

Proceedings of Meeting No. 20

of the

SPECIAL INDUSTRIAL RECOVERY BOARD

held in

The Conference Room, No. 5842

Department of Commerce

October 23, 1933

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Copy No. 6

For Hon. Frances Perkins

Distribution of copies:

1. Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt
2. Hon. Daniel C. Roper, Chairman
3. Hon. Homer S. Cummings
4. Hon. Harold L. Ickes
5. Hon. Henry A. Wallace
6. Hon. Frances Perkins
7. Hon. Charles H. March
8. Hon. Lewis W. Douglas
9. Hon. Hugh S. Johnson, Administrator
10. Hon. Harold M. Stephens
11. Hon. Rex Tugwell
12. Hon. Turner Battle
13. Hon. John Dickinson, Executive Secretary
14. Col. Louis Mc Henry Howe
15. Hon. Marvin H. McIntyre
16. Mr. E. W. Jensen, Assistant Secretary
17. File

ATTENDANCE AT MEETING NO. 20

October 23, 1933

Hon. Daniel C. Roper, Chairman, Secretary of Commerce

Hon. Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor

Hon. Harold M. Stephens, Assistant Attorney General

Dr. Rex Tugwell, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture

Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, Administrator

Hon. Alvin Brown, Assistant Administrator

Hon. John Dickinson, Executive Secretary

Mr. E. Willard Jensen, Assistant Secretary

Mr. Russell Hardy, Assistant to Judge Stephens

Mr. B. P. Foote, Reporter

SPECIAL INDUSTRIAL RECOVERY BOARD

AGENDA

Meeting No. 20, Oct. 23, 1933

1. Approval of minutes of 18th and 19th meetings.
2. Discussion of major activities during the past week.
3. F. H. Massmann, president National Tea Company and Food Grocers' Chain Organizations requests consideration of a report concerning code of fair competition for food and grocery stores.
4. Inclusion in the record of Mr. Peebles' report on his trip to California, together with a report on conditions in the Chicago District.
5. Regulations for the adjustment by District Compliance Directors of complaints of code violations to be effective until a permanent governmental code compliance system is established.

Advisability of using legal talent of existing agencies in cities where the District Offices are located.

6. Approval of additional personnel.

Proceedings of Meeting No. 20

of the

SPECIAL INDUSTRIAL RECOVERY BOARD

October 23, 1933

2:32 P. M.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: How about the minutes? Are there any objections to them? If not, we will consider them approved.

We have here several Personnel Journal sheets which have been approved by me and I would like to have that action confirmed. There are no large salaries involved here; the largest is \$3825 to Wm. S. Nicholson, an Assistant Administrator. (See Appendix "A" for complete list.)

JUDGE STEPHENS: I move the approval of the Secretary's action.

DR. TUGWELL: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: Without objection we will regard that as the sense of the Board.

Here is a long night letter from F. H. Massmann in regard to the Retail Code. He is objecting here to the Retail Code on the grounds that the wages should be fixed, as I recall, on the volume of trade rather than the size of the town. You are probably acquainted with that, General.

GENERAL JOHNSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: I think you can get the substance of it in the last

two or three pages. He apparently sent a similar one to nearly everybody, including the President and us here, and I presume one to Secretary Wallace also.

GENERAL JOHNSON: We have to pass on it, but we do not conduct the hearings. Do you know how that stands over there?

DR. TUGWELL: The hearing was held about a week ago.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: I saw a letter saying that Massman is arriving here this afternoon or tomorrow morning.

How about the next item--Mr. Peebles' report.

MR. JENSEN: It is a long report, giving the details of the satisfactory conclusion of that California situation.

(See Appendix "B" for complete report.)

CHAIRMAN ROPER: I think he rendered a good service out there.

GENERAL JOHNSON: He did such good work that we want to take him away from you!

JUDGE STEPHENS: How did he handle it?

MR. BROWN: The situation was between the State and District Boards. He got the Northern and the Southern elements to confine themselves to their own home towns.

JUDGE STEPHENS: That is a very wise move. They have two states out there, you know.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: That's right, and it is very gratifying that the Department of Commerce has been able to help out in that respect. It may be gratifying also that the General is so pleased with the way it was handled that he wishes to continue to use the man who did it; but that is the other side of the question.

Now, No. 5--"Regulations for the adjustment by District Compliance Directors of Complaints of Code Violations." This is a matter, though, that we have already approved.

MR. JENSEN: Do you want the Board to approve your action?

GENERAL JOHNSON: Everybody who was interested was consulted and approved it.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: It is probably just a matter of incorporating it into the minutes, as I understand General Johnson approached the members individually and got their approval. (See Appendix "D" for the above mentioned "Regulations.")

The next question is very interesting to me. I understand, Mr. Brown, you have been making some studies about attorneys.

MR. BROWN: I have talked with Mr. Jensen about it.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: The only suggestion I made, and it may be an impracticable one, was that we should make a canvass of the various Federal agencies that are using attorneys in the particular localities where this service is required, with a view to seeing whether those attorneys could not take on this extra service to the NRA and thereby avoid any further appointments. As to whether that is advisable or not, I do not know. That is a matter we will have to work out with further data. Don't you think so, General?

GENERAL JOHNSON: Yes, I think it is just a matter of study.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: That cleans up this agenda with the exception of the discussion of major activities during the past week by General Johnson.

GENERAL JOHNSON: One of the principal developments during the past week was that the President finally called on the owners of the captive mines and asked them to adopt the provisions of the Commercial Mine Code in so far as they affected the conditions of labor and put it squarely up to them, but there has been no answer. In the meantime, the situation in the captive mines has begun to threaten again. I don't think the President can afford to wait very long on an answer to that, because it has been long enough now. The next step is to call a hearing and impose a code on the captive mines.

The President during the week approved the Retail Code, with a provision in it that it should not apply to small local establishments in towns of 2500 or less, employing less than five people. He also determined upon and promulgated an interpretation of Section 7 (a) of the Act, which may do a great deal to stop a lot of this uncertainty and strife. He also directed this Administration to conduct a general survey of wholesale price increases and to set up machinery for the purpose of allowing people to complain locally about complained-of retail price increases. The development of those things has taken most of my time.

In the meantime, quite a few of the more unimportant codes have been approved, and I cannot think of anything else of outstanding interest.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: I should have brought to the attention of the Board, perhaps at an earlier moment, a memorandum from the

Secretary of Labor, in which she says that she has approved of the compliance code arrangement with certain conditions; and the chief of those conditions is that she is suggesting a break-down by states rather than through the District Offices. As a matter of fact, I do not see any inconsistency there, because I think it is very natural that if you start with the District Office as a unit, you can break down then into State units if conditions require it.

