

facturers Association at its annual meeting is having a panel discussion of the question of operating offshore.

In other words, they are considering whether they should manufacture apparel offshore for the U.S. market, and if many of their members decide affirmatively, then the American textile manufacturers will be forced to decide whether they are going to supply these customers with foreign production because there certainly would be no reasonable chance that they would pay for American goods to be exported to the Orient to be manufactured into apparel and subsequently exported to the United States.

Mr. LANDRUM. It occurs to me, then, that in the face of these known facts about the impact of the textile imports on American jobs, and those in the departments of our Government that have the job of administering these trade agreements, tariff limitations, and so forth, continue to look upon the increased efficiency, ability of the textile industry, up to the present at least, to meet this unfair competition, and say that we can just continue to go on and on and on absorbing these, and that nothing can ever stop, there comes to my mind—I have forgotten its source—what is known as the Prometheus myth and I am afraid some of us, particularly those who administer the import laws, are looking at the efficiency of this industry and its ability up to this point to meet this unfair competition in somewhat the same light that this myth expresses: “we are eating our own livers and congratulating ourselves on a good meal.”

Would that be a good description of it?

Mr. DENT. I think that is quite accurate.

Mr. LANDRUM. I want to thank you and the gentlemen associated with you for your most detailed and complete statements. Moreover, I thank my friend from Missouri for deferring to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I would like to get your testimony in a little better context.

Is your association supporting the administration bill? I know that there is one aspect of it that you recommend against on page 16.

You “do not think the textile tariff-cutting authority of more than 5 percent should be granted in the pending legislation.”

Has your association taken a position on the overall administration bill? Do you support it or oppose it or what?

Mr. DENT. No official position has been taken on the trade bill as submitted by the administration but within the recommendations we see a continuation of the trade which we are protesting.

Mr. CURTIS. I appreciate that you are essentially testifying on behalf of the Mills bill; but the subject before the committee, as you know, is a broad one and certainly we are anxious, or at least I am anxious, to receive testimony on the administration proposals from the various associations and industries and labor unions who are testifying.

The administration proposals are not necessarily in conflict with the Mills bill; although you pointed out, from what I understand, that you felt that the trend of the administration bill was perhaps against the theories of the Mills bill. Am I correct in that interpretation?