the penitentiary. But I've always had a great respect for the Galloway boys and I don't blame em for being angry at me but just the same I think we would have lost that first case. And particularly that conviction of grand larceny later in Spokane was the clincher that did the business with the jury.

SAM: It seems like very careful judgement on your part.

AG: Oh, I don't know about that.

SAM: One thing I'd like to ask you about, and I was thinking about when you talked about the U. S. District Court meeting in Moscow. It occurred to me that that meant that the Indian cases would be tried in the district court there too. Is that correct?

AG: That's right. All the Indian cases from the reservation were all tried here. And of course there was tried a lot of federal cases for selling liquor to Indians. And of course occasionally there was some serious crime committed or accused who was an Indian, and against an Indian and it was an offense on the reservation so those cases were tried here. We always had a few Indian cases every term of court.

SAM: Were there any that were particularly outstanding?
A G: No, I'll tell you I don't really think there was any--oh, I'm sure there were some murders and so on like that--but I was busy with my county prosecuting and of course I was practicing law all this time also because you see my salary was only fifteen hundred dollars a year as prosecuting attorney. But I carefully avoided any cases in which there could possibly be any conflict of interest. And my cases were all between individual citizens and no connection with the county, and I had nothing to do with a case where the county could possibly be involved.

SAM: Were you ever involved in a murder or manslaughter case?

A G: Oh, I was involved in several manslaughter cases. I'm not sure about murder cases. I was involved in a number of manslaughter cases. I don't remember any murder cases. I defended manslaughter cases and assault with a deadly weapon cases, both tried them and defended them after I got out because I did do some criminal work. But I didn't get into much criminal work unless it was some very important case or I had some sympathy for the accused and I knew his family and I was personally convinced of his innocence. I tried some fairly important cases that way. And I did a lot of work in trying automobile accident cases, bank cases, insurance cases, railroad cases. I was attorney here for the Union Pacific, for the Great Northern and I tried cases both for and against the Northern Pacific Railway. I wouldn't take an appointment, they wanted me to be their local attorney—the Northern Pacific—but I didn't want to do it. I tried one case against the Northern Pacific for the death of a twelve year old boy out on the Northern Pacific Railway on the railway that goes out toward the cemetery out there. That case I brought in the federal district court because it involved the Northern Pacific Railway, which was not an Idaho corporation, it was a diversity of citizenship. I won that case, and I won it in a peculiar way. It was admitted that the train was going about
twenty-five miles an hour at the time it struck this youth, a very moderate speed. But I dug up an old city ordinance passed in 1904 that provided that no train should go faster than twelve miles an hour within the city limits of Moscow. And the federal district judge, when we got all the facts in and in our case, and I had submitted my properly authenticated copy of the ordinance of the city of Moscow through the city clerk. And it was still full force and effect and since I'd shown that was within the city limits, that the train admitted that was going twenty or twenty-five miles an hour—there was nobody lived out that way but it was still in the city limits. The court held that that negligence per se and it was up to the jury to determine what the amount, the verdict for the parents. And we got a handsome recovery. The Northern Pacific then appealed the case to the circuit court of appeals. But went to argue that San Francisco, the railroad finally settled it in a satisfactory way and we cut down our verdict some. The case was originally brought to me by Bill Fowler who was also practicing here but he hadn't been trying many cases; a fine fellow. And he brought the case to me but I tried the case. But Fowler was a very fine fellow who later gave up the practice of law and left. . . Well, he lived here for some time and then was a reserve officer, got in the. . . He was called to duty with the Civilian Conservation Corps, oh a year or so later and stayed in the service and served all through World War II and then later died before he was released from the army after World War II. But he did become a colonel in the army.

SAM: Did you do work for Potlatch Lumber Company?

A G: Oh, I tried cases against em and for em. I tried more than one very important case against them. I examined a lot of abstracts for them. I had worked for the Potlatch when I was in college and Mr. Laird, who was in charge of the
brought a lot of abstracts to me to be examined. It was very helpful to me in my early days. They were very friendly to me. After I left I was instrumental in a case brought against Charles Oken who was then the constable there. Gleave had gone and for firing a gas pistol at a fellah who was being arrested for disorderly conduct and it damaged his eye. We won that case in a state court but it was turned on appeal by the state supreme court after I was in Africa, twelve thousand miles away.

