Both these factors have operated with special force in knitted outerwear. In consequence, the rise in imports of knitted outerwear has been swift and continuous. While domestic production and shipments rose and fell with good and bad years, total imports of knitted outerwear in every year throughout this period were higher than in the previous year.

In 1956 the total of such imports in all fibers amounted to less than 3 million pounds. We estimate that it then represented less than 2 percent of our market on a poundage basis. But in 1967 this total rose to 64 million pounds; and though figures on domestic production for last year are not yet available, we estimate that imports represented close to 18 percent of our total apparent consumption of knitted outerwear in all fibers.

But this overall comparison between imports and domestic consumption represents a mere statistical generalization. It offers only an average for a broad variety of products. Not in all sectors of the market has the influx been held to 18 percent of consumption. In some areas the penetration has been considerably deeper.

Imports of cotton knitted outwear have been held to approximately 10 percent of the domestic consumption, thanks in part to the Geneva long-term cotton arrangement.

In wool knitted outerwear, where no controls exist, the ratio of imports to consumption in 1965, 1966, and 1967 has hovered between 30 and 32.8 percent. In manmade fibers the ratio in 1967 slightly exceeds 20 percent, but the rate of increase has been so precipitous that at its present pace the extent of market penetration is likely in a short time to exceed even that for wool.

But even within these fiber groupings, some product classifications have been affected more severely than even these averages by fibers indicate.

In the case of women's sweaters of wool, imports in 1965 came close to 50 percent of our total consumption—that is, one such sweater imported for nearly every sweater manufactured in the United States.

Now, Mr. Masaoka has made much of the contention that the textile import problem is a selective problem and does not yet affect all classes, he claims, of such goods.

Now, let me make it clear that if the same effects have not yet been apparent in other classifications of knitwear, it is not because foreign producers lack the capacity to enter those other areas of our market. They clearly possess the same advantage of labor cost in knitwear of all types and fibers and in other types of textiles. But they cannot as yet invade on all fronts at the same time. Given time for further expansion, they can surely capture other sectors of our market with the same detrimental effects upon domestic production as in the case of women's sweaters.

They are building bigger plants and will make new inroads. The initiative is theirs. We are exposed and vulnerable in all sectors.

Mr. Masaoka, in stressing selective treatment of imports, asked the avoidance of quotas across the board. It should be pointed out that any exporting nation under H.R. 11578 can avoid quotas across the board by simply negotiating and even under the long-term cotton arrangement made at Geneva, although all cotton goods are covered by the agreement, quantitative limitations have been only selectively