

imports can readily secure other jobs or be retrained for other employment. In the case of garment workers, it is most doubtful that such alternative employment opportunities do in fact exist or can be readily developed.

The issue is not that of choosing between free trade and protection. In the case of the apparel industry the problem is one of weighing the full consequence for the nation as a whole of permitting the erosion of an indigenous industry which provides a large number of jobs to persons for whom few alternative job opportunities exist. The issue cannot be defined in terms of the international division of economic activity based on comparative efficiencies and technological capabilities, product quality or distinctiveness, peculiar nature of raw material going into the manufacture of apparel or the need for price discipline as a countervailing force needed when competition lags in the domestic market. None of these points apply to the domestic apparel (knit and woven) industry as has been demonstrated in the preceding pages. The only advantage that foreign producers have over those in this country is the payment of extremely low wages and the maintenance of sweatshop conditions banned from this nation as a matter of public and private action. It would indeed be an irony if, after eliminating such conditions at home and still enabling the domestic apparel industry and its employment to expand, the United States would now consciously permit it to be eroded by sweatshops abroad. It is precisely because