SAM: When you worked on abstracts for them, were these the purchases of timberland and...

A G: Lots of timberland, you see, there was land owned that had been homesteaded out here that they were buying this land. And in those days there were no title companies operating here and there was an individual abstract made up for each piece of land. And it was examined to determine whether the title was clear before they purchased it. Now, you see we have this title insurance that the company checks the titles in the records and then they insure the purchaser against any loss by reason of the title. But we didn't have those then. And that examination of abstracts is all a thing of the past; that's done by the abstract companies themselves.

SAM: What about the story that you mentioned about the way that the mill came to Potlatch instead of to Moscow. There was controversy about that?

A G: I'll tell you, it's no bad to go into it. It was before my time. Very briefly and there are books that tell about this, and there are some interesting books that tell about it. Very briefly, it was this: the Potlatch Company bought up the mill at Colfax. Earlier somebody bought up the mill down at Palouse. There was a mill operating at Colfax because the south Palouse was heavy with timber in the early days, clear down to Colfax. They used to
run logs down to Colfax. Then they ran down to Palouse. The Potlatch got those mills and then they wanted to build a mill for the great mass of timber between Palouse--and that was heavy timber--between that and the Montana line. Bill Deary was sent out by the Potlatch Lumber Company, a main corporation that had been operating in Michigan and Wisconsin that cut that commercial timber off there then to move out here, that it acquired large tracks of land here. They sent Deary out here to select a site for the mill. He came over to Moscow, Moscow Mountain was then heavily timbered; that was about 1909 or 1908. Moscow interests of course wanted the mill to be located here. They were going to build a logging railroad, that Washington, Idaho, and Montana railroad. They from here. But Deary came out to look things over. He looked over a possible site on Cumerine Gulch or someplace here. He looked into the matter of acquiring a right of way from here up to their timber in the Deary-Bovill area up there. But some of the property owners here anxious to make a killing and they certainly held up the price. And so Deary looked around elsewhere. He finally made a report to his directors and as I understand the story, Bill Deary, a good Irish Catholic, who later became what they called the bull of the woods. He was the logging superintendent out here, wrote back to his directors something like this: "I've looked over a possible site of our mill. I've looked carefully over Moscow, which is a prosperous town, it'd be a nice location for the community itself. But I've also looked up the location on the other side of the mountain and on the South Palouse River. I've come to the conclusion that you can't build a mill unless you've got plenty of water for mill and for your mill pond. And in my opinion there's not enough water in the Moscow area to baptise a Protestant bastard. So I strongly recommend you build the mill over at Potlatch." And that's what they did. And of course as it eventually developed
he was right about it, and the Palouse River was ample water. He was right; there wasn't sufficient water here. And then he ran into this trouble about building the railroad and instead of hooking it on to the Northern Pacific or the Union Pacific here they hooked it onto the Northern Pacific over at Palouse and they ran it on their own land and mostly on their own land from there clear up to the Milwaukee Road up at Bovill.

SAM: Okay, what about the Depression?

