

**FREE IMPORTATION OF TEXTILE  
MACHINES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL  
PURPOSES**

**HEARING**  
BEFORE THE  
**COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**  
**UNITED STATES SENATE**

**EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS**  
**SECOND SESSION**

ON

**H. R. 1012**

**AN ACT TO PERMIT EDUCATIONAL, RELIGIOUS, OR CHARITABLE  
INSTITUTIONS TO IMPORT TEXTILE MACHINES AND PARTS  
THEREOF FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSES**

---

JANUARY 17, 1952

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Finance



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1952

## COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia, *Chairman*

TOM CONNALLY, Texas

HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Virginia

EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Colorado

CLYDE R. HOEY, North Carolina

ROBERT S. KERR, Oklahoma

J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr., Delaware

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Colorado

ROBERT A. TAFT, Ohio

HUGH BUTLER, Nebraska

EDWARD MARTIN, Pennsylvania

JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Delaware

RALPH E. FLANDERS, Vermont

ELIZABETH B. SPRINGER, *Chief Clerk*

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Text of H. R. 1012.....	1
Testimony of—	
Campbell, Malcolm, dean of the School of Textiles, North Carolina State College.....	5
McFarland, Alex J., representing the National Association of Textile Machinery Manufacturers.....	13
Additional information submitted by—	
Cooley, Hon. Harold D.: Statement.....	4
Lowell Textile Institute: Letter from Everett V. Olsen, President, to Hon. Harold D. Cooley.....	11
National Association of Textile Machinery Manufacturers: State- ment.....	15
State Department: Report.....	4
Treasury Department: Report.....	3
United States Tariff Commission: Memorandum.....	2



# FREE IMPORTATION OF TEXTILE MACHINES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 17, 1952

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,  
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a. m., in room 312, Senate Office Building; Senator Clyde R. Hoey presiding.

Present: Senators Hoey (presiding), Kerr, Frear, Millikin, Butler (Nebraska), Martin, and Williams.

Also present: Senator Willis Smith (North Carolina); and Elizabeth B. Springer, chief clerk.

Senator HOEY. The committee will come to order.

This hearing was set this morning to be held on H. R. 1012, which is a bill to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes.

In order to make the record complete, I will submit a copy of the bill for the record.

Also, a résumé from the Tariff Commission which gives information covering the importations of machinery, and so forth.

In addition to this, I submit a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury touching this bill, and also a letter from the Secretary of State relating to this measure.

In addition to this, I want to put in the record a statement from Congressman Cooley from North Carolina, who is the author of this bill. Congressman Cooley is at home, sick, and it is impossible for him to be here today. He has a short statement that I will not read but I will include in the record.

(The documents referred to are as follow:)

[H. R. 1012, 82d Cong., 1st sess.]

AN ACT To permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of title II (the free list) thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:*

"PAR. 1817. Any society or institution incorporated or established solely for educational, religious, or charitable purposes may import free of duty any textile machine or machinery, or part thereof, for its own use in the instruction of students and not for sale or for any commercial use, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe."

Passed the House of Representatives January 17, 1951.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk.

## UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D. C.

JANUARY 11, 1952.

## MEMORANDUM FOR THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE ON H. R. 1012, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, A BILL TO PERMIT EDUCATIONAL, RELIGIOUS, OR CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS TO IMPORT TEXTILE MACHINES AND PARTS THEREOF FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSES

H. R. 1012 proposes the addition of a new paragraph to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930, to read as follows:

"PAR. 1817. Any society or institution incorporated or established solely for educational, religious, or charitable purposes may import free of duty any textile machine or machinery, or part thereof, for its own use in the instruction of students and not for sale or for any commercial use, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe."

The enactment of this legislation would exempt from duty textile machinery when imported by the institutions and for the purposes specified in the proposed amendment which are now dutiable under paragraph 372 of the Tariff Act of 1930 at various rates. A table of 1930 and current tariff rates applicable to textile machinery under paragraph 372 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is attached.

It has been the historical policy of Congress to encourage the advancement of culture and science in the United States by providing duty-free treatment for a fairly extensive list of articles which are imported under prescribed conditions and the importation of which free of duty was considered by Congress to be in the interest of cultural or scientific advancement in the United States. Educational and religious institutions have been among those which have long been granted the privilege of free importation of specified articles, and the present policy of Congress in this respect is reflected in paragraph 1631 of the Tariff Act, which reads as follows:

PAR. 1631. Any society or institution incorporated or established solely for religious, philosophical, educational, scientific, or literary purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts, or any college, academy, school, or seminary of learning in the United States, or any State, or public library, may import free of duty any book, map, music, engraving, photograph, etching, lithographic print, or chart, for its own use or for the encouragement of the fine arts, and not for sale, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

It should be noted that, throughout the history of the type of legislation under discussion, Congress has more or less limited the free-entry privilege to classes of articles whose importation would aid the development of the arts and sciences in the United States and which would necessarily customarily be of a type which was not readily available in the United States. The proposed legislation (H. R. 1012), which is in reality a proposed extension of the present exemption provided for in paragraph 1631 of the Tariff Act, would if enacted permit the free importation by specified institutions of any textile machine or machinery, or part thereof, a class of goods entirely unlike books, maps, music, engravings, photographs, etchings, lithographic prints, and charts, which are presently covered by paragraph 1631. Although there are some unique types of textile machines available abroad for which no counterpart could be found in the United States, it is probable that for the most part textile machines produced abroad can be or are duplicated by the domestic industry producing this class of machinery. Although it is possible that some textile machinery that would be imported under the bill if enacted would consist of machines of types manufactured in the United States, it is likely that most of such machines would be special machines or machines having special features and of types not made in the United States at the time of importation.

Although the Commission has no information available as to the extent to which the proposed exemption, if enacted, would be utilized, it seems probable that the total imports of textile machinery under the provisions of the proposed bill would be small in proportion to normal domestic production and sales of such machinery in the United States. The real policy question involved here is whether Congress desires to expand the classes of articles which educational institutions may import free of duty to include textile machinery. Should this bill be enacted, institutions of the type named in the bill and similar institutions might seek privileges with respect to other types of equipment used in these institutions for the purposes specified and perhaps for other purposes.