GENERAL JOHNSON: We are starting with the District Offices. As I understood that memorandum, the thing she is most interested in is that she does want a State organization.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: A State organization must be built up gradually. You are in an emergency and you are going to use these District Offices for this emergency program.

GENERAL JOHNSON: She says here: "In approving of these temporary regulations for securing code compliance, I do so upon the understanding that immediate attention will be given to the development of the permanent compliance system." In other words, this is a stop-gap. (See Appendix "C.")

CHAIRMAN ROPER: What you would call a bridge.

GENERAL JOHNSON: That is right.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: The question arises, When shall we begin to work into the State supervision objectives? It looks to me that if you get certain experience out of operations under the District units--hinging around the District units of the Department of Commerce--that will enable you to perhaps work more speedily in certain states than in others. In other words, you would work it out in accordance with the demands.

GENERAL JOHNSON: Judge, you sat in those conferences, and you know the developments better than I do.

JUDGE STEPHENS: Madam Secretary feels quite strongly, Mr. Secretary Roper, as she expressed herself in this memorandum, that ultimately the development should be along State lines because, as she puts it, the people are "state-minded." I agree with her in that. Also, she feels quite strongly that there should be some Adjustment Boards sitting with the local Compliance Director to help work out complaints from both standpoints--the standpoint of the employer and of labor. I think she understands that the immediate problem is an emergency problem and that the General is to go ahead.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: In order to treat her suggestion with every courtesy, the question arises, Shall we begin right now to work to the State units, or shall we wait and get more experience?

GENERAL JOHNSON: Do you understand, Judge, that because you do have State organizations, that would be inconsistent with the District set-up?

JUDGE STEPHENS: I do not think so.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: You mean you can have your State set-up and these will be supervisory? I can see how that would be valuable in that you get a common viewpoint probably in this general supervision from the District office.

JUDGE STEPHENS: I think there is a great deal of merit in Madam

Secretary's viewpoint that the people are familiar with the functioning of their State Government and their State officials. While I think we could work through the District Boards to that, I am inclined to think that we should have State organization eventually. How soon we can reach it, the General can tell.

GENERAL JOHNSON: I do think we will have to have more experience.

In executing the draft we had the State set-up of the District Board and it worked out very well. I know that we have had very effective service from the District Offices of the Department of Commerce, and I should say more effective service than the State Boards have given.

DR. DICKINSON: Would it be advisable for the District Office in San Francisco, which might find itself somewhat handicapped by distances, working over in Utah, to have someone tentatively appointed in Utah to work as its representative and form a nucleus for the growth of the State organization that will grow out of the District Office?

GENERAL JOHNSON: I had never thought of handling it that way, but I do know that out in that country you get long distances-- longer distances than it shows on the map.

JUDGE STEPHENS: As I see this compliance work, it is going to mean considerable personal activity. The employee will have to have a chance to make his complaint to someone near by. The employer will want to have a hearing.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: Is it your thought that the District Offices shall

be used at this time not only for the immediate emergency, but also with a view to working through them to the State units at once--that is, that the people who are in charge, at least the superintendent of the District Office, would immediately get in touch with the proper people elsewhere? Would there not be considerable danger in that? People in a given state might object to having people sent in even though they may have been well trained. There is a good deal of this "state-mindedness" that the Secretary refers to and state pride as well. I do not see anything that the State office could do in that respect, except to bring uniformity in treatment--that is, the man in the District Office could visit the several State offices included in the district from time to time, and make sure that the kind of administration was uniform throughout the district. That would always be helpful. Otherwise, you will have complaints that a certain kind of case has been handled one way in one State and another way in another State.

DR. DICKINSON: My thought was that the District Office might become a nucleus for getting the State unit started; not that they would send anybody in, but that the District Director would see to it that there was a State unit in the States in his district.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: You mean to say that he could be used to go over and instruct them?

DR. DICKINSON: He could get them started.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: That is the kind of supervision that I think would be effective and perhaps frequent visits from time to time would be worth while. If we are going to work immediately to the State units we ought to become pretty active in that respect.

GENERAL JOHNSON: I think we need some experience; and I think furthermore you need to let this thing settle down for a while and get a chance to work out some system.

JUDGE STEPHENS: I think there is a great deal to be said for that. I think the General should be left pretty well alone as far as this immediate emergency is concerned, but I think we should plan toward some ultimate system.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: Then the minutes would show that we are approving of the program of using the District Offices at least for immediate purposes, with a view to ultimately reaching, if experience proved it wise, the State unit program. I think that would satisfy Miss Perkins.

JUDGE STEPHENS: Except perhaps the thought of using the State system unless it proves unwise. She is very insistent on that and I think there is some force in her argument.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: How would you change that, then?

JUDGE STEPHENS: I understand she has consented to this only on the terms of her letter. Her letter stipulates that we shall move forward toward the State system, and I understood you to express the thought "if it were wise."

CHAIRMAN ROPER: You would suggest the elimination of that condition? Just state it as you think it should be.

JUDGE STEPHENS: I move that the compliance work go forward on the basis to which Madam Secretary has agreed in her written memorandum. That will make it perfectly clear. If experience develops that it is unwise, the General will be the first to see it, and the rest of us will be ready to agree to the change.

DR. DICKINSON: Might I raise one further question about State units? It seems to me it would be a matter of sufficient importance to talk about in connection with these State Boards and the attitude of Madam Secretary toward the State Boards. We had a communication here from the Department of Labor, I think, about State Boards over in New Jersey and it seems to me that if we are going to use State Boards, here is precisely an illustration of the kind of situation we may get into. There is a difficulty in New Jersey because this particular individual who is mentioned here happens to be State Administrator and also they have a local NRA Act there, and this gentleman is the State Administrator under that Act.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: If the time of our District Managers is to be completely taken up by this work, it would be expected, of course, that they would be assigned definitely to that work and that their compensation would be defrayed by the NRA so that we, in turn, could assign another man to what we call the general run of our commercial contacts, for which the Department of Commerce is primarily responsible. The Lieutenant committed the General to that program the other day, so he is already committed! (Laughter.) Now with that in mind, here is a

very interesting situation to which Dr. Dickinson has just referred. This man Eisner--

DR. DICKINSON: A brother of Mark.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: Mark, living in New York City--this man is the head of our Board for the State of New Jersey and is also head of the Board operating under their State law for NRA. There is considerable complaint against Eisner here, and we have referred those complaints to the Department of Labor. Mr. Battle writes a letter indicating that they would like to get rid of Mr. Eisner. I do not think they can get rid of him. If we remove him, he is still in charge of the State. I think we have to grin and endure this.

DR. DICKINSON: I cite that as one of the illustrations in connection with the use of State units along the line of Madam Secretary's proposal.

