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COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Thank you. Thank you, Bill. All right. Good afternoon, everyone. We are very excited to welcome you to our first roundtable as a part of the information gathering for the USITC study on the distributional effects of trade and trade policy on U.S. workers.

My name is Rhonda Schmidtlein, and I'm one of the five currently sitting Commissioners at the United States International Trade Commission. I am the moderator for today's roundtable, so I thought I would tell you a little bit about myself, and the purpose of this roundtable before we get started with the discussion.

I have been a Commissioner at the ITC for almost eight years. I was confirmed by the Senate in 2014 after having been nominated by President Obama. Before coming to the ITC, I had worked at different government agencies as a trade lawyer, including the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, and the United States Department of Justice.

In terms of my personal background, although I've been in Washington for a very long time, I grew up in a small town of 3,000 people in rural Missouri. My parents are long retired, but they still live there. My father was a pipe fitter, and a heavy equipment operator, and worked on the
road in the oil and gas industry, and was a member of the union for over 50 years.

I was the first person in my family to go to college. I earned an accounting degree, and then I went to law school. I thought I wanted to be a tax lawyer because that seemed like job security, but my career took me in a different, and what some may say, more interesting path. No offense to any tax lawyers out there.

So, you might wonder how it is that I've been at the ITC for so long. Well, the answer is that the ITC is what is called an independent agency. Because of this, the length of service for Commissioners is longer than what is typical for political appointees.

The term for an ITC Commissioner is nine years, and just to refresh everyone, being an independent agency means that the ITC is technically not a part of the Biden/Harris Administration, or any Administration for that matter. We do assist the Administration, and Congress, when requested, like in this study, but we have other responsibilities as well, including, for example, deciding dumping cases, and intellectual property cases. Our job is to be independent and objective in everything we do.

So, back to why we're here today. Today's event is one of seven roundtables at which we will collect input on the potentially different effects of trade on U.S. workers as
a part of the study requested by the United States Trade Representative. Each roundtable will focus on a different category, including by skill, wage and salary level, gender, race/ethnicity, age, and income level, especially as they effect under-represented and under-served communities.

As you know, the focus of today's event is race and ethnicity. At the conclusion of all the roundtables, we will submit a written report to USTR summarizing the information that we've gathered during the roundtables. This report will be delivered in October of this year, and it will be publicly available.

My role today is to ask questions, and manage the flow of discussion so that everyone has a chance to speak. Your role as a participant is to share experiences, opinions, and information. We want this to be a wide-ranging conversation, so you may hear something that you disagree with. Just remember that there are no right or wrong answers, and that we value all prospectives. What we want are your candid thoughts.

So, before we get started, I have a few housekeeping items in addition to the ones Bill just mentioned. Our discussion today is scheduled to last for two hours with a short break after the first hour. Having said that, we may continue our discussion past 3:00 p.m. if our conversation continues to be lively as we want to ensure that
everyone has an opportunity to be heard.

Of course, we realize that not everyone may be able to stay past 3:00 p.m., so please don't feel obligated to do so in the event we continue. Please be conscious of the fact that this is a public meeting, which means that the meeting is open to the public and the press. In fact, if we do have media joining us today, please feel free to reach out to our Public Affairs Department if you have any questions. The contact information for Public Affairs is on the ITC website.

Also, the discussion today is being transcribed for the record, and a link to that transcript will be included in the final report to USITC. I'm sorry, to USTR. Therefore, you should be careful not to share any information that you, or any firm or organization with which you are affiliated may view as confidential.

If you would like to respond to a question, as Bill mentioned, please use the Webex raised hand feature, and I'll recognize you. If that doesn't work for some reason, or if you've done that and I don't see it for some reason, just wave your real hand to get my attention.

If you are participating by phone, you may jump in when you sense there is a pause, or if you want to let me know that you want to speak so I can call on you, please email Jen Powell, or Tamar Katchatorian, at the emails that were provided in the booklet that was circulated, or you can
email us right now at DE, D as in dog, E as in Edward, at
USITC.gov, and they'll notify me that you'd like to speak.

As Bill mentioned, please remember that only
registered participants will be invited to speak during
today's discussion. If you are here today as a member of the
public observing, and you realize that you'd like to provide
some input, you can email us at the de@usitc.gov email
address, or you can register to participate in an upcoming
roundtable. We have six more, and we have another one on
race and ethnicity on March 10th.

Whenever you make a comment, we ask that you state
your name so that it's clear to everyone who is speaking, and
if there is an organization with which you are affiliated
that you'd like to identify, please also state the name of
that organization or firm when you comment.

Finally, I ask that my fellow Commissioners and ITC
staff hold any questions that they may have until the end of
the roundtable. At that time, I will invite the other
Commissioners and staff to pose any questions that they may
have.

Once again, I'd like to thank you all for being
here today, we very much appreciate it. I'm looking forward
to an enlightening discussion, so let's get started.

So, I know you received a packet with a list of
questions, and what I'd like to do is begin with the basic
general question that sort of combines some of those questions, and that is has trade impacted workers in your communities.

So, as I mentioned, this is really a combination of questions three, four, and five that were previously circulated. For purposes of this question, I'm using trade to mean imports, exports, or foreign investment in your communities, but if there are other trade policies that you're aware of that are having an impact on workers, we'd like to hear about those as well.

Examples of impact could be loss of employment, employment opportunities, wages, working conditions, or overall economic welfare as you can't specifically identify what you think the impact is, but, you know there is one.

Furthermore, the impact could be direct or indirect, so, for example, there may be direct effects of competition with imports such as reduced hours at a plant, or a plant closing.

The indirect effects of trade could include the growth of unrelated businesses such as restaurants in your communities because there are more employment opportunities because of businesses exporting, or foreign investment, so forth. We'd like to hear about all of that.

So, with that, I'd like to open the floor to that basic question, and then we'll move on to talking about how
the impact may differ depending on the race and ethnicity of the workers.

So, who would like to speak first? Is it a shy group today? All right. I see somebody's hand. Mr. Mitchell.

MR. MITCHELL: Yes, my name is Michael Mitchell, and it had -- it did affect the area which I live in, which is Gary, Indiana. I hired into U.S. Steel through the -- it was under a 75 -- under this consent decree (phonetic). There was at the local that I was at 18,000 people at that local. Through bad trade deals, technology, I saw that number drop to when I retired in 2006 to 2,300, in there.

The number of people living in Gary, Indiana at the time that I started working at U.S. Steel in '75 was somewhere around 160,000. That number is less than 60,000 now. Businesses started to leave. As those businesses started to -- left up out of there, it left less opportunities, but individuals who were not working at U.S. Steel, or who had been laid off from U.S. Steel, to find a good paying job to support their family.

I was one of this individuals who got laid off in 1979, and did not work a full year at U.S. Steel until 1989. I had to work a job that paid minimum wage to support a family of five, which took every cent that I had to put food on the table.
The community lost its tax base. Businesses started to leave, which left that city with fewer tax dollars in order to provide services that that community needed. Grocery stores, hospitals, education, all of those things were effected through bad trade deals in there, and it was difficult to get out of that vicious cycle because there were no opportunities left for that community to do anything with less manufacturing in there.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: All right. Thank you so much. We have a couple more hands. Dr. Spriggs, I know your hand came up next, and then I think, Mr. Holt, I know your hand is up as well, and I see Mr. Jenkins. So, Dr. Spriggs.

DR. SPRIGGS: Thank you. I want to speak to what Michael just said, which is to share the research that I did with my students. What he mentioned was not isolated to his community. So, our research in particular focused on looking at the pattern across work commute zones, and comparing those work commute zones that were more or less exposed to trade from China.

So, we're isolating elements that some people may think were caused by technological routines. We're talking about trade. And we're talking about what happened in the short period of time in this century, the 21st Century. So, what I'm talking about now is not the effect of technology, but the effect of trade in a particular -- in this century
the massive amount of imports that came from China.

What we found exactly, as Michael said, was within a commute zone there was immediate loss from jobs where those workers that were most exposed who made the products that most aligned with the imports from China.

More importantly to this point, while black and white workers suffered from that, the problems were black workers became -- because there were fewer high wage jobs, the competition for the next best job became intensified, and, so, what happened is that black workers now competing for the next best job find themselves out.

So, there was a disproportionate loss of jobs for black workers because of this secondary effect, exactly what he just said, but because there were fewer good jobs, then within the commute zone it becomes a zero sum game of who will get the next best job, and in that process, black workers lose out. This is a set of institutional structures. This is not the effect of differences in education, or experience.

What also happened to black workers was part of the success of white workers when they got displaced was a better ability to land union jobs in the next best sector. What was missing for black workers was the ability to maintain their union membership, and as a result, and Michael was talking from having been in a steel plant where he would have been a
member of the United Steel Workers, where he would have had a pension, and where he would have had health insurance. As a result, black workers lost out of those jobs that provide pension and health benefits. So, there's a cascading result. So, there's the first order, the community loses its best high wage jobs, it sets in motion a competition for fewer of the next best set of jobs, and there are limits to which you can squeeze everyone in, and in that zero sum game black workers rebound is disproportionally lost. That's the effect of the trade agreements we have done. The friction that is missing in most models, economists in the past have done trade evaluations, assumed that workers just magically move from place to place, and that just is not the real world, and we don't redistribute those good jobs, so the workers who are left behind, exactly like Michael said, not just in his instance, but what we found as a pattern was that workers have fewer good job opportunities, and that hurts black workers in particular.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: All right. Thank you so much for that. I want to let everyone speak, and then maybe we'll ask some follow-up questions on this. Mr. Holt, I think you were next with your hand up, I believe, and I know there are a lot of hands. I've got a list here, so we'll get to everyone.

MR. HOLT: Thank you. Thank you. So, I just
wanted to start off. My name is Derick Holt. I'm from Wiley Rein.

So, when I look at trade, it's supposed to be a two-way street. You're supposed to sell some goods to me, and I'm going to sell some goods to you. But black people have been systemically and disproportionately affected on both sides of the equation.

On the import side, which you heard from Michael and Dr. Spriggs, you know, traditionally trade policy that deals in favoring corporate globalization, and job offspring, has disproportionately impacted black and Latino workers.

Research from a 2021 report published by a public assistance global trade watch demonstrates that black and Latino workers were disproportionately represented in nine out of the ten manufacturing industries that have been hit hardest by import competition since NAFTA and the WTO went into effect.

These industries include several that the Commission is already familiar with, some that we represent here at Wiley, such as fabricating metals, primary metals, furniture, plastic, rubber, chemicals, transportation equipment, paper manufacturing, the beverage industry. You know, in the last 25 years black people have lost 494,000 manufacturing jobs based on employment data from the Labor Department.
So, the promises of NAFTA and the WTO, which included more jobs, the rising wages did not materialize for black and brown people. And there's a lot of data, and there's more testimony during the roundtables on this issue, so I'm not going to expound on it. I assume that some other people will do so.

So, what I really wanted to talk about today is the export side of the situation, or the equation where black people have been disproportionately left out of the benefits of trade.

The Census collects data on companies with exports through its annual business survey for which 2018 has the most recent data. The data shows that exports comprise a near 0.65 percent of total receipts from black-owned businesses. In comparison, the data shows that all other companies export at a rate five times greater than black-owned businesses.

Whether exporting goods could have big enough opportunities for black people, the data shows that black people are not participating, or benefitting, at equitable rates compared to all other companies.

And I'll note that 0.65 percent bigger that I just mentioned includes both goods and services. If we were just to include manufactured goods, the figure would be much less. In fact, in 2018 just 1.1 percent of black businesses were
in the manufacturing industry according to U.S. Census Bureau small business survey people.

