give to the President and the administration the authority and tools with which to carry out the textile program which the administration adopted in 1961, and which has been reaffirmed many times since. That program, in its simplest terms, was for the purposes of controlling imports of all textiles by quantitative limitations on a country and category basis. Because the program was implemented in part, and because we understood that it would be carried out in full, many of us supported the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Subsequent efforts by the administration to secure international agreements controlling imports of wool textiles encouraged us. We were also mindful of President Kennedy's statement that "should further authority be necessary to enable the President to carry out these objectives, I shall request such authorization from the Congress."

Now, however, we find that our tariffs have been significantly cut in the Kennedy round; that the administration takes no action and utters no word to carry out the program, and, finally, we are castigated for supporting the program itself.

We can hardly be expected to view the act's extension with anything less than anger and resentment.

The dismal story of the effect of imports on the textile industry has been investigated, studied, and reexamined for the past decade, and I shall not start another recitation. In the interests of brevity, I should like to stress only a few points:

1. The real issue before this committee is whether or not the U.S. textile industry is expendable. Obviously, our costs of production are higher and will remain higher than foreign producers whose wages are a fraction of ours. No amount of theorizing will change this. In a free market, the low-wage producer and the sweatshop will drive the decent employer out of business. Our proposal—the Mills bill, which we heartily endorse—will prevent this while at the same time permitting a large and growing volume of imports of textiles to continue. Unless the principles of the Mills bill are included in the administration bill, it offers us liquidation in return for adjustment assistance—burial expenses instead of vitality, doom instead of hope.

2. In making your decision, I respectfully suggest that the size and distribution of the fiber-textile-apparel complex and its 4 million jobs is of major significance to the national economy, as well as the regions where the industry is concentrated.

In New England and the middle Atlantic area alone, 880,000 people work in over 23,000 textile and apparel plants. New York employs 347,000, more than any other State. Pennsylvania ranks third with 248,000, and in New England, one out if every eight workers is employed in the textile-apparel industry.

3. Lastly, I urge that you reject a policy which would destroy jobs at a time when the creation of productive employment is essential in the war against poverty. Hard-core unemployment exists in many places such as Lowell and New Bedford in Massachusetts; Manchester, N.H.; and Lewiston, Maine. In each of these communities there are at least 2,000 hard-core unemployed, and concentrated employment programs exist for the purpose of putting these people to work. In these communities, textiles and apparel provide substantial job opportunities.