

concession to arbitrary restrictive barriers made by our government as our major trading partners reply in kind.

Finally, the necessity to discriminate between countries and importers, to assign shares and to determine limitations, and to administer and enforce the ceilings on hundreds and thousands of prospective imports, all add up to ever-increasing bureaucratic supervision and dictation over industry and business, to a speed-up in the centralization of government, and to an ominous challenge to the free enterprise system.

Endangers National Security

Textile import quotas also endanger our national security.

By weakening the nation's economy, the national security is weakened too.

Beyond this, by alienating our trading partners, most of whom are allies in a tension-filled and troubled world, America's collective security system is jeopardized.

And, if by refusing to permit them to trade with us, we force them to trade with our enemies and our potential enemies, we are not only losing our allies but also strengthening our present and future adversaries.

Furthermore, an artificially protected uneconomic textile industry, dominated by huge companies, will be in a far less favorable position to provide the necessary textiles for national emergencies and for future limited and other wars.

And what the government must purchase will be at a higher price, with the specifications subject to the dictates of a monopolistic industry, for only the large companies will be able to supply the requirements of the military.

Even in times of crises, textile imports beyond a certain limit cannot be increased in order that the domestic combine may concentrate on producing for the emergency, while imports are made available to civilians and textile-consuming industries at reasonable price.

Even more crucial, textile imports may not be increased to meet shortages in military demand which the American industry may not be willing or able to supply.

Costly to Individuals

Textile import quotas are costly to the individual citizen—as a consumer, as a taxpayer, as a businessman, and as a worker.

As a consumer, he is forced to pay a higher price for a much more limited selection of textiles for himself and his family, for his home and for his office, for his business and for his industry.

With fewer goods, available, he must pay the higher price. With a ceiling on merchandise for export, foreign producers cannot afford to experiment with new fibers, fabrics, and fashions.

In the case of the poor and the poverty-stricken, the availability of inexpensive clothing may mean the difference between being decently clothed and “going without”, or accepting textile substitutes made of plastics, paper, glass, metal, wood, or other materials.

Because the anti-inflationary influence of textile imports will be eliminated, the consumer will have to pay more, not only for his textiles but for all other goods and services that he may need and require, for inflation is a contagious infection that cannot be contained or isolated to just textiles.

And, once an import quota is granted to the textile industry, it will probably start a chain reaction of similar import quotas for other import sensitive industries. After all, if the Congress accords such privileged status to one industry, it can hardly deny it to others.

As a taxpayer, the individual is more heavily taxed to pay for the administration and enforcement of first one and then many import quota laws. He is also taxed to pay for any direct or indirect subsidies that this favored textile and other industries may receive.

Unless he himself is an owner of a mill or plant, as a businessman or manufacturer involved in textiles, an import quota could put him at the mercy of the domestic supplier and his “freedom of choice” would be severely compromised.

As a worker, he may be the unwitting and unknowing victim of an uneconomic and uncompetitive sector of the giant textile industry who is being denied and deprived of the opportunity to secure adjustment assistance that will improve his skills and add to his abilities, thereby making him a more qualified candidate for higher-paying jobs in a more competitive sector or industry than the textile “prison” to which he may be confined.