I would posit that it's terribly difficult to export goods when you're not manufacturing them at home. So if you look at both the imports and exports, they both negatively impacted black workers in America. I think they go hand-in-hand, and I'll -- I have other comments, but I'll let other people talk since I know there's a good team of 20 participants that's supposed to talk today.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: All right. Thank you for that. Mr. Jenkins.

MR. JENKINS: How are you all doing? My name is Ephrin Jenkins. You can just call me E.J. Jenkins. And I'm going to piggyback a little bit about what Mike said earlier.

I'm from Gary, Indiana also. So, I feel like hearing the stories of manufacturing in the 70's, and the 60's, and all of that, and look at the condition of our city now, even looking at the condition of northwest Indiana when it comes to manufacturing, and then look at the communities of black and brown people, you will see like, you know, the bad (phonetic) managers when it comes to us.

So, it's like a lot of jobs have left. I mean, they have left, and when they close down, like the Army Practices, when it comes to other people in our community, half the trade has been impacted. These certain facilities,
or plants, whatever, the hiring practices is just not likely
to benefit workers of color, does not benefit black or brown
people because we're almost at the bottom of the totem pole
when it comes to being hired in a lot of these facilities,
especially coming from Gary, Indiana, a predominantly black
city. When you have a mill that's in a predominantly black
city that wasn't resembling the work force of us, I mean, it
wasn't resembling the residents within that city within the
work force.

So, I'm saying that because like when we talk about
trade, we talk about stuff like this, and we talk about
manufacturing when it comes to its cities, I don't think we
really like looking down at some of the root problems that
actually happen.

So, it's like the brother just said about pretty
much the affects (phonetic) about investing within black
people within their own businesses, and all that, but at the
same time that's actually true. When we get plants in here -
- we have one company that came into Gary, Indiana, and it
was probably the first one I've seen in my years that
actually, I think, they hired 65 percent of the city, was
supposed to be an agreement, would be that work force.

So, that actually was something that came into the
city, and it probably will benefit from trade because of a
lot of the things happening right now within the
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infrastructure, and all that, it's actually benefitting the City of Gary.

Now, that's only one plant. We have to look at the whole picture. Look how many that are not doing that. I would -- also, that's like -- that are not doing that.

Like I say, you know, I think when we get back to benefit black folks when it comes to plants that deal with things such as trade, all that, I think we really got to look at the hiring practices to see how we can benefit them that actually have the benefits of being in the union, the benefits of having pensions, the benefits of having medical benefits, and benefits of having a livable wage. Those are benefits of good trade agreements, but those good benefits, or good trade agreements need to be benefits to black folks that's actually living in these communities that these plants are placed in.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: All right. Thank you. Mr. Pink, I believe you were next.

MR. PINK: Yes. Good afternoon. I have actually listened to everyone. I'd actually turned mine off because I was really curious to listen to my colleagues' on here interesting discussion.

Bill Pink, President, Grand Rapids Community College in Grand Rapids, Michigan, the westside of Michigan, and as I was listening to your -- to the question, and also
listening to the dialogue, it's really interesting really from a community college perspective, and from a community college that sits on the westside of Michigan where manufacturing is very alive when it comes to second and third tier automotive, as well as we're known for our furniture production over here with major furniture production, and what goes on there.

My only comment that I had was looking at, and listening to this, from a trade perspective, and what we're seeing here in west Michigan is this is what I would call a resurgence of our manufacturers here locally on the westside having more and more focus when it comes to wanting to hire, and get in more people of color, more black and brown individuals into their work forces, as well as going as far as to really stand up within companies more focused on diversity, equity, inclusion within their company not only in recruiting more individuals black and brown people into their company, but what do we do with how we sustain those black and brown individuals who are already in our companies.

And, so, we're seeing some of those conversations when it comes to the trade piece in this regard. A lot of that question here obviously that I think everyone across the country is dealing with in the last two years is distinguishing what are these factors that are causing in the midst of a pandemic, how much of that, and the great
resignation, is causing some of our black and brown communities to either walk away, or be left out of some of these opportunities.

And we're really wanting as a region, aside from being president of the college, I'm also serving on our economic development offices here in west Michigan, as well as at the state level, and from an economic development perspective, and keeping an eye on trade, and what that looks like here. The focus of ours on an economic development perspective is how you keep the companies here that are here, and how at the same time you continue to attract those from other parts of the country, but also other parts of the world because many of our manufacturers, especially here in west Michigan, have a global footprint.

And, so, for us, that's a huge focus not just as a region, but as a state in keeping those companies here, and figuring out, making sure we're doing the right things because some of the best recruitment is your retention. And if you can keep the folks in that that you have in terms of these organizations and companies, in the trade, and the work in commerce that they perform, we're good, and we're better off as a region in that retention.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Yeah, I hear that, and we're going to come to that more specifically in just a little bit, and follow-up on that in terms of what can be
done with education, training, and helping with retention.

But, Mr. Odume, can we hear from you? I know you
don't have a lot of time, so we definitely want to hear your
thoughts.

MR. ODUME: It's Odume.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Oh, Odume. Ah-hah, you
know, I thought it was Odume, and everyone told me no, so --

MR. ODUME: My name is Keith Odume, Local 1277,

Yes, I agree that I would just say bad trade bills
decimated this city. This city of Syracuse was a
manufacturing hub. Most of your -- at least a lot of my
family members, I'm quite sure people can attest that their
family members as well, come from the south for better jobs.

So, they came to specifically the Syracuse area.

They had Carrier, Kraft Heinz, Crucible Specialty
Metals, which I work for now. Ford, Chrysler, they had multi
plenty of jobs where you pretty much could quit one job and
go to another job and make a living. So, you could pretty
much quit one job and make a living.

Communities were built. If you had one of these
jobs, you had a sense of pride. This was from, at least that
I remember, from the early 80's all the way up into the mid
90's. Whole communities, I think it was the tenth ward on
the Syracuse south side they had -- they were flourishing
with their own grocery stores, and stuff like that. Economic
development came through with the Plaza 81. It was just very
vibrant. That isn't anymore.

All of those jobs that I just mentioned left, and I
can bet it was because of trade bills that didn't benefit
those specific companies.

I've seen, at least in my community, where it
affected families, and the crime rate has skyrocketed, and
there hasn't been any solutions, so when the crime rate,
kids, poverty levels, that's all been taken away.

Now the push is go green, technology, but at the
same token, you know, who do those jobs benefit. So, now you
have flourishing factory of retail jobs, and jobs that really
-- you can't make a decent living, and stuff like that.

So, to make a long story short, yes, I've seen the
decimation, the critical element of bad trade bills in my
area specifically where people are suffering and can't
provide for their families. So, I just wanted to touch base
on that. I won't take up too much time because I'm quite
sure I can -- there's going to be a lot of things that I
could chime in on.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Well, I know you have
limited time with us today, so, do you want -- you know, do
you have any thoughts on what would be some solutions to
this? Can this be -- you know, can it be reversed some of
the injury that you've seen?

MR. ODUME: Solutions, first of all, I really think one of the solutions would be go to the people and get them involved. You have a lot of people making decisions that don't even know -- they don't pretty much live in the community, and the ones that live in the community, unfortunately, respectfully, in my opinion, I just think that it started off a good element, but, unfortunately, people tend to have their own selfishness, and it doesn't really genuinely trickle back down to the people that need it.

I honestly feel that you really have to get the people that went through those past experiences, and have a conversation with them. It can't be -- it cannot be just the individuals making the top decisions that really don't understand the need of the people in education, and things of that nature.

For instance, I'll just -- they have a community, some type of technology infrastructure going down in the community of south side Syracuse. There's a building hub, they're building computer chips, and put up a new building, and it's supposed to generate 500 jobs, good paying jobs, training and everything, right smack in the heart of the inner city.

The problem is if you did a survey, just a survey and asked people that live in that community, they wouldn't
even know that existed. They don't know that it exists, they
don't know if it -- when it -- who to go to, who to network,
is there some training. None of that is being translated.

So, you have outside people that will take those
jobs, and these jobs, this building, is right in the smack
dab of south side Syracuse. And how do I know this? Because
I've had conversations with people that live in these
neighborhoods, including -- and I live in the neighborhood,
and for the likes, I just don't understand why wouldn't these
people know about these jobs, and the training, and stuff
like that.

And then you have these roundtable discussions with
people that don't look black, you know what I'm saying,
respectfully?

So, I just think that it has to start with genuine
conversations with people that is affected by the economic
disproportionateness. That's where it starts. You have to
get everybody involved.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Right, I appreciate
that. All right, I know we have a lot of people who want to
talk, so let me go to Mr. Rodriguez, I saw your hand next,
and I see a lot of hands -- we have Mr. Tucker, Ms. Mayoral,
Mr. Baston, Mr. Ferry, Ms. Diaz, and Mr. Mitchell, I see your
hand again. So, Mr. Rodriguez?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Commissioner. My name's
Gabriel Rodriguez. I'm with a company called A Customs Brokerage. I'm a Customer Broker here in South Florida, in Miami specifically. For our state, you know, trade and tourism is key. It's number one to our economy.

Specifically, here in South Florida, one out of every four jobs is related to trade specifically, and a larger amount to tourism. For us, the increase in trade has been beneficial. We've been able to provide for new opportunities for new jobs, been able to hire more people, specifically in the last couple years.

It's been difficult to find the talent to be able to bring into the organization, not only my company but many that we deal with. You know, in some cases, even foreign companies come in and establish themselves here and create those new opportunities for new jobs here in South Florida.

Case-in-point, you know, our state's under five percent in unemployment right now, and it's because we've been able to benefit from the trade that has occurred. So, Florida specifically is one of the few, if not, I think, the only in the entire United States that has pretty much an equal balance of trade. We've got equal amounts of imports and exports.

And so, for us, not all the trade deals are perfect, but within there being trade deals, it does provide for that increase in movement of cargo in and out of the
United States and provides for us that opportunity to provide further employment.

And taking it down to race and ethnicity question, South Florida is a hub of many different cultures, and, you know, when I was asked the question before, I actually sat back and counted. 94 percent of my company is of a minority race. And so, you know, the fact that there is trade available down here in South Florida has benefitted us in that aspect. So, thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Okay, thank you. Do you have any -- I know that you have a big client base probably, right? Can you give us some ideas of, like, what types of jobs have you seen opportunities because of, you know, trade, trade deals?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: So, the specific buzzwords in the news these days "supply chain", right? So, you know, I think there's been a lot of push on the American consumer to buy cheaper, to buy more variety of products and whatnot.

And, you know, we manufacture some of that here in the United States, but a lot of it we don't, and so the American consumer looking to buy cheaper products basically forces us to go overseas. Also, with the convergence of so many different, you know, races and cultures that we are, you know, here in the United States, people bring their own, you know, products from home, you know, and that creates other
opportunities within this country.

So, you know, what we've seen is a myriad of different job opportunities, and some of it is very traditional, you know, accounting jobs and legal jobs and stuff like that, and some of it is specifically, you know, trade-related. It may be a Purchasing Manager, it may be a Warehouse Manager, it may be a Forklift Operator, it may be, you know, somebody that's doing loading and unloading in the warehouse.

So, there's a wide variety of jobs that are available, you know, that, again, we're trying to fill here in South Florida and throughout the state, as well, you know, throughout the state of Florida for a lot of different, you know, trade-related jobs.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Okay, thank you very much. Mr. Tucker, I had you next on my list.