## Textile machinery and parts—Rates of duty in 1930 and current rates

	Percent ad valorem	
	1930 rate	Current rate
Embroidery machines, including shuttles for sewing and embroidery machines:		
Shuttles for sewing and embroidery machines	30	30
Other than shuttles	30	15
Lace-making machines, and machines for making lace curtains, nets and nettles:		
Levers (including go-through)	30	15
Other	30	10
Knitting, braiding, lace braiding, and insulating machines, and all other similar textile machinery, finished or unfinished, n. s. p. f.:		
Knitting machines:		
Full-fashioned hosiery	40	20
Circular	40	15
Other	40	20
Textile machinery similar to knitting machines, other than braiding, lace braiding, and insulating machines	40	20
Braiding, lace braiding, and insulating machines, and similar textile machinery	40	20
Looms	40	20
Machinery for making synthetic textile filaments, bands, strips, or sheets	40	20
Bleaching, printing, dyeing, or finishing machinery	40	20
Machinery for textile manufacturing or processing prior to the making of fabrics or woven, knit, crocheted, or felt articles not made from fabrics:		
For manufacturing or processing vegetable fibers (except winding, beaming, warping, and slashing machinery and combinations thereof)	40	10
Circular combs commonly known as "Notke" or "Bradford" combs	40	40
Other, including winding, beaming, warping, and slashing machinery and combinations thereof	40	20
Other textile machinery	40	15
Parts, n. s. p. f., wholly or in chief value of metal or porcelain, of any of the foregoing:		
Textile pins	40	20
Other	(1)	(1)

<sup>1</sup> The rate for the articles of which they are parts.

<sup>2</sup> The current rate for the articles.

FEBRUARY 2, 1951.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,  
Chairman, Committee on Finance,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of January 22, 1951, requesting a statement of this Department's views on the bill H. R. 1012, "To permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes."

The proposed legislation would add a new paragraph to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide for the importation free of duty by any society or institution incorporated or established solely for educational, religious, or charitable purposes of any textile machines or machinery, or part thereof, for its own use in the instruction of students and not for sale or for any commercial use, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Department has had experience with somewhat similar language in other tariff provisions such as paragraph 1631 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and on the basis of such experience, anticipates no unusual administrative problems if the proposed legislation is enacted into law. This Department, therefore, would have no objection to the enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to the committee.

Very truly yours,

JOHN S. GRAHAM,  
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

FEBRUARY 14, 1951.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,  
*Chairman, Committee on Finance,*  
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: Reference is made to your letter of January 31, 1951, requesting the views of the Department of State on H. R. 1012, an act "To permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes."

This bill would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit, under rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the duty-free entry of textile machinery or parts thereof for the above-mentioned use.

This Department has examined the bill for its possible relationship to United States commercial policy and has no objection to its enactment from that standpoint.

No comment has been made on possible administrative questions raised by this proposed legislation since such matters fall within the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. McFALL,  
*Assistant Secretary*  
 (For the Secretary of State).

STATEMENT IN BEHALF OF MR. COOLEY, AUTHOR OF H. R. 1012, JANUARY 17, 1952

H. R. 1012 was introduced by Mr. Cooley, of North Carolina, January 8, 1951. It would amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and permit free entry under that act of any textile machine or machinery or parts thereof imported by any society or institution incorporated or established solely for educational, religious, or charitable purposes, for its own use in the instruction of students and not for sale or for any commercial use under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The machines which would be imported under the bill would be special machine or machines having special features and which are not made in the United States at the time of importation.

H. R. 1012 was considered by the House Ways and Means Committee in 1951. The Department of State, Treasury Department, and the Department of Commerce advised the committee that they had no objection to the enactment of the legislation and the committee was also informed that the Bureau of the Budget had no objection to the bill.

The House Ways and Means Committee unanimously reported the bill favorably. Thereafter a rule was granted and later the legislation was considered in the House and was approved and passed by unanimous consent January 17, 1951.

Mr. Cooley, author of the bill, requested that I say to you gentlemen that it has been the policy of Congress to encourage the advancement of culture and science in the United States by admitting free of duty certain articles for use by religious, philosophical, educational, scientific, and literary institutions. He has directed that I express in his behalf the hope that you gentlemen will report the bill favorably.

Senator HOEY. I believe the first witness this morning is Mr. Malcolm Campbell, dean of the North Carolina State College. Mr. Campbell, will you come forward, please.

Senator SMITH. This is Mr. Campbell whom I have the pleasure to introduce to you.

Senator HOEY. Senator Smith of North Carolina presents Mr. Malcolm Campbell of the North Carolina State College, dean of the school of textiles.



**STATEMENT OF MALCOLM CAMPBELL, DEAN OF THE SCHOOL OF  
TEXTILES, NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE**

Mr. CAMPBELL. My name is Malcolm Campbell. I am dean of the school of textiles at the North Carolina State College of the University of North Carolina. I wish to speak in favor of this bill.

It is our objective to train young men and women in the technology of the textile industry and thus to produce future leaders and executives for the industry. There are nine other college-level textile schools in this country with essentially the same objectives. The textile courses in these institutions consist of lectures, classroom studies, and laboratory work.

In our own school, which is fairly typical, we have machinery and apparatus in our laboratories for the processing of all types of fibers, including cotton, wool, and rayon and synthetics, into yarns, woven fabrics, and knitted fabrics; and for the bleaching, dyeing, and finishing of these products. We also have machines, instruments, and apparatus for the testing of fibers, yarns, and fabrics.