JUDGE STEPHENS: I am not sure that she means to use State units appointed by the State. My understanding is that she wants to take units appointed by General Johnson. I would disagree, myself, with that.

DR. DICKINSON: Even if you did that I think it would be more difficult from a psychological standpoint to control a State unit tied in with the general State situation than to control the District Office.

GENERAL JOHNSON: I think it would be a good thing to look into the New Jersey law, with which I am not familiar.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: What was that statement you made about the number of State laws?

JUDGE STEPHENS: I agree with you. Our one desire is to be of help to you. We certainly must keep in step, and we would be very glad to have a conference.

GENERAL JOHNSON: I think it would be well to have it very soon.

JUDGE STEPHENS: We will be very glad to meet you and discuss it with you.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: Is there any service, General, that these District Managers can render to the cause by making reports with regard to the conditions they find?

GENERAL JOHNSON: They have been making them. I think it would be very wise to have a report, say, once in two weeks.

MR. JENSEN: They have been making one each week.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: Is there any special information you would like to draw out from them?

GENERAL JOHNSON: We have been using the information they give.

CHAIRMAN ROPER (to Secretary Perkins who had just come in a few moments before): We have just approved of the Compliance Code on the basis of your letter which you sent me.

SECRETARY PERKINS: That was the thing we discussed the other day?

CHAIRMAN ROPER: This relates to the State set-up--not relying permanently on the district.

SECRETARY PERKINS: This thing you approved of uses the District Offices.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: Yes, temporarily.

GENERAL JOHNSON: Is there anything on that Tennessee case?

JUDGE STEPHENS: No decision yet, but we hope to have one during the week.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: We have just completed our agenda, without there is something that you would like to submit.

SECRETARY PERKINS: I have nothing further. I am sorry to be so late. I would just like to ask General Johnson whether or not he has had reported to him any estimate of the men employed in Public Works?

GENERAL JOHNSON: I do not know anything about it.

SECRETARY PERKINS: I saw that the President stated 4,000,000 people had gone back to work.

GENERAL JOHNSON: I talked to him about it and I said I did not know of any 4,000,000.

SECRETARY PERKINS: I thought perhaps you had gotten this information.

DR. TUGWELL: Certainly not 4,000,000 attributable to Public Works.

SECRETARY PERKINS: Labor can account for 2,700,000.

DR. TUGWELL: Up to now Public Works could almost be disregarded. On public roads it was 63,000, which would be the largest item of any.

GENERAL JOHNSON: I should think so because it was started sooner.

DR. TUGWELL: There has been an extraordinary amount of trouble on that. Everybody thought he saw a chance to gip the Federal Government. We could not get satisfactory statements from the states because they were determined to gip us. They thought they saw a good chance because we were in a hurry.

SECRETARY PERKINS: They would not give the information?

DR. TUGWELL: As soon as they found we were firm they began coming across and it is going ahead very rapidly now.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: That was a good talk last night, didn't you think so?

SECRETARY PERKINS: Extremely so.

CHAIRMAN ROPER: It reminded me of the remark of a rather ignorant man after one of the President's former speeches. The next morning the man said to a friend "Did you hear my President talking to me last night?" That is what really counts. Really he is wonderful over the radio.

Is there anything else? If not, we will stand adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10.

- - - o - - -

APPENDIX "A"

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION PERSONNEL JOURNAL

Nos. 54 and 56-60
covering 16 names.

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Position</u> | <u>Salary</u> | <u>Bureau, Division or Office</u> | <u>Effective</u> |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| Herzog, Paul M. | Asst. to the Sec'y | \$3060 | Robert F. Wagner | 9/6/33 |
| Houghton, Ernest D. | Supv. of Files and Records. | 1700 | Personnel | 10/11/33 |
| Murphy, Marie Waltye | Stenc. | 1296 | Res. & Planning | 10/9/33 |
| Toole, Grace E. | Steno-File Clerk | 1296 | Blue Eagle Div. | 9/22/33 |
| Raffa, Aldo L. | Speaker | 3500 | Public Relations | 10/1/33 |
| | | | (One month only) | |
| Malia, Anne | Steno. | 1296 | Malcolm Muir | 10/5/33 |
| Barry, Helen | Steno. | 1224 | Steno. Pool | 10/6/33 |
| Kelley, Christine | Steno. | 1224 | A. D. Whiteside | 10/3/33 |
| Nicholson, Wm. S. | Asst. Deputy Adm. (net) | 3825 | A. D. Whiteside | 9/25/33 |
| Wilson, O. F. | Asst. Statistical Clk. | 1452 | Res. & Planning | 10/7/33 |
| | | | (One month only) | |
| Prawde, Libbye G. | Steno. | 1224 | A. D. Whiteside | 10/4/33 |
| McFall, Burge | Reader & Abstracter | 2400 | Div. of Press Int. | 10/9/33 |
| Cook, Albert Willard | Newspaper Clipper | 1260 | Div. of Press Int. | 10/4/33 |
| Holbrook, Catherine | Newspaper Clipper | 1260 | Div. of Press Int. | 10/2/33 |
| Cofer, Zella | Jr. Clerk | 1080 | Div. of Press Int. | 10/10/33 |
| Barry, Leonore T. | Administrative Asst. | 2600 | Blue Eagle Div. | 9/11/33 |

(gross)

APPENDIX "A"

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION PERSONNEL JOURNAL

Nos. 54 and 56-60
covering 16 names.

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Position</u> | <u>Salary</u> | <u>Bureau, Division or Office</u> | <u>Effective</u> |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| Herzog, Paul M. | Asst. to the Sec'y | \$3060 | Robert F. Wagner | 9/6/33 |
| Houghton, Ernest D. | Supv. of Files and Records. | 1700 | Personnel | 10/11/33 |
| Murphy, Marie Waltye | Stenc. | 1296 | Res. & Planning | 10/9/33 |
| Toole, Grace E. | Steno-File Clerk | 1296 | Blue Eagle Div. | 9/22/33 |
| Raffa, Aldo L. | Speaker | 3500 | Public Relations | 10/1/33 |
| | | | (One month only) | |
| Malia, Anne | Steno. | 1296 | Malcolm Muir | 10/5/33 |
| Barry, Helen | Steno. | 1224 | Steno. Pool | 10/6/33 |
| Kelley, Christine | Steno. | 1224 | A. D. Whiteside | 10/3/33 |
| Nicholson, Wm. S. | Asst. Deputy Adm. (net) | 3825 | A. D. Whiteside | 9/25/33 |
| Wilson, O. F. | Asst. Statistical Clk. | 1452 | Res. & Planning | 10/7/33 |
| | | | (One month only) | |
| Prawde, Libbye G. | Steno. | 1224 | A. D. Whiteside | 10/4/33 |
| McFall, Burge | Reader & Abstracter | 2400 | Div. of Press Int. | 10/9/33 |
| Cook, Albert Willard | Newspaper Clipper | 1260 | Div. of Press Int. | 10/4/33 |
| Holbrook, Catherine | Newspaper Clipper | 1260 | Div. of Press Int. | 10/2/33 |
| Cofer, Zella | Jr. Clerk | 1080 | Div. of Press Int. | 10/10/33 |
| Barry, Leonore T. | Administrative Asst. | 2600 | Blue Eagle Div. | 9/11/33 |

(gross)

APPENDIX "B"

October 17, 1933

TO: Mr. Alvin Brown,
National Recovery Administration.