MR. TUCKER: Hi, yeah thank you so much, and thanks to the Commission for putting together this really important study and series of roundtables. I'm D.C.-based but from the Midwest, so nice to hear so many other fellow Midwesterners on the call today.

I'd like to just kind of make a recommendation on how the ITC could think about this research, which is to take a broad view of distribution and really sort of think of it, you know, not only in racial terms, also in class terms, and
I think that that will help inform also the racial inequity analysis part of it as well.

And, you know, economists often like to study causation and establish causation, but I think there's a really important public service the Commission can do, just by presenting descriptive statistics on a few key variables of interest, which is, you know, namely, how have changes in trade policy over time led to changes in the observed incidence of manufacturing jobs, of unionized jobs, and of unionized manufacturing jobs, and then breaking that apart by race.

We know, from an increasing body of literature, that union membership is associated with wage and income premiums. There's even more recent research that shows that union membership is associated with a decline in the racial wealth gap between white and black workers.

And I'll submit to the Commission, sort of, a review that I've done some of this social science work, and hopefully it can be useful for you as you put together your report.

But there's a lot of really interesting work, sort of, showing how those changes in union membership have affected inequality overall and racial inequality specifically.

And, you know, that's not surprising, because
obviously trade -- and we've been hearing the stories today
-- for any given region, it leads to, you know, a change from
one type of economy with a certain type of bargaining power
between the different workers and employers there to a
different kind of economy with a different type of bargaining
power

And, you know, we know that, for instance, the
ability to off-shore jobs leads employers to be increasingly
aggressive in opposing a union-organizing drive. So, there's
a lot of ways that trade policy connects to the incidents of
how many workers get access to a union job.

So, I would encourage you to, again, sort of
present some of those descriptive statistics, and I think
it's also a useful counter-factual to sort of look at some of
the data that Dr. Spriggs and his co-authors have pulled
together for their recent study which details, you know, what
were some of the years where there were key variables of
interest?

You know, percentage of black workers in
manufacturing, percentage of black workers with access to a
manufacturing union job. Look at some of those historically
when those peaks happen, and then do the counterfactual of,
had those peaks continued up until today, you know, what
might have been the impact of a lower racial wealth gap on
greater equality, you know, from the 1970s or from the 1990s
to today.

And I think that can be just a very useful input to the public debate, so that we can have a sense of the magnitude of either the gains or losses that we're talking about over time. So, again, thanks for putting this together. I look forward to participating later on in some of the further questions as well, if we have time. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Right, and I appreciate that. And of course, like, the Staff would welcome you to provide that sort of specific input to them, Todd, so if you haven't been in contact with Jen Powell or Tamar Katchatorian or, you know, the academic symposiums coming up, like, I would encourage you to be in contact with them directly, or they'll reach out to you, too. All right, thank you. Okay, I had Ms. Mayoral next?

MS. MAYORAL: Hello, and thank you for having me. My name is Amanda Mayoral. I'm an economist at the Coalition for a Prosperous America. I wanted to say thank you to Mr. Odume and Mitchell in particular for their comments, and I agree with what they said and the sentiments of their comments.

And I think at the heart of the issue that we're dealing with today is because the trade agreements we've made over the past few decades have not been made with the real
and long-term effects that they have on workers in mind, let alone the
distributional effects of different types of workers.

And I think a big issue surrounding all of the things that come up
today is that we have to normalize this type of thinking, the real
effects it has on workers going forward to improve the situation. So, just
that comment, but in addition, I want to talk a little bit about research
that we have done at the coalition.

You may have heard of this, but we've recently published a report on the
job quality index, which we do every month, but we did a special one
last year for the first time, which we're going to continue, on the effect
of job quality by different types of ethnic groups -- Black, Hispanic,
and Asian.

So, our job quality index is a measure of job quality which is based
on individuals' weekly income. So, each month we take the income
of America's 100-million production and non-supervisory workers, and
then we split them up based on whether those workers earn more or
less than an average wage, and that allows us to count how many
low-quality or high-quality jobs there are.

Right now, for the entire workforce, the American non-supervisory
workforce shows that job quality declined steadily since 1990, starting
with a level of 93, and it's
now about 81 today. So, this means that just about over half of all jobs are low-quality jobs.

And this is because we've replaced the number of jobs, substituting high ones for low-quality ones over time. And I think a big point that we want to make is that it's not just the number of jobs that matter with trade deals, but the quality of them, and that's what this measure gets at.

So, when we did sort upon different ethnic groups, we found that the worst affected, in terms of job quality over the past several years, has been Black Americans. The job quality index, JQI we call it, for Black Americans is 39, which is 42 points below that of all the average worker in the United States.

Another way of saying this is that 72 percent of Black American workers are occupying low-quality jobs, which is a lot more than the average amongst all workers, which is 55 percent. It's a serious situation because Black Americans only make up 13 percent of the total workforce, and yet they have 17 percent of all low-quality jobs and only eight percent of the high-quality ones.

So, relative to the size of the Black workforce, they are getting a disproportionate share of low-quality ones and not their fair share of high-quality ones. So, to understand why this is, you can see that the job composition in the U.S. has changed a lot, especially since 1990, which
is the date that our study began.

But as others have said on this call, these effects have been going on longer than that. Since then, we've lost 4 million non-supervisory manufacturing jobs and gained more in service jobs. You guys have read the ITC report last year that they saw trade agreements led to an increase in service jobs and a fall in manufacturing jobs.

So, this is an overall trend. We're substituting for manufacturing into services, and the manufacturing jobs we're gaining tend to be low-quality ones. So, the data we found on the dim effects of these trade policies on different ethnic groups is consistent with what we see in other economic indicators.

If you consider, you know, Black Americans have less school with lower educational qualifications than other types of ethnic groups. According to the census, 35 percent of White Americans have a four-year college degree or better.

Only 21 percent of Blacks have that level of education, which is less, which, you know, is similar to the magnitude of the size that we're seeing in the quality of jobs that Black Americans are able to get.

In our opinion, the decline in the manufacturing sector has greatly damaged the chances of non-college-degree-holding Americans -- so, this is also important for this reason -- so, specifically Black Americans
who as a population have less of a college degree.

So, it's depriving them of these opportunities, and then we don't have the manufacturing sector that would provide jobs that don't require these more educated degrees with. So, we think it's a very important issue. We plan to continue working on it, and thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Thank you very much for that information and perspective. All right, the next one on my list, I had Mr. Baston from Rockland Community College.

MR. BASTON: Certainly good to be with everyone today, and I have thoroughly enjoyed the comments of all of my new colleagues and friends on this conversation. One of the things that concerned me -- I'm from New York, about 25 miles from New York City -- one of the things that concerns me is that there's very little in the conversation about the participation of people of color within the trade context.

And so, if you don't have access to participation, you don't get into these kinds of roundtable discussions. If you are not at the table -- oftentimes we hear, if you're not at the table, sometimes you're on the menu -- and what happens for black and brown people is that if we're not actually given access -- look at so many black and brown millennials who are going into work for themselves.

So, they are actually in the gig economy. They are
working, sort of, a lot of these kinds of jobs, but some of them are creative. So, they're using Etsy to get their wares out. To what extent are we as a country very intentional about supporting the development of those black and brown folks who want to build businesses and have a seat at the larger trade table conversations?

So, we're having a lot of conversations about, you know, what we do for workers, and that is very important. But also, we've got a whole lot of entrepreneurs and folks with an entrepreneurial spirit that are not brought into this conversation, that they don't have the clarity of pathways to be in any kind of trade with anybody else, except through these more localized mediums.

So, I think we've got to be very intentional about understanding how people are going to be brought to the table to participate. How are they going to be able to be engaged so that they can actually see the impact of the creativity and work of those black and brown people, that they can be trade partners with others?

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Good point, how do you make people aware of the opportunities. All right, Mr. Ferry, I had you on my list next.

MR. FERRY: Thank you, Commissioner. I'd like to thank the Commission for organizing this very important study and survey. And we've heard some very interesting things
from various folks, including our colleagues in the steel industry, and I want to just speak a little more generally about the underlying economics here.

My 40 years of studying economics have convinced me that a fundamental fact of our economy and every economy in the world is that industries matter. Certain industries pay more and offer more opportunity than others. The manufacturing sector includes industries that do that. They pay more, they make more profit, they invest more, and they offer better jobs to everybody.

Derick mentioned some of those industries -- metal, steel, transportation, textiles, and so on. What our import strategy has done for the last 50 years has said to the rest of the world, "We are a country with high wages and lots of opportunity. Why don't you guys take shots at us and try to overthrow our successful industries and sell cheap imports here, and our people will move to low-productivity industries?"

And they've been successful at that, and we've allowed them to do it under the banner of "free trade", and what that's done to black and brown people is, quite simply, horrific, because some of the best opportunities for black and brown people have been in these manufacturing industries.

Manufacturing offers a pathway to prosperity to a man or a woman who has only a high school degree. And the
best example, if you know your history, around 1921, Henry Ford broke with tradition in Detroit, which said only white people work in the automotive industry, and he said, "My company is growing too fast. I need black employees here."

And he went down the Mississippi River to Mississippi and Alabama, and he recruited black people. Detroit was shocked, and it was the best opportunity for those black people and their children and their grandchildren at any time in history.

And we've seen other things with other industries. And when we allow these industries to decline, black and brown people lose out because these are industries that offer opportunities to people who don't have a graduate or a post-graduate degree.

And as others have said, black and brown people, minorities, are over-represented in those groups that have lesser education. So, we need to focus on this. There are other countries, like Germany, that have twice as much manufacturing within their economy as the U.S. does, and that has created more opportunities for minorities.

I don't want to overstay. I'll wrap-up, but I think my point, Commissioner, is that this fundamental view that some industries matter more than others, some industries provide more opportunity than others. Steel, by the way, as Keith mentioned, is a prime example of a high-paying industry
that offers great opportunities. Our steel industry's actually growing since we levied some tariffs, and I think the models you use, Commissioner, do not allow for these differentials.

You know, as others have said, the city of Syracuse was damaged. That does not show up in your economic model. So, I think these are important economic fundamentals that the ITC needs to recognize. Thank you very much for the opportunity.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Yeah, I appreciate that. I think that was part of the impetus for the request from USTR, right, for us to develop some new research approaches.

MR. FERRY: Well we want to help.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Oh, great. All right, so Ms. Diaz, I saw your hand up? Thank you.

MS. DIAZ: Thank you so much for having me. It's a pleasure to be here. My company itself is Diaz Trade Law, I'm the President of it, and I have previous been a President of the Organization of Women in International Trade international group which has 25 chapters across the globe, and we care about fostering international trade for women and education as a leading force within that.

I'm quite active in the local South Florida community, and as Gabriel said, our job market here is on fire. So, if anyone outside of South Florida is seeking
employment, please come because we want you and need you. And locally, if you go on an Indeed search and do a search in relation to "international trade", there are 1292 jobs, like, right around here, and that's just from international trade, not even a specialty, not even discussing what it is.

Between the UPSs and FedEx's and any major company within, there are so many job openings that we are seeing. Personally, I'm working closely with universities locally in South Florida via my involvement in a trade and logistics committee with the Beacon (phonetic) council, which is public-private sector partnerships, trying to get the local community colleges, as well as other universities, onboard to ensure that the education and training that is received by these students is working to get them employment locally as well, because we want our students to stay locally, as anyone should.

So, we're also similarly working with municipalities and cities that want to talk to us about, for example, poverty in different counties, in different cities, and we're seeing specific issues in some cities where it really leads to vocational training, and the lack of it and the lack of infrastructure within those cities to get the training to get access to all of the knowledge that they need and the jobs that they need.

