

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 8

APRIL 1, 1970, TO APRIL 10, 1970
(PAGES 9923 TO 11270)

crumb from the opposition is hard to explain to the public.

It could be that the organized forces opposing Judge Carswell are more alert to press agency than the loose coalition in the senate that is supporting him.

The press agent offers fresh news, while the Record brings it stale to the attention of news gatherers upon whom there is great pressure to start every day off new with the abundance of news you know is going to develop that day.

That, really, could be a better explanation than the common assumption that our Washington reporters are just naturally more anxious to report something bad about a man—especially if he is a conservative, than something complimentary. But it isn't a very good explanation, at that.

[From the Birmingham News, Mar. 26, 1970]

GOLDBERG AND CARSWELL

We hadn't intended commenting again so soon on the Carswell nomination. He will or won't be confirmed by the Senate for reasons having little to do with his qualifications, and there is not much anyone can say which is going to have much influence with the so-called "liberals"—who are anything but—who have decided that the President of the United States has no right to appoint a conservative, strict constructionist judge to the court.

We hadn't, as we said, intended to comment again—but it is impossible to let pass without note the judgment by former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg that Carswell is "not fit" to serve on the high court.

This is Arthur Goldberg, whose nomination to the Supreme Court by President John Kennedy was confirmed by the U.S. Senate—including many of the same men who now oppose Carswell—without a dissenting vote, despite the fact that Goldberg had not had one day of judicial experience and despite the fact that his whole career had been devoted to serving as lawyer for a special interest—organized labor, specifically the United Steel Workers and the AFL-CIO. (These are the same senators who accused Judge J. Clement Haynsworth of "conflict of interest.")

Many of these same senators, it might be added, were in the Senate when the other of President Kennedy's Supreme Court nominees, Byron "Whizzer" White, was confirmed—again, without a dissenting vote. Like Goldberg, White, then an assistant to Attorney General Robert Kennedy in the Justice Department, had not a single day of judicial experience.

Even more of the senators who opposed Haynsworth and now oppose Carswell had come to the Senate by the time President Lyndon Johnson made his first appointment to the Supreme Court—Abe Fortas. Like Goldberg and White, Fortas had a reputation as a lawyer, but had no judicial experience whatsoever. He was better known as a political associate of the President. Like the other two, Fortas was confirmed by voice vote, with no dissenting vote recorded.

President Johnson's second appointee, Thurgood Marshall was serving on the federal bench at the time of his appointment, so it cannot be said that he had no judicial experience. But before his appointment to the bench (and previously to the post of U.S. solicitor general), he, like Goldberg, had made his reputation primarily in the representation of one special interest—civil rights groups. The only opposition to his confirmation was dismissed as motivated by Southern racism and was trampled down.

Without any comment at all on their performance on the Supreme Court, the point is that each was the appointee of a "liberal" president, and that while each had factors presumably weighing against nomination for

service on the highest court in the land (lack of judicial experience or close identification with special interests), all were routinely approved.

And now here comes Goldberg to say that Judge Carswell is "not fit."

We wondered what our reaction had been to Goldberg's own nomination, and checked the files.

"The obvious thing to say of President Kennedy's appointment of Arthur J. Goldberg to the Supreme Court is that here is another case of political reward," The Birmingham News said editorially on August 30, 1962. "Mr. Goldberg has no previous judicial experience. He is known exclusively as an attorney dealing with labor union matters.

"Yet if this yardstick is to be the major criterion in measuring capacities of promise of judges, one could conclude only that the American judicial system is rife with incompetency. The opposite is the case . . .

"Presidents, of either party, do name on basis of politics. But they also have shown a considerable feeling for what lies within a man. There are exceptions, but agree or disagree with judicial histories or opinions, the overwhelming majority of Supreme Court justices have been men who served well, thoughtfully, and contributed to creation of a spirit of justice."

It seems to us that President Richard Nixon is entitled to the same presumption of good faith and careful consideration of qualifications of Supreme Court nominees that President John F. Kennedy was entitled to (and got). It seems to us that G. Harrold Carswell (and Clement Haynsworth before him) is entitled to the same benefit of the doubt that Whizzer White, Abe Fortas, Thurgood Marshall and—yes—Arthur Goldberg got.

The anti-Carswell (really, anti-Nixon or anti-strict constructionist) forces' desperate effort to block him not only smears a man who, if confirmed, inevitably will carry with him to the high court some of the stain of doubt, not only cheapens and further erodes public confidence in one of the basic foundation stones of our system of government—it is directly opposite to the treatment which "liberal" nominees of at least equally questionable qualification received.

Has Goldberg forgotten? Have the senators who voted to confirm him forgotten? Or has their sense of fair play been blunted by pettiness and "liberal" dogmatism?

INFLATION

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, I have become increasingly alarmed by the boasts of the current administration that the battle against inflation has been won and that the possibilities of a recession are nonexistent. Surely the facts indicate that such optimism is not warranted. Last month the cost of living index took another leap—consumer prices are rising at an annual rate of 6.3 per cent.