Most of the machinery and apparatus in our laboratories was manufactured in the United States. However, in the past 2 years I have personally visited textile schools, mills, research laboratories, and textile machine builders' shops in several countries in Europe and in South America. I have seen there a number of textile machines and devices that are substantially different from any that are obtainable in the United States. I am convinced that it would be to the advantage of our textile students to see and to use some of this equipment. I believe that as a result of the new ideas and thinking that these machines would stimulate in our students, the textile industry of the United States would be the beneficiary.

At the present time the import duty on this machinery and equipment ranges from 10 to as much as 40 percent. I would like to depart from my statement for a moment and say I have been told today that the 40 percent on looms has probably been reduced to 20 percent. In my statement I mention 40 percent, but I am not sure of that figure.

As a general rule, the budgets for new machinery in the textile schools are very limited, so that the duties may make the cost prohibitive in some cases.

For purposes of illustration, I will mention two textile machines manufactured in Europe, which several of the schools need, which are not manufactured in this country, and on which the duty constitutes a considerable outlay of funds. The first is a "sample weaving machine" made in Switzerland. This device has a pattern mechanism operating on the electromagnetic principle which permits a wide range of new fabric patterns to be made very quickly. It is ideal for the teaching of fabric pattern designing, but it could not possibly be used for the commercial manufacture of fabrics. The Treasury Department has told us that since this is a loom it is subject to a 40 percent import duty, which amounts to \$1,500 or more per machine.

Another case in point is the Shirley Analyzer, a machine built only in England, which permits an analysis to be made of the foreign matter content of cotton, both in the raw and semi-manufactured

states, as well as of cotton waste. This device is almost indispensable for the attack on many cotton research problems. The duty on it amounts to several hundred dollars.

Other foreign-made textile machines which we have examined are substantially different, in one respect or another, from any made in the United States. I am certain that if some of these could be brought into this country duty free, the schools would buy a number of them, and that as a result our textile students would obtain new ideas that would eventually be of benefit to the textile industry of the United States. I wish to repeat that these machines are materially different from any made here. To illustrate, in 1950 I saw a shuttleless loom in Brazil, which was said to have been invented there. Now, Brazil is not noted for new developments in textile machinery, but that loom was so different from any American loom we know about that it would be a highly desirable mechanism for our students to study. Similarly, the French have developed a circular loom that has no counterpart in the United States. The Germans have brought out a new yarn twister which I saw last year at the International Textile Exposition in Lille. The spindles of this machine are driven by gears instead of the conventional tapes, and it is considered somewhat revolutionary.

There has always been a high degree of cooperation between the American textile machinery builders and the American textile schools. This relationship is now a closer and more mutually helpful one than ever. American-made textile machines form the basis of education in textiles here today, and they always will. No textile school in the United States has either the desire or the funds to import more than an extremely limited number of machines, most of them essentially different from any made here. I am sure that our own textile machinery builders, however, do not claim to have a world monopoly on improved machine design. The passage of this bill as written, therefore, will be of definite benefit to the textile industry of the United States, by enabling our schools to import machines now saddled with an unfair duty, for educational purposes only, and by stimulating new ideas of design in the minds of tomorrow's American textile leaders.

That completes my statement, sir. Thank you.

Senator HOEY. Thank you, Doctor.

Doctor, how many textile schools are there in the United States?

Mr. CAMPBELL. There are ten college-level textile schools.

Senator HOEY. What do you estimate would be the number of machines of any one of these kinds that probably would be desired to have imported?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think all 10 schools would desire to have a sample of the specific machines that they know are available.

Senator HOEY. So your estimate is that these 10 textile schools in the United States would probably want a machine of each type for the purpose of studying it?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Senator MILLIKIN. Do you train your students to operate textile machines produced in this country?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, we do, not for the purpose of making machine operators of them but for the purpose of acquainting them with the potentialities and possibilities of the machines.

Senator MILLIKIN. The general field of training the students in your school is to operate the machines made in this country, is it not?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Senator MILLIKIN. What is the reason for importing the machines from abroad?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Because our students not only become textile executives but they become engineers, machine designers, and many other things in the textile industry, and because the mechanisms on some of the foreign machinery are so different in many respects it would stimulate new ideas in the minds of our people.

Senator MILLIKIN. Could they be taught from blueprints?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Probably not; I should think not.

Senator MILLIKIN. Your students can read blueprints as well as study the machine, can they not?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes. However, in order to determine the over-all possibilities of the machine they should have the machine available and test the product on the machine, which cannot be done, of course, from blueprints.

Senator MILLIKIN. You say there are no comparable machines made in this country?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I don't believe I understand your question, sir.

Senator MILLIKIN. You have listed three or four different types of machines made abroad.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Senator MILLIKIN. Do we make the same type of machines in this country?

Mr. CAMPBELL. In many cases, no.

Senator MILLIKIN. In some cases we do?

Mr. CAMPBELL. In some cases we do, and in many cases we do not.

Senator MILLIKIN. Would you mind telling us where we do and where we do not on the illustrations you have given?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The illustrations I have given here, sir, relate only to machines not made in this country. I can perhaps mention some machines made abroad that have similar counterparts in this country. There are spinning frames made in England, spinning frames made in Switzerland, and also made in Germany, Italy, and other countries, that are, to some extent, similar to, in many details, to machines made in this country.

Senator MILLIKIN. What has made you believe the 20 percent tariff in some instances, as I understand it, and up to 40 percent, determines the use of the machine for instruction purposes?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Because the machinery budgets for all of the textile schools are so limited, and we have to try to spread our money as far as we can, and a 40 percent duty in some cases makes it practically impossible for us to afford it.

Senator MILLIKIN. Of the various machines that you described, what is the cost of the Swiss patternmaker, if that is what you called it?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Swiss sample weaving machine.

Senator MILLIKIN. What is the cost of that machine?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not sure of the present-day cost, but with the electromagnetic equipment that is needed in it, it is in excess of \$3,000.

Senator MILLIKIN. About \$3,000?

Mr. CAMPBELL. From three to four thousand dollars.

