

Tufted Textile Manufacturers Association represents 80 percent of the production of tufted carpets and rugs, schedule 9, paragraph 921; 90 percent of the production of tufted bedspreads, schedule 9, paragraph 911 (a); and 98 percent of the production of tufted robes, schedule 9, paragraph 919, in the United States.

Tufted textiles originated in the north Georgia area. Tufted textile products have been made by machine for about 20 years. There now are approximately 250 factories, large and small, some integrated in part. There are factories established now in 18 States of the Union and in 11 foreign countries, to our knowledge. Hundreds of requests are coming in from foreign countries for more and more information on tufting machines for making tufted products in foreign countries.

Modern ideas and ingenuity of the north Georgia machinists developed these tufting machines, which have a marked advantage over weaving. The machines are only partly patented (or only certain parts of the tufted machines are patented), and there is no protection of these patents in foreign markets. Some foreign countries are building these machines today.

The last year's complete statistics on the tufted textile industry as reported by the Bureau of the Census revealed the industry used 135,060,000 pounds of cotton yarns and gray goods in 1952, and other types of fiber in the amount of 4,734,000 pounds. Accurate figures for the first half of 1953, quoted by the Bureau of the Census, plus preliminary figures given by the Bureau of the Census for the last half of 1953, reveal the industry used approximately 152,942,000 pounds of cotton yarns and gray goods last year. This is 319,963 (478-pound net weight) bales of cotton. To produce the lint, estimated by the National Cotton Council of America at 275 pounds per acre, 558,153 acres were required.

There has been a large increase in the use of synthetic fibers and jute backing for carpets and rugs in this industry; however, we do not have these figures at this time. The Bureau of the Census is now securing these statistics for the period July 1, 1953, through June 30, 1954, and has been authorized to secure the figures for the last 6 months of 1954, which figures are not available at this time.

Tufting machines are capable of tufting certain types of bedspreads at the ratio of 10 to 1 over weaving, or tufting lineal yardage 40 to 54 inches wide for robes at a ratio of 25 yards to 1 over weaving, and tufted carpeting 12 to 15 feet wide at a ratio of from 10 to 15 to 1 over weaving, depending on grade of product.

There are 25,000 production employees working in the tufting factories and tufted finishing plants in the United States. It takes approximately 25,000 more production employees to supply the industry with yarn, gray goods, machinery, chemicals, and other vital materials necessary for manufacturing tufted products.

The average hourly wage earnings in the textile industry is \$1.30. In the carpet and rug industry, Government figures for average hourly earnings are \$1.73. We compare these wage earnings in the United States to foreign countries' wage earnings in the textile world: Japan, 13.6 cents; India, 9.5 cents; England, 40 cents; Germany, 31.7 cents per hour.

Tufting machines made in America are being exported to foreign countries in increasing numbers. The production potential of these machines, plus that of tufting machines manufactured in foreign countries, pose a serious threat to American industries if the products of these machines turned out by low-paid foreign workers are allowed to enter into our domestic market and compete with products produced in the United States.

We would emphasize that the tufting machine was invented and perfected in the United States; that its value in producing certain consumer textile goods is recognized throughout the world; and that the sharing of American production knowledge and export of American tufting machines have been of great value to foreign countries.

The tufted-textile industry is principally that a converter. Cotton is the principal fiber used in the industry—cotton raised in the United States and spun by cotton mills in the United States. When you disturb, by low tariffs the economic condition of this industry, you affect the cotton mills and the cotton growers, as well as all others in this country who supply the industry.

The net profits on sales in the industry have already reached a peril point. To quote Dun & Bradstreet's publication, Behind the Scenes of Business, 1952 edition, "The 5-year average, 1947-51: Net profits on net sales for cotton goods converters, nonfactored, was 2.37 percent."

Tufted products produced in foreign countries up to the present time are inferior in quality to American products. If introduced into the American market, they would tend to establish a low price base, which would have an insidious effect upon the industry's entire price structure and would seriously affect our domestic tufted industry.

