

away American jobs just to keep Japan or any other nation from retaliating against us. I don't enjoy sitting here listening to you say that we are putting a gun to Japan's head and turn right around in the next statement and say Japan is going to put a gun to our head if we don't let Japan have it.

That is about the extent of your statement as I see it.

Mr. MASAOKA. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry if I misstated it. I thought I made clear that the statement concerning retaliation was suggested by Mr. Freeman last week in his testimony to this committee.

Now, as far as the suggestion made about the Japanese coming to this market, we think that it should be definitely a two-way street. We urge this.

Mr. LANDRUM. But in establishing a two-way street, Mr. Masaoka, let us keep in mind that the present concern of this Congress is true reciprocity—a real two-way street.

What we are concerned about, what this Congress is concerned about, is not preventing the nation of Japan or any other nation from coming in for their fair share of our market. What we are concerned about is when have we reached this ratio between production and consumption that it becomes unacceptable and then a threat to our own employment in this country.

We would, I think, appreciate Japan's own concern about our invasion of any market that she has. Of course, of the products you mentioned that we are fortunate to sell to your nation, the great majority of them are unavailable to Japan in Japan's own natural resources or in her own economy.

I quite understand that and I recognize that the degree of efficiency that the Japanese nation has reached in the production of textiles is just about as high as any nation has ever reached. We don't complain about that, but what we are concerned about is that we don't feel that this industry in this Nation that furnishes employment to more than a million people is entirely expendable just to keep Japan satisfied.

Mr. MASAOKA. I just want to clarify this. As far as the textiles are concerned, Congressman Landrum, we think that the overall impact of imports is not bad. The Tariff Commission has examined this. It came to the same conclusion. We are saying that if there are particular imports that do have an impact there are ways to take care of that, but why put a protective cover over the entire industry when it doesn't need it. How does one account for the fact that the industry is doing so well if imports overall have this tremendous impact.

I could site statistics if you wish, Mr. Chairman, into the record, but I don't think it is necessary because they are already in my printed brief, but if you will go through the record for the past 10 years you will find the profit margin has increased, the production overall has increased, the dividends have increased, almost every economic factor that we can think of has increased, Mr. Chairman.

Under these circumstances we feel that the selective import approach is a proper approach, particularly since by allowing Japan to ship to this country it would allow her to generate the money with which to buy these goods.

It is as simple to us as this. We are not threatening anybody. When I say "we" I mean in the context of this particular country. It just