Via: Mr. Frank Healy, Blue Eagle Division, N.R.A.

From: Leighton H. Peebles.

With reference to the two reports submitted today, one concerning California and the other concerning Chicago, my observations would indicate that there will be difficulty in developing an organization which would suit each District Office, covering their cooperation with the N.R.A. and supervision of the Compliance Boards.

Each section of the country that I visited presents a different economic condition. In some sections, patriotic and able citizens have actively taken over the work, reporting regularly to the District Office. In other sections it will be necessary for the District Manager or a representative from Washington to go into the communities and assist in establishing and operating the Compliance Boards.

The requirements of each district will have to be considered separately, as the situation develops. The work of the District Offices in connection with compliance will not be a routine matter. The situation is such that there must be someone in each vicinity to constantly spur on activity and guide and direct compliance work.

The Chicago situation is particularly acute and some action should be taken at once, either by increasing the staff of the District Office permitting active supervision of compliance work or by sending proper representatives from Washington, possibly both.

(Signed) Leighton H. Peebles,
Liaison Officer,
Bureau District Offices and NRA

LHP.EH

CC to Mr. Alvin Brown.

October 17, 1933.

To: Mr. Alvin Brown,
National Recovery Administration.

Via: Mr. Frank Healy, Blue Eagle Division, N.R.A.

From: Leighton H. Peebles.

At the request of Mr. Alvin Brown, I left Washington on Wednesday, October 4, at 12 noon by airplane for San Francisco, to investigate the N.R.A. condition in California.

Connections at Cleveland permitted my spending four hours in the Cleveland Office where I found matters in good shape, the work of receiving signed agreements and compliance certificates nearly completed. A marked reduction of staff is in sight. I was informed that the Cleveland Compliance Board was functioning satisfactorily.

I arrived in San Francisco on October 5, at noon, being met by George Creel who immediately made a detailed explanation of conditions on the West Coast and particularly those conditions affecting his resignation.

Considerable publicity regarding my visit had been given by Creel and others and I was immediately besieged by many callers, including J. A. Pettis, General Counsel and General Manager, California Manufacturers' Association; O. H. Fisher, President, California Manufacturers' Association, President, Union Engine Company; J. A. Mailliard, President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Chairman, Local N. R. A. Committee; John L. Clymer, Assistant Manager, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Frederick J. Koster, Member of the State Recovery Board, Director of the State Chamber of Commerce, President of the California Barrel Company; Norman H. Sloan, General Manager California State Chamber of Commerce; F. H. Dupree, Publicity Director of the State Chamber of Commerce; H. H. Whiting, Member of the California State Recovery Board, Vice President & General Manager and Treasurer of the General Metals Corporation; Edwin Van De Leur, Member District Recovery Board, President, San Francisco Labor Council; Dr. Irving Reichert, Member State Recovery Board; Mr. Benton Fremont, County Chairman. All the above expressed their admiration for Mr. Creel and their desire that he remain as Chairman of the District Recovery Board and head the N.R.A. Program in Northern California.

I left San Francisco on Friday night for Los Angeles, arriving

there Saturday morning. I got in touch immediately with Mr. W. F. Graham of the Southern California branch of the State Chamber of Commerce. Also with Mr. John B. Elliott, Member of the N.R.A. Special Advisory Board; Jack Warner, Chairman of the State Recovery Board; A. W. Hoch, Member California Board of Public Works, President of the California State Federation of Labor, Member of the Los Angeles District Recovery Board; G. A. Rogers, Chairman of the Los Angeles District Recovery Board; C. J. Hyans, Assistant Secretary of the Los Angeles Central Labor Council; Oscar Howard, Secretary of the State Recovery Board; Thomas H. Storke, Member State Recovery Board; William Keck, Member State Recovery Board; H. S. MacKay, County Chairman, N.R.A.; Campbell McCulloch, Secretary State Recovery Board; A. I. Cohn, Assistant Secretary, State Recovery Board; Guy Finney, Superior Oil Company; William A. Simpson, Member Los Angeles District Recovery Board and President Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

On Sunday I called on Mr. Harry Chandler, owner and editor of the Los Angeles TIMES and Mr. William M. Garland, a real estate operator.

Mr. Chandler was of the opinion that the Los Angeles situation was better than elsewhere. He was much in favor of the N.R.A. and felt that George Creel has done excellent work and should be retained.

Mr. Garland thought the situation well in hand and that the administration was in good hands. He felt that more authority should be given someone for the punishment of violators and that failure to check violations was fast causing a loss of interest in the N.R.A. program. He expressed himself as believing Creel a wonderful man, who should be retained.

On Monday afternoon I met with all those listed above, except Messrs. Elliott, Chandler, Garland, Hyans and Graham, at a luncheon at 1 p.m. The situation in Southern California was thoroughly discussed and it was suggested by Mr. Simpson, Member of the District Recovery Board, and agreed with unanimously that the resident members of the District and State Boards should be merged for supervision of the administration of the N.R.A. in Southern California. The question of expense of administration of these boards was discussed and when it was understood by the members of the State Board that the N.R.A. was not paying expenses in any other section, sufficient funds were underwritten by Mr. Warner, Mr. Keck, Mr. Rogers and Mr. Howard to insure proper administration and it was agreed that those temporarily carried on District Office payrolls for account of the Los Angeles Board were to be taken over as of October 16.

The question of proper administration of Northern California was discussed and it was decided by the combined boards that it was best to leave the administration of the Northern part of California to the members of the District and State Recovery Board resident

in that part of the State. Mr. Warner, Chairman of the State Recovery Board agreed to appoint as Vice Chairman for the Northern California territory any member of the State Board designated for that position at a meeting to be held in San Francisco.

The combined board in Los Angeles decided to continue the work of Mr. Campbell McCulloch as Executive Secretary, reporting direct to Mr. Warner.

All members of the combined board agreed to actively cooperate and supervise the establishment of Compliance Boards in all sections of Southern California and with that in view a meeting of all county chairmen was called for Monday, October 16 at Los Angeles.