So, similarly, I've led a trade mission in Kenya a
few years ago, and we were able to do a lot of education and training for women that want to export from Kenya and/or women that want to import within, you know, items from -- like, for example, utilizing the GOA free trade agreement.

And what's interesting is the use of GOA, for example, is a good metric. We only have stats from 2019 that I'm able to see on USTR, but totaled 8.4 billion in 2019, and it was up, thankfully, from previous years. And it's not just oil, which is great, and that's what we want to see. We want to see trade.

And to me, one of the main issues that we saw during that trade mission was the lack of education and knowledge, and I think that's one of the big factors that I see in my work on a day-to-day basis with importers, is it's quite easy to start a business in the United States. It's not a difficult process to do so.

In Florida, you register a company on SomeBiz (phonetic), and you're in business, and you register with the IRS, and you're good. And then you tell U.S. customs that you want to import, you get a customs bond, and voila, you're an importer.

And although that may be a simplified process, there is so much liability and legal responsibility that comes with that. So, my perspective on trade is that I'm very pro with the free trade agreements, and I think there
are access to a whole lot of jobs that come from that to, in my market and things that I've looked at, researched, are the women within that market.

And I'm able to see the advancements of women within the international trade route. Exporters employ more women. In developing countries, women make up 33 percent of the workforce of exporting firms, and trade jobs create better jobs and opportunities for women. So, women of every color and race and ethnicity, and women are likely to employ more women as well, as my firm does. And I mean, as Gabriel said, in South Florida, my firm and his firm and many other firms have many employment opportunities.

But from what I'm seeing on the customs perspective is the implementation of the free trade agreements. My personal request is that it be simplified. It's so difficult to understand a free trade agreement with any -- if you walk down the street and ask somebody if they've ever read the text to a free trade agreement, a normal person wouldn't.

A normal person doesn't know what a Federal register notice is. A normal person doesn't understand a harmonized tariff schedule and 10-digit code and the duties that relate to it. The education that's needed for it is pretty dire and substantial, and the risks that an importer takes when importing is also substantial.

So, I'm seeing the flip side of a lot of the
conversation today, which is the businesses that are taking that risk, that are importing and taking advantage of free trade agreements, per se, but they lack the education and knowledge to take advantage of it correctly, which is a whole other topic and conversation.

In terms of solutions, I really think education is key for that, and in terms of job opportunities, I would really love to see, personally, more outreach with our universities in the United States to discuss all of the wonderful opportunities.

There's so much going on, and whether or not it's at the high school level -- which we also have high school partnerships in South Florida as well, which is great. Some students really should have amazing technical training. We have so many technical jobs that are needed and technical training itself for those and innovation within those technical training is great.

I mean, there's a space and time for all sorts of job opportunities, and getting through the correct training to have the ability to utilize those skills in those new jobs I think is essential, and having those public-private partnerships to be able to discuss what type of training is needed for what type of job. I think seeing more of that on a national scale would really be wonderful.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Yes, we are going to
talk more about, and since I want hear from Mr. Mitchell and
Mr. Jenkins, and then I'd like to switch gears to talk about,
like, what might some of the solutions be, if you will, or
programs or policies that could help.

So, Mr. Mitchell, I saw your hand up, and then Mr.
Jenkins, I know you had your hand up. We'll hear from you,
Mr. Mitchell, and you can decide, Mr. Jenkins.

MR. MITCHELL: Yes, I want to go back to the
question that was asked to Keith about what can you turn
around the effect of the trade agreements. I agree with what
Keith said on it, but something else we need to do is, in
order to turn this around, you have to make an investment in
people.

If you do not make an investment in people, you're
going to have a difficult time turning it around, and there
are a couple of technical schools out there that I agree with
what they said in there. And there are three training
apprenticeships in the area where I am, and none of them are
in the minority neighborhood.

There's an ironworker, there's a carpenter, and
there's one for a pipe-setter. None of them were built in a
predominately Black neighborhood. They were all built
someplace else. So, if you're looking at trying to help
black and brown people, you need to bring those individuals
to the table who are building these apprenticeships and start
looking at the minority neighborhood in order to get something going.

If you give people an opportunity, they will take the training, and they will do the work. The other thing that I wanted to comment on as we talked about bad trade deals in there, I was paid TRA (phonetic) when I was laid-off. And I'm not sure how many individuals on this call will remember the term "TRA". I think it was "trade adjustment assistance" in there.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Right, TAA we call it, yeah.

MR. MITCHELL: The name has been changed. If you make a trade agreement that you have to pay an individual in the United States a subsidy because they have been impacted by that trade deal, that's a bad trade deal from the start.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: All right, we're going to come back to that. Mr. Jenkins, what were you thinking? I think you're on mute.

MR. JENKINS: I want to piggyback on what Mike and Keith said. We've got to stop having these external resources for internal problems. And what I'm saying is, like, we're talking about, like, how trade can actually either benefit or not benefit the Black community.

We need to start having more conversations with the leadership within the Black community, and I'm not just
talking about the representative from the Mayor's staff. We need to have more community leaders. We need to talk to these community leaders.

A lot of Black communities have community benefits agreement committees, and I think we need to bring more of those people in to have these conversations on how trade is really impacting the Black community in a real way.

A lot of people they get -- they live with the perception and think that because you have, like, either a big (technical Interference) or a big water plant or a big electric plant or something like that within the black that automatically those workers within that plant is Black, and it creates a false perception because a lot of those individuals aren't a benefit of that plan.

So, it's like those good jobs and everything out there, it's not benefitting the Black community. But it's crazy because it's like, if trade happens and then, you know, people start to leave or, you know, a bad trade deal happens and we, you know -- the steel sectors are impacted, the rubber sector's impacted -- well they do these big calls what they call hiring practices, we're not the first to be called for these job opportunities, you know what I mean?

I was just talking to a person from a tire plant in Tennessee. They have 1200 members, but only 30 of them are Black. As someone was saying earlier, Mayoral (phonetic),
what she was saying earlier, giving the stats and stuff when it comes to Black workers and where we literally are at on the totem pole.

I think that needs to be a real conversation. And when it comes to, like, these trade deals, are we really looking at communities of color when we're talking about these problems, or are we just looking at the external components of them?

Because, if you really look over the country, a lot of your manufacturing facilities, a lot of them hail within the black and brown communities, but it's just not a benefit to black or brown people. So, if we can actually have convos (phonetic) and real conversations about that, especially when dealing with trade, I think we could create solutions amongst the roundtable discussion because we'll know the problems, we'll know the impact it was actually having.

We don't spare the treatment, it's going to the povertized communities that's actually coming from the lack of either bad trade deals impacting that community. But we have more of an understanding of what's going on, so whatever solution we could try to create will be thoroughly impacting those communities that it's affecting.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Jenkins. We're going to take just a very, very short break so people can stretch their legs, just five minutes, and then
we're going to restart. And when we come back, I want to shift -- we already started into the conversation a little bit -- but shift into more specifically -- and people have talked some about how the impact of trade affects people differently depending on their race or ethnicity.

What are some of the potential solutions to that, you know, is TAA useful, what are some ways to create opportunities or, you know, give people knowledge about those opportunities that could be helpful for them?

So, you could think about that and the role that education training plays in that, the role that local community colleges play in that. So, those are the things that we want to talk about next, and then sort of closer to the end, I guess, you know, how do these impacts compare to other impacts that are affecting workers and communities, right?

Because we'd like to have a sense from you all what you think, you know. And I don't know, maybe you can't separate it, you know, in terms of what else is going on, but that's what we're going to talk about. So, I have 2:11 on my computer. We will come back right at 2:16 so that we don't waste too much time, but I want to give people a chance to get a drink or stretch their legs, all right? So, I'm going to leave it up to you all to come back, unless Bill can put a clock up?
MR. SECRETARY: We sure are.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Okay. We're going to
put a countdown clock up so you'll know exactly when we'll
restart.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: All right, welcome back,
everyone. If we could have our roundtable participants turn
back on their cameras? All right. I'm seeing most people
now.

Okay. So, I thought we'd use the second half of
the roundtable to talk about what might some of the solutions
be, and maybe "solutions" is too strong of a word -- how
might we address some of the impacts we've heard about this
morning?

And I know Mr. Mitchell's already mentioned the
trade adjustment assistance -- it was called something else
30 years ago or 40 years ago -- but the TAA program. We
talked a little bit and we've heard a couple different
witnesses, the idea of training, education, outreach, in
terms of making people aware.

So, I was hoping that maybe we could expand on
those -- maybe people would be willing to expand on those?
So, you know, the idea is we've heard this morning the
positive and negative impacts trade has had on workers, and
we've heard a little bit about what some of those solutions
might be.

So, if you would like to, let's talk about what
needs to be done going forward. And if you could talk about
that through the prism of whether or not it's effective
depending on the race/ethnicity of the person using that
program or, you know, benefitting from that, that would be
helpful.

All right, Mr. Spriggs, I saw your hand go up
first; I know we've got a lot. Let's start with you, Dr.
Spriggs.

MR. SPRIGGS: Thank you, William Spriggs. So,
there are a couple of things, one that the ITC must do
itself, and that's to do better studies, studies that
incorporate that fact that there are real ramifications, and
for many communities, there are real job loss, so there are
real costs, and presenting to the American people general
equilibrium models that, as we've all seen, show marginal
benefits but don't get to showing cost, mean that we don't
prepare properly because we don't incorporate what the costs
are going to be.

Then, understanding the costs, the costs are to
those communities. Trade adjustment assistance is wonderful
for the specific workers who can document they are displaced.
It's not adequate. Those workers actually need more money
to compensate them for their losses. We need to be more
honest about how much it really does cost to lose the amount of capital -- human capital -- that those workers lose.

We disrespect workers. We don't understand that you've taken away a huge amount of human capital when you take away their job, and we undervalue it. But the loss to the community is -- the data are clear; the community loses a set of jobs. This creates a zero-sum game.

Yes, you can have a community college that can play into that zero-sum game and give some people a leg-up on outcompeting other people for the fewer jobs left. But that doesn't resolve the problem for the community. So, there need to be community impact funds so that the community can have the opportunity to find another employer who's going to be a high-wage employer.

And there needs to be enough time and enough funds for the community to make that happen. So, it's nice to concentrate on training, but we over-emphasize training when it comes to -- that doesn't create the replacement, the amount of jobs that must be replaced.

And then, we have to be looking at the younger set of workers who are the ones, in many ways, who are the most displaced because the next set of workers, the ones who are just graduating high school when we take away 200 good-paying jobs, or 3,000 good paying jobs, the next generation that's about to enter the labor force are the ones who've been hurt
We have to direct a lot of opportunities at them so that either we give them mobility so that those who don't have access to move have some help, but you also have to give them some opportunities to have training for the job we hope that that community using the targeting funds for economic development will be able to use to attract the next employer.

And we must enforce, at that critical moment where we take away good jobs, we must be serious about enforcing anti-discrimination laws. In our nation, we don't enforce them. We imagine that discrimination is not a problem. Discrimination is real. It is a problem. This is not an issue of training. This is not an issue of education. This is an issue of discrimination.

And we spend too much time talking about training and education, which takes away our attention from enforcing anti-discrimination. It becomes an excuse; it becomes an out. It becomes the way that we don't pay attention to discrimination.

But it is at that moment that we have to get much stricter about enforcing anti-discrimination laws. And so, additional attention and funds have to be given so that the OFCCP, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, those Government agencies charged with that can have the resources to pay attention to those communities where we know there's
going to be heightened pressures to discriminate.