A G: Well, now I think that's important before we get through. Now, there was a world wide depression that started in the late twenties. There had been a depression after the end of World War I. Along in the early twenties there had been quite a depression, but not of real seriousness depression. You see the adjusting of industry after World War I, there had been such a dislocation. The livestock men and the sheep men got into a real depression. There was a lot of changes in manufacturing, from manufacturing war machines and war supplies and ammunition to go back to peacetime and so on. There was quite a depression in the early twenties. By the later twenties and starting in about 1928 and particularly in 1929 when the big stock market crash came, the whole world was more in a state of disorder and depression. Hoover was blamed for it, but he did every means in his power. And that was used in the campaign against him. Why that President Hoover who had one of the most wonderful records as an administrator and as a public servant was blamed for it. And of course he was voted out in the greatest landslide that we've ever had in a national election, almost, maybe there's been some since but certainly when Johnson was elected over Goldwater, and of course, Nixon had quite a landslide. But after Franklin Roosevelt was elected then the real Depression started and all over our country there was widespread unemployment. Here, some of the concerns begin to suffer, the stores, some
of the stores, a few of em had to quit business, though our main stores stayed through it, because people couldn't pay their bills. There was widespread unemployment. Fortunately the Potlatch kept up much of its employment so we weren't hit as bad there as we might have been. But the big thing that hit us here locally was the price of wheat. The price of wheat went down from twenty-five to twenty-one cents a bushel. And the farmers had had unrivaled prosperity during World War I and greatly expanded their efforts, bought lots of machinery, built fine homes and re-made their barns and everything else, borrowed money at the bank to do this. And they weren't able to pay their bills. Wheat went down so cheaply it wouldn't be cheap enough to pay the cost of producing it. Well, the banks had heavy loans out all over the county to these farmers, these heretofore prosperous farmers. The price of livestock went down. The wheat price just hit rock bottom. Farmers couldn't pay their bills; they couldn't pay their notes at the bank. The banks were no longer in a liquid condition. And Roosevelt was elected in '32, by 1933, when he took office, there had been the crash. The banks all over the country were failing with their loans to industry and so on, when various industry went out of business and so on, had to close down. And so the situation here was so bad that everybody was uncertain, were uneasy. And I was then a director, Mr. Orin and I were attorneys for the First National Bank in Moscow, a local bank. There was the First Trust and Savings Bank, a local bank, and there was the Moscow State Bank, a local bank. John Hess Heckathorn was cashier of the First National Bank, Haakon Melgaard was president, and William Cahill was the cashier at the First Trust and Savings Bank, Robert Whittier was president of the Moscow State Bank, Harry Whittier was cashier. Now all of these were fine men--active, public citizens. Melgaard had been or was later mayor of Moscow. Harry Whittier and Robert Whittier were active
in the community. J. S. Heckathorn was much respected and later ran for
Congress, ten or fifteen years after the Depression. But there was uncertainty
everywhere and we were all worried about the banks. We knew that the banks
in these small towns were having trouble. There were banks that Bovill and
at Deary, at Juliaetta, at Genesee besides these banks here in Moscow.

Well, one night along about midnight I got a call from Heckathorn, the
cashier of our bank, asking me to come down to the bank at once. They were
going to have a meeting of the directors. Well, I didn't know what was up,
but I was worried, and I went down. We found the directors were there. Mainly

the directors I remember were: Tim Sullivan, he ran the agency, there

was Max Griffith who ran the credit bureau and was an attorney, there

was, Tom Wenner was a director but he wasn't able to be at the meeting, he

was an old pioneer, J. S. Heckathorn, myself and C. J. Orin. And when we got
down there J. S. Heckathorn told us that he just had a call from Spokane

that the Old National Bank of Spokane was not going to be open the next

morning. Well, that was catastrophe for us because, like most banks we

kept a liquid sum of money to take care of the regular business, cash on

hand to take regular business, depositors there, we could handle any ordinary

business, and we had quite a cushion besides that. But we had been very careful

in our loans and had quite a substantial sum of money on deposit at the Old National Bank.
The Old National Bank had an interest in stock in our bank and we had it up

there, extra money for emergency. And it was quite a custom for banks to

let this money, if it was surplus, wasn't being used to get interest on

that. But we had our money up there and he said that when this gets in the paper
tomorrow morning, when it comes out, we're going to have a run on the bank.