Senator MILLIKIN. Now, I am told that the chief machine that carries more than 20 percent is what is known as the circular comb, called the Noble or Bradford comb, that carries 40 percent.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Senator MILLIKIN. Can you tell us why the tariff on a machine that costs \$3,000 keeps you from buying the machine, if you want it badly enough?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not if we want it badly enough, but it curtails the opportunities to buy other machines that we definitely should have.

Senator MILLIKIN. The burden of your testimony is it is the 20 percent tariff which keeps you from buying the machines.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Senator MILLIKIN. If that is not the burden of your testimony, will you please explain what is the burden of it?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think that is, sir.

Senator MILLIKIN. We have got a lot of precedents to watch in connection with this and that is why I am questioning you. Don't you think that that 20 percent additional cost, if it is reflected as additional cost, could be met, assuming that the machine is highly desirable?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It could in individual cases, sir.

Senator MILLIKIN. Your institution is not too-poor, you have a wealthy institution, haven't you?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It has that reputation; yes.

Senator MILLIKIN. Am I to believe, if you want this \$3,000 Swiss pattern machine, whatever you call it, that one-fifth of that, or \$600 would keep you from getting it?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It would probably postpone the day when they did decide to get it.

Senator MILLIKIN. It might not be as easy to get it?

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is correct, sir.

Senator MILLIKIN. I am suggesting surely if it highly desirable in your instruction course you are not going to let \$600, which I assume once invested will be useful for a long time to come, stand in the way of the proper instruction of your students.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No, in exceptional cases I think it will not.

Senator MILLIKIN. Thank you very much.

Senator HOEY. Are there any other questions?

Senator MARTIN. Mr. Chairman.

Senator HOEY. Senator Martin.

Senator MARTIN. Do you have a list of the 10 institutions that you mentioned, that are on a college level?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I can quote them to you, sir, or I can prepare a list and give it to you. Would you like me to tell you where they are located?

Senator MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There are five in the North and five in the South. In the North there is the Lowell Textile Institute at Lowell, Mass.

Senator KERR. Is that a State school?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, that is supported by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. There is the New Bedford Textile Institute at New Bedford, Mass., which is also State-supported. There is the Bradford-Durfee Technical Institute at Fall River, Mass. That is also State-

supported. The textile department of the Rhode Island School of Design in Providence, R. I., which I believe is a privately supported institution. The Philadelphia Textile Institute in Philadelphia, which is also privately supported. The School of Textiles at North Carolina State College. All the five Southern schools are State-supported. The School of Textiles of the Clemson Agricultural College. The A. French Textile School of the Georgia Institute of Technology. Textile department of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute. The textile department of the Texas College of Technology. Those are the 10.

Senator MARTIN. They are all State-supported except the one in Philadelphia?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The one in Philadelphia and the one in Rhode Island, which are privately supported.

Senator MARTIN. That answers the question.

Senator MILLIKIN. Dr. Campbell, I would like to call your attention to the fact that the bill before us does not limit the importation of machines that are not made in this country. In other words, it refers to the importation of any kind of machine even though it is a duplicate of the machine made in this country.

Senator KEHR. Do I understand it provides an umbrella large enough for many institutions to get under other than those designated here?

Senator MILLIKIN. I think so. The thing that bothers me is the precedent. We open the door for one particular segment of industry and it would be difficult to refuse the same privilege to other industries.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Senator, I would like to comment on the remark you just made.

Senator MILLIKIN. I would not for one moment put a prohibition on your institution to bringing anything in from any foreign countries that you want to bring in for educational purposes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Senator MILLIKIN. The sole question is whether we should take the tariff off to facilitate your process of instruction.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If I understand you correctly, you said if a machine today was not built in this country, if we did not have anything similar to it today, that it could be imported duty-free for educational purposes.

Senator MILLIKIN. No; I did not say that. I said you could pay the price and bring it in. The sole question, from my own viewpoint, is whether this tariff that we are talking about, which in all instances is less than 40 percent, except for one classification, whether we should take off that tariff or whether the problem could not be met by paying the tariff just as everyone else does.

Senator HOEY. I think you misunderstood the Senator's reference, to the effect that this bill is broad enough so the machines could be brought in whether we brought in the same type of machine or not.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Thank you. I understand it now.

Senator HOEY. Are there any other questions? Thank you, Dean, for your appearance.

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman, if I may make this observation, the reason I think this particular question is important, I assume it would permit them to bring in machines which are not similar to the ones produced in this country, to instruct the students how to use them, and it is equally true it would permit them to bring in machines

which are similar to the machines we make in this country, and thus we are distinctly discouraging the production of the domestic product where the domestic product duplicates the foreign product. We are teaching them to teach the use of the foreign machines after they are instructed how to use them.

Senator HOBY. I think one thing involved in Dr. Campbell's statement is these students become engineers, designers, and so on, and by a study of the operation of the foreign machines some improvement might be made in other machines which would be produced in this country.

Senator MILLIKIN. I want to repeat again I am not taking any position that we should foreclose the teaching of the operation of any machine in our educational institutions, the sole question to me is whether this tariff is an important deterrent to the proper spread of knowledge and whether it will open the door not only in this case but whether it will set a precedent in many others.

Senator MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not want it understood that I was opposing it in my questions, I just wanted to get the scope of the bill. But there is another feature that should be mentioned. We are having right now some unemployment by reason of the importations from various parts of the world. Up in my State it is getting to be a very serious problem. In regard to what Senator Millikin said there, it might be setting a precedent that would be rather embarrassing for us in the future, so I think it ought to be given very careful thought. I do not mean to imply I am opposing it at all.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Senator, I would like to add something. I have here a list of the rates of duty on textile machinery and parts as of 1930 and the current rates, which I got from Mr. Cooley. The letter of transmittal is dated October 28, 1950, and the rates on looms are 40-percent ad valorem, the current rate as of October 28, 1950, and among other machines, textile machines are listed up to 40 percent. I am not sure that is the latest but it is the latest that Mr. Cooley had.

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to advise that is not the latest. That has been revised down to 20 percent.