This disturbing disparity between hopeful claims and stark reality lends greater urgency to the need to fundamentally reevaluate present economic policy. It is time we realized that a satisfactory answer to the problem of inflation does not, and cannot, require more jobless men on the streets or the sacrifice of homes and small business through exorbitant and inequitable rates of interest.

Mr. President, the doubts which I have expressed in the administration's assessment of, and responses to, our grave economic crisis are not shared by me alone. An editorial published recently in the New York Times squarely addresses it-

self to these issues. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAILURES OF ECONOMIC POLICY

The cost of living index took another big jump last month. Nationally, consumer prices were rising at an annual rate of 6.3 per cent; in New York City the climb was at a 9.6 per cent rate.

Assertions by spokesmen for the Nixon Administration that inflation is slowing still sound more like political propaganda than fact. A few days ago House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford emerged from a White House meeting with the cheery declaration that inflation had been "defeated" and that the chances of a recession were "nil." The only real enlightenment provided by the Ford statement is that the Nixon Administration has decided that the political dangers of recession are greater than those of inflation. President Nixon made that even clearer in his recent news conference.

In this election year, the Republicans have decided to attack a potential recession before there is any evidence that inflation has been checked. Less than two months after the President vetoed the Health, Education and Welfare bill on grounds that it would increase outlays by \$1.5 billion, the Nixon Administration has released an extra \$1.5 billion in construction funds. More importantly, the President and his key aides have been stepping up their insistence that the Federal Reserve increase the money supply, and Chairman Arthur F. Burns has indicated that the Fed is already doing that.

It begins to appear that those skeptics, especially in the business world, who refused to believe that the Administration would carry its anti-inflation campaign to the point causing a significant downturn, were right. If that were all there is to economic policy, much could be said for such an approach; unemployment may well be more costly than inflation, economically as well as politically. But the problem of policy cannot validly be put in such simplistic terms.

The Nixon Administration does indeed seem to regard inflation and recession as two ends of a seesaw, and it strives vainly to find the right balance. But the essential job which the Administration refuses to face up to is the necessity of improving the trade-off between inflation and recession—that is, improving the underlying structure of the American economy.

The President backs off from taking even those first steps to improve the economic structure urged by his own top economic advisers. A prime case is Mr. Nixon's rejection of the report of his own task force on oil import quotas, which showed that oil quotas are costing consumers \$5 billion a year. Not only was this report thrust aside, but the White House has now moved to restrict by law the flow of crude oil from Canada, a move that flagrantly disregards the national security basis for any import quotas, which is their only legal justification.

Other recent examples of the Nixon Administration's tendency to aggravate rather than attack structural problems can be found in its expanded program of subsidies and tax breaks for the merchant marine and its support for protectionism against competition on textile imports. At the same time that it yields to powerful pressure groups, the Administration declines to make any effort to develop an effective incomes policy to restrain prices and wages.

If the Administration continues to accommodate its every economic move to the specific political pressures that reach it, the nation's hope of simultaneously achieving economic growth, high employment and price stability will be doomed.

DR. ROBERT J. ANDERSON, DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, as a member of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee for over 12 years, I have had an opportunity to become acquainted with quite a number of dedicated men at the Department of Agriculture who have devoted their careers to the advancement of American agriculture. They represent an impressive array of education, experience, and expertise, and have pursued their distinguished careers as public servants through administrations of both political parties. One of these outstanding men is Dr. Robert J. Anderson, who is presently the Associate Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service.

Dr. Anderson and I have become acquainted over the years as a result of his efforts and leadership in the area of livestock disease control. Recently, we have worked together to establish a U.S. international livestock quarantine station. We have been pursuing this goal together since 1968 when it became apparent that to import new livestock breeds into the country without exposing American livestock to new foreign diseases such as a station was essential. During the past session of the Senate, I introduced a bill, S. 2306, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a quarantine station. That bill has now been passed by both Houses of the Congress and is awaiting only agreement of the Senate on one technical amendment made by the House.

Let the record show that Dr. Anderson deserves the highest praise for his foresight and imagination, as well as his intimate knowledge of American livestock, in developing this idea, and fullest credit for his perseverance and statesmanship in bringing the idea to fruition.

Regrettably, Dr. Anderson is retiring today, April 1, 1970.

He is completing 35 years of dedicated service in the Federal Government, during which he has demonstrated unusual skill in administering programs devised to increase the efficiency of agriculture by controlling or eradicating agricultural pests and diseases. At the same time, he has vigorously stressed the importance of using pest control methods that create the least possible hazard to man and his environment.

Through his efforts to promote the productivity and safety of American agriculture, Dr. Anderson has contributed significantly to the well-being of millions of farmers and consumers in this Nation and in many other countries throughout the world.

