purchases imported garments this represents a loss of business to the local manufacturer of the garments, of the fabrics contained therein, and of the fibers which go to make it up.

If the textile mill industry imports fabrics this represents a loss to the local textile mill industry and to the manmade fiber people and if they import fibers it is a loss to the fiber producer.

So that we are involved in the incursions of the imports in all the segments of this industry.

The second point we wish to make is their situation, which they feel is acute and with which we would agree, has been occasioned in considerable part by the fact that our European trade partners have responded to these conditions in a very effective manner, and we have made a part of our statement a paper prepared by the Office of the Special Representative in which he outlines the restrictions applied by 12 foreign countries in 1967 and it speaks for itself.

The Europeans have effectively limited the incursion of the lower cost, largely Far Eastern countries into their markets where our markets remain open.

The third point that I would like to make is to reiterate a point which was made by a group of the House in March in which they discussed the problems besetting the textile industry and they in their reference to Appalachia made clear that there is an economically underdeveloped nation within the United States and that in these areas the textile industry is suppling one out of three manufacturing jobs.

I think I should also like to point out that in the manmade fiber industry 50 percent of the employment is located in these counties of Appalachia. The United States is the world's largest textile market and yet it is unprotected except for the long-term cotton agreement controls that provide for the orderly development of cotton textile and apparel trade.

With full recognition of the dangers and problems arising from the use of quotas, we submit that we have no choice but to embrace them so long as they are employed by our foreign competitiors in such a very effective manner.

Now I would like to turn to the chemical section of the considerations which we have before us and talk very briefly as to perhaps why there is this marked difference of viewpoint. The Government witnesses are saying that the Kennedy round and the supplemental agreement represent a tremendous opportunity for export expansion.

We say that this is not true. You have heard that this morning. And in the case of the Du Pont Co. we have analyzed with great care all of our export business in an effort to determine whether we do have such export opportunities.

Briefly, to take you through one critical case of our Common Market exports, we exported roughly $68 million worth of goods in 1967. We find that only about $2 million of theses are susceptible to export expansion if the supplemental package is approved.

The reasons are briefly these: In the case of $37 million of them, 56 percent of our sales, they are primarily manmade fibers and polychoroprene synthetic rubber and the duties are outside the agreement and will be unaffected by it.