We're going to have a run on all the banks here in town because people'll be worried. Here's the big bank in Spokane closed down, everybody's going
to run into town here and to all the banks here and demand their money.
And of course no bank can have all cash on hand to meet every depositor's account. We can meet the normal amount and have some extra to be sure if there's a partial run. But if everybody come in and demanded the money, it's going to put every bank out of business here in town. So we talked it over and I sat down and drew a proclamation and took it and woke up Homer Estes who was the mayor of Moscow, woke him up and told him the predicament and got him to sign the proclamation. It was a proclamation declaring a legal holiday in Moscow for the next day. I went off home and finally got to bed, got down to the bank the next day and here the banks in town had a proclamation up in the window: "Legal holiday today. Declared by order of the mayor." And these people are milling around. Of course they read about this and were all excited and to come in and get their money. And of course did a fine job. He was well respected by all the Scandinavian population. He was out in front of his bank, Heckathorn was down there. The people came up and milled around and they explained that the bank was in good shape and if everybody in demanded their money of course they were going to have trouble. And you know Moscow's a pretty good place. They were finally convinced that if they rushed in and demanded their money that everybody was goin to lose out. But unfortunately the Moscow State Bank was in such bad state and they had so much invested in farm loans that couldn't be paid, and land had depreciated so much in value, that they had to close and close permanently. Now by two days later President Roosevelt declared a national bank holiday. So that staved off that. And then there was various acts passed that enabled the banks to establish different kinds of accounts and so on. And as a result of the substantial citizens in Moscow, the First Trust Bank and the First National Bank weathered the storm, and we had some difficulty about the money that was in the old National Bank. Eventually got that, though we were about
the last to open. We opened shortly before we got it after careful examination of the books we were permitted to open kind of a special account where they couldn't have drawn their old one for a while and only a part of it. But we were open but the Moscow State Bank was unable to weather it and was closed, and all the other banks in the county closed, all of em were liquidated. And the real difficulty was the low price of wheat and the way farmland went down. And we eventually came out of it. One of the interesting developments was the passage by the Congress of the National Recovery Act and the establishment of what was called the N. R. A.

(End of Side B)

A G: The National Recovery Act was passed by the Congress in 1933. It was designed to encourage national industrial recovery. And under this, why the National Recovery Administration was created to combat the widespread unemployment. The act was designed to protect the consumer, competitors, employers and employees. A code for each industry was promulgated by this National Recovery Administration. Prices were fixed, hours of labor were fixed, pay, and where there was any disposition on the part of an industry not to comply, why they had to get a license from the National Recovery Administration to operate. And the employees were given the right to bargain collectively and the free right to join unions which hadn't existed before that time. And that they couldn't be discharged if they failed to do it. And the country all over was appealed on a patriotic basis to support the National Recovery Administration and these National Recovery Codes for employing employee and price fixing for commodities in the interest of bringing us out of the Depression. And we had a local committee organized right here in Latah County.
And Burt©n L. French, who had been congressman here and had been defeated the last time in 1932 was the county chairman and I was selected as--I was not in politics or anything of that kind--I was selected as secretary of the N. R. A. board for Latah Couty. And it was purely a voluntary organization, we drew no pay. We used to meet down in the courtroom, the federal courtroom in the then post office building. And merchants and employers and businesses here in town were encouraged to take the pledge to follow the code for national recovery. And they were given what was called the Blue Eagle. It was a placard that they put up in their windows that we support the National Recovery Program. And we will support the code. And it got widespread public support and we had these Blue Eagles and far as I know right here locally everybody was willing to abide by the code. And there were codes for every kind of industry came out from Washington in the National Recovery Administration. This went on for a coupla years, but there was a poultry concern that took the case finally to the United States Supreme Court. And the United States Supreme Court after hearing argument in 1935 decided that the Congress had unproperly delegated legislative authority to the executive branch in setting up all these codes. And they held that the act was unconstitutional. And so that ended the Blue Eagle days. But it was quite an exciting time and then later there are various acts passed by Congress, general acts. And the National Labor Relations Board was created to take care of this labor situation. As a matter of fact all these efforts and the W.P.A.--the Works Progress Administration--and all these different devices that were brought forth by Congress and by the national administration to pull us up by our bootstraps were almost as bad a Depression by the late 1930's as we were when we started it. And there was a lot of people that became educated to live off the government. And I can remember out here in the woods the woodrats who lived out there that
cut wood and they got cash relief, and they got commodity relief and they had more money than they ever had before in their lives. And there was cash relief and surplus foods were given away freely. This W.P.A work, it was make work jobs where they got paid and where it was, everybody regarded it as almost a disgrace the way these men would be kept busy carrying things across one side of the street and then pick it up and carry it back again. It was all a make work progress. And what really brought us out of that Depression was the commencement of World War II in Europe, which started I think in 1939 and with a tremendous demand for food, equipment, for all kinds of munitions and everything else in Europe. It brought us out of the Depression. Of course the price of wheat came up and there was huge employment and of course the United States became the arsenal of the powers which were fighting against the Germans. And then we got into the war ourselves.

