

it and that there has been so much leakage under it is because there are six agencies of Government involved in its administration. They have to get together.

They have to agree. This involves both the State Department and the trade negotiator's office. They are very often at variance with the positions taken by the Departments of Commerce, Labor, Treasury, or Agriculture, for example.

So we always get back in these administrative procedures to the complications of trying to get our complex Government together in order to take an action, and it is one of the reasons that we and other industries feel that our only recourse is to come to the Congress and to ask for much more specific guidelines for these executive agencies.

Mr. CURTIS. I appreciate that answer. That is very responsive. You actually point out what I have been seeking, which is some advice from industry and those who have actually had to go through these OEP proceedings as to how we can improve them.

I wish I had more knowledge and wisdom on this point as to how we can improve OEP procedures because apparently they are not working.

Again though, we get back to the key question and I don't know what the answer is. You can pass laws until you are blue in the face but, if people don't want to administer them and carry them out, what do you then do?

It isn't just in this trade area. I have seen laws on the books that just remain ignored. Maybe it gets back to the concept that people in high office have, seeming to prefer government by men as opposed to government by law.

I won't dwell on this further.

I do have one little comment. On page 14 you say, "The textile industry is presently supplying an average of 200 yards of cloth for every man and woman in uniform."

In a modest way I think you did get Congress to do something on textiles because there is an appropriation bill now where the law says that the military can't buy textiles from anyone but American producers. Am I correct in that? This would be every bit of cloth that is bought by our Armed Forces.

Am I making a fair statement here?

Mr. DENT. Yes, sir; and I hope the day will never come when we will clothe American fighting men in imported uniforms.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, that is interesting. I think I have made my point. There are ways that assistance to the industry can be done.

Now, I come to what I think is really the key question. We have had other industries before us. I assume that if you think this quota approach is the correct way to proceed for textiles that this is the proper way for others to proceed too, steel, for example, nonferrous metals and just about anyone you can think of.

Is it your recommendation that the United States change its approach on international trade from a multilateral approach—including agriculture which I was very pleased to see got in the Kennedy round—and go back to this business of an industry by industry approach to trade? Do you want to get away from the multilateral trading of nations? Your approach would seem to move us back into the