

Mr. BARBER. I am getting to that.

Senator PROXMIRE. I think it would be very popular, incidentally.

Mr. BARBER. Well, here, I similarly have a question.

Senator PROXMIRE. Maybe we ought to divide it this way: If you are not a stockholder in a firm that is the target of antitrust prosecution, it probably is popular.

Mr. BARBER. That calls to mind the report that appeared in the Wall Street Journal the earlier part of this month which reported on a survey made by the Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton for 70 big—this is the Wall Street Journal saying—big corporate clients.

It was a cross-section survey of the population as a whole, and the persons interviewed were asked whether they thought one or two companies have “too much control” in the Nation’s largest industries.

It seems to me the results were rather surprising: 61 percent of the people answered “Yes,” and indeed 68 percent of the businessmen who were polled answered in the affirmative, a larger percentage than of the public generally.

But when you get down to more specific questions as to what you want to do, the initiation of specific cases, then the percentage of popularity of this may tend to decline.

When we consider the effect on the economic situation, first of all it strikes me that there probably would be some impact in the stock market but if we are going to ask the kind of longer run question what would be the impact ultimately upon employment, upon growth, upon income, the distribution of those incomes and such, then it seems to me there is a very strong case that greater competition would be achieved through a vigorous program and, as a consequence, you would attain a climate that would be more favorable to business.

So I think that the longrun implications of any such program would be distinctly favorable to the businessmen, to business opportunities.

From this point of view, therefore, it seems to me that the program is the kind that we should go forward with even though at the outset you would be bound to get a degree of hostility on the part of certain interest groups.

Mr. ADAMS. Senator, I don’t think, with all due respect, that the issue is necessarily a genuine one. In fact, it may be an altogether phony issue.

I think we ought to be aware of the fact that there was more vigorous antitrust enforcement under the Eisenhower administration than there has been under the Kennedy administration so far, and no one, to my knowledge, has considered the Eisenhower administration anti-business for that reason.

Senator PROXMIRE. I suppose that is right; and historically isn’t it true there was less vigorous enforcement under the Taft than under the Roosevelt administration?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir.

Senator PROXMIRE. Because of Teddy’s fierceness, and so forth, he was labeled by many, at least, as a trustbuster, and Taft quite to the contrary.

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, again, if we refer to history, I think it is safe to say that Teddy instead of speaking softly and carrying a big stick, spoke loudly and carried a twig [laughter]; besides, I don’t think we should accept this argument that vigorous law enforcement