SAM: How much belt tightening was there during the Depression in, let's say, Moscow? Did people have to cut back a lot on what they had been able to spend previously? Did people have to eat differently or were people pretty much able to continue the way they had been in the twenties?

A G: Well, I'll tell you, when our banks closed I had seven dollars and fifty cents in my pocket, in cash. And that was more or less general— the banks were closed and then there was the holiday afterwards. And of course there was pretty widespread unemployment. And your man that ran the store couldn't collect the bills; there were lots of bills that were unpaid. And of course there was a cutting down of things that weren't necessities. But of course in those days there wasn't as many automobiles. There were television. There were, as I remember very few radios. People lived a very much simpler life but they did have to cut down. And you see to compare the way people live now, when they think they're hard up now, to an oldtimer they live in
unpalleled munificence, the way people live now. And when I hear some fellah kickin about how hard up he is and how terrible it is and how high priced food is. And this fellah has one or two color televisions, and one or two cars and a radio, and he had an electric washing machine, and electric dryer and all this equipment, y'see, you just have to adjust yourself to what you can live on. And those people didn't enjoy all the convenience that we think we have to have now. And of course there wasn't then to that extent some much dealing in credits and buying everything on credit and buyin all their furniture on credit. And in those days a man didn't get married unless he had a job that would support a wife. Now they get married whether they have a job or not and the women work. Few women were working then. Sure they had to tighten there belt. Sure people cooked at home. The thing that then, all the groceries stores—that was before the chain stores and these so-called supermarkets. Then you went to the grocery store and you bought flour by the sack but everything else—cheese was in a great big wheel and you cut off what you wanted. You went to the butcher and you wanted a roast and he hauled a quarter out and slammed it on the block and cut off what you wanted. And if you wanted a steak he cut it off and then wrapped it up in butcher paper there. There was none of this, all this individual packaging of every little thing. And things were sold in bulk largely. And you see all that costs money, labor to do all that. And of course, people insist, they kick about the high price of all this prepared and frozen food and anything. We didn't have that then. Food was cheaper because there was 't all that labor involved. Now of course people demand it. When this came on now, the old style grocery store's gone out of business. Everything has to be packed in cellophane, has
to be cut and priced and weighed and labeled and has to be so that the housewife can take it home and put it in the oven and cook it, right as it is. People lived much simpler then. You had to be a good cook, you had to take and combine, and of course there were bakeries, but there was lots of baking done at home. But the main thing is about these supermarkets, people have to pay for all this labor that's expended. And if a supermarket doesn't have it they just go out of business. People won't put up with it. But if we got into another depression they could learn that you could live a lot cheaper, you don't have to have all these things. And those people did do that. We didn't have any real want here. People were very good about helping each other. And they grew gardens and people got along and did it. And I just wonder these people have got the mistake that they've got to have everything prepared, it's just so convenient. But they have to pay for it. And that's one of the difficulties. And now they just live so infinitely better and have so many more conveniences those people had then, back in the early thirties.

SAM: When you talk about the Depression that followed World War I, the minor Depression, the problems nationally there are two things that made me wonder: First, was that operating here? And secondly, they talk about prosperity in the twenties, that there was a lot of prosperity, did we have that here too, was there a lot of prosperity followed...?