Senator HOBY. The latest figures are included in the report from the Tariff Commission which is already in the record.

Senator MILLIKIN. I would like to advise also that almost all of these duties very recently have been cut in half, from 40 to 20 percent. One I notice has been reduced from 40 to 10 percent, which in itself is a substantial encouragement.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman,

Senator HOBY. Senator Smith.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, of course the paragraph of the bill that we are dealing with is only a very short paragraph and I think it might be well to put it in the record.

Senator HOBY. I have put the entire bill in.

Senator SMITH. It reads:

Any society or institution incorporated or established solely for educational, religious, or charitable purposes may import free of duty any textile machine or machinery, or part thereof, for its own use in the instruction of students and not for sale or for any commercial use, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

Now, of course, this is somewhat in the nature of other machinery or other patterns that might be brought in by our schools of medicine,

and that sort of thing, that teach students how to operate a particular item of machinery. I can understand that there is maybe a question of precedent involved which I am not capable of discussing to any great extent, but if there should be a machine in other parts of the world that was so much more efficient that would justify being imported into this country by manufacturers, that they could see their way clear to obtain, then we ought to have a chance for young men to learn the technique of using the machines.

Of course, it is not just one institution or one section of the country but it is all sections. I have here a letter from Mr. Everett V. Olsen, assistant to the president of the Lowell Textile Institute, Department of Education, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in Lowell. This letter is addressed to Mr. Cooley, the introducer of this bill, and the letter says:

Your letter to Prof. James H. Kennedy, Jr., of our institute has been turned over to my office because it is of real interest to me and to the institute, as a whole.

H. R. 1012 is of particular interest to this institute because of the manufacturing equipment which we must purchase which will be used only for classroom demonstrations. It is true that the manufacturing potential of the machine remains, but we are not a manufacturing concern and, as a purely educational institute, we feel that this bill is quite fair for us. I know also that Harvard University and other schools in the area would have an interest in your bill because they import certain machinery, surgical instruments, and other equipment not manufactured in this country for use in their laboratories and classroom demonstrations. I sincerely hope that this bill is given a favorable report and passed into a law.

We would appreciate hearing further from you if there is anything which we might add to help strengthen the case for this bill.

I put that in because you gentlemen have been told already, and you gentlemen know, it is not just one institution. Dean Campbell happens to be the dean of our State college of engineering. I was told several years ago by one of the distinguished men in Massachusetts, with whom I had some business dealings, distinguished in the textile field, that he regarded the North Carolina School of Textile Engineering as the finest in America.

Now, the State of North Carolina has appropriated large sums of money from the public treasury to develop this school. We have a large number of boys not only just from North Carolina but from all over America who go there, and we even have some boys from foreign countries. I remember there was one from Turkey sometime ago, and some other countries. So we really have a very fine textile school, and I think that our State has been determined to do all it could to further its functions.

This is just one of those things that may not be too big in its over-all proportions and yet it means this amount of money is paid by way of taxes and by contributions from the textile industry to the educational institutions. We have that all over our State. These machines would be used for educational purposes in the classrooms. That is all this amounts to, because under the regulations that the Treasury Department would prescribe under the terms of the bill they could not be used for any other purposes.

So far as I am able to analyze the bill, it could not allow any manipulation or maneuvering that would put these machines in the hands of anybody that would use them, except in classrooms. So it seems to me, from what I know about it, that is not very much.

I do have great confidence in Dean Campbell, and I am sure everyone who knows him, both within this State and out of the State. We

felt very fortunate years ago when we were able to get him to come to North Carolina to take charge of our textile school.

Then I might say there is the element of private business in this. It is true that textile people, people who are interested in textiles, generally contribute to all of these textile schools, as I understand it. I know some of the businessmen in the State of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania continually try to improve the process by which they try to make a better product.

So it seems to me, from a cursory examination of this question there can be hardly any doubt of anybody being done any serious harm from the passage of this bill as it is written. I might call your attention to one of the sentences and then I am through. In the House report on this measure there is this sentence:

It has been the historical policy of Congress to encourage the advancement of culture and science in the United States by admitting free of duty certain articles for use by religious, philosophical, educational, scientific, and literary institutions. Paragraph 1631 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, provides for such free importation of books, maps, music, engravings, etc.

That is the statement I found in this report.

I did know something about the surgical instruments and about machines in connection with all sorts of investigations of human ills because of my connection with the biggest medical school in the South, and I know we had been continuously faced with whether we might have money for the particular machine. It might not be only a question of \$600 or \$800 or \$1,000, but the purchase of the machine might be postponed because of budget necessities or requirements. So I know that all of you gentlemen cannot help but be favorably disposed toward this, if you can work it out, and I hope it will be done.

Senator HOBY. Thank you for your statement, Senator.

Senator MILLIKIN. Senator Smith, the provision you mentioned is the provision of the Tariff Act which does exempt some of these things. That all goes for the purposes specified generally as fine arts. It speaks of books, maps, music, engravings, photographs, etching, lithographs, prints, charts, which is somewhat different from going into the field of machinery. To me, from my own viewpoint, there might be some fine art in machinery, but I don't think that is the general understanding.

Senator SMITH. I had never seen it until I read it in this report. But, anyway, a question might develop whether it is well to allow it in from the standpoint of gratification. It might get in as a fine art, a psychic gratification, or whether it would be some advantage to make it possible for our students, to make it available to them to study the manufacturing techniques. I am not too familiar with textiles but I do have some little experience with some phases of the business. You can see the difference in results produced by the use of certain machines over other machines.

Senator MILLIKIN. To many businessmen the cash register would probably be deemed as a work of fine art.

Senator HOBY. Thank you, Senator Smith.

Senator HOBY. There is one other witness to be heard, Mr. Alex J. McFarland, who represents the National Association of Textile Machinery Manufacturers.



**STATEMENT OF ALEX J. McFARLAND, REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEXTILE MACHINERY MANUFACTURERS**

Mr. McFARLAND. Gentlemen, my name is Alex J. McFarland. I am a member of the firm of Herrick, Smith, Donald, Farley & Ketchum, of Boston. I am appearing before you this morning as a counsel and a representative of the National Association of Textile Machinery Manufacturers.

