

pro quo would be offered to the rubber footwear industry, because we don't sell abroad. We can't.

Mr. BURKE. According to the figures here of the Department of Commerce, they are virtually—no——

Mr. COOPER. They are virtually meaningless, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURKE. Balance of imports.

Mr. COOPER. I might point out that at one time, about 20 percent of the production of this industry went abroad, but that market has been taken over principally by the Japanese.

Mr. BURKE. Are there any further questions?

We wish to thank you gentlemen for your presentation.

Mr. COOPER. Thank you very much.

Mr. BURKE. The next witness is Mr. Noel Hemmendinger.

If you identify yourself for the record, you may proceed with your testimony, and also please identify your associate.

STATEMENT OF NOEL HEMMENDINGER, COUNSEL, IMPORTED FOOTWEAR GROUP, AMERICAN IMPORTERS ASSOCIATION; ACCOMPANIED BY EDWARD LIPKOWITZ, CHAIRMAN

Mr. HEMMENDINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am Noel Hemmendinger of the Washington law firm of Stitt, Hemmendinger, and Kennedy. I represent the Imported Footwear Group of the American Importers Association of New York.

I have with me Mr. Edward Lipkowitz, who is chairman of the Imported Footwear Group.

I feel that I have quite a challenge here this afternoon, at 5 o'clock, after a long day. I admire the patience of the committee members who are here, and I will try hard to hold your interest, in what for me, for some 10 years, has been an extremely fascinating subject. There are those who don't share my enthusiasm, however.

I want to suggest that this is, while not the most important in amount of trade, perhaps the most extraordinary particular subject that this committee may have to consider in the course of all these hearings.

My friend, Mr. Cooper, put his finger on one reason for that, when he himself suggested that it was extraordinary for his group to be supporting a proposal of the administration in the trade field. It is truly extraordinary, and the reason they favor it is that the proposal unduly favors the domestic rubber footwear industry. The reason that it unduly favors the industry is, I have to suggest, that the administration is prepared to pay an unfair price for the support of this industry, lest it jeopardize the whole chemicals package on ASP, with which it has very little connection.

In short, it is the politics of ASP that leads a proposal to be made by the administration which is demonstrably unfair and extraordinary.

It is extraordinary because it is a tariff-increasing proposal, arising out of the Kennedy round, which was a tariff-reducing exercise, and because it is in favor of an industry which already enjoys and has enjoyed the most, I suggest, the most extraordinarily favored treatment of any industry in the history of the American tariff laws since the American selling price duties were put into effect by proclamation of President Hoover in 1933.