A G: Oh, there was. Why, yes. Oh, yes I'd say so. Eventually there was a slight depression due to the dislocation of things. And about two or three or four years after World War I; it ended it 1918. Then we developed an unparalleled prosperity that lead to the stock market crash in 1929 when everybody was investing money and manufacturing things, people were selling land at elevated prices. They were buying land at high prices. There was tremendous building going
on and everything. They overbuilt; they overextended in the construction of plants. Particularly in Florida, overbuilt in California. They overbuilt. Land was too high priced. Our farmland here was too high priced. There was a period that the cash came in '29 and then gradually it deepened into a continuing depression kept gettin worse and worse until about 1933 it was the worst. And then it remained at kind of a bad level up till the European war started, '38 or '39.

SAM: There's one point on the N.R.A. that I wasn't entirely clear on as far as the local group went. Were you saying that the main goal of the local group was to encourage business. ...

A G: Voluntary compliance, it was based on voluntary compliance. We encouraged people for the general good to comply with these codes that had been promulgated. We didn't prosecute anybody here. We just relied on the patriotic desire of employers and employees and consumers to live up to the price scale and to live up to the hours of labor, and things of that kind. We didn't prosecute anybody. It was an entirely voluntary concern in which the community shared in generally.

SAM: When you talk about the Depression catching the farmers up short here as far as their expansion goes, that's just part of the general prosperity of the twenties that farmers and people in the county also believed that the times were really more prosperous than they were?

A G: Oh yes, they were. And prices were elevated and so on, they bought lots of machinery and they did lots of improving and went just a little too strong. And that's what brought on the 1929 Depression. It was the farm situation here that hit us the hardest, and that's what broke the banks. Now look, I don't want to go on very much further, but I'll tell you, now you asked me about my service in the state senate. Well, in the late forties I was elected to the state senate. I went down to Boise, my wife went with me.
We had two small children. I went down there first, located an apartment, decided the best thing to do would be to bring the family down. And I found out I could enter my children in school. So my wife packed our dishes and a few other things that we'd need in this apartment and we rented an apartment for the session. I went down and we entered the children in school. We had a very interesting time. At that time of course the big interest was the appropriation for the university and that's always true with somebody here from Latah County. I had a very interesting time; there was lots of social functions. Chase Clark was the governor. He was a lawyer and an old friend of mine. And in fact when my son had his birthday Governor Clark invited him into his office and had his picture taken. It was in the Boise paper with my son, Tim, sitting in the governor's chair on his birthday.

Well, of course there were plenty of things that came up in the session. I think that probably the most worthwhile thing I did there during that time, from my standpoint, was that I was able to introduce and get through legislature, the bill, sponsored by the bar association, which recognized the right of the courts to fix their own procedure. In other words, this was verified by statute that the courts would fix the procedure. The legislature would fix all the criminal laws and the basic civil laws but the procedure that was to be followed in the courts was recognized by statutes that the courts could make the rules for handling the procedure and trying the cases in the courts. And that was passed; it's in our state statute now. And I think I can claim the major credit for getting it through the legislature. And it's basic right that we were one of the early states that got such a law in effect. And it's continued to operate effectively and it's been followed by a number of other states in the union.

Now another bill that I was interested in was the bill to provide retirement...
for state judges at all levels. And this was worked out on the basis where the judges would contribute part of it and the state would contribute part of it. That finally passed the legislature and we do it now. There's been some additions and changes in the law but we did work out a retirement statute for our supreme court and our district court judges. Oh, there are a number of other matters affecting agriculture, forestry and so on that I had a part in. If I do say, I did play a prominent part in the state legislature. And Mrs. Goff proved very popular; we were active socially. She was an attractive blonde. She had been a teacher in the Boise school for three years sometime before we were married. She had wide acquaintance there. She'd been the acting head of the Women's Physical Education Department here at the university. Although in those days there wasn't a competitive sports for women, and her principle job was teaching folk dancing and putting on the May Fete and things of that kind. Because there wasn't the number of competitive sports and then of course there was simply physical education but there wasn't the competitive sports then. She was an accomplished dancer and knew all these dances and so on. She was very popular socially in Boise, and the Boise Statesman, in its society page, at the end of the session, carried a large picture with an article, "Our Favorite Legislative Wife." And they went all through our stay and the socialites of Boise at the time. And enumerated why she was the favorite legislative wife of the session. And she was extremely helpful to me and was so when later on I went to Congress.