Dr. Anderson's greatest contribution through the Department of Agriculture has been the steadiness of his leadership in meeting the complex requirements of changing times. He has displayed sound judgment in times of stress. He has established and maintained understanding and cooperation among the farflung organization of field personnel operating regulatory programs, as well as representatives of agriculture, industry, and the general public.

His outstanding accomplishments and leadership qualities are recognized as

characteristic of his public service career. The impact of his unusual ability is illustrated by the comments made by others.

Dr. M. R. Clarkson, executive vice president, American Veterinary Medical Association, has pointed out that Dr. Anderson is recognized throughout North America and in other parts of the world as an outstanding administrator, with enviable personal traits.

Dr. George C. Poppensiek, dean of the New York State Veterinary College, Cornell University, stated that during the years he served as Chairman of the National Academy of Sciences Advisory Committee on Foot-and-Mouth Disease he appreciated the incisive way Dr. Anderson explained policies of USDA. He said that few people possess the mature judgment and diplomatic awareness that Dr. Anderson displayed so excellently. In his work with the Academy's Committee on Animal Health, Dr. Poppensiek commented that he had found it refreshing to work with a person who has Dr. Anderson's "enviable ability to cut through the superfluous and reach the nub of the problem so incisively."

During the past few years of his career, Dr. Anderson has taken a leading part in coordinating Federal efforts to assure the safe and effective use of pesticides. He has also served as Chairman of the USDA Food Safety Work Group, responsible for evaluating problems relating to food contamination from such sources as: microorganisms, including bacteria, viruses, and mycotoxins; drugs, chemicals and antibiotics; and other environmental contamination from agricultural sources.

Highlights of his accomplishments in eradicating pests and diseases are as follows:

Under Dr. Anderson's direction, for the first time man-reared insects, sterilized by atomic radiation, were released to eradicate insect populations by the resulting failure of natural reproduction. In cooperation with the States involved, Dr. Anderson administered the program that eradicated screw-worms from the Southwest and suppressed screw-worm populations in the Southwest. Prior to this program, screw-worms had been costing American livestock producers an estimated 100 million a year.

Dr. Anderson has provided leadership for the cooperative Federal-State hog cholera eradication program instigated in 1962. Incidence of the disease has been greatly reduced, and the goal for eradication is set for 1972. Dr. Anderson has been Chairman of the Secretary's National Hog Cholera Eradication Advisory Committee since its formation in 1962. In this position he has been one of the principal directors of the eradication program.

Dr. Anderson directed the successful campaign against vesicular exanthema, a serious disease of swine. The disease reached epidemic proportions in 1952 with a million hogs infected or exposed in 43 States. The disease was eradicated and no case has been reported since August 1959.

Dr. Anderson played a major role in the administration of the foot-and-

mouth disease eradication campaign in Mexico, serving throughout the program from 1947 to 1952. If foot-and-mouth disease had not been eradicated in Mexico and had spread to the United States, our Nation's supply of livestock products could have been reduced by one-fourth. The people who worked with him in Mexico give Dr. Anderson much of the credit for the success of the campaign.

The ability and tact Dr. Anderson demonstrated in working with representative members of the Mexican Government and livestock industry during the campaign created a lasting respect that is largely responsible for the unusually good relationship that exists today between the Department and Mexican officials. The good will is important in continuing cooperative efforts of the two countries in plant and livestock pest and disease control programs.

He has continued to work in the best interests of the livestock industry in helping to find ways to import breeding stock safely into the United States to improve breeds of animals without endangering the country through the introduction of foreign diseases.

Dr. Anderson received his doctorate in veterinary medicine from Texas A. & M. University, College Station, Tex., in 1935. He was employed by USDA that same year and continued his work in the Department, with the exception of military service from 1941 to 1946, until his retirement today. He is returning now to his native State to make his home in Marshall, Tex.

Mr. President, there is no question but that Dr. Anderson has earned and well deserves the rest and recreation that he desires. We hope, however, that because of his great interest in agriculture and livestock that his sound judgment and great knowledge will be available to advise those interested in American livestock. Nevertheless, he will unquestionably be missed in Washington by those of us who have known him and his work.

FARM PROGRAM PROPOSALS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on Monday of last week the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Hardin, testified before the Senate Agriculture Committee on new farm program proposals. At that time he presented to the committee the administration's so-called set-aside proposal, and openly rejected for the first time the "coalition farm bill" which has the support of 32 major farm groups.

Mr. Tony Dechant, president of the National Farmers Union had the following comments on the Secretary's testimony:

The Nixon Administration's proposals to lower price support loan rates and weaken supply management under a so-called "set-aside" plan, add up to only one thing, and that is lower farm income. We object. Farmers desperately need higher income. This is no time to cut farm income.

I agree with Mr. Dechant. This is no time to be considering farm programs which would have the effect of lowering already depressed farm prices. Farmers are caught in a worsening cost-price squeeze, and without the adoption of the