

industry through the quantitative approach, or is this to be a temporary measure until something else transpires.

Mr. DENT. I think that the question there relates to how soon the developing countries will move forward in raising their standards of living to where their people live as our people do.

Mr. CURTIS. I think this is very responsive. Let me go to another area then and I might say I join with my colleague Mr. Landrum in complimenting you for your presentation and analysis of the various techniques employed by nations abroad which, in my judgment if proven, constitute what I call unfair trade.

I assume though from your answer that just eliminating these unfair trade practices would not put the domestic textile industry in a position where it would not need the quantitative restrictions.

In other words, it still would be essentially the labor cost item that bothers you. Am I right in that assumption?

Mr. DENT. Yes, sir: you are.

Mr. CURTIS. How much do you think getting rid of these unfair trade practices would be of assistance? Would that be of assistance? Is this the direction in which you would like to see your Government move, toward eliminating as many of these unfair trade barriers as we can?

Mr. DENT. I think that without question movement in that direction would be most desirable but by the same token from a realistic standpoint our industry could not wait until the millennium has been achieved in this area.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not asking that. I said that this was in light of whether the quantitative restriction quota was to be temporary or permanent. Then I was relating it to whether or not the elimination of these unfair trade practices would put us in a position where we could get rid of quantitative controls.

That was the thrust of my remarks.

Mr. DARMAN. Mr. Curtis, might I make two comments on those observations.

First, with regard to permanent legislation my impression from reading history is that no legislation is really permanent in that, if conditions change, the Congress has the right to change the legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. May I interrupt to say, "and none is temporary."

Mr. DARMAN. But, sir, I would certainly urge for your consideration the fact that we are involved here, in what to many people is, a sensitive international area. Let's face the issue once, not have to face it with threats of retaliation every 2, 3, 4 or 5 years.

Let's be in a position where, when the millenium comes, the Congress can repeal the legislation and gracefully say to the world, "We are doing something for you," and hopefully get something in exchange.

But let's not put this into a form where we have to go through this every 2 or 3 years with all the cries that are engendered, not so much from abroad but in large measure from those at home who don't see eye to eye with the need for facing the world situation realistically.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, of course, I agree with one part of what you say very much. I am afraid—and Mr. Byrnes well expressed it—that we