I have filed a statement with you gentlemen, and I must say that the questions that the Senators have asked I think have brought out the points that I wish to make, but for the sake of the record I should like to repeat them.

Senator HOEY. Your full statement will be included in the record.

Mr. McFARLAND. Thank you, sir.

I might say that the association is opposed to H. R. 1012 only as it is presently worded. We suggest, as I will develop later, a simple amendment which I feel sure will produce the results which Dean Campbell and the textile schools desire.

Let me say that the association feels that the purpose of this bill is a worthy one, to permit these textile institutions in particular—although I do point out that it includes other charitable and religious organizations—nevertheless, it permits those organizations to purchase machinery at less cost than if the duty were imposed.

This association that I represent is well cognizant of the importance of textile schools. As a matter of fact, I am sure that most, if not all, of the members of the association have contributed to one or more such schools in the past and are constantly concerned and interested in their development and progress. However, we believe that H. R. 1012, as presently drawn, might—and I emphasize “might”—have some severe effect on the domestic textile machinery manufacturing industry.

As a bit of background, and as is set forth more particularly in the written statement I have filed, it is to be noted that the tariff on textile machinery has been reduced substantially since 1930. There have been several cuts and, as a matter of fact, within the last 6 years, since 1945, the tariff has been cut almost in half on the bulk of the machinery that is manufactured by the members of the association that I represent.

Senator MILLIKIN. May I interrupt you there?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, Senator.

Senator MILLIKIN. What are the principal manufacturing centers of textile machinery abroad? what nations?

Mr. McFARLAND. That I am not prepared to say, Senator.

Senator MILLIKIN. Is there anyone in the room here who is prepared to say? Do you know, Dean?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir. I would say the Manchester, England, area; some areas in France; the area around Zurich, Switzerland; Milan, Italy; Dusseldorf, Germany.

Senator MILLIKIN. I want to suggest to you in view of what you just said, in addition to the 50 percent cut in tariff you have had almost the equivalent of that by the devaluation of the pound.

Mr. McFARLAND. I also wish to point out that especially in Great Britain we find there is a decided competitive element that has arisen in connection with our domestic manufacture by reason of the lowered labor costs in particular. That may be attributed to several things: the standard of living, and so forth. But the fact of the matter is that the tariff protection to this industry has been reduced, and our position is simply this, that we are generally opposed to any broadside, general reduction in the tariff schedule. It is a selfish reason, to be sure, but perhaps, in large part, that is the reason for the tariff. However, if a general exemption is granted in a particular case, it then opens the door to requests for other general exemptions. It is not unreasonable to suppose, were this bill to be enacted in its present form, that other groups, who are interested not in educational institutions, mind you, but manufacturers and others who have research and experimental shops, as most of these textile manufacturing concerns have, would request perhaps a reduction on their behalf.

Senator MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, might I ask a question in that connection?

Senator HOEY. Senator Martin.

Senator MARTIN. Isn't the reason for the tariff largely to take care of the differences in the wage scale in America and in competing countries?

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish I knew, Senator. I think there have been various reasons given for these tariffs in the past. I am not enough of a student of tariff matters to answer that question. I wish I could.

The association requests that the committee consider the extreme possibilities of what might happen under this act as presently worded, in order that you might appreciate our position. I am not imputing any sinister motives to Dean Campbell in particular, or to any of the textile schools, but I think we should keep in mind the possibilities.

Under this bill it is perfectly possible for any textile school to import, duty-free, machinery which is highly competitive with the domestically manufactured machinery. There is no restriction in that regard. Let us suppose that happens—and it might well happen for the pecuniary reasons to which Dean Campbell refers, namely, that that import and purchase could be made at less expense than the purchase of similar machinery manufactured in this country—the result might well be that those who are schooled in these textile schools in this country would be schooled, in large part, perhaps exclusively to take the most extreme position, on machines that are manufactured abroad and which are sold in competition with our domestic machines. That is an extreme position, but I point out that it is possible, and for that reason the association feels the bill is too broad in its present form.

Reference has been made to the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I should like also to refer to another paragraph in that committee's report in which it was stated:

It is anticipated that most of the textile machines which would be imported free of duty under this bill would be special machines or machines having special features and which are not made in the United States at the time of importation.

I also refer to Dean Campbell's statement before you gentlemen this morning in which he referred to the desirability of purchasing abroad substantially different machines, or materially different machines, and

he gave some examples of what I would take to be materially different machines than those produced in this country.

We are in entire accord with this bill if its provisions were limited to machines which are not manufactured in this country, or to machines where the substantial equivalent is not manufactured in this country. In other words, we are entirely in sympathy with the purposes of the textile schools in that regard. However, we believe that this limitation of materially equivalent machines should not be left to speculation or to mere hope, and we merely request that that should be finalized in the bill so there would be no question in that regard.

In the written statement I have submitted the association has suggested an amendment to the present bill. This amendment appears at the bottom of page 5 and the top of page 6 of the written statement that I submitted, and the amendment really only adds to the end of the bill as now drawn the following words:

*Provided, That any such textile machine or machinery or part thereof, or the substantial equivalent thereof, is not at that time manufactured in the United States.*

We believe that that will entirely carry out the intent and purpose of this bill, which I believe was introduced on behalf of Dean Campbell by Representative Cooley. It will provide the results that were anticipated by Dean Campbell and at the same time it will provide a definite safeguard, we feel, to the domestic textile machinery industry.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Senator HOEY. Thank you, Mr. McFarland.

(The prepared statement submitted by Mr. McFarland reads, in full, as follows:)

#### STATEMENT OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEXTILE MACHINERY MANUFACTURERS

H. R. 1012, providing for the duty-free importation into this country of textile machinery destined for charitable institutions, is of the greatest concern to the textile machinery industry of the United States. As a representative of a major portion of that industry, the National Association of Textile Machinery Manufacturers wishes to record, on behalf of the textile industry, its objections to H. R. 1012 as presently worded.