I came home from the legislature, later was called to active duty for a short period with the Third Division, a regular army division, headquarters at Fort Lewis to which I was assigned. And then came back, and then later in August of 1941 I was called to duty in the army and went to Washington, D.C. From whence I was sent overseas a month after Pearl Harbor to the British 8th army
in the Middle East with headquarters at Cairo. I had some adventures
gettin' there. There was a small group, the U. S. North African Mission
which were British forces. I was there in the spring of 1942 when
Rommel made his great drive for Cairo. I was in Cairo when he was outside,
was there when we heard over the radio that Mussolini was flying over from
Italy to take part in the triumphal entry to Cairo but it didn't work out
that way. I was with the British forces in some of the bombing and out in
the western desert. Rommel was finally turned back, I was there. And
then down in Italian East Africa over in the West of the Middle East, over
in Iran and Iraq, in the Holy Land, in that area through the Middle East down
on the Red Sea and came home after Rommel's force had been surrendered in
North Africa and it was all over. Of course, I served after that in the
United States. I served over in Europe. Principally with the Judge Advocate
in the Judge Advocate of the army where I was assistant chief of the
International Law Division. Then I was sent over to Europe in matters over
these punishment of war crimes. I later served in the Pacific and was on
General McArthur's personal staff in the occupation of Japan. And I came
back as deputy director of the War Crimes Office. I joined Army and Navy
Officers for Defense, went into the Under Secretary of War's office
as a member of a clemency board. And from that I had been nominated
for Congress while I was still there. There was a provision that permitted
that, and I'd been nominated while I was still in the army in the primary.
Came home the first of September 1945, got into the campaign, was elected,
went to Congress as a freshman congressman, defeated a Common I. White
who had had thirteen terms as a Democrat. This was called a Democrat district.
I defeated him by only about two thousand votes. It was a close race and it
was a great surprise when I was elected. Because first I had little chance
to campaign and next this was considered a settled Democratic district. I went to the Congress, took my wife and family with me. We left here before Christmas, in fact we took the train because the train was the way to travel then. It was in the wintertime, took the kids with us, had our Christmas on the train, went back to Washington. I had selected as my office secretary the secretary to the International Law Division, Department of the Army where I'd been the assistant chief, a very competent woman. I selected her as my congressional secretary in advance. And a woman by the name of Margaret Brown, a widow, and she had rented a house for us there in Washington. But we stayed first with an old friend from Idaho who was a graduate of the university and was then the commandant of the Army War College. We stayed there the first night and then we went on out to our home. If I do say it myself, I got along pretty well in the Congress. We formed an organization of all the first year Republican members of Congress. And I from out here in a sparsely populated, far out state of Idaho was elected president of the organization. And Richard Nixon, by the way, from California was elected secretary. And we knew each other well, we were good friends.

Florence was good friends with Mrs. Nixon. But that was an organization of the freshmen Republican members of the Congress. We had regular meetings every two weeks. We usually had somebody, an outstanding national figure as the speaker. I remember we had Allan Dulles as a speaker at one time; we had Herbert Hoover another time. I met all these people personally. We met a number of other prominent people. I was the presiding officer and conducted the meetings. It was a very interesting organization. Thereafter in the session I was named to the Committee on Agriculture which was very important here because with our farming and of course the Department of Agriculture also has forestry. Forestry all came under the Committee on Agriculture. And why I
was on this committee we had had a lot of trouble here about the infestation of the tussock moth in our forests out here. And I introduced and pushed through--I can say we had lots of help--but I introduced the department bill on. . . And it was called the National Forest Pest Control Act, which provided for the Department of Agriculture to handle the spraying of infested land whether it was tussock moth or whatever it was. And that's the act that authorized that and I can claim that I was the one who got, startin in our committe on agriculture, we got that bill through.

