

by Mr. Eastman for so many years with only limited opportunity for tangible and lasting accomplishments during his lifetime.

To sum up: If it is now possible to restore some of the standards for which Joseph Eastman worked and for which he is still revered, then I can think of no greater honor than to be asked to help, and no assignment which could command more of my energy, loyalty, and gratitude. I hope I have not belabored the point beyond reason, but it will be of crucial importance to me if called upon to decide whether to serve.

I have no direct or indirect interest, ownership, or association in or with any type of industry regulated by the Federal Government, or in any association maintained by such industry. No such industry or association has asked me to become a candidate for appointment to a regulatory agency, and no such industry or association has been or will be authorized by me to assist my candidacy (if I should become a candidate) for such an appointment in any way, directly or indirectly.

Please accept my thanks for your interest in this matter. Regardless of the outcome, so far as I am concerned, I hope some sweeping improvements are made soon. Believe me, the public is entitled to better treatment from the Federal regulatory agencies than it has been getting.

Sincerely,

HOWARD MORGAN.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, the press has reached too many conclusions about the contents of my letter to President Kennedy, and it has been widely misquoted. Two principal questions seem to have arisen from these press stories. One was: Was I referring to my colleagues on the Federal Power Commission in any derogatory way? The answer is "No," and the letter itself makes that plain. I want to make it even plainer now. My colleagues are able, honest, conscientious men, and further, they are men whose company I enjoy, and for whom I have formed a genuine personal fondness. And this includes all of them. I cannot and will not make derogatory comments about them. And I am very sorry that my letter to the President has been misinterpreted by those who have sought to make a sensational thing out of it.

I have differed with my colleagues on policy matters, sometimes quite strongly. But that is what a commission is for. It would not be a proper commission if it did not have the interplay of opinions, including those that are strongly held. But on a personal basis, my association with my colleagues has been pleasant, friendly, even, and amicable, and I have no reason to believe that it will do other than continue on that basis.

Another question has arisen as a result of press stories; and that is: Was I referring to myself when I described the qualities that an ideal commissioner should have? The answer to this is also "No," as was made plain in the letter, and I would like to make that plainer now.

I mentioned four men who served on the Interstate Commerce Commission a number of years ago who exemplified my idea of outstanding commissioners to serve as a model for all regulatory agencies. They were the great Joseph Eastman, Clyde Aitcheson, Walter Splawn, and Charles Mahaffie. I knew three of those men personally, and I knew them all by reputation. I worked for one of them for a brief period.

Now, gentlemen, if I had twice the brains I have and five times the knowledge, and were about two-thirds of my present age, and were appointed to a regulatory commission, I think that after serving 20 years there might be a chance that I could possibly belong in the company of those men. But under no other circumstances. So I was not referring to myself.