Not only is that not the case, but it should be pointed out that our so-called trading partners in Europe have had recourse to various types of limitations and quotas on their imports of textiles and apparel. All of this has apparently been ignored. Indeed, public information on these limitations has been difficult to obtain. We deem it essential to your study that your Committee should obtain from the State Department the fullest information with respect to quota arrangemens on textiles and apparel now in force in European countries and in Japan; and, further, how such restraining measures have not in some of these countries prevented some increase in imports consistent with orderly marketing and the survival of domestic industries. The Canadian Government whose policy has been no less committed to liberal trade, has nevertheless instituted quota arrangements with Japan and even with the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong. ments on textiles and apparel now in force in European countries and in Japan; Great Britain has done the same. West Germany has such arrangements with at least Hong Kong, but the details have never been made public and we have never been able to obtain them. Similar limitations apply in France. They have been instituted, we have been advised, in some of the Scandinavian countries. And all these are not limited to cotton but apply to other fibers as well. And only within the last few months Australia has granted relief by similar measures to its knitted outerwear industry on the basis, mark you, not that the domestic industry had not yet been injured, but that it ought not to be placed in jeopardy and exposed to future injury that will follow from a continuation of present trends. How much more serious is our case. We urge that this study by your Committee include a complete examination of these arrangements.

Too much of the public debate has been carried on in terms of abstract principles. It is only by examining the distinguishing realities in the difficulties of the apparel and textile industry that a solution appropriate to this special case can be found. The old dialectic between free trade and abstract protectionism is dead. The arguments are stale. The realities are far more complicated and more severe than can be treated through vague generalities. The facts which the industry is placing before you cannot but demonstrate the basis for a program of reasonable limitations of imports such as has been adopted by other GATT nations and such as will permit the survival and growth of our own

textile and apparel industry.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Explanatory Note on Method of Developing Ratios Between Domestic Production and Imports of Knitted Outerwear in Pounds.—Because classifications of imports do not correspond with classifications of knitted outerwear reported in surveys of domestic production, it is not possible to make complete comparison in units. It is necessary to make the comparison on a poundage basis.

in units. It is necessary to make the comparison on a poundage basis.

Domestic production, however, is not specifically reported in pounds, and poundage must, therefore, be derived from other data. The sources used are two:

(1) Data published by the National Cotton Council of America in its annual survey, entitled "Cotton Counts Its Customers," covering all classifications of knitted garments constituting "knitted outerwear" and thus comparable to the total of import categories included in this general term. Such data provide, first, the total fiber weight of materials used for producing each classification of end product, and; second, the portion thereof consisting of cotton. They do not show what portion was wool or what portion man-made fiber. To obtain figures on the weight of wool knit outerwear a second source was used.

(2) Data on wool yarns consumed in the manufacture of knitted outerwear, as derived from the "Apparel Survey, Series M23A" of the Bureau of Census of the United States Department of Commerce. This report shows the total consumption of yarn in the production of knitted underwear, nightwear and knitted outerwear (but not broken down). These figures were supplemented by a further re-

port, Series M22K, "Knit Cloth for Sale."

In the first of these two Bureau of Census reports, the figures showing wool yarn consumed for underwear, nightwear and knit outerwear are assumed to be nearly entirely absorbed in knitted outerwear (except for a small percentage). But since these figures reflect consumption of yarns only in integrated knitted outerwear mills, it is supplemented by data in the survey of Knit Cloth for Sale, showing the quantity of wool cloth sold to cutters for fabrication into garments—