The footwear industry has been seeking recognition and relief on this problem since 1959, when it presented an extensive exhibit of imported footwear to Senators and Congressmen from important footwear-producing States, and to representatives of various Government agencies.

In fairness to the officials involved, it should be pointed out that when the footwear industry showed the need for better marking of imported footwear which were mismarked in order to avoid proper tariff duties, some action was taken to correct this problem. There is more to be done in this direction, and I urge customs officials to give this matter their attention.

In 1961, the footwear industry again invited Senators and Congressmen to visit an exhibit of imported footwear and to appraise its impact on the domestic industry. Well over 100 Senators and Congressmen took advantage of this opportunity.

Following this meeting, I introduced Senate bill 1735, the Orderly Marketing Act of 1961. I have again introduced this bill as S. 1446. This was not, and is not, a protectionist bill. It was not a bill to roll back imports or raise tariffs or provide any other unrealistic treatment of imports under existing world conditions today.

It recognizes the administration's desire to increase and promote international trade. It is based on a live-and-let-live philosophy. It follows general practices which have prevailed in certain other countries and, in fact, is much fairer than certain of these practices.

It calls for the establishment of voluntary quotas which would guarantee to all nations the share of the U.S. market which they had earned over a recent period.

Furthermore, they could continue to share in the normal growth of the U.S. market.

There was no action on this bill in 1961, and there has been no action taken on S. 1446, this year's bill. Congressman Burke and other Members of the House recognized this serious problem years ago.

The situation in footwear and other commodities calls for a thorough review by this Congress.

At the various hearings on trade policy or international monetary problems, we are inundated with views which go back to the views of Adam Smith that "the prudent man will never make at home what it will cost him more to make than to buy" and to John Stuart Mill that "the benefit of international trade is a more efficient employment of the production forces of the world."

We can admit that the gains from international trade are important and that trade should be encouraged while at the same time, admitting that the realities of trade in today's world—what Oscar Gass, the noted economist, called a world of quotas and buying discrimination—may call for some modification of the 18th- and 19-century thinking.

No one with any understanding of international relations today would argue for a major curtailment in innternational trade, or even high traiffs, or rolling imports back to some former base. But the time has come when we must consider the impact of imports on certain of our industries and agriculture and adopt policies which may, when necessary, be used to regulate the growth of imports to some live-and-let-live basis.