

Mr. CURTIS. Well, you see, this gets to a problem that has come up in previous colloquy. Other witnesses have said Congress ought to get into the act more and I point out that, whatever Congress does by writing laws and putting in guidelines, when the chips are down people have to administer the laws. That is, the executive branch of the Government administers them. I am wondering whether we should simply write more laws when the laws that we presently have are not administered the way I myself have thought they were supposed to be administered.

But on the other hand, it is perfectly proper to discuss whether we can improve the laws themselves hoping that future administrators will administer them properly.

But from what you have just said, I must conclude that the long-term cotton textile agreement has not produced the results that you want, that really your argument is that things would have been worse but for it, but they are still bad with it. Is this a fair statement?

Mr. DENT. The long-term cotton textile arrangement deals with only one segment of our industry which today is multifiber.

Mr. CURTIS. You are talking about other things. I want to first know whether I am making a fair statement. This is what I said, again simplifying the main thrust of what you are after now is to make the long-term cotton textile agreement more comprehensive to include wool and manmade fibers.

Is this a fair statement? Is that what you are really saying you want to do?

Mr. DENT. No, sir. This legislation which we are endorsing gives the President negotiating authority to come to agreements covering manmade fibers and wool textiles. It recognizes our obligations under the existing cotton long-term textile arrangement for its duration but it substitutes the will and direction of Congress for administratively negotiated long-term cotton textile arrangement.

Mr. CURTIS. Then you are not extending the agreement manmade fibers?

Mr. DENT. Yes, sir, we definitely are in the legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to let you fully explain. I am simply trying to explore this issue and get it on the record. Just because I say it, don't resist the statement if it is true. I think extension of the agreement is one of the things you are trying to do.

I am not for or against. I am trying to find out what you really want. I also want to find out the machinery that you would change in your proposals.

Again I resort to requesting a memorandum, if that is the better way to proceed. If you care to I would like a response as to just where you think the present machinery in the long-term cotton textile agreement is ineffective, where the law—and you have already brought that out—needs to be changed to be more comprehensive. You think that if we include manmade fibers and wool and possibly change the machinery somewhat that then your industry will be able to move more smoothly. Am I correct? (See letter dated July 9, 1968, on p. 2388.)

Mr. DENT. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. One other thing. Is it your concept that this would be permanent legislation, that we would permanently handle the textile