The spirit of the meeting was harmonious and all regarded the situation in Southern California as well in hand. The sense of the meeting in Los Angeles was that George Creel should remain as Chairman of the San Francisco District Recovery Board and a telegram was sent to him by the Southern California Board, telling Creel of their plans for the administration of Southern California and suggesting that a similar set-up in the North be organized.

I returned to San Francisco Monday night, arriving there on the morning of the tenth. Again I was in conference all day with members of the State and District Recovery Boards and heads of industry who called of their own volition or who had requested appointment through Deputy Administrators from Washington.

I made arrangement for a meeting of resident members of the combined boards for Wednesday the eleventh at 1.30 p.m. All were present at this meeting except Koster, who had been called out of town.

Creel had agreed with me on Tuesday night to stay and at the meeting this announcement was received with enthusiasm. He was elected chairman of the combined boards and with his usual energy promptly developed plans for the administration of N.R.A. in Northern California. His plan provides for the closest coordination of Compliance Board work.

As the labor situation in various parts of the state was acute, I sent a telegram to Washington for Senator Wagner, suggesting that the N.R.A., through the National Labor Board, authorize the merged boards to offer mediation. I have noted by the press since that the Senator evidently followed this suggestion. Creel was designated to act as mediator.

All those with whom I discussed the matter, seemed highly satisfied with the outcome of the situation and I feel that the Northern California situation is well in hand.

While in San Francisco, I talked with the District Offices in Portland, Oregon and Seattle, Washington.

Portland reported that it had wonderful cooperation from State and District Recovery Boards; they have a fine organization and Compliance Boards are set up and working smoothly.

Seattle reported that everything was running smoothly except for a few sore spots and Blalock requested permission to visit Tacoma and Bellingham where there are difficulties and where he wanted to investigate the establishment of Compliance Boards. Authorization for such trips was given him.

I was visited by many manufacturers, all of whom seemed to feel that the West Coast has a different economic problem from the East, particularly so when a major part of an industry is located in the East. Many strongly recommended that an Administrator be appointed for the West Coast.

Further there is a strong feeling among industrialists, both in the Northern and Southern parts of the state, that there should be close cooperation between the activities of the N.R.A., the A.A.A. and the P.W.A. and other government agencies furthering recovery. If it were possible to have the offices of these national agencies of recovery housed under one roof, it would make a good impression on the public.

The oil industry situation is causing considerable disturbance and a local oil administrator for San Francisco seems to be needed.

The question of travel expense for Creel will doubtless come up. Neither Creel nor his board members are drawing any funds from the Federal Government and while he has promised me to attempt to raise funds for Compliance Board administration by the District Board, in event of failure to do this, he would have to pay his own expenses on supervising trips. He is not a wealthy man and such an outlay would be a real hardship. I have told him that after he has exhausted all other possibilities of raising funds in the event of incurring necessary travel expenses, I felt that reimbursement could be obtained from the Government.

I left San Francisco Wednesday the eleventh at 10.50 by airplane for Chicago.

A report on Chicago will be covered separately.

(Signed) LEIGHTON H. PEEBLES
Liaison Officer,
Bureau District Offices & NRA.

CC to Mr. Alvin Brown
LHP.EH

October 17, 1933.

To: Mr. Alvin Brown,
National Recovery Administration.

Via: Mr. Frank Healy, Blue Eagle Division, N.R.A.

From: Leighton H. Peebles.

In accordance with a telegram received in San Francisco instructing me to stop in Chicago to investigate the local N.R.A. situation, I arrived in Chicago on October 12, 1933, at 3.30 p.m., immediately reporting to the District Office, where a conference was held with Mr. Roberts, District Manager, and other members of his staff.

I asked Mr. Roberts to telephone all resident members of the Illinois State and Chicago District Recovery Boards to endeavor to meet me at luncheon the next day. Unlike the men in California, these men were too busy and could not arrange for a luncheon on such short notice.

On October 13, I met with the Interpretation Section of the Chicago District Office, talking with them from 9.30 to 12 noon. This office, unlike many other sections of the United States, has not had the aid of a city organization and has had to handle all requests for interpretation. As yet there is no civic organization to undertake this work and this may require the maintenance of an Interpretation Section in the Chicago Office longer than in the other offices.

I found that the Chicago Compliance Board had not as yet met but was having its first meeting that afternoon. I was invited to attend the meeting and talked to the members for about half an hour.

The Board planned to meet once a week and expected to handle the Chicago situation with a membership of seven. The campaign to raise funds for expenses had been started and \$1,100 had been received to date. Space had been obtained at 201 N. Wells Street and a paid secretary and two conciliators had been employed.

I suggested that to handle compliance properly in a city of the size of Chicago, other boards should be appointed as provided in Bulletin No. 5.

The Chicago Compliance Board did not appear to have a full realization of its responsibilities. Most of the members seemed

to feel that the position was one from which they would get favorable publicity. I explained to them their responsibility and informed them that upon the success or failure of the Board depended the like success or failure of the P.R.A. in Chicago. I told them they had undertaken a patriotic duty which they should carry out without fear or favor.

The situation in Chicago is one of apathy, in that the N.R.A. Recovery Committee has had no Complaint Section functioning and lack of enforcement has brought about a bad psychological effect. There has been no consumer check-up and no employer check-up. The situation has gone so far that a popular song has been paraphrased as "Who's Afraid of the N.R.A."

Friday afternoon I called upon Mr. Willaby Walling, Chairman of the District Recovery Board. He very frankly expressed the opinion that the District and State Boards have lacked morale on account of the lack of instructions sent from Washington giving them prompt and definite word on their duties.

He stated that the District Recovery Board had met and organized, he being elected chairman.

I called also upon Colonel A. A. Sprague, Chairman of the State Recovery Board. This board was organized with a paid secretary supplied by the governor and it was supervising in a general way the appointments of Compliance Boards within the State. He informed me also that he ascribed the board's lack of action to the fact that no definite instructions had been received from Washington.

The morning of October 14, the Chicago papers carried an account of a speech made by Mr. A. A. Bruce, Chairman of the Chicago Compliance Board, indicating that he questioned the legality of the N.R.A.

Mr. Bruce was not present at the meeting of the Compliance Board I attended, for he was then making the speech referred to.

I pointed out to Mr. Walling and Colonel Sprague that I felt it their duty to investigate the newspaper reports concerning Mr. Bruce's speech and his opinion that the N.R.A. was not legal. If the report proved true, his resignation should be requested or Washington should be asked to request his resignation.

I pointed out further to Mr. Walling and Colonel Sprague that their duties would be dependent largely upon their own initiative and

imagination. Washington expected them to supervise appointments of Compliance Boards. They were to render to the Secretary of the District Recovery Board such assistance as they could, and they should take an active part in the development of the Chicago Compliance Board situation, and the promotion of the intent and purpose of the N.R.A. throughout their state and district.

