

year. In 1967, domestic shipments continued to decline, while imports continued to rise to an all-time high of 44,660,000 pairs or 23.1 percent of domestic consumption. All of this, mind you, under the supposedly prohibitive protective barrier of American selling price.

Just a word, if I may deviate from my testimony for a second, to point out that the imports tabled on table B are the official Bureau of Census canvas import figures. About 50 percent of those imports, in fact, come in under ASP. All of the domestic production comparable to the tariff schedule are shown, so you have total canvas, domestic production, total canvas imports, as reported by the Bureau of the Census, the official Government statistics. These figures are not ours, except insofar as the domestic production figures are reported by member companies of the RMA, nor are they adjusted by any fashion by us nor are they estimates. They are official Government figures.

The domestic industry has not taken the Treasury's arbitrary change in the guidelines lying down. We have challenged this action in the customs court, and the case has been called for trial. In addition, during the last session of Congress, you introduced Congressmen Burke and Monagan, among others, introduced bills designed to restore the old guidelines. These bills are now pending before this committee. A conversation of ASP under the old guidelines would produce a rate in excess of 95 percent; yet I remind you that under those guidelines the Japanese had no difficulty in capturing 17 percent of our domestic market.

Now there is a rather important matter, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, which came to my attention just awhile ago when I had any opportunity to look at the testimony that the importers are about to give you.

If I can do so, I would like to call your attention to the table on page 6 of the importers testimony. That table, according to the importers, as appears on the bottom of page 5 of their testimony, is designed to put forward—

They say: "For explanation of further data in its preliminary report, the Tariff Commission had furnished to interested parties data set forth in the table which follows."

That table appears on page 6 of the importers testimony. Unfortunately, however, it is an extract from the table which the Tariff Commission actually provided to the parties, and I am going to ask Mr. MacFadden to make available to the committee the actual table provided by the Tariff Commission staff to all of the interested parties. The reason why this is important at this point is that the difference between the table actually provided by the Tariff Commission staff and the table which appears on page 6 of the importers' testimony is as follows: The heading, instead of "Under New Guidelines," should be "Under New Guidelines and Old Guidelines," and you will notice that there is a column at the end of the table which shows ratio of calculated duty to export value, under the old guidelines, in the Tariff Commission report, as well as under the new, and this is particularly important in view of the fact that among the bills pending before this committee are the Burke and Monagan bills, and I do want to point out to you that under the old guidelines, the figures are not 50.8 percent, et cetera, but rather 78.1, 100.5, 96, 120, for an average of