So, I would say it's that multitude of things, it's not just one single thing. But directly to the responsibility of the ITC is to have better studies and to understand that this is real, these are real costs, and they have to be factored in when we think about what is this trade deal really going to do and what should we recommend to Congress.

What should be the report from the ITC to Congress on the trade deal, in terms of what's the best measure of how much this is going to cost and what Congress needs to put in place?

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Thank you, Dr. Spriggs. All right. I have Mr. Odume, Mr. Tucker, Mr. Baston, Mr. Holt. The hands all went up at once, so I apologize if you saw it in a different order, but that's how we'll go right now. So, Mr. Odume?

MR. ODUME: Like with anything else that needs a lot of change, traditional thinking, old-school thinking, have to bring new ideas. For far too long, for decades, the same talk, the same type of energy, and guess what? We're back at it at 2022 and having these same conversations.

The problem is, people get set in their ways, we throw money at different organizations, different training programs and stuff like that, and you put the same people
with the same attitude, or they may know somebody that'll
pass the baton with that same attitude (phonetic), and
nothing gets done.

I'm a strong believer -- I do believe in education,
training. I do think that is a core, but at the same token,
there's so much red tape, for instance, you have a lot of
these cert programs, training programs, and to get into these
programs, you've got to be Inspector Gadget -- so much
paperwork, red line, God forbid if you don't know this
individual and this or that.

And then the lack thereof the information, I just
think people need to get out of the way. I think that it
really has to be a new time of thinking. You can't have
change with old thinking.

And like I said, I mean, I'm quite sure my parents,
my grandparents, had these same conversations, and if they
were alive today, they'd say, man, we had this conversation
20, 30 years ago, and guess what? It's gotten worse.

So, it's kind of frustrating. I'm really
passionate about it because it affects so many people,
including myself, to this day. You know, we had over 1,200
people here. We're at 175, with one woman that recently
retired. And these all are, you know, bad trade deals or --
I can go on and on.

There's no focus on kids getting trades anymore.
It's all about high-tech, green, go green, and I don't have a problem with that because you've got to move forward. And I'm not shooting shots at that type of industry. But what I'm saying is you still have a motor, and you have wheels. The wheels can't turn without the motor, so everything has to coincide with each other.

How do you get to that point? I don't know. I know the first thing I know with anything, being honest -- honesty with everything. We can't just keep on having forums and we'll be back, maybe, when I'm dead and gone and having the same conversation. There has to be a very (Technical Interference).

We can throw statistics, numbers, all of this stuff in the world, but you have to change the thinking. You have to change the leadership, and that goes all across the board, from grass, the box (phonetic), you know what I mean?

We can go in so many details and so many levels, you know? I mean, I wish we had six hours for this thing. I'll take a day off. I will take a day off, if we can really come to some things that's going to make a change here, you know what I mean? People are suffering, you know what I mean?

We've got COVID and all this other stuff, but just -- it's just sad. It really hurts the soul. I mean, I commend that you're doing your investigation. I just would
like to see different thinking, people with different positions, and nothing against the seasoned people, you know what I mean? Nothing against them.

With all due respect, but I think it's a new way of thinking. You bring some fresh ideas in here, and people really got to care and get out the way and not take this all personal because times change, situations change, and thinking has to change. And that's what I would like to see, first and foremost, and that's it.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Thank you. Well, I hope you know that your comments are going to be provided directly to the United States Trade Representative in this report. So, she is going to hear it, and of course, we are taking in all this information about the way we do our reports. So, we do value that and appreciate it.

MR. ODUME: Can I just add one more thing, like 30, 20 seconds? I'm sorry everybody for taking up so my time. I just want to give an example. They have a program here called SURGE, right, and the whole objective is more training, right -- serious training, good training.

How you get into that, no one knew. I just happened to see it on Facebook. For the likes of me, I don't know why it wasn't in the media. For the likes of me, I don't know why the community leaders didn't push this thing. I found out about it, so I wanted to do a litmus test, and I
I had an interview. I think it was, like, an hour-and-a-half on a Zoom call, three people, three individuals, all white men. I would guess they're not from around the south side of Syracuse or anything like that. Then, after this interview, you had an application process, and after the application process, you had to come down and do a drug test, and after the drug test, you had to blah, blah, blah, blah. Why?

It made no sense at all. First of all, no one knew about it. Second of all, when you did know about it, you had to go through hoops and all this other crazy stuff just to get training. That made no sense. And, put it this way, this was in a state facility. So, I'm assuming that the money was provided by the state or the Government, whatever case the scenario.

It made no sense. You've got money thrown to an organization that it took hell to get in, and it made no sense. And then I had to wait another two weeks where I never got a response, and then I got a response four weeks later that I was accepted.

Then, when I went down there to get accepted, they wanted me to do this hand test to see if I'm mechanically inclined, even though they knew I work at this place for over 21 years, but I still had to do this. And I did it; for me,
I could do it, but imagine someone else coming off the streets that, you know, they're just trying to better themselves. That made no sense at all. And I can only imagine what other cities are going through.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Well, I really appreciate these specific, you know, real-life examples are really important. So, I really appreciate it.

MR. ODUME: Thanks, everybody. Forgive me.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: All right. I had Mr. Tucker next, and then Mr. Baston, Mr. Holt, and I see one more hand up there. I see you, Mr. Pink, too. Okay.

MR. TUCKER: Yeah, so this has been really rich, and I really appreciate the comments of Mr. Odume and so many others. I really like the idea about, sort of, the new thinking. I think that's really key.

I think, as we think about solutions, it's important that we take a broad view and be creative, and take a broad view of what trade policy really is -- you know, really have it reflect the full scope of what contemporary trade agreements are all about, which are, you know, both economic and regulatory agreements and have a lot in them.

You know, I think that there's a lot of interesting new thinking out there about building-in pre-distribution obligations into the text of the agreements themselves, you know, building obligations for compensation for workers that
are displaced, and building that into the text of the agreement themselves so that it's actually enforceable on the back-end.

And I think the types of analyses that I was earlier recommending the ITC collect about the intersection between the availability of manufacturing jobs and the union premiums and the ways that those union premiums can help lower the racial wealth gap, all of that data that you collect can be the basis for undertaking obligations around compensation and pre-distribution in the agreement itself.

And there's also all the other stuff that's, like, the less traditional aspects of trade agreements that are in contemporary trade agreements, and I think we know even less about the distributional impacts of those, but they're likely to be very important.

You know, for instance, all of the requirements around intellectual property protections that increase the cost of pharmaceutical drugs to consumers -- you know, consumers generally, consumers of color specifically -- getting a better sense of how those kinds of provisions affects distribution is really key.

I know, Commissioner, you mentioned at the outset that ITC is not part of the Biden-Harris Administration, but I think it's important for just context that, you know, as part of the Biden-Harris campaign, they committed to adopt
Senator Cory Booker's plan for racial justice and environmental justice, which obligates every agency in the Federal Government to develop plans for environmental justice and racial equity.

And I think, you know, just to give sort of one example of a way that we could maybe think about incorporating that into ITC studies of the potential impact of trade agreements, you know, I know that in the recent USMCA study that the ITC did, they attempted -- as far as I know, for the first time -- to actually model the economic impact of some of the investor rights provisions in that deal and looking at basically what the economic impact might be of companies suing the Federal Government over labor and environmental policies and other types of policies.

And actually found, you know, in that study, a positive impact because of the way that the projection assumed it would impact investment patterns. Well, you know, if you go back to that sort of Cory Booker plan and think about how you might apply that in this context, you could look at some of the ways that communities of color generally, and indigenous communities in particular, have been negatively impacted by some of those provisions.

And this is not me talking, you know, there's a U.N. Human Rights Report that sort of outlines precisely the kinds of challenges and costs that those investor state
dispute settlement rules can have on communities of color. So, I think, you know, having those type of costs to put against some of the benefits for the other part of the ITC modeling can kind of just be a very concrete way that we can incorporate some forward thinking about solutions into your analysis. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Okay, yeah, I appreciate that. And of course, I didn't mean to insinuate that we weren't bound by different Executive Orders. Article 1 is complicated and exactly what we do. So, I had next Mr. Baston from Rockland Community College?

MR. BASTON: Thank you so much. I want to build off what Todd and Keith talked about, with the idea that the ITC really can surface, in your research, the lack of goals for addressing disparate impacts on trade for black and brown people.

By surfacing the lack of a national set of goals to address these disparate impacts, you could also then surface the fact that there's not an intentional strategy -- first, there's no goals, and there's no strategy.

So, to what extent can we be thinking about the goals to address the negative impacts of black and brown people based on the trade decisions that have happened, and what are the strategies that we are going to do to make sure that we are intentionally included, not only in the
conversation, but the outcomes.

Because, at the end of the day, we have lots of
great conversations, but beyond the statements, very rarely
are there steps that are being taken. So, I want us to
really think about that. And then also, how can we encourage
the funding of collective impact strategies where the
community, specifically black and brown communities, that are
locked out of the opportunities, educational and otherwise,
to engage in trade, that if we continue to surface, the local
community has to be included in whatever's rolled out.

Your ability to say that to our Congressional
leaders, your ability to say that to our State-elected
officials, your ability to put that as a part of a mandate
for moving forward, would be helpful because right now we
have no goals, we have no strategy, and there's no plans of
implementation to bring the people most specifically impacted
and affected to the table to participate.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Good point. All right,
Mr. Holt, I had you next, please.

MR. HOLT: Good afternoon. So, I just wanted to
talk about maybe three things that could be solutions. One,
obviously, would be trade rules (phonetic). So, on a macro
level, I think we have to make sure that we level the playing
field. Obviously, strict enforcement of anti-dumping and
countervailing duty laws helps preserve U.S. jobs.
Someone was talking about the tariffs earlier this morning that helped increase steel jobs. The EPI found that, you know, 3200 new steelmaking jobs were created through the 232 steel tariffs. So, let's first level the playing field by enforcing the existing trade rules, right?

Another thing that we can do, in terms of the Commission specifically in collecting data, is that, in its questionnaires through anti-dumping and countervailing duty cases, the Commission could collect employment data by race, ethnicity, and gender.

You know, the Commission refused dozens, if not hundreds, of industries each year that are materially injured or threatened with material injury, and the agency collects data around employment or production-related workers in its questionnaires, and I would suggest that this information could be broken down by race, ethnicity, and gender.

We can tell whether an AD order has been effective because we can compare the relative health of industries over years, you know, from the original investigation to a sunset review, to the second sunset review, to the third sunset review.

So, you can have a long period of data for multiple industries, selected by industries directly impacted by unfairly traded imports. Another, I guess, the last thing that I just want to point out there is that the question that
we're asking is, you know, how do we make the benefits of trade accessible to all Americans?

And that's a shameless plug, because that's the title of my podcast, right? But one of the answers is that we need to manufacture in underserved communities in an environmentally sustainable way, and that means investment throughout the entire supply chain, from the manufacturer who's building the actual mill or production facility, to the climate-sustaining technology that will be used to make sure that these communities aren't harmed by the manufacturing going on.

Earlier today, we heard from EJ and Michael, and they discussed how, you know, their local communities were thriving in the '70s and '80s and up until the mid-90s, and we know that from every one manufacturing job, 7 non-manufacturing jobs in other industries are created.

So, manufacturing can be a path forward. Another thing that we have to think about is that it's not only manufacturing, but it's also investment, an investment in minority ownership in manufacturing.

Earlier today, I told you that, you know, only one percent of all Black businesses are in manufacturing. We have to invest in manufacturing with an emphasis on black and brown people. You know, we heard today from EJ, and he was talking about, you know, manufacturing plants that are in
black and brown communities and the workers don't look like them.