When the basic price structure of retail merchandising of given products in the country is undermined, or there are depressed prices, it is then felt in the wage structure of an industry. There is then a lowering of basic standards in the industry to the point where the affected products in many cases are discontinued in the retail merchants' stores.

The tufted-textile industry is now a large link in the economic structure of this country and a most vital segment in the overall textile industry. Tufted-textile products rank fourth in the use of cotton. In addition, it has played a major role in lifting the living standard in the American homes of all means.

Tufted-textile products, principal market is the United States. The small amount of export which is done is principally to Canada. At one time the industry enjoyed a fair amount of export business. However, with foreign countries now establishing tufting machinery in their factories and their patronizing of their home factories, and because of import restrictions by most foreign countries, there is practically no exporting of tufted products from this country, even though our standards for tufted products are far superior to those found in foreign tufting plants.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in the 83d Congress, together with my colleague the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] and several other of my colleagues, I sponsored a resolution providing for the creation of a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters. The number of that measure was House Concurrent Resolution 169. It provided that the committee be composed of 9 Members of the Senate and 9 Members of the House, the Members to be selected by the presiding officers of the two houses, and to be representative of both political parties. That measure was intended to bring the various intelligence

activities of the executive branch under coordinated congressional scrutiny.

Today I am reintroducing that resolution together with several distinguished Members of this House. It is our hope that other Members will shortly join us in cosponsoring this measure.

Mr. Speaker, the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and of related intelligence services have been handled from a congressional standpoint in a piece-meal fashion. The importance of these activities to the national security demands at this time the creation of a joint committee, which will keep the Congress informed and bring these activities under coordinated, responsible congressional scrutiny. The proposed committee would operate in a manner which has been successfully adopted by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Intelligence has developed as an activity of utmost importance since World War II. The agencies in this field are entitled to a continuous, consistent and stable relationship with the Congress. The membership of the Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters, which would be presumably drawn from those charged with responsibility for military and foreign policy matters, would supply this important link in this crucial area.

In recent years it has become apparent that the intelligence agencies activities of the executive branch have been and may in the future be subjected to undue interference by free-wheeling, congressional investigating committees, which consider themselves called upon to inquire into their operations. The proposed Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters would obviate the need for such separate uncoordinated investigations.

It is my sincere hope that the concurrent resolution, the text of which I shall now read into the RECORD, will receive prompt and favorable consideration from this House:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters to be composed of 9 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 9 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than 5 Members shall be members of the same political party.*

Sec. 2. The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the intelligence activities and problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government. The Central Intelligence Agency and related intelligence services shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to their activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Central Intelligence Agency and related intelligence services shall be referred to the joint committee. The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to

the joint committee or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed \$\_\_\_\_\_ per year, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursement so made.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on July 20, 1953, with my distinguished colleagues [Mr. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, and Mr. JUDG, of Minnesota] I introduced a House concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee of Congress to supervise all intelligence activities. I have reintroduced this measure today and I understand several of my colleagues are also submitting it.

I was interested to note that a resolution similar to mine was introduced in the Senate in 1954, and a slightly modified version of it is receiving extensive sponsorship in this Congress. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this points up the importance of this measure and gives rise to the hope that it will be enacted in this session.

In 1947, the Central Intelligence Agency was created. It is responsible to the National Security Council only and is not subject to supervision by the legislative branch of the Government. It is absolutely free from any check by the Congress even to the control of its expenditures. The need for secrecy in our intelligence agencies is obvious, yet I feel that much of the abuse of the Central Intelligence Agency can be avoided by the creation of a joint committee of Congress to supervise all intelligence activities along the lines of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The resolution I have introduced today would establish a joint committee composed of 9 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 9 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House. In each instance,

no more than 5 members shall be members of the same political party. The resolution further provides that the committee shall make continuing studies of the intelligence activities and problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments and agencies of the Government.