The National Association of Textile Machinery Manufacturers is a voluntary association of manufacturers of textile machinery and parts. Its membership includes all major concerns which manufacture carding and other preparatory, spinning and twisting machinery; winders; beaming, warping and slashing machinery; looms; and bleaching, printing, dyeing and finishing machinery. A list of the association members with addresses is attached as exhibit A.

H. R. 1012 has a worthy purpose. It is apparently designed to make acquisitions of textile machinery by this country's textile schools less expensive. The importance of the textile schools to the textile industry of this country cannot be overestimated and is fully appreciated by the Association.

Nevertheless, H. R. 1012 as presently drawn may if enacted into law have severe repercussions on the textile machinery industry and in that respect go further than the framers of the bill intended. Therefore, the association would like first to indicate briefly the danger to the textile machinery industry involved, and second to suggest an amendment to H. R. 1012 designed to remove some of that danger.

1. H. R. 1012 if enacted into law would invite further broad exceptions to the Tariff Act of 1930 and, more important, would in effect subsidize textile school teaching on textile machinery imported from Great Britain and other foreign countries.

The textile machinery industry of this country has recently had to absorb the shock of repeated and drastic cuts in the tariff on importations of competing foreign machinery. The following table, comparing the present import duties with

those of 1915 and 1930 on certain textile machinery items covered by paragraph 372 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is dramatic evidence of that fact:

Description	Import duties (percent)		
	Act of 1930	1915	Present
Carding, twisting, spinning and other preparing machinery and parts:			
For cotton and jute.....	40	20	10
For wool and other fibres except cotton and jute.....			
Worsted combs.....	40	40	40
Other.....	40	20	20
Winders and warp, preparation machinery.....	40	20	20
Looms and parts.....	40	40	20
Textile bleaching, printing, dyeing, and other finishing machinery and parts.....	40	40	20
Miscellaneous textile machinery and parts.....	40	25	15

As is readily seen from the above table, the duties on weaving machinery, finishing machinery, and cotton spinning and preparatory machinery, which comprise the bulk of the production of the members of the National Association of Textile Machinery Manufacturers, has been cut in half since 1915. And these cuts have been made in the face of the fact that there is a substantial differential in cost between foreign manufacture, such as the British, and ours, largely due to lower foreign labor costs and to subsidization of textile machinery production by foreign governments. Of course, in the case of the Japanese, who are aggressively expanding their textile machinery industry, the labor cost differential is much greater.

As a general proposition, the association is opposed to any broad exception to the structure of the tariff set up by the Tariff Act of 1930. The particular exception proposed by the present bill, if passed, would invite attempts to make further broad exceptions. To take only one example, it is not improbable that a similar bill providing for duty-free entry of textile machinery to be used for research or experimental purposes by various United States business concerns would be proposed. Not only do such broad exceptions bring inevitable administrative complications by virtue of difficulties of interpretation and application—they also inevitably threaten the competitive position of the domestic industry by lessening the demand for domestic machinery.

H. R. 1012 is, however charitable its nature, another tariff cut. It is true that this cut does not immediately spell commercial competition to the domestic industry, but its long-range effects are regarded with apprehension by the association.

The immediate effect will be stepped-up importation of foreign textile machinery to the numerous textile schools and other institutions "incorporated or established solely for educational, religious, or charitable purposes" throughout the country. It is an opportunity that will not be missed by foreign manufacturers to sell their machinery at the very root of the textile industry of the future. Where future textile industry operatives and executives are being trained and educated, the low cost of the foreign product will be stressed and attention drawn to the advantages of dealing with a subsidized industry. This is an added burden to a domestic industry already faced with rising labor and material costs and lower tariffs on competing products.

2. H. R. 1012 should be amended to allow duty-free imports of only such textile machinery as is not manufactured in the United States.

The report of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on H. R. 1012 states:

"It is anticipated that most of the textile machines which would be imported free of duty under this bill would be special machines or machines having special features and which are not made in the United States at the time of importation."

The National Association of Textile Machinery Manufacturers would have no objection to the bill if this anticipation should prove to be the reality. Therefore, it suggests that, rather than leaving the matter to speculation, there be added to the language of the bill as presently drawn a proviso that free entry be allowed only when the equivalent machinery is not then being manufactured in this country, so that the bill as amended will read as follows:

"PAR. 1817. Any society or institution incorporated or established solely for educational, religious, or charitable purposes may import free of duty any textile

machine or machinery, or part thereof, for its own use in the instruction of students and not for sale or for any commercial use, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, *provided that any such textile machine or machinery or part thereof, or the substantial equivalent thereof, is not at that time manufactured in the United States.*" [Italics to indicate the amendment supplied.]

Such an amendment would, it would seem, effectuate the intent of the House Ways and Means Committee.

There is furthermore an interesting parallel providing precedent for such an amendment from a source sometimes regarded as too careless of United States interests. This is an agreement sponsored by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, which agreement was in part negotiated by representatives from the United States State Department. The agreement is entitled "Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials," and is designed to effect generally duty-free importation of educational, scientific, and cultural materials by countries signing the agreement. It is not entirely clear whether textile machinery is covered by this agreement, but if it is, it could only be under the following language of the agreement:

"Scientific instruments or apparatus, intended exclusively for educational purposes or pure scientific research, provided—

"(a) that such scientific instruments or apparatus are consigned to public or private scientific or educational institutions approved by the competent authorities of the importing country for the purpose of duty-free entry of these types of articles, and used under the control and responsibility of these institutions;

"(b) that instruments or apparatus of equivalent scientific value are not being manufactured in the country of importation." [Italics supplied.]

Here is clear-cut recognition of the interest of every country in protecting its domestic industry. At least 20 countries, including the United Kingdom, have signed the agreement, although as yet apparently only one has filed the necessary instrument of acceptance.

