

Memorandum of separate conversations with Mr. and Mrs. Charles Horsky
October 28, 1948

The Horskys did not move to 1239 30th Street until early October, 1936 (they were married on October 2). Consequently they were not in position to have any recollection about the car situation in July, 1936, when we moved to 1245 30th Street.

Charley remembers merely that I had both the Plymouth and the Ford sometime during the winter of 1935-36.

They came frequently to our house and we to theirs during the period after they moved into 1239 up to the time of our moving to Volta Place in late December, 1937. They felt no hesitation in dropping in when they were free whenever the fancy struck them. Both remember our having the piano and the recorders. They also recall that there was no period of abstinence with respect to alcohol at any time during their acquaintance with us. Barbara remembers that we had two cocker spaniels in the winter of 1936-37 and both remember Timmy as plump. Barbara was at home a good deal during the day and saw Priscilla frequently during that time. As she was just learning to cook she remembers being impressed with Priscilla's interest in unusual and tasty dishes. Barbara had not lived in Washington before and while she knew some people in Washington my close friendship with Charley and our nearness made her regard Priscilla as a special friend. They both recall very well Tim's accident and subsequent illness in February, 1937. They recall us as frequently having other guests in addition to themselves and they at no time saw anyone of Chambers' description coming in or out of the house.

Charley is checking whether he was already in the Solicitor General's office when I came in on August 15 or not. In any event, we came in within a week or two of each other and worked closely together continuously on various aspects of the AAA case and particularly on the Bankhead case. We worked nights and weekends with consistent regularity until after the AAA argument. He remembers several occasions on which he came into my office late at night and found Prew Savoy, the Department of Agriculture processing tax lawyer stretched out asleep on the table while the rest of us were working on some other part of the brief. As one of the younger members of the staff, he was frequently pressed into service to bring in coffee when we were too busy to go out and get it ourselves. During this period we were both also handling other cases in the Solicitor General's office on a regular basis, which helps to explain the pressure of the work. The AAA argument did not represent any marked let-down in the work as there remained the problem of "unjust enrichment" cases being brought to recover the very large sums which had been paid in as processing taxes. On this latter point, it is Charley's recollection that Warner Gardner worked most closely with me.

In the course of our conversation I also recalled the fact that shortly after the AAA decision I was assigned the only case which I have personally argued before the Supreme Court -- U.S. vs. Knott (298 U.S. 544) -- which I argued on March 30 and 31, 1936. It was a rather complicated case in which there were three opposition briefs (and I believe oral arguments) against the Government.

Horsky