Michael was talking about black and brown people that are not at the table, and they don't have access to participation. When you have access to participation, when you have ownership and minority ownership, they'll be at the table, right, because they will be those manufacturers that they have to interact with the county executives and the state politicians.

The other thing that we also need to recognize is that -- and Dr. Spriggs kind of mentioned it -- you know, discrimination is here. Bias is here. At the end of the day, we have to address that part of the manufacturing issue, and one way to do it is to invest in minority businesses.

We know that people tend to hire people just because of bias -- people that look like you. Earlier today, we heard Jennifer had said that, you know, her team is diverse. It's not just by happenstance, right? We know that if you go out there, you look and you try to find people, there are good workers for everybody.

And at the end of the day, if we invest in minority businesses and entrepreneurship, that's going to be another opportunity for the benefits of trade to be accessible to everybody.
COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Thank you. All right.

Mr. Pink.

MR. PINK: Yes, thank you, Commissioner. I just want to also kind of double click a little bit on some things that have been said really around the idea of just a post-secondary credential. I know I am one of those people because of my job as president of this college, but also just my passion and my career. I'm a believer in what post-secondary education and preparation looks like and what that can be for people in helping them get to that next. I'm not always satisfied with the fact of just saying that a certain group of people, this is what you can do, this is what you can do. I think education has the power to open up those possibilities for individuals and I think it's -- I've heard for so long this either/or proposition of either skill trades or higher education and there's an and -- there's a both and to that conversation because we at community colleges and other institutions, we can provide those opportunities for folks to have that skill trade while they're progressing through a degree in, as we do here and with some of our four-year partners, a degree that is in welding, in machining, in culinary arts, those associate applied science degrees that lead to the Bachelor's degree, that also help that person do other things as far as their career is concerned, if they so choose. But it allows choice
and I think -- when I think about ITC, when I think about partnerships that our institution has with some of our federal-level offices and departments, it's so helpful when those departments give -- provide us some of those opportunities to incentivize some of these things. Because if, as Mr. Wiley said, without intentionality, this stuff is not going to happen. If you don't have the intentionality around hiring more black and brown individuals, you can't just think it's just going to happen by happenstance. There has to be -- in our day and age, there has to be levels of intentionality around that.

I appreciated Ms. Mayoral a while ago before the break and what she was talking about in terms of low-quality jobs in the workforce that see so many, in this case, African Americans in those positions. I think the more -- again, intentionality, if we can focus more on -- and looking across the board, across the country, there are best practices out there, friends, that are doing some of this work and they're doing it well. What are the best practices? How are they digging into communities and making it happen? When she talked about low-quality jobs, how do we do more to better prepare individuals of color, how do we better prepare our Black citizens here in Grand Rapids for those jobs that not only pay a wage, but pay a high wage, a living, sustainable wage. And sometimes that doesn't necessarily mean that we
just pigeonhole them over here. That means that we give them that choice.

And the last thing I'll say is that I encourage any of you, tap into your local — your local community colleges and talk to them and ask them about these kind of things because, typically, the community college should be just that, the community's college. It should be a convener. It should be a space where you can bring industry, K-12, four-year institutions, the business community, philanthropic. It ought to be the space that you can bring all those together to have this at the local level, this intentionality around how to get to solving some of these issues that we see and so prominent. Use them as that convener because community colleges, one thing about us, the community comes to us, which means we can keep people in the community instead of having to pull them in from somewhere, then they go back home where they're out of state. We have them here in the community. Take advantage of those community colleges and ask them and push them to make sure they're doing this work alongside you.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Yeah, that's a great point. We have heard when we tour some plants in connection with our Title VII cases that businesses who partner with their community college, industries that are partnering, in order to get the skills incorporated into the curriculum that
they see they need down the road, right, and that is a local endeavor and it's specific to jobs that are there coming on line, you know. So I think your point is well taken.

By the way, I have three nephews that went through OSU just recently, so you were there while they were there. All right. So I have next on my list, Ms. Mayoral.

MS. MAYORAL: Thank you. So two points I wanted to make. First, none of this that we're discussing today is possible unless we address the real underlying reason for losing all of these arcane jobs, which is that our firms are not competing with other firms. They're competing with largely other countries. The highly subsidized firms, they own them, they subsidize their labor, they subsidize the land, they subsidize the investment, and then they manipulate the currency. It's absolutely impossible to make meaningful changes on this issue unless you address this larger issues that this is a part of. And that's probably not the topic of this debate, but it's important that we have to work on that as well.

Secondly, in order to continue, I think, we need to have goals before we can have strategy. We also need to have an understanding of the effects. And I appreciate that we have people on the call that are bringing their experiences, but we also need more data and this is the motivation for some of the work that we started and hope that there's going
to be more after us and maybe the ITC does something like this.

But we, you know, we represent a group of manufacturers and labor unions and we're working with one of them right now to do a survey to understand the effects that trade labor relation has had on these workers who lost their jobs. So to give you some specifics, one of our members, Sherrill Manufacturing, who now makes stainless steel silverware or flatware, they're located in Sherrill, New York. They are part of what was called Oneida, which was a company that was founded before the Civil War in Sherrill. This company was the source of prosperity for a large part of this place in Upstate New York in the 19th and 20th Century. And 30 years ago, Oneida employed over 4,000 people at that time and it's not just those people that they employed, but it's also the secondary industries that come with that type of employment and the services and the supporting industries around it. So once we started seeing a rise in Chinese imports in the steel industry in particular, this eventually led Oneida to shut down and fire a lot of its workers, and not just Oneida, but a lot of other U.S. spot or manufacturing businesses. They pushed them out of business. Since that time what we know from speaking with people at this former -- people who worked at this company, which is going to be something we're going to write a report
on, but we know that the region around Sherrill has suffered severe economic decline when these good quality jobs left the region. Today, there are major problems of drug abuse and crime. And just to give you an idea, the largest employer now no longer is this manufacturing plant, but a gambling casino. While this did bring money to the region, it also brought low-paying jobs. There is a gambling addiction and even a prostitution issue there. So it's led to changes that have not been advantageous for us.

So we want to understand this better and this is the point of the survey that we're conducting and obviously we'll share it with you. But we also want to point out that, you know, standard modeling that would have modeled the effects on what happened in Sherrill, New York would have never picked this up because it doesn't pick up the changes in, you know, what holds unemployment constants -- unemployment constant. We're not capturing these and it needs to be a change in the mind frame of how we model them and how we go into trade agreements. And that's something that we're also working at, at CPA, and we look to partner with other people who are also working on these problems.

And just before I go, I want to say I really appreciate everyone's comments and we would love to reach out to other people on the call and work with you guys going forward and hear what else people are working on, on this...
issue. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Thank you so much. We certainly welcome you to reach out to us. All right. Ms. Gates Black from Delaware County Community College.

MS. GATES BLACK: Thank you so much, Commissioner. This has been a really wonderful, rich conversation. And I apologize, I am going to have to get off at 3:00, but there are a couple of comments that I wanted to make before I left. I wanted to echo my colleague, Bill Pink's, remarks that community colleges offer the greatest opportunity for community to have an educated and skilled workforce and we do that by building all the partnerships that we've been talking about.

But I also want to talk about how we work with our communities. You know, one of the things I've heard today was the lack of planning and that is evident because when you have a major industry in a black or brown community and that industry leaves, if there is no plan, the community will fall apart. And as I was listening to Ms. Mayoral, I said, yep, I saw the same thing when an industry left, they put in a casino. That is not the kind of planning. That is the knee jerk reaction to a situation. So there needs to be ongoing planning, the kind of planning that's taking place in our lower affluent communities, so that if a business leaves there, there is a plan in place. We need the ITC to really
lobby for there to be a plan for how we're going to raise up
the black and brown communities.

One of the things that we are seeing in our
communities of color is the lack of information around
manufacturing, skilled trades, all of those kinds of things.
They still think manufacturing is this dirty industry with
dirty floors at the time my dad was doing that kind of thing.
No, it is technology infused throughout everything you do,
whether you're working on automobiles, whether you're doing
HVAC, whether you're in carpentry, whether you're welding,
whatever you're doing, there is technology infused in that.
And so we have to find a way to get this through to parents
that these are indeed well-paying jobs that will bring them
-- their families up to living wages and that are needed in
our community.

I often hear parents from more affluent communities
and say, well, no, we don't want that here. My job is going
to a four-year institution. Maybe they're going to a
four-year institution and they're getting a liberal arts
degree and they're going to live with you and they're going
to keep paying back mom. That's one -- that's one strategy
for you or you can look at what the community college has to
offer. Whether they're coming to us with a two-year degree
and then moving on to transfer or whether they're coming to
us to earn a certificate, which allows them to go directly
into the workforce, come back to us and earn another
certificate, and then perhaps an Associate's degree that
creates and puts them on a pathway, that's what they can do.

In any event, we have jobs in our communities that
can raise up our communities. We have them in our community
colleges and we've got to do a better job of getting that
word out there. So I'm just excited about this conversation.

Thank you all for this opportunity today and I'm just so
sorry I have to jump off and get on another call, but this is
wonderful. Thank you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: We understand. Thank
you so much for joining us. Okay. Ms. Stanger-McLaughlin
from the Native American Agriculture Fund.

MS. STANGER-MCLAUGHLIN: Hello. First, I would
like to apologize for my tardiness. I wasn't here for the
earlier conversations, but, (greeting in native language).

My name is Water Runs Downhill and I am from the
Colville Confederated Tribes located in Northeastern
Washington State and I represent the Native American
Agriculture Fund as their new CEO. The work that we do
encompasses a lot of production in production agriculture
across the United States, but we also see issues in education
as one of our eligible entities.

We are a grant-making trust fund and we also see
the need for encompassing a holistic approach to how we look
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at economic development and international trade within the indigenous communities in North America. We have an annual granting funding cycle. Our next funding will occur on April 1st. So all of you on this call, I've heard a few of you are from community colleges, you are eligible entities. If you have an indigenous tribal community located within your region, I encourage you to look at how you could qualify for our funds because the work that we do encourages international trade. We know that some of our grantees have been devastated by trade issues. One in particular in the Coast lost the entire -- their entire seafood industry. They had to pivot and we were there to help them do so. But we're going to continue to work in this space and we invite others to join us in that effort.

That effort goes beyond grant-making. We also work across the Federal Government and actually I was on a call with EDA earlier, which is another great resource domestically for you to lean on when you're trying to look at community economic development. But just know that the Native American Agricultural Fund is here to support.

And we have a vision. Our vision is for rural supported indigenous space, agricultural infrastructure. We would like our partners, our tribal communities to stand up agricultural infrastructure for all, not just our indigenous communities, for our neighbors. And I just recently
published an article in Agri-Pulse a few days ago and it's looking at domestic and international food security through an indigenous perspective. It mentions in there our vision. We have a vision document on reimagining Native food systems and, again, it encompasses our partners. It's about working with states and the Federal Government and our neighbors, our communities, our colleges so that we can move forward together. So thank you for your time.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Thank you. Thank you so much for joining us. Okay. Ms. Diaz, you had your hand up.

MS. DIAZ: Sure. The last speaker had great programs, itself, and in terms of the outreach, I think that's one thing I would love to hear more of in terms of ITC plans and something to think of in regards to the partnerships and so many wonderful educational institutions that you have. There's specific funding opportunities and in terms of how educational institutions and our businesses here about opportunities to hire, whether it's minorities, whether it's any student with any technical skill, I would love to hear more about getting the word out.

