

areas of the world. In textiles and apparel, product competition is labor competition.

In the face of such extreme differences of conditions, we submit that it is irrelevant and worse to discourse on the philosophical merits of the principles of free trade. The President's special trade representative, Ambassador William M. Roth has chosen to ignore the dangers confronting industries like ours by condemning our requests for relief as "protectionism" and as "turning back the clock."

Such diatribes contribute nothing to a solution of the problem but a false notion of the true alternatives.

As for turning back the clock it must be observed that Mr. Roth still insists upon carrying on at this late date a quarrel he had apparently had with the late Senator Smoot, Congressman Hawley, and indeed the late President William McKinley. Times change, conditions change. But the doctrinaire never changes, never changes, and never notices changed conditions around him.

The old debate over the philosophy of free trade is stale and passé. Yet Mr. Roth, I respectfully suggest, is quixotically still tilting at old windmills and, worse, at windmills that are no longer there.

Most of us today advocate trade liberalization. But we want fair trade, as Congressman Curtis himself acknowledged. What we in the textile industry are seeking, therefore, is an accommodation, an accommodation of a generally accepted policy to the distinguishing facts and circumstances of a special case.

To proceed in a manner which is unyielding, in a manner which refuses all accommodation and which, therefore, must entail serious hardship and inequity for many, will ultimately cast disrepute upon the cause of trade liberalization itself and will render it politically and economically unsupportable. That which will not bend will break.

In a very real sense, therefore, it is we who seek reasonable accommodation of policy for the orderly growth of imports, it is we who will in the end prove to be better preservers of trade liberalization than the rigid and doctrinaire economic theologians who refuse to recognize special and differentiating circumstances.

Mr. Roth has always referred to quotas as if they necessarily will destroy all present imports of textiles and apparel. In truth, nothing of the sort would be involved in a system of reasonable limitations. Indeed orderly growth would rather be assured.

He has fostered the impression that any such system of limitations would be destructive of trade liberalization and that under GATT exporting nations would apply retaliation. But it must be clear that retaliation by another government could only aid, even if it were resorted to, one of its industries other than textiles and that the foreign textile industries affected, which export to our market, could not gain by retaliation but would find it more clearly in their interest to come to terms with the United States and enjoy a limited rate of expansion here instead of countering with retaliatory measures that at best can only help some other foreign industry, not textiles.

It is most unlikely that the powerful textile industries abroad would themselves favor retaliation. They would prefer negotiation and they have indeed negotiated with other nations which have arranged for quantitative limitations.