I am of opinion that the lethargy in Chicago is such that action by the N.R.A. would do much to help. For instance, the removal of the Blue Eagle where there is evidence of flagrant violation would have good effect. Possibly publicity concerning the removal of the Chairman of the Compliance Board may be advisable.

While in Chicago, I called upon Mr. Rossiter, President of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Chairman of the N.R.A. Recovery Board. Mr. Rossiter was much distressed over the Compliance Board situation and agreed to meet with Mr. Walling and Colonel Sprague in an endeavor to straighten out the situation.

It was suggested that Mr. Melvin Traylor would be an excellent man to get behind the N.R.A. work in Chicago and spur it on.

I was informed that the Wisconsin State Board had organized and is actively following the establishment of Compliance Boards.

I left Chicago at 12.40, stopping in Cleveland for one hour where I met Miss Mary E. Woods, Secretary of the Ohio District Board. She informed me that the situation in Cleveland is well in hand and that Compliance Boards throughout the State were functioning smoothly in most places but that there are some bad spots. She asked permission to visit some of these places, her transportation to be without expense to the government. I authorized her to make this trip.

(Signed) LEIGHTON H. FEEBLES
Liaison Officer,
Bureau District Offices & N.R.A.

CC to Mr. Alvin Brown.

LHP:EH

Inclosures (newspaper clippings)

APPENDIX "C"

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Office of the Secretary
WASHINGTON

October 20, 1933

Honorable Daniel C. Roper
The Secretary of Commerce
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Secretary:

I am sending you a memorandum ex-
pressing my views on the plan for securing
code compliance.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Frances Perkins

Enclosure

MEMORANDUM

In approving of these temporary regulations for securing code compliance, I do so upon the understanding that immediate attention will be given to the development of the permanent compliance system.

I believe that the permanent compliance system should be built up along state lines, since our people are "state-minded." They are familiar with the functioning of their state government and with state officials.

I suggest that a State Compliance Director should be appointed in cooperation with the Governor of the State. I also suggest that there be appointed in each state a board of Adjustment to consider complaints that the State Compliance Director cannot adjust to the satisfaction of all parties in interest.

The Board of Adjustment should be composed of representatives of employees and employers, as well as representatives of the public. The members should be appointed by the NRA in cooperation with the Governor of the state. Complainants who have not had their complaints adjusted to their satisfaction should have the right to appear in person before the Board or to submit a written statement to the Board. Likewise, employers or others against whom complaints have been lodged should have this right. If the matter still is not adjusted to the satisfaction of all parties in interest, there should lie an appeal to NRA authorities in Washington. This Board should also have the right to consider requests for exceptions and variations from code provisions, and to make recommendations to NRA authorities in Washington. The proper code authorities should, of course, be notified of all proceedings before these State Boards. I feel that it is only by such means that justice can be kept close to home and made effective.

These items have been discussed in the conference between Lieutenant Johnston, representing the NRA, Al J. Altmeyer, Judge Stephens and myself, and I believe we are agreed on this procedure.

(Signed) Frances Perkins

APPENDIX "D"

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C.



October 19, 1933.

TO: All Managers, District Offices, Commerce Districts
FROM: The National Recovery Administration
SUBJECT: Code Compliance

The approval by the President of an increasing number of permanent Codes of Fair Competition necessitates the creation of a regional Code Compliance System in addition to the administrative agencies within the industries themselves.

You are hereby appointed as District Compliance Director for all the territory in your Commerce District until such time as the permanent Code Compliance System is established. You will receive all complaints of Code violations referred to you and will act upon them in the manner prescribed in the accompanying "Regulations for the Adjustment by District Compliance Directors of Complaints of Code Violations."

HUGH S. JOHNSON
Administrator for Industrial Recovery.

Approved:

DANIEL C. ROPER
Secretary of Commerce.

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION

October 19, 1933.

REGULATIONS FOR THE ADJUSTMENT BY
DISTRICT COMPLIANCE DIRECTORS OF
COMPLAINTS OF CODE VIOLATIONS.

(Effective until a permanent Govern-
mental Code Compliance System is es-
tablished.)

REGULATIONS FOR THE ADJUSTMENT BY
DISTRICT COMPLIANCE DIRECTORS OF
COMPLAINTS OF CODE VIOLATIONS.

I. FORM OF COMPLAINTS.

(a) Complaints of violations of approved Codes will be in writing, preferably on the approved form (copies of which may be obtained at all Post Offices, local N. R. A. Committees and Compliance Boards). If possible, they should be sworn to before a notary or witnessed by at least one witness familiar with the facts.

(b) Anonymous complaints may be acted upon at the discretion of the District Compliance Director.

II. Filing of Complaints.

All complaints should be sent to the District Office of the Commerce District in which is located the establishment or the person against whom the complaint is registered (hereinafter called the Respondent).

III. RECEIPT OF COMPLAINTS

At the District Office the Legal Advisor to the District Compliance Director will examine all complaints for legal sufficiency.

A. Rejected Complaints.

1. A complaint will be rejected if it is obviously crank or where, even if all the facts as stated therein were true, those facts do not constitute a violation of the Code.

2. A rejected complaint will be returned to the complainant with an explanation as to why it has been rejected.

B. Accepted Complaints.

If a complaint states facts which, if true, constitute a violation of the Code. The complaint will be handled as follows:

1. Where NRA has specifically instructed the District Compliance Director that a particular agency of industrial self-government is to handle that particular type of complaint.

(a) One copy will be referred to the authorized agency with a Time Limit Notice (See Form No. 1). One copy will be kept in the files of the District Compliance Director. The Complainant (See Form No. 2) and the Respondent (See Form No. 3) should be informed that the complaint has been so referred.

(b) If, upon the expiration of the time given in the Time Limit Notice, the agency to which the complaint had been referred, has not reported an adjustment of the complaint to the District Compliance Director, the District Compliance Director will proceed with the case as prescribed in Section IV below.

(c) If, within the time given in the Time Limit Notice, the agency to which the complaint had been referred, has made a report to the District Compliance Director, from which it appears that a satisfactory adjustment has been reached, the District Compliance Director will file the complaint as an adjusted case.

2. Where NRA has not specifically instructed the District Compliance Director that a particular agency of industrial self-government is to handle that particular type of complaint, the complaint will be handled as prescribed in Section IV below.

C. Other Complaints.

Although a complaint does not state a technical violation of the Code, it may indicate a state of facts under the Code which should be rectified because there is some provision of the Code which is so loose as to allow acts which violate the spirit and intent of NIRA or the Code, without causing a technical violation. In such a case an explanatory letter will be sent to the Complainant and the Respondent and a report to the National Compliance Director.