Furthermore, in the case of this UNESCO agreement, the United States representatives went even further and provided in a protocol to the agreement that the United States had the option of becoming a party to the agreement with a reservation permitting the suspension of any imports under the agreement if there is any threat of "serious injury to the domestic industry . . . producing like or directly competitive products." This reservation was insisted on in a case where only educational, scientific, and cultural materials were being covered. How much more reason is there to insist on a measure of protection to domestic industry in a case involving the highly competitive field of textile machinery.

In conclusion, the association recommends that the bill be amended in the manner suggested or, if such amendment is not deemed desirable, that the bill be reported unfavorably.

Respectfully submitted,

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEXTILE  
MACHINERY MANUFACTURERS.

By ALEX J. WOOLAND.

#### EXHIBIT A

#### NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEXTILE MACHINERY MANUFACTURERS ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP LIST

Abington Textile Machinery Works, 10 Congress Street, Boston, Mass.  
Barber-Colman Co., Rockford, Ill.  
Birch Bros., Inc., 32 Kent Street, Somerville, Mass.  
G. I. Brownell, Inc., Station A, Worcester, Mass.  
H. W. Butterworth & Sons Co., York and Cedar Streets, Philadelphia 25, Pa.  
Burlington Engineering Co., Graham, N. C.  
Cocker Machine & Foundry Co., Gastonia, N. C.  
Crompton & Knowles Jacquard & Supply Co., 300 Brook Street, Pawtucket, R. I.  
Crompton & Knowles Loom Works, Worcester 1, Mass.  
Curtis & Marble Machine Co., Worcester 3, Mass.  
Davis & Furber Machine Co., North Andover, Mass.  
Draper Corp., Hopedale, Mass.  
Duke Machine Co., Inc., 288 Derby Street, Salem, Mass.

Fay Scott Corp., Dexter, Maine.  
 Foster Machine Co., Westfield, Mass.  
 Fletcher Works, Inc., Glenwood Avenue and Second Street, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 David Gessner Co., 41 Fremont Street, Worcester 3, Mass.  
 H. & B. American Machine Co., Pawtucket, R. I.  
 George S. Harwood & Son, 60 Lagrange Street, Worcester, Mass.  
 Holdsworth Gill Screw Co., Inc., 1 Eudora Street, Providence 3, R. I.  
 Hermas Machine Co., Inc., Warburton Avenue, Hawthorne, N. J.  
 Rodney Hunt Machine Co., Orange, Mass.  
 James Hunter Machine Co., North Adams, Mass.  
 Hussong-Walker-Davis Co., Coral and Valetta Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Charles B. Johnson Machine Works, Piercy and Holman Street, Paterson, N. J.  
 Kearny Manufacturing Co., Inc., Kearny, N. J.  
 F. A. Lazenby & Co., 3106 Elm Avenue, Baltimore 11, Md.  
 Marshall & Williams Corp., 46 Baker Street, Providence 5, R. I.  
 Mawco Machine Co., 56 Bogart Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
 Morrison Machine Co., 1171-1225 Madison Avenue, Paterson 3, N. J.  
 Mount Hope Machine Co., 15 Fifth Street, Taunton, Mass.  
 National Drying Machine Co., Lehigh Avenue and Hancock Street, Philadelphia 33, Pa.  
 Parks-Cramer Co., Box 444, Fitchburg, Mass.  
 B. F. Perkins & Son, Inc., Box 388, Holyoke, Mass.  
 Proctor & Schwartz, Inc., Seventh and Tabor Road, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Riggs & Lombard, Inc., foot of Suffolk Street, Lowell, Mass.  
 B. S. Roy & Son Co., Worcester, Mass.  
 Saco-Lowell Shops, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston 10, Mass.  
 C. G. Sargent's Sons Corp., Graniteville, Mass.  
 James Smith & Son, 982 Southbridge Street, Worcester 3, Mass.  
 Smith, Drum & Co., Allegheny Avenue below Fifth Street, Philadelphia 33, Pa.  
 The Terrell Machine Co., 3000 South Boulevard, Charlotte, N. C.  
 Universal Winding Co., Post Office Box 1605, Providence 1, R. I.  
 Van Vlaanderen Co., 370 Straight Street, Paterson 3, N. J.  
 Venango Engineering Co., Inc., G and Lycoming Streets, Philadelphia 24, Pa.  
 Waresett Warner Co., 40-44 Church Street, Lowell, Mass.  
 Werner Machine Co., Inc., Passaic, N. J.  
 United States Textile Machine Co., Scranton 8, Pa.  
 Whitin Machine Works, Whitinsville, Mass.  
 Woonsocket Napping Machine Co., Woonsocket, R. I.  
 The Warner & Swasey Co., 5701 Carnegie Avenue, Cleveland 3, Ohio

Senator HOEY. This concludes the schedule of witnesses appearing today.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, may I add a few remarks?

Senator HOEY. You may.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Gentlemen, I would like to make a very brief comment on Mr. McFarland's proposed change, and that is this, that if such an amendment were approved and passed it would, of course, leave up to some Government agency the question of determining whether a machine was substantially different from anything built in this country, and I personally am afraid that, in many cases, it might not be possible to find a person qualified to distinguish between machines made in our country and machines made abroad, to determine whether that is similar or dissimilar, and that might cause difficulties in connection with the carrying out of this act.

Senator MILLIKIN. We have the same problem in connection with all classification questions in the tariff.

Senator HOEY. There was a suggestion by Mr. McFarland, Senator Millikin, that we add:

provided that any such textile machine or machinery or part thereof, or the substantial equivalent thereof, is not at that time manufactured in the United States.

Senator MILLIKIN. Is there serious objection to that, Dean Campbell?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No, sir; not a serious objection.

Senator HOEV. This concludes the schedule of witnesses for today. The record will be written up and the committee will consider this matter at some future meeting.

We thank all of you for attending this morning, and if it meets the approval of the committee, the committee will adjourn.

(Whereupon, at 11 a. m., the committee adjourned.)

X