

bilateral approach a great deal more and to get away certainly from the most-favored-nation principle.

Am I correct in saying that your industry does recommend that we change our trade policy approach and move to establishing quantitative methods of regulating international trade industry by industry.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Curtis, I think that textiles has perhaps had the longest record of international trade of any industry in existence today. It dates from the days of the Phoenicians.

When the United States adopted the reciprocal trade program in the thirties, a committee, I believe, which represented the executive branch and included Secretary Cordell Hull, recommended that action be taken to voluntarily restrain cotton textile imports from Japan.

I think that the record clearly indicates the existence not only in this country but in many countries of special programs relating to trade in textiles. This is so because of the unique vulnerability of the textile industry in developed nations to low-wage foreign imports. There is a special textile program in this country, although it has not been adequately implemented.

Now, by the same token, I believe that all industry deserves fair and equal consideration and we would hope that an emerging trade policy recommended by this committee would look out for all American jobs, not just textiles but include textiles.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, we are all interested in that. Again in response to that, I hope no one involved in this dialog, whatever position they take, is not interested in jobs. When you make statements—as you just did—saying that you hoped that we never would have an American boy in a uniform not made out of American cloth, to me those are red herrings and it makes it difficult for me to carry on a dialog at length.

I am just trying to figure out how you accomplish these results because if you are wrong in your approach you can be the very ones doing the damage to the boy in uniform. You can be the ones who really are cutting jobs out from under our people. So let's don't go off on tangents. Our motives are the same.

Mr. DENT. There is no question.

Mr. CURTIS. These issues are so difficult that we have to devote a great deal of our brainpower to try to come out with solutions without these kinds of irrelevant approaches.

So that, your point as I see it, and there is merit to it and it is worthy of consideration, is that textiles remain healthy. I would point out that older than the textile industry are agricultural products. I thought that one of the achievements of the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1962 and the Kennedy round was that for the first time we began to treat agricultural products with the same methods that we have developed in our society for regulating and trying to create a fairer climate for international trade.

Agriculture, my heavens, is really involved in the quantitative approach. Arguments of national defense for agriculture cannot be gainsaid by anyone because a country does have to have the ability to feed itself.

But I had thought that the Kennedy round procedure was a step forward. I would say agriculture has the best argument of any to be treated differently, but I would be willing to listen to textiles.