And another bill I introduced was the, what I call the Air Supremacy Act. I took the position that the most important thing for national defense, and I was very strong on it, was to build up our air force. And the bill that I introduced, it had been proposed that we spend two billion dollars to build up an air fleet, and my bill would appropriate three billion dollars more to make the United States Air Force infinitely superior to any in the world because I took the position that no foreign enemy--we already had the strongest fleet in the world--but there's no foreign enemy could attack us at sea. . . what we had to worry about was a foreign attack through the air, and I opposed the Universal Military Service Act because I said the emphasis was on the wrong place. It wasn't men we needed because our only antagonist after World War II was the Communist State of Russia. And it was hopeless to match them in manpower, that we would never invade Russia, both Napoleon and Hitler tried to do that and what we needed was air power, and that we would never be attacked except by air. And that if we had the strongest air force in the world that would insure that we'd never have to use it.

Well, my bill didn't pass, . . . But as the result of that, the Committee in Congress . . . (Break).

(End of File C)
A C: ... combined not to push through my bill called the Air Supremacy Act as such, but they enormously increased the appropriation for the Air Force and the building of planes. And as a combination of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee, what I'd recommended in this separate bill I'd introduced. So I can claim that I had something to do—I wasn't an Airman—but I felt so strongly that we should build up our Air Force as the surest defense against any foreign attack. And that's what they did. And we did develop this tremendous bomber fleet as the result of the action of the Congress in 1946.

Now in addition to this Organization of the Freshmen Young Republicans, the Speaker of the House, Joe Martin, decided that we should have a Republican steering committee. This would be composed of leading members of the Republican party who'd assist the speaker in pushing important legislation in the Congress. And I had the good fortune to be named by the Speaker as a member of the Republican steering committee. And I was the only freshman congressman named on that committee. And I have a picture with the Speaker, Joe Martin, in which he had taken me when he made my appointment as a member of this steering committee which was a kind of a super committee for the Republican leadership. It was a Republican congress and we had a Democratic president, President Truman, on legislation. I can say that I made, I think, quite a few friends on both sides of the aisle. And I served on the Committee on Agriculture. It was very interesting to me. There were a lot of other forestry and agriculture matters that came up on that committee. I went out with them in the summer of 1948 and we had hearings all over the country in connection with some of the agricultural bills we went to the various agricultural stations and so on. By the election came around that fall and it turned into an unexpected general Democratic
For Truman he'd been in, out by about the same vote as I came in. By the next time I determined that this business of being in Congress for two years, I'd either get into politics or get out of it. So two years later instead of running for my old place in the House I ran for the Senate in the Republican primary, didn’t make it and thought I was out of politics. A couple years later President Eisenhower, there's quite a story connected with that, appointed me as General Consul to the Post Office Department. I served there four years in the largest general civil government department, consul and attorney for a cabinet officer, then the Post Master General. Then in 1958 President Eisenhower named me a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission and I was later elected chairman because we were the only regulatory agency that elected its own chairman, I became chairman, served in the Interstate Commerce Commission which regulates all surface transportation in the United States and coastwide shipping: barge lines, express lines, freight forwarders, pipelines and so on. I served as a member and chairman for nine years and then retired and came back to Moscow where I always wanted to make my home and where I have my friends--like the people, like the country.

Now all this time my wife has been very helpful to me and I have a couple of speeches here, copies of a couple of speeches that I made while I was in Congress. One of em is on the Air Supremacy Act, it's a short one. Another is a speech that I made representing the state of Idaho. I made it at Valley Forge. In Valley Forge Chapel they had one service a year made for a state, and they get somebody that speaks for that state. At least they did that then, I don’t know whether they do that now. I have here a copy of a speech, probably my best effort I think, that I gave at Valley Forge in 1947: "Keep Watch for Liberty." I have the speech I made on the
Air Supremacy Act in the Congress in November 1947. And I also have here speech made by my dear wife, Florence, here in Moscow, telling of the social sidelights of Washington, D. C. I think these might be of interest and I'm happy to turn em over.
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