In any event, this is a sample of what was found. In the saw-mills, less than 5 percent of production worker layoffs were due to imports, and over 95 percent ascribed to productivity gains and working hour changes. Approximately the same was true in cotton broad fabrics.

Among bakery producers, imports were even less of a factor—about 1 percent. They were only a 3 percent factor in job displacement in the electron tube industry.

Footwear, of the nine sectors, was where imports had the biggest impact. ECAT's analysts report that while rising productivity brought about 75 percent of the industry's layoffs, imports contributed 25 percent, or one out of every four jobs lost.

Changes in the hours worked had only minor effect, ECAT notes.

ONE STEP FURTHER

The international business group went one step further, updating employment data in the nine industries through 1966. It reveals that jobs in six of the nine increased since 1964, the comparison year TRC used. The most marked expansion was in electron tubes with good gains in footwear and hosiery. The three industries showing further jobs declines were sawmills, hats and caps, and cotton broad fabrics.

But frankly, both studies leave us wondering. What about factors like market growth and competition from other domestic products? Don't they also influence the job equation?

This January, President Johnson asked for a few hundred thousaind dollars to make a comprehensive study on the effect of foreign trade (both imports and exports) on U.S. employment. It seems unlikely, however, he will get the funds. The House has slashed the special trade representative's budget too deeply.

It's a shame. Obviously, this study is sorely needed to provide the best answers possible to this perhaps most important of foreign trade policy issues, especially at a time when U.S. policy is being put under the microscope.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mundt. Mr. Mundt, if you will identify yourself for our record we will be glad to recognize you, sir.

STATEMENT OF JOHN C. MUNDT, VICE CHAIRMAN, CEMENT INDUSTRY ANTIDUMPING COMMITTEE, ACCOMPANIED BY DONALD HISS, COUNSEL

Mr. MUNDT. My name is John C. Mundt. I am vice chairman of the Cement Industry Antidumping Committee and senior vice president, marketing and public affairs, for the Lone Star Cement Corp.

I should like to introduce Mr. Donald Hiss, a partner of Covington & Burling, counsel to our committee, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We appreciate having both of you with us this morning and if you have to omit any parts of your statement, Mr. Mundt, in cooperating with our schedule, do so with the knowledge that all of the statement will appear in the record.

Mr. MUNDT. We intend to proceed in that way, Mr. Chairman. There will not be time to read a 30-page statement and we will discuss the pertinent portions of the statement with you.

Our committee represents 90 percent of the rated cement capacity in the United States. It consists of 34 companies producing portland cement in this country. We have had some very bad experience, Mr. Chairman, in the past with dumped cement from other countries. In the period from 1958 to 1965 members of our industry were compelled to file 19 complaints under the Antidumping Act of 1921.

The Treasury found reason to suspect dumping in 14 of these cases and in four of them antidumping duties were actually imposed on cement from Sweden, Belgium, Portugal, and the Dominican Repub-