equivalent of the imports of manmade fiber in manufactured form.

Just within the past 4 years our imports of these manmade fiber products have had a net increase, in 4 years, a net increase of nearly half a million cotton bale equivalents.

The long-term arrangement for international trade in cotton textiles provides a certain amount of restraint upon cotton textile import, but experience has proven that this device is very, very inadequate.

Actually the biggest increases have come since this arrangement was adopted. The trend of these imports as shown on a moving average that I have inserted there in exhibit A has risen 55 percent in the last 4 years with the long-term arrangement in force throughout. Now, the reasons why this system permits such increases may be arguable, but the fact that it actually does so is not arguable. It is just a fact. It is documented in exhibit A.

Now, the terms of each quota arrangement as well as the decision whether there shall be a quota or not in each case are essentially matters for individual negotiation. While the negotiators are governed by a stipulated minimum increase, a minimum increase of 5 percent each year for each country in which the quota applies, they work under no stipulated maximum whatever, and then the manmade fiber imports are just outside of the long-term arrangement. They come under no quota restraints whatever.

Against this background of experience, gentlemen, the national cotton council recognizes the very urgent need for new legislation which will place all these textile imports under a reasonable degree of restraint. The cotton council favors the principle that the increases in such imports should be limited to a reasonable and clearly defined share of any growth which actually does occur in the domestic market for textile products so that our own raw cotton people will be able to plan and work and invest for future production with some confidence that their efforts will not be undermined by unfair import competition and that they themselves will participate equitably in any future expansion of their domestic market.

Now, then, a word finally on the relationship of all this to our export market for raw cotton. It is sometimes said that the cotton which we import in textile form is actually our own cotton which has been exported in raw form and made into textiles abroad and reshipped to us. Now, this is just largely untrue today.

The 10 countries which sent us the largest amount of textiles last year get less than 14 percent of their cotton from the United States. The most striking of all our increases in cotton textile imports during recent years have come from countries which grow their own cotton. Our biggest imports of cotton textiles have come from the countries which grow the raw material right within their own boundaries.

This fact is set out graphically in exhibit D which I have submitted. It is also argued, and you have been reminded of it right recently, that if we place greater restraints on textile imports, the exporting countries will retaliate by refusing to buy our cotton.

Such arguments would hardly seem to come from people who realize that over the past 15 years we have allowed cotton textile imports to rise tenfold to a million bales or more. These arguments sound as if we want to cut back all these imports rather than placing them under a