

Mr. SWIDLER. I think it has to be recognized, Mr. Moss, that attacks on motives make discussions of the merits very difficult; that this is a last resort.

Mr. MOSS. Sometimes a motive becomes very important.

Mr. SWIDLER. This is a last resort. When a man challenges motive, he is giving up appeals to reason.

Mr. MOSS. Frequently you are dealing here with policy, aren't you?

Mr. SWIDLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSS. Not a clear matter of law, with considerable latitude. You do not think a person is entitled to examine motive or discuss it?

Mr. SWIDLER. I will repeat, Mr. Moss, when attacks are made on integrity, it becomes very hard to discuss matters of policy on their merits.

Mr. MOSS. Can't you discuss motive without impugning the integrity?

Mr. SWIDLER. When the charge is improper motive, I think it challenges integrity.

Mr. MOSS. I didn't see anything of that. A person can challenge motive very vigorously, without impugning integrity. I know people I regard very highly whose judgment I would question in some circumstances.

I would only say, if you are this sensitive, I would not want you to come out into my district and run a political campaign because you would find your feelings hurt a good part of the time.

Mr. SWIDLER. I am just sensitive enough to want to defend myself when a congressional investigation is held on charges against me—no more.

Mr. MOSS. I want you to defend yourself with vigor.

Paragraph 2, then, of course, is the key to your feeling that this is a personal attack?

Mr. SWIDLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOSS. And you only find paragraph 3 objectionable if it is read with 2. Standing on its own feet you would not find it objectionable?

Mr. SWIDLER. There is much in this that I would agree to—most of it, as a matter of fact, is framed in neutral terms and if intended as merely expressing the generalities applying to public administration; yes, there is a great deal that I would not quarrel with at all.

Mr. MOSS. Then on its own you do not find it objectionable?

Mr. SWIDLER. Much of it, yes, sir.

Mr. MOSS. Do you find any of it objectionable?

Mr. SWIDLER. I think I expressed some disagreement on the question of whether regulators should have long terms or short ones.

Mr. MOSS. That is not in the letter. It is in the statement of recommendation.

Mr. SWIDLER. That is right.

But by and large, I do not disagree that men are the key to good administration and that every effort should be made to attract and hold able, vigorous, intelligent, forthright, courageous people.

This I agree with, and if that is all the letter says, then—if that is all I thought the letter did say—I would have no quarrel with it; no sir, none whatever.