

In 1964, President Johnson, when visiting New England, pledged in Providence and in Portland to carry out this program. It is critical that this be done because wool textile imports have continued to rise and manmade fiber textile imports have jumped from \$60 million in 1960 to close to over \$300 million currently. Wool and manmade fiber textiles are of vital interest to the workers and to the welfare of the cities and towns in my district. I'm fully conscious that this also a problem for many other districts and States. It is a national problem when one realizes that 2 million jobs in the United States in textile and apparel are at stake.

The bill which I have introduced would enable the President to carry out the pledges which he has made to the Nation. It gives him the authority and direction to make international agreements covering wool and manmade fiber textiles as well as cotton. It provides guidelines for these negotiations which would permit him to, first, select the highest level of imports in recent years and, second, to assure to exporting countries their proportionate share of the U.S. market. This means that if our markets grow, imports will grow. When one considers that imports of these products last year exceeded a billion dollars in foreign value, one realizes that this is indeed generous.

If, however, these foreign governments who themselves participate in many restrictive import practices, international agreements, and other devices to protect their own markets, refuse to make reasonable, sensible, and liberal agreements with us, then my bill would restrain imports to the average level which prevailed during the years 1961-66. The committee may feel that a somewhat different historical period such as 1962 through 1967 is more appropriate. I realize that such a historical period would involve some decrease in the level of imports. This should provide an incentive to these governments and the foreign exporters to work out with us a mutually satisfactory arrangement based on the higher level of more recent years. This is eminently reasonable and is the least that we can do to be fair to textile and apparel workers in my district and throughout the country. I might note that, even if foreign governments were unwilling to make such agreements, they are still assured their historical share of our market which again means that if our market grows, their exports to this country will also grow.

I feel strongly that a viable international trade policy must meet these realities—jobs for those currently employed and jobs for those disadvantaged groups which exist not only in city ghettos but in other communities as well. In Manchester, the largest city in my State, we are about to begin a concentrated employment program at the cost of many hundreds of thousands of dollars to train the hardcore unemployed for jobs. It makes no sense to me nor to the voters in my district to make these expenditures of time, effort, and money while at the same time we pursue a foreign policy which destroys the jobs which the unemployed can perform and can secure.

Twenty years ago I served as the first counsel to the first Joint House-Senate watchdog committee set up to monitor the European recovery program. The name of this committee was the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation and its staff kept a close watch on billions of dollars then being spent in the process of rebuilding European nations ravaged by war.