The House and the Senate measures differ only in the proposed composition of the committee to be established. In the House resolution the membership of the committee comprises 18 members while in the Senate resolution only 12 would be appointed. The Senate resolution further specifies that the members be selected from the Appropriations and the Armed Services Committees of the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this resolution should receive a high priority for consideration in this session. During the past year, President Eisenhower found it necessary to create the Intelligence Activities Task Force headed by Gen. Mark Clark and a personal study conducted by Gen. James Doolittle, to investigate the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. The findings of both groups are secret. It is highly important that the Congress have a continuing check on this Agency and necessary changes in it should be promptly written into legislation.

#### PROTECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

(Mr. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include newspaper articles.)

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks already made by my good friend and former fellow casualty the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] regarding the question of security in this House, or the absolute lack of it so far as I am concerned.

As you might know, I normally expect when I go back to my State and district to be asked, as I was last year several times, what security measures have been taken since the episode of last March 1st. I am asked if professional police have been employed at the Capitol or just what has been done to protect the membership.

I am forced to inform them that the only additional protection furnished since that time has been temporary inclusion in the Capitol Police Force of 10 detectives on loan from the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia, which has cost the District about \$30,000, and which has not been repaid.

I have to tell my constituents back home when I am asked the question as to what has been done since last March that about the only changes we can see in the House are that some of the bullet holes have been patched up in the ceiling, they have patched up the holes in the walls, and repaired some of the furniture that was splintered; they have made various changes like that, but so far as improvement of security is con-

cerned I have been unable to find any of it.

I helped support last year, Mr. Speaker, a bill which passed this body, H. R. 9413, to establish a professional police force, a bill which unfortunately did not pass the other body. I sincerely hope that legislation such as this, or that about which my colleague from Tennessee has spoken, will be introduced in this session of Congress and will pass both Houses as quickly as possible.

The next strange lady who walks down the aisle and asks for recognition from the Chair may have some other intention in her mind than simply making a speech.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard statements today about the propriety of remarks made by Members of one body of this Congress relating to Members of the other body. While the rules protect against character assassination and character assassins, yet we do not have any protection against any other kind of assassination as far as this House is concerned.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 15, 1955]

#### CAPITOL INSECURITY

The ease with which the woman in red reached the rostrum of the House directs attention anew to the inadequacy of the present guard system at the Capitol. The woman told reporters later that only a page boy questioned her as she sought to enter the Chamber. "I don't think they could keep anybody out of there," she commented.

It may be that the incident would have occurred even if the House had been protected by a trained police force. But the fact is that the lax security system still in effect at the Capitol, despite last year's shooting affray, makes it relatively easy for unauthorized persons to violate floor or gallery rules. After the Puerto Rican attack on House Members last March there were vociferous demands on both sides of the Capitol for a reorganization of the police force, starting with the elimination of political patronage. But legislation to effect this urgent reform died with the past session.

In the meantime the new Congress has asked the Metropolitan Police Department to detail 10 picked detectives daily to assist in protecting the Capitol. Chief Murray can ill afford to lose the services of these men. A similar special assignment cost the department nearly \$30,000 last year, for which no repayment has been made to date. This makeshift arrangement is unsatisfactory from every standpoint. Congress ought to forget patronage and reorganize the Capitol Police Force on an efficient, merit-system basis. Until that is done the legislators will have no one but themselves to blame for lax security.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of January 16, 1955]

#### CAPITOL FORCE STILL PATRONAGE PLUM

(By Hector McLean)

Of Congress it might be said: "Experience is a great teacher—but not for long."

Less than a year ago, on March 1, 1954, a band of Puerto Rican terrorists stood up in the House visitors' gallery and turned it into a shooting gallery.

They sprayed the House Chamber with automatic gunfire that cut down 5 Members of Congress and drove others cringing to the floor during a crowded moment of voting.

Then it was over. The memory lingered on, however, at least for those lawmakers who literally stood under the guns that day.