

Mr. BURKE. You mean the semiprocessed material?

Mr. TRAVIS. That is correct. It would not reduce the rate on the finished article. I see nothing wrong with the current rate on the finished article. Given a fair situation I will compete with any foreign manufacturer. I have certain design patents that I market, and I in fact am now getting my design ideas patented in Europe, and I even plan to compete with them on the European market due to some design ideas I have. But first of all I, as well as other manufacturers, need an equitable an even basis, and frankly I think the rate on the finished article should definitely be higher than that on the material from which it is made.

For instance, natural wood shuttles are also, that is, the finished shuttle, is also dutiable at 12½ percent currently under item 670.74 whereas the material, the natural wood shuttle block, is duty free.

There is a 12½-percent difference there. Congressman Ashmore is only suggesting about a 5-percent difference.

Mr. BURKE. In other words, you feel that the high rate on the semiprocessed material in comparison to the scale finished work is unfair to you?

Mr. TRAVIS. Most definitely.

Mr. BURKE. You feel that the finished product should be higher?

Mr. TRAVIS. Yes, sir, because it is a completely finished product. Currently these products are being manufactured by European manufacturers 100 percent in Europe and these manufacturers have selling offices here in this country and they are importing the finished article at a lesser duty cost, not only rate, but cost, because my semiprocessed material is so far processed that it is almost as expensive as the finished article.

But they are being given a definite cost advantage over American manufacturers. We have some advantages over them as I mentioned, design ideas, and in some ways we are ahead of them but as far as material is concerned, quite frankly, they are ahead of us. They developed this product back during the war, the Germans did, when they could not obtain American hardwoods. They developed a means of compressing their indigenous woods and came up with a product far better than we have ever had on the market.

I have sought domestic manufacturers of similar material. My firm was chosen by the Atomic Energy Commission to evaluate the wood plastic material. You may be familiar with this product. They work with Lockheed Corp. in Marietta, Ga., developing primarily as a research project applications for this wood-plastic material which our Government holds a patent on. Its a Government patent, I understand.

Mine was one of two firms chosen to evaluate this material and quite frankly it is a good material, but for our purposes it is quite impractical in that the European woods last about three times as long as this more expensive wood plastic that I have tested thoroughly for the Atomic Energy Commission. They paid me for my cost of participating, et cetera.

Mr. BURKE. Are there any further questions?

Thank you very much, Mr. Travis.

Mr. TRAVIS. Thank you.