IV. ACTION BY DISTRICT COMPLIANCE DIRECTOR.

A. Adjustment by Correspondence.

1. Where an agency, to which a complaint has been referred with a Time Limit Notice, has failed to report a satisfactory adjustment within the time given in the Time Limit Notice, the District Compliance Director will proceed with the adjustment of the complaint by communicating further with the Complainant (see Form No. 4) and the Respondent (see Form No. 5).

2. In all other cases, the District Compliance Director should initiate the adjustment of the complaint by acknowledging the complaint (see Form No. 6) and informing the Respondent that he has been complained against (see Form No. 7).

B. Adjustment by Personal Interview.

1. If the Compliance Director is unable to effect an adjustment by correspondence, the Respondent should be given an opportunity to discuss the matter at a personal interview with the District Compliance Director (see Form No. 8). This will be feasible in a great number of cases because of the location of the District Offices in the great centers of population. In the permanent compliance system, opportunity will be afforded for personal interviews in all cases.

2. If the District Compliance Director is unable to effect an adjustment through correspondence or a personal interview, he will inform the Respondent that unless the Respondent furnishes him with satisfactory evidence of compliance within a stated number of days, the District Compliance Director will refer the case to the National Compliance Director (see Form No. 9).

C. Reference to the National Compliance Director.

If the District Compliance Director has been unable to effect an adjustment, either through correspondence or a personal interview, and if the Respondent has failed to furnish the District Compliance Director with satisfactory evidence of compliance, he will inform the Respondent that he is referring the case to the National Compliance Director. (See Form No. 10). After allowing the Respondent sufficient time to furnish evidence of compliance by return mail, he will forward one copy of the complaint, together with all previous correspondence thereon, the District Compliance Director's recommendations and such other pertinent matters as may be within the knowledge of the District Compliance Director, to the National Compliance Director.

D. Adjusted Cases.

Whenever a case has been adjusted by the District Compliance Director, he will report that fact to the Complainant (see Form No. 11) and the case will be filed as an adjusted case.

E. Weekly Report.

The District Compliance Director will make weekly reports to the National Compliance Director of all complaints received during the week, indicating the Code involved, and the nature and disposition of all such complaints.

F. General.

1. The District Compliance Director must bear in mind that his function is to attain compliance by education, explanation and adjustment. He is not an enforcement officer in any sense of the word.

2. When the Respondent is first notified of the fact that a complaint has been registered against him, he will be furnished with a copy of the Code of Fair Competition for his industry and a detailed explanation of that part of the Code which it is claimed the Respondent is violating.

3. All complaints must be treated absolutely confidentially. If the name of the Complainant is revealed, it may mean the loss of the Complainant's job. Conversely, the mere revelation of the fact that a complaint has been filed against an employer, may cause adverse public opinion which will be disastrous to that employer.

V. ACTION TAKEN IN WASHINGTON.

Although it is unnecessary to go into detail in these regulations as to the action which will be taken in Washington upon unadjusted complaints, the following outline is given for the general information of all concerned:

A. Divisional Administrator.

Upon the receipt by the National Compliance Director of an unadjusted complaint from a District Compliance Director, it will be taken up with the Divisional Administrator. The Divisional Administrator may decide to attempt adjustment by some appropriate agency of industrial self-government. If so, he will take steps to effect this adjustment. If an adjustment is not so effected, or if the Divisional Administrator decides that further adjustment should not be attempted by the Code Authority, or other agency, the case will be referred back to the National Compliance Director.

B. National Compliance Director.

In such case, the National Compliance Director may attempt further adjustment by direct correspondence with the respondent, or otherwise. He may ask for a sworn certificate that the Respondent is complying with the provisions of the Code. If the National Compliance Director decides that further attempts at adjustment should not be made by him, he will refer the case to the National Compliance Board. His report should include all previous correspondence and action taken, together with his own recommendations and that of the Divisional Administrator.

C. National Compliance Board.

Upon the reference of a complaint, with reports and recommendations thereon to the National Compliance Board, that Board may decide to:

1. Undertake further attempts to reach an adjustment.
2. Recommend to the Administrator that an exception be made or the Code be amended.
3. Call a public hearing on the case to be held in Washington, or locally.
4. Remove the Blue Eagle of the Respondent and give publicity to this fact.
5. Recommend to the Administrator that the case be referred to the Federal Trade Commissioner or the Attorney General for appropriate action.

D. Federal Trade Commission.

Upon reference of a complaint to the Federal Trade Commission by the Administrator, the law permits the Federal Trade Commission to:

1. Make a further investigation of the facts.
2. Issue a Cease and Desist Order if the complaint is sustained.
3. Prosecute for contempt of the Cease and Desist Order, if not complied with.
4. Take other action within its powers.

E. The Attorney General.

Upon reference of a complaint to the Attorney General by the Administrator, the law permits the Attorney General to:

1. Take action in the Federal Court to enforce the penalties of the Act.
2. Bring injunction proceedings.
3. Take other action within its powers.

VI. LABOR DISPUTES.

If at any time in the course of adjusting a complaint, a situation develops where there is a threatened or actual strike or lock-out, the complaint, together with a report of all action taken to date and of all pertinent facts, will be referred direct to the National Labor Board in Washington, or to the nearest National Labor Board regional agency authorized to handle such cases.

HUGH S. JOHNSON,
Administrator for Industrial Recovery

Approved:

Daniel C. Roper,
Chairman National Industrial Recovery Board.

1940--6.

FORMS TO BE
USED AS MODELS BY DISTRICT
COMPLIANCE DIRECTORS
IN CORRESPONDENCE ON
COMPLAINTS

BLUE
EAGLE

(Form No. 1
Time Limit Notice)

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION

Office of

District Compliance Director, _____ District.

Date _____

TO: (Agency specifically authorized to
handle particular type of complaint.)

FROM: The District Compliance Director.

Gentlemen:

Attached is a complaint of a violation of the Code for your Trade/Industry, which has been received by us. We are instructed by N.R.A. that this particular type of complaint may be referred to you for adjustment.

We are keeping one copy of this complaint in our files. Please report to us within _____ days whether or not you have been able to effect an adjustment in this case. Your report should indicate the nature of the adjustment if one has been reached, and if not, the reasons why you have not been successful.

District Compliance Director.

1940--8.

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION

Office of

District Compliance Director, _____ District

Date _____

TO: (The Complainant, where complaint has been referred to authorized agency on Time Limit Notice.)

FROM: The District Compliance Director.

Dear Sir:

We are in receipt of a complaint filed by you against _____, to the effect that he is violating the Code of Fair Competition for the _____ Trade/Industry. A preliminary examination indicates that if the facts stated therein are true, they constitute a violation of the above Code.

