Mr. DONOHUE. Yes. We have filed the statement and I ask, please, that the entire statement appear in the record.

Mr. BURKE. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. DONOHUE. I shall not read any part of this statement now but rather I would like to comment generally on the presentation that has been made and perhaps answer some of the points that have been raised by the representatives of the domestic industry. I think it is appropriate to note at the outset that the average rate of duty imposed on all imports is 12.2 percent and the arithmetic average of all of our rates of duty on footwear is 14.8 percent.

Accordingly, the rates of duty imposed upon footwear are somewhat higher in average than the general assessment of duty on all of our dutiable imports.

It is undeniably true that there has been an increase in imports of footwear. The question of whether that increase has really injured the domestic industry might best be answered by references to statements of the industry itself. I state, based upon what I have been able to examine and what has been incorporated in our submission, that the American industry is sound and prosperous, that overall its prosperity is improving and increasing, and I take my statement from, for one, the annual reports of some of the leaders in the industry. Perhaps the biggest of all shoe manufacturers in the United States is Brown, Interco, Melvill, and Genesco, I think, rank as the second, third, and fourth. You will find in the most recent annual statements that each of those companies is applauding its success and announcing that it has reached records in sales, in production and in earnings, that outstrip their previous record-breaking year of 1966. Endicott-Johnson, United States Shoe, and Wolverine are perhaps next in order of financial importance and volume of business. You will find in their annual statements some references to a slight decline in sales or a slight decline in earnings when compared with the previous year but in each instance an explanation is given and, while we have prepared a little chart showing 19 different reasons for whatever decline or change in business has occurred, it is significant that no report in any instance states that any decline is chargeable to imports or to an increase in imports. For example, one industry noted that its sales had decreased but because its business theretofore had included a tannery which was unprofitable and, therefore, they had closed the tannery and their sales decreased, but none of these companies indicated that any of their problems, if problems they had were chargeable to increases in imports and, therefore, their annual statements support assertion that their little declines in business in the instances where the declines occurred were chargeable to other domestic conditions.

We have given in our memorandum rather copious references to the trade press and here again it seems to be the general consensus of the manufacturers and sellers of domestic shoes that 1967 has been a banner year.

Our friends who preceded us and represented the domestic industry filed a brief with the committee in which they stated that during the first quarter of 1968 the sales had increased about 9 percent and so I would say that the report of the domestic industry is virtually unanimous and that report speaks of prosperity and not of injury from imports. The explanations for the slight declines by some of the