It is our feeling that too often trade policies are formulated without regard to the impact upon the individual employees working in an industry. The primary concern of the URW in this matter deals with the devastating impact which recent U.S. trade policy has had upon the employees in the rubber-soled footwear industry.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported 24.5 thousand production workers in this industry in 1965, a year in which the ratio of imports to domestic shipments stood at 20.2% (165,741 to 33,363 pairs). By 1966, nearly 1,000 fewer workers were involved in production, 23.6 thousand, and the ratio of imports to shipping jumped to 22.3% as shipments dropped to 157,388 pairs and imports rose to 35,060 pairs. In 1967, the number of production workers dropped further to 20.5 thousand with the ratio of imports to shipments leaping to 29.8%, 150,694 pairs versus 44,659 pairs.

While we recognize that there are many other factors influencing employment in this industry, we strongly feel that these facts and figures support our contention that the decline in employment can be directly tied to the importation of rubber-soled footwear.

In only three short years, 4,000 employees lost their jobs in the rubber-soled footwear industry. This represents a 16.3% decline in employment which we feel can be tied to the 9.1% decline in domestic shipments (15,047 pairs) and the 33.9% increase in imports (11,296 pairs).

In the eight URW Locals which are presently involved in the production of rubber-soled footwear, there has also been a marked decline in our membership. In 1965 there were 12,369 URW members engaged in production in nine URW rubber-soled footwear locals. By 1967 the number of employees had dropped to 10,263, a loss of 2,106 members representing a 17% decline in employment. One URW Local representing 711 members was lost entirely because the company went out of business. Another URW Local engaged in the manufacture of canvas shoes has seen this operation completely phased out within the past year so that only limited amounts of rubber footwear are now produced. The loss in employment in this one local exceeds 600 employees with barely 500 employees still working.

We would also like to point to the employment situation in th B. F. Goodrich plant in Watertown, Massachusetts, which is engaged in the manufacture of rubber footwear. This plant is represented by Local 21914 of the Federal Labor Union. In the past year, employment dropped from 4,800 employees to 2,300 with another drop of 1,300 to 1,500 employees set for the end of July. By the end of this summer, only 800 employees are expected to remain at this plant location.

Let me make one point clear which may not be immediately apparent to the Committee. In many of the communities in which our local unions are located, (this is also true for other companies not organized by URW), the footwear plant is one of the key employers—if not *the* key employer—in that area. These plants are located in cities of less than 75,000 population—many of them substantially smaller. When the job opportunities provided by the footwear plant are declining, his is immediately reflected in the economic life of the entire community.

We feel that these individuals and these communities have already suffered too much as a result of past tariff reductions and that positive steps should be taken to restore some equity and justice to this problem. Therefore, we firmly support Section 401(b) of H.R. 17551 which converts ASP to a rate of 20% plus 25¢ a pair, but not less than 58%, based on foreign value, effective January 1, 1971.

We not only support Section 401(b) of the 1968 Trade Expansion Act because it provides equity in converting ASP, but we also support H.R. 17551, along with other interested parties, because it is obvious that the ASP method of rate setting is ineffective and that retention of such a policy is serving only to antagonize our principal trading partners.

However, because we feel that H.R. 17551 in itself will not provide the final solution to this overall problem, we therefore urge the Committee to also consider and recommend favorable action on the 16 points included in the 1967 AFL–CIO resolution on international trade as set forth in the AFL–CIO's testimony before this Committee on June 13, 1968.