

In 1966, for illustrating, the average hourly wage for all private industry was \$2.55; for mining, \$3.06; for contract construction, \$3.88; for all manufacturing, \$2.72, divided into durable goods, \$2.90 and non-durable goods, \$2.45.

Workers in textile mill products averaged only \$1.96 an hour, while workers in apparel and other textile products averaged even less—\$1.89.

In durable goods manufacturing, the average hourly wages ranged from \$3.33 for transportation equipment workers to \$2.21 for furniture and fixture workers. In nondurable goods manufacturing, the hourly wages in 1966 for ten industries ranged from \$3.41 for petroleum and coal products workers to \$1.94 for leather and leather product workers.

Within the average hourly wage of \$1.96 paid to textile mill products workers in 1966, those working in the several sectors were paid averages ranging from \$2.12 in cotton and manmade textile finishing mills to \$1.62 in certain hosiery mills.

Within the average hourly wage of \$1.89 paid to all apparel and related products workers, those employed in the various operations were paid averages ranging from \$2.45 in manufacturing women's and misses' suits and coats to \$1.54 in manufacturing men's work clothing.

Not only are the hourly wages for textile workers below those for all manufacturing, but so also are the numbers of hours worked per week for those employed in the apparel and related products lines. The average work week for all manufacturing in 1966 consisted of 41.3 hours, while for apparels and related products it was 36.4 hours, or about five fewer hours a week. For textile mill products, on the other hand, the average work week consisted of 41.9 hours, or 0.5 hours more per week than for all manufacturing industries.

At the same time, industry employment data suggest, despite the outcries of certain textile industry leaders, that total employment has not decreased since 1961. These employment figures, moreover, do not reflect the number of workers laid off or discharged because mills or plants moved from the North to the South to take advantage of the cheaper wages, less stringent working standards, less unionization, and other lower production costs in the new location. Neither do these charts account for the number of workers who lose out to automation, to increased efficiency of new machinery and equipment, to modernized and even computerized management, etc. And, how does one record the number of workers, probably more than that in any other category, who lost their jobs because of new substitutes for textiles, such as paper, plastics, glass, etc.? And, the new employment created by some imports that stimulate certain kinds of jobs?

TEXTILE INDUSTRY EMPLOYMENT

Year	Number employed (in thousands)	Average hourly earnings	Man-hours of work per year
1961.....	2,178.9	\$1.66	1,865
1962.....	2,242.7	1.71	1,895
1963.....	2,250.2	1.75	1,900
1964.....	2,281.9	1.81	1,938
1965.....	2,371.6	1.88	1,948
1966.....	2,450.1	1.95	1,949
1967.....	2,458.8	2.06	1,925

While employment in the textile industry increased only slightly in the past few years, the productivity per man was increasing at a dramatic pace, especially in the newest manmade fiber textile sector.

The *Monthly Labor Review* for February 1968 stresses that, "Some rough indication of overall improvement in recent years, however, is suggested by the sharp rise in output between 1960 and 1965. Various measures of textile output indicate that it (productivity-output per manhour) rose from 30-35 percent during this period. Estimated all employee manhours rose by only four percent. These changes for the textile industry as a whole reflect substantial variation among the individual sectors of the industry. . .

"Cotton and manmade fiber broadwoven production, for example, was 25 percent greater in 1965 than in 1948, but there were 22 percent fewer looms in place and two percent fewer loom hours worked in 1965. Engineering studies of future technology suggest a continuation in the reduction of equipment per unit."