Without vouching for the accuracy of these projections because there are so many factors that should be taken into consideration that may not have been, we have projected some sample estimates.

In manmade fiber imports, there would be about a 26% reduction from all countries, with Japan losing about six million pounds.

In manmade fiber yarns, there would be about a 63% loss in imports from all nations, with Japan losing more than two million pounds.

In manmade fiber fabrics, there would be about a 33% decrease in imports from all sources, with Japan losing about 51 million pounds.

On manmade fiber textile made-up goods, there would be a reduction of about 48% on all imports from all countries.

On manmade fiber knitted goods, there would be a cut of some 48% in total imports.

On manmade fiber wearing apparels, the reduction would amount to some 68%.

And, on manmade fiber floor coverings, the drop would be in the range of about 66%.

On a number of specific manufactured items that would be most affected by the proposed ceilings, we have had estimated some sample effects of the imposition of the specific textile quota bills.

On not-knit manmade dress shirts, for example, the total imports would be reduced by about 87% and Japan's share by about 83%.

On not-knit manmade fiber trousers, total imports would be cut 35% and Japan's share 36%.

On not-knit wool suits, total imports would be dropped 50%, with Japan's share also being cut 50%.

On manmade bed sheets and pillow cases, total imports would be almost excluded, with total imports being decreased by about 99% and Japan's share by about 98%.

On manmade fiber sweaters, the total cut would be 80% and Japan's share some 63%.

On manmade fiber knitted outerwear and other articles, except sweaters, total imports would decrease by about 67% and Japan's share about 62%.

On tutular rugs of manmade fibers, total imports would be 59% of 1967 imports, with Japan's share being about the same 59%.

On manmade fiber fish netting and fishing nets, total imports would be reduced by about 57%, with Japan's share about 55%.

* * * * * * *

These selected samplings indicate that the depth of cuts for so many textiles, especially in the manmade sector that least warrants any additional protection, are so exclusionary that many countries may be forced to cut back drastically also on their annual purchases of United States goods and services.

That textile exporting countries are most concerned about these textile quota bills is witnessed by the report that "more than 60 nations" have already registered official protests with the State Department on these and other import limitation legislation, according to nationally syndicated columnist Marquis Childs in *The Washington Post* for June 17, 1968.

* * * * * * *

That the enactment and enforcement of these textile import quota bills would result in the establishment of a huge bureaucracy should not be ignored. These bills would impose import quotas, which are quite different from the LTA limitations which are export controls in that exporting countries supervise and administer the many group and category limitations.

* * * * * * *

And, the imposition of import quotas will not assure that the domestic textile industry will continue to maintain their operations on products it may desire to eliminate for various management reasons. For instance, it has been called to our attention that on May 3, 1968, Congressman Samuel Stratton of New York had to intervene with Mohasco Industries to postpone for at least six months its decision to shut down all Wilton carpet weaving in Amsterdam that would eliminate 500 jobs by the end of the year in that community.

In this connection, Congressman Stratton had joined with other law-makers, including Senators, to persuade the President only last fall to reverse a Tariff Commission finding and continue high protective tariffs on Wilton carpets to "protect" American jobs. But, it was not permanent import protection from im-