march to take place, and here we have American industries which are ready and willing and have shown an indication of their willingness to offer their services and jobs for these people, and I can't for the life of me understand why it is not being taken advantage of.

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much, that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions? Mr. Curtis, Mr. Landrum?

Mr. LANDRUM. I am perfectly willing to defer.

The CHAIRMAN. He says it is all right. He wants to take a little more time than he thinks you will take.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Dent, first with regard to the same subject that Mr. Burke was pursuing with Mr. Darman on retaliation, you treated this subject of retaliation and compensation in your statement, I thought, very well; but you didn't touch upon a question that is continually thrown at us about retaliation in regard to our agricultural exports.

I would like to pursue with you just a moment this question of whether or not in your judgment our agricultural exports would be seriously affected if we should enact legislation along the lines of H.R. 11578 or the Mills bill?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, we, of course, are interested in the strength and the future of American agriculture. It is as much a part of our interest as it is yours.

I think the record is clear that foreign nations who are purchasers of bulk agricultural commodities seek out those areas of the world where they can be purchased most advantageously.

Our own Nation is a very large purchaser of raw jute from India and Pakistan, but we do not tie our purchases in with the export of burlap bags to India and Pakistan.

We buy it for our own advantage. If we look at the record for the year ending March 1967, Japan purchased $95 million worth of raw cotton from Mexico. Mexico has very stringent import restrictions and, as a result, Japan exported to them $5 million worth of textile products.

We, on the other hand, do a sizable business with Japan. The Japanese purchased approximately $144 million worth of cotton from the United States in return for which we purchased $403 million worth of cotton products from them. The patterns of trade do not seem to be related and crossed with respect to these types of purchases, in our opinion.

Mr. LANDRUM. So, in your judgment, our agricultural exports would not be adversely affected by enactment of any concept of H.R. 11758?

Mr. DENT. That is correct. I think if you look at the record with respect to cotton in the 10 years 1956 through 1966, our imports of cotton textiles increased over 808,000 bales of cotton equivalent, while at the same time our exports of raw cotton declined 1,200,000 bales, so that this great advantage of exports to our farmers would soon choke them to death if permitted to continue.

Mr. LANDRUM. Now, Mr. Dent, in a very general and broad-based version of the bills that are proposed here, and I am one who introduced one of them, we have had the statements made that the impact of those bills would limit the growth of imports and we have been told of the effect that it would have on the American consumer and his choice.