One of the speakers said that they found out about an opportunity on Facebook, which I think is great. Finding out about social media -- finding out about opportunities on social media is terrific and utilizing those platforms wisely to get to your target audience, I similarly think is great.
I think the level of partnerships that you can have in both the public and private sector is amazing and is limitless in terms of education, outreach, training, workforce development. I've seen programs where there are internships active as part of curriculum in community college and I've seen the success of those in terms of jobs that are after. So if there are some international trade-related curriculum that require an externship as part of that curriculum, itself, to get that degree and quite often those opportunities turn into jobs at the end of the day. Somebody gets to see you in action, as well as part -- as part of that.

I would love to see more of that because I think the education and training portion along with the internship and development and companies coming to the table that actually have those jobs available really is part of a solution.

The other is, and it's sort of necessarily just a strict enforcement of existing trade laws, what I personally would love to see is a commonsense enforcement of trade laws. While I've seen a lot of minorities and small- and medium-sized businesses, especially in South Florida, get squashed and have to shut down and become bankrupt as a result of trade laws, that they didn't truly understand when they started their operation, which I think is a real shame.
I think it's -- and I'm probably -- most of my clients will probably hate me for saying this, but I'll say it anyways, I think it's again too easy to become an importer without a test, without some sort of understanding of what obligation you're taking on.

So, for example, there are Enforce and Protect Act cases that you may or may not be aware of, but they are brutal and I have many clients that are very tiny, teeny businesses that take part and they're chosen as entities that "evaded" antidumping and countervailing laws. At the beginning of the import process, they might not have even known that there was an antidumping and countervailing duty order on their specific goods. Now, you can point fingers on whether or not it was the brokers fault, whether or not it was their fault, whether or not it was whoever's fault, it's their fault at the end of the day because they're the importer of record and they're the liability and responsibility for their importations. But we want to see these small- and medium-sized enterprises, we want to see them open up. We want to see them succeed. And I see a lot of really great small businesses out there, but the education and training as well to do that for those international trade jobs, the opportunities are limitless. The economics of it are really phenomenal.

But now going back to that EAPA case, let's say
that you're chosen as a participant, you don't even hear the full allegation against you. So if I was to say that Commissioner Rhonda, she committed some sort of horrific act and evaded antidumping duties and I have a complaint that I allege to Customs, you only get to see part of the complaint. It's confidential. And then your job is to respond to that and you don't even know the full allegation against you. And only until you've spent sometimes hundreds of thousands of dollars on lawyer fees, where you may or may not have it, can you get to the Court of International Trade where you finally get to see the full record and it's opened up and not confidential anymore. To me, the programs like this defeat the purpose of having wonderful international trade opportunities because, yes, we want people to know the law, we want people to comply with the law. I would love everyone who imports to deal with and to have pre-compliance as part of their budget, but quite often we don't see that.

I think you can ask many international trade lawyers to take a stab at what percentage of importers actually do a whole lot of homework prior to importing a specific item and the things you can do to help ensure that people aren't stuck with bills in the tune of $500,000, millions of dollars, and millions and millions of dollars, if they can't pay. And at the end of the day, you have the businesses going bankrupt, the government not collecting the
funds. What good is it for anybody?

And another aspect of that is the Customs enforcement angle of that where I'm seeing small businesses have to deal with, which is tough, especially for these smaller businesses. A lot of them are owned by minorities. And with the enforcement levels, what we're seeing this day and age post-COVID is a lot of remote work environments, which I'm all for, but the proactive communication that we used to have and we used to have the ability to have to pick up the phone and be able to call somebody in the Federal Government and get an answer right away, that's gone and now it's send me an email. Well, let's have a conversation about this. No, no, no, I talked through your email, great. So, as a lawyer, I can write a book. I write a book for an email and that's what it takes for me to get a phone call after the fact.

The level of communication that should be there, we're seeing duplicity in enforcement efforts consistently across the board and to get -- for example, Customs can send a request for information where they want to see if you're complying with the antidumping laws, right, and that request for information has a very tight deadline, 30 days. Then if Customs isn't happy with your answer, they send a Notice of Action, taking actions, and you didn't comply with the antidumping order and I'm telling you, you need to comply
with the antidumping order and you're going to change your
entry or so on. What we're seeing is those two opportunities
that you would typically have to respond, instead Customs is
taking that away and just issuing Notices of Actions with
action taken. Say, no, no, no, your imports were subject to
the antidumping order and I'm not even giving you the right
to communicate with me and to tell me whether or not. It's
part of the due process that's gone and you should have the
ability to communicate what your side of the story is prior
to that adverse event just taking place against you.

Similar to EAPA, the Enforce and Protect Act cases,
having your confidentiality as part of the bridge of the case
and not even understanding the true allegation against you
until you spend beaucoup bucks, and it's also -- the best
part about EAPA for me is the alleger, whoever that might be,
gets to selectively pick what imports they want, which means
you selectively get to pick any particular imports and squash
their businesses, while there are other importers from the
same producer that aren't necessarily picked. It's a very
interesting program, but I think programs like that need to
be reevaluated because their negative impact happens to be on
the ethnic groups that you're speaking of as well because
they're the ones particularly that may not have the education
and training before they start a really cool entrepreneurial
business, if that was a really great opportunity, and wound
up being debt for life.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Yeah. It sounds like --
I mean this point about, you know, outreach and being able to
communicate this information so that people understand what's
available, what the -- you know, what the responsibilities
are --

MS. DIAZ: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: -- is incredibly
important. So, I think it's a --

MS. DIAZ: I saw a recent page of -- I think it was
by the World Trade Organization. They recently published a
website on resources and opportunities for education for
newer importers and getting the word out about that -- like
I'm putting that in my communication to importers when
they're starting to import in terms of like top tips when
you're importing because the lack of knowledge, that they're
almost 40 Federal Government agencies that regulate imports
and exports, that's a lot. It's a lot to understand.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Exactly.

MS. DIAZ: You very much know that yourself. And I
mean being able to digest that as a small business and
understand what's obligated of you in order to successfully
compete in this market, the education and training portion is
just essential for that.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: It's essential, yeah.
That's a very good point. So we are already a little past three o'clock. You know, for those of you who can't stay any longer, I totally understand and, you know, you can certainly drop off whenever you'd like. If there are -- I did have one more question and I wanted to give my Commissioners, my fellow Commissioners the opportunity to ask any questions.

So if you can stay -- can folks stay for the ones who are still here for another 15 minutes maybe, 10 or 15 minutes? Okay, I'm seeing some hands shaking.

So the other -- the last question sort of to wrap up, I guess, is in your view, if you have one, how important is the impact of trade on things like employment, wages, working conditions, as compared to other factors in the economy that are impacting employment, wages, working conditions? So, obviously, trade is not the only thing going on in the economy, right? Trade has a huge impact. In your all's view, how does it compare to other things? So, for instance, maybe the Federal Reserve's policy on interest rates, right? You know, things like that that obviously have an impact on the economy, is it as important or if not more? You know, I realize this is a bit of an abstract question, but Spriggs, I was going to call on you if you didn't raise your hand, so --

MR. SPRIGGS: Thank you. Well, trade is important because the trade agreements we have been adopting don't
properly protect labor standards or environmental standards of the United States. And they treat trade -- the trade agreements, I've treated those as things that can be manipulated and the result is that it creates a huge downward pressure on our labor standards and on our environmental standards. And those American companies that are devoted to American workers and want to stay in place, they're at a huge disadvantage because of that, and they feel under pressure because of those rules. So it's important because it sets an atmosphere.

I mean it's also important that we've undermined labor laws through other methods as well. So the importance of passing the Protect the Right to Organize, the PRO Act, maintaining proper minimum wage, those are vital to keep the wages up. It's vital that we have a Fed committed for employment. All of the models that economists use to predict the impact of trade assume that we will stay devoted as a nation to our stated legal policy and our laws state that the policy in the United States Government is for employment in terms of macroeconomic policy. We have let the Feds stray from that way too many times. Those combine to make the problem for workers.

Technology is not a problem for workers. Technology increases the productivity of workers. But if workers don't live in a world in which they can bargain for
their fair share of the increase in productivity, then, yes, productivity is bad because workers don't get the increased productivity. And over the last 40 years, that's what we've seen, productivity of American workers has gone up and up and up, the wages of American workers have gone nowhere. That's part of what makes this a zero sum game.

So I know that many economists have convinced themselves that technology is bad, but we have the fastest growth in productivity to take place between 1946 and 1976. We think productivity so much in this nation that within a short amount of time, we were able to double what the average worker could produce and that took place with rising wages, falling poverty. So there's nothing about technology that makes things worse for workers. But if we're going to have a race to the bottom with the rest of the world, then, yes, and we need trade agreements that force everybody up.

Just imagine the world we would be in if Mexican auto workers were like Canadian auto workers. If Mexican auto workers were getting paid $20 an hour or $25 an hour instead of $9 a day, imagine the demand for goods and services in North America. We couldn't make enough cars if Mexican auto workers were like Canadian auto workers. We would all be benefitting. And the new trade agreement that is allowing for the first time honest elections by auto workers in Mexico at least put us on a path where maybe
Mexican auto workers will be like Canadian auto workers and will one day get the same wages. We moved our auto industry to Mexico. I mean this is a reality. We did that without creating the demand on goods that should have gone with the tremendous increase in productivity that's taking place in Mexico.

None of us benefit from rules that let people arbitrage our labor laws or our environmental laws. And right now part of our inflation is coming from environment. The shortage of pasta is from an environmental disaster of it being too late to put Durum wheat into the ground. And so if we want American workers to be part of the solution to global warming, we have to show American workers that we're going to have a level playing field in the world when it comes to addressing global warming. And that means we have to revise our trade agreements and the USITC needs to say to Congress, you can have this trade agreement, but you're going to increase global warming. You can have a trade agreement with a country that isn't going to be committed to lowering carbon emissions and we're going to import the carbon, but American workers have to give up their jobs, that's not going to be acceptable to the American workers. It's not part of a just transition.

And so in answer to your question, I think trade plays a role, in that it sets what are the rules that either
allow workers in America to benefit from increased productivity and so far we have implemented agreements that work against that. And I think the key thing to remember and the way that economists talk, technology, as most American workers have experienced, did not destroy their jobs. When you ask auto workers did we lose our jobs to technology, they normally say, no, because in the 1980s the auto industry intensified the use of robots and really tried its best to squeeze extra productivity. The UAW negotiated to save jobs and so, yes, the share of people in the auto industry in the United States went down, but those workers kept their jobs because they were being trained to be retooled for where the industry was going in terms of skills. What happened this century is different. We actually lost manufacturing jobs. People came in one day and saw their plant gone the next day. That's not -- and that's why people respond to trade because there's no way to bargain my plant moving.

So I think that in fairness the big factors have been: a lack of commitment to full employment, the inability of workers to continue to organize and freely join unions if they wish, the lack of protecting labor standards broadly and the role that trade plays in American business no longer being a partner, and maintaining labor standards or defending labor standards in the United States.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Thank you. Mr.

MR. MITCHELL: What I was going to say was just what you all were saying so, I mean --

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Okay.

MR. MITCHELL: I would just be repeating the same thing.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Okay. Okay. All right. Did anyone else -- would anyone else like to comment on that question, you know, how do you see the impact of trade as compared to the impact of other factors that, you know, affect wages, employment, economic health? Mr. Ferry?

MR. FERRY: Yes, thank you, Commission. I agree pretty much with everything Dr. Spriggs said. I guess just looking at it from an economist's perspective, also I would say that if you think of, you know, you asked how important are trade agreements or free trade in the process, hurting workers' wages and particularly minority workers and hurting employment opportunities, you know, I would say that many of us in economics and politics over the last 50 years have performed an enormous fete of mental hypnotism. If I said to you imagine that we're going to create free trade between Africa and South America and thy have two different prices of coffee, what would happen after the Free Trade Agreement
between these two continents.