Your complaint has been referred to the (name and address of authorized agency) for adjustment.

We are keeping a copy of the complaint on file in this office and will take further action thereon if the above agency does not effect an adjustment.

District Compliance Director.

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION)

Office of

District Compliance Director, _____ District.

Date _____.

TO: (The Respondent, where complaint has been referred to authorized agency.)

FROM: The District Compliance Director.

Dear Sir:

We are in receipt of a complaint that you are violating the Code of Fair Competition for the _____ Trade/Industry, to which it is alleged you are subject. The preliminary examination of the complaint indicates that if the facts stated therein are true, they constitute a violation of the Code. In substance, the alleged facts are:

Probably this complaint is due to some misunderstanding. However, the (name and address of authorized agency) has been authorized to adjust this type of complaint. We are referring this complaint to it. Since you will undoubtedly want to clear up this matter as soon as possible, you should communicate with that agency.

For your information, we are enclosing a copy of the Code of Fair Competition for your Trade/Industry.

District Compliance Director.

BLUE
EAGLE

(Form No. 4)

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION

Office of

District Compliance Director, _____ District.

Date _____

TO: (The Complainant, where complaint has been referred to authorized agency which has failed to adjust.)

FROM: The District Compliance Director.

Dear Sir:

The agency to which we referred your complaint against _____, to the effect that he was violating the Code of Fair Competition for the _____ Trade/Industry, has failed to report an adjustment in the matter.

We shall, therefore, take the complaint up with the Respondent directly from this office.

District Compliance Director.

1940--11.

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION

Office of

District Compliance Director, _____ District.

Date _____

TO: (The Respondent, where the complaint has been referred to authorized agency which has failed to adjust.)

FROM: The District Compliance Director.

Dear Sir:

On (date) _____, we informed you that we had received a complaint that you were violating the Code of Fair Competition for the _____ Trade/Industry and that we were referring it to the (name and address of authorized agency) _____, which agency has failed to report an adjustment in the matter.

A copy of the Code of Fair Competition for your Trade/Industry is enclosed. Your attention is particularly called to paragraph No. _____ thereof. This paragraph means:-

(Set out in simple language the Employer's obligations under this paragraph)

Probably this complaint is due to some misunderstanding which you can clear up by giving us the correct facts.

The most effective way for you to do this is by a sworn statement. If you agree that the facts as stated in the complaint are substantially true, you should promptly advise us whether the apparent violation was due to inadvertence, ignorance or misunderstanding of the Code provisions, or some other cause. If you admit that there has been a violation of the Code, you should propose some method of adjusting the complaint. We will be glad to assist you in any way we can in effecting an adjustment.

Will you please let us hear from on this matter at your earliest convenience.

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION

Office of

District Compliance Director, _____ District.

Date _____

TO: (The Complainant, where no reference to any agency)

FROM: The District Compliance Director.

Dear Sir:

We are in receipt of a complaint filed by you against _____, to the effect that he is violating the Code of Fair Competition for the _____ Trade/Industry. A preliminary examination indicates that if the facts stated therein are true, they constitute a violation of the above Code.

We shall take the matter up at once.

District Compliance Director.

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION

Office of
District Compliance Director, _____ District.

Date _____

TO: (The Respondent, where no reference to any agency)

FROM: The District Compliance Director.

Dear Sir:

We are in receipt of a complaint that you are violating the Code of Fair Competition for the _____ Trade/Industry to which it is alleged you are subject. The preliminary examination of the complaint indicates that if the facts stated therein are true, they constitute a violation of the Code. In substance the alleged facts are:

A copy of the Code of Fair Competition for your Trade/Industry is enclosed. Your attention is particularly called to paragraph No. _____ thereof. This paragraph means:-

(Set out in simple language the Employer's obligations under this paragraph)

Probably this complaint is due to some misunderstanding which you can readily clear up by giving us the correct facts. The most effective way for you to do this is by a sworn statement. If you agree that the facts as stated in the complaint are substantially true, you should promptly advise us whether the apparent violation was due to inadvertence, ignorance or misunderstanding of the Code provisions, or some other cause. If you admit that there has been a violation of the Code, you should propose some method of adjusting the complaint. We will be glad to assist you in any way we can in effecting an adjustment.

Will you please let us hear from you on this matter at your earliest convenience.

District Compliance Director.

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION

Office of

District Compliance Director, _____ District.

Date _____

TO: (The Respondent, where District Compliance Director has been unable to effect adjustment by correspondence).

FROM: The District Compliance Director.

Dear Sir:

Our previous correspondence indicates that there is some misunderstanding as to your obligations under the Code of Fair Competition for the _____ Trade/Industry. We realize that correspondence is often an unsatisfactory means to affect an adjustment of such matters. We suggest, therefore, that if possible, you make a personal visit to this office some time at your convenience. We will be glad to assist you in every way possible in adjusting this matter.

District Compliance Director.

(This letter should be changed at the discretion of the District Compliance Director to fit the location of the Respondent. Of course, in many cases it would be impracticable to ask the Respondent for a personal interview because of the travel involved. See Sec. IV-B-1.)

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION

Office of

District Compliance Director, _____ District.

Date _____

TO: (The Respondent, where District Compliance Director has been unable to effect adjustment by personal interview.)

FROM: The District Compliance Director.

Dear Sir:

As you are aware, we have been unable to adjust the matter of the complaint registered against you for violation of your Code by correspondence or by interview. Unless you furnish us with satisfactory evidence of compliance within _____ days, the undersigned will be forced to report your case to the National Compliance Director in Washington, D. C.

District Compliance Director.

BLUE
EAGLE

(Form No. 10.)

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATOIN

Office of

District Compliance Director, _____ District.

Date _____

TO: (The Respondent, where he has failed to furnish
satisfactory evidence of compliance.)

FROM: The District Compliance Director.

Dear Sir:

Since we have been unable to adjust the complaint of your violation of the Code for the _____ Trade/Industry to which you are subject and since you have failed to furnish satisfactory evidence of your compliance to this office, we are reporting your case to the National Compliance Director.

District Compliance Director.

NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION

Office of

District Compliance Director, _____ District.

Date _____.

TO: (The Complainant, where matter has been adjusted.)

FROM: The District Compliance Director.

Dear Sir:

The complaint filed by you against _____
_____ that he was violating
the Code of Fair Competition for the _____
Trade/Industry has been adjusted by: (set out the manner
of adjustment, e.g., Employer has agreed to pay back wages,
etc.)

We are satisfied that the Respondent is now complying in full with this Code. If at any time in the future, it comes to your attention that the Respondent is failing to comply with this Code, you may again file a complaint with this office.

District Compliance Director.