Well, of course, the coffee prices wouldn't cooperate because that's the purpose of the Free Trade Agreement is to let the coffee manufacturers compete and everybody wins, and if I said what would happen to wheat prices or coconut prices, you'd say exactly the same thing.

Then, round about 1980s in this country, people began to say let's have a Free Trade Agreement with Mexico and how about China, how about Central America and nobody said in the Congress, well a few people did, but they were drowned out, well if we asked wages to compete, and if U.S. wages are up here -- I don't know how the camera's doing, and wages in Central America are down here or China, they're going to do this.

U.S. wages are going to come down and Central American wages and Chinese wages are going to come up or, as Dr. Spriggs pointed out in Mexico, if there's a structure that doesn't allow their wages to come up, our wages will go down more, and indeed the BLS did a study of auto wages in this country and found out that in real terms, they fell by over 20 percent over the last 20 years, so I think most of you haven't had to struggle through 10 years of economic study as I have immediately grasp this point. It's not hard if you haven't been hypnotized by the economics profession.

So without turning this into an economics lecture
I'll say my conclusion is GDP is the wrong measure for the success of an economic policy or a trade policy. The right measure is are you creating more high-wage jobs and are wages rising each and every year, and that sounds fairly abstract to some of you, but I'll put it in real terms this way. The steel industry right now is creating more jobs and boosting people's wages each year. When we go into a trade agreement, we all hear tons and tons about the pharmaceutical industry. The pharmaceutical industry is actually offshoring production to Asia and Europe, so it's creating fewer jobs in the United States each year. Now, it is paying its engineers above $200,000, and I respect that. We all want to see education and innovation in this country, but if you're reducing the total number of your workforce by eliminating jobs to the lower half, and that's what affects the minority population disproportionately, you're not serving the good of the economy, so I'll stop there for fear of turning it into a lecture. Thank you, Commissioner, for the opportunity.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Great. Yeah, my pleasure. Thank you very much. All right. Anyone else who would like to comment on that question for those of you who are still here? Dr. Spriggs, I see your hand up again. Oh, you're on mute.

MR. SPRIGGS: So I just want to add one more fine point, and what that is we are cutting off our nose currently
to spite our face. American workers lost millions of manufacturing jobs this century, and you will hear repeatedly companies saying why don't Americans want these jobs, you know, the jobs. You're just talking that we're willing to let these jobs go. Why do I want a job that you have set in place policies that say we don't want those jobs. You can't have them both ways. You can't get kids to go into something where they just saw their parents lose their jobs, their uncles lose their jobs, their aunts lose their jobs, and then you say why don't you want to go into that industry? You just sent me the signal, and they're responding to the economics of it.

If you want Americans to be manufacturing workers, then you got to stand up for American manufacturing workers. It has to be a job that they -- that you protect.


MR. RODRIGUEZ: I think it's a valid point and, you know, going back, I guess to the second half question that you posed, you know, I wrote down five major points, you know, as to a path moving forward, and, you know, one of them is there's definite reality that we need to bring parties to the table, all affected parties to the table, and that seems to be something that's been left out, right? A second thing
is we need to use real statistics, not just my statistics or your statistics, real statistics, you know, we are different realities, you know, we've heard on this call a good amount of people speaking about bad trade deals and trade deals being, you know, wrong for this country.

We've heard some people, you know, myself included, speaking about the fact there are benefits to it. I don't think there's a perfect trade deal that works, you know, to the benefit of everyone, you know, but I think that's a real point is we need to use real stats, you know, how it really affects all different, you know, portions of the communities that participate in this country.

I think another point that was made earlier, and I want to reiterate it, is we need to plan accordingly once we have that information and once we have, you know, the right people at the table, we need to plan accordingly, right? And appropriately so that it's across-the-board equivalent to the representation that's there and equivalent to the people of this country. Jennifer mentioned a lot, and others did as well, education, you know, is definitively necessary, you know, there's some things in this country that we're never going to produce again, you know?

Our cost of labor is extremely high, and it's uncompetitive in our own market and therefore we have to go outside of this country to bring some products in because we
just can't compete against ourselves at, you know, the true
cost of labor that we have plus all the additional factors.
There's just products that we will never produce again, and
so we've shifted into a service, you know, service economy,
and education plays a huge role in that, you know, we can't --
- I think one of the two gentlemen now was just saying, you
know, why doesn't my kid want to do what my, you know, what I
did and what my grandfather did and -- well, because the
world's changed, you know, and so some of these jobs just are
no longer realistic jobs.

How many of us benefit from jumping online and
buying something online, something that didn't exist, you
know, 10, 15 years ago, you know, the world has changed, and
I think, you know, my final point behind all of it is I think
we all need to take our own personal responsibilities in our
actions, in our activities and ensure that, you know,
whatever the situation be or whatever the situation of a
trade agreement and how that can affect -- we need to kind of
look at ourselves and make sure that we're taking personal
responsibilities for how we live our lives, what actions we
take and how we carry that out.

And I think that's something that continuously gets
left out of the conversation, but I just wanted to drop that
in there at the last moment, you know, of this, so thank you
for the opportunity to me and pleasure, you know, hearing
everybody here speak.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Thank you. Thank you so much for participating, so I think a couple of Commissioners want to say something. We have the other four Commissioners who are on the phone or on the line I should say, the video. You can see their pictures there. We have Jason Kearns, Randy Stayin, Amy Karpel and David Johanson who are the other four of the five, and I know both Jason and Randy I saw you wave your hands. Jason, you've got your electronic hand up, so if you all have some questions, please jump in.

COMMISSIONER KEARNS: Okay. Well, first off, thank you all for appearing before us today. This is really helpful. I have a number of questions. I don't want to take all the time so I will try to just ask one. Maybe I can followup with a few of you with some written questions after, but just a followup on Commissioner's Schmidtlein's last question, I guess. I mean, I think another way of going about asking that and in a way that may be -- I don't know how many, you know, actual like factor workers we have on anymore. I think Mr. Mitchell, you're one. I don't know if Mr. Odume's still on or Mr. Jenkins.

Okay. So a different way of asking the same question, I think, is, you know, in your experience on the factory floor, you know, was there ever concern expressed that if you all negotiated for higher wages, better
conditions, you know, better pensions, better, you know, more
time off that the result would be that those jobs would go
overseas? Was that ever something that like caused you all
to be reluctant to seek higher wages, seek better conditions?
Is that something that happened, and is that something that
your coworkers talked about? Is it something that management
threatened you all with or how does that work?

MR. MITCHELL: That was a constant of all of our
basic labor agreements when we went into negotiations. We
were always competing against free trade agreements who
didn't have any labor bargaining, they -- human right
protections, the environment, so we were always competing
against that ghost whenever we went in. We were reluctant to
ask for a lot at the table. Our pensions were not what some
others are because we were afraid we was going to go bankrupt
like a couple of the steel companies did, so that was always
the back thought as to what we should ask for and what the
reality was of how we would survive, so yes to your question.

COMMISSIONER KEARNS: Okay. Thank you, and yeah,
we don't get enough opportunities to talk to workers like you
and so I appreciate your input, and I don't know, Mr.
Spriggs, if you can just -- a quick followup questions before
I hand things over to Vice Chair Stayin, and Mr. Mitchell, if
you want to add anything, too, but, I mean, my understanding
of U.S. labor law is not as good as it should be, but my
understanding is management is not allowed to threaten to
move factories overseas if, you know, if workers asked for
higher wages. Is that the case and does it nevertheless
happen?

MR. SPRIGGS: It nevertheless happens. This is a
constant threat, and it's made to workers even when they try
to organize. When workers try to organize, they're told that
they -- nothing about them going in for a union keeps the
jobs there, that the company's response to having a union may
be we won't stay in the United States. They're told this in
meetings, and then they're pulled in during the election to
organize, to organize the union. They're pulled into
individual meetings and repeatedly told this.

COMMISSIONER KEARNS: Thank you, and, Mr. Mitchell,
I know you wanted to say something, too. Let me just ask to
also comment on, you know, to put this more in the way that
Commissioner Schmidtlein asked it, okay? So that, you know,
trade has been a way that you all have felt like you can't
push for more in labor negotiations. Has technology -- have
they said, you know, if you ask for more money, we're going
to get roadblocks instead or has interest rates or federal
reserve policies have that affect or of all those causes what
did you hear most to kind of -- is pushing wages down and
working conditions, you know, in the wrong direction? Was it
trade and moving jobs overseas, or was it these other things
like robots?

MR. MITCHELL: The first one is going to be, and I think this was in a basic labor agreement somewhere around '84. We took a cut, and we took like $1.50 cut across the board in order to compete, and I'm talking U.S. Steel, and from that point on, we didn't see a raise for 10 years at U.S. Steel. We stayed at that flat rate for 10 years in there. The other part of that that took place, too, was they did a lot of job combining whereas if you were an electrician, then you also had to go with systems for for your electronics and a welder was also a pipefitting, so they combined a lot of jobs in there and what that did was not you have maybe one person doing three crafts and that saved them money in order for us to compete.

I don't have the knowledge to say whether or not it helped save that industry, but there are a lot of job combinations out there now where people are asked to do more than one I'll say trade in order to compete on a global economy.

COMMISSIONER KEARNS: Okay. Thank you. I'll let others ask questions.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Vice Chair Stayin, did you have a question?

VICE CHAIR STAYIN: I did. Can you hear me?

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Yes.
VICE CHAIR STAYIN: Okay. I'll make sure my microphone is on. It's -- certainly I grew up in a city with a lot of manufacturing and my colleagues are probably fed up with my stories about how much it meant to the families and the workers, so -- and, of course, the Commission, what we do in terms of dealing with antidumping and counter-veiling duty laws and enforcing them in order to protect our people from unfair trade practices, but I would like as much input that we can get.

Obviously, the classic is the shifting of making automobiles from Detroit or Michigan or wherever they're being produced -- to Mexico is a classic, and I would certainly like to know about other situations where we can get information from all of you where you know of a circumstance where a company shifted -- went offshores and why can't -- to try to -- we're trying to understand the impact. I know what typically happens and what it feels like. What I want to know is what we could do to try to stop it.

And one thing that I must say that prior to coming to the Commission I was kind of the trade practice of a big firm in Indiana, and in Indiana there are quite a few Japanese companies that came and opened up factories producing products here in the United States, and in that circumstance, we actually had it kind of in reverse where a
foreign company came in -- companies came in and created jobs, and I think one of the questions is well how can we incentive more of that happening to try to encourage manufacturers in other countries to come to the United States and take advance of the great workers that we have.

So I think these are things we need to think about and I appreciate all what you do here today, and I understand where you're coming from and I assure you that all of us at the ITC are very much aware, and part of our job is to try to make sure is you're not going to be hurt beyond trade practices. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Thank you. Commissioner Johanson or Commissioner Karpel? Commissioner Johanson, it looks like you want to say something. No? Oh, you're on mute.

COMMISSIONER JOHANSON: I was actually trying to put up a question to host. Hopefully, I would sound more coherent, but I'll go ahead and just try to pose it as it is. Dr. Pink earlier today stated that manufacturing in western Michigan is still very alive. Unfortunately, Dr. Pink had to leave the roundtable as I was going to post a question to him. I will pose it to you all. There are still -- there is indeed still manufacturing in our country. What are these manufacturers doing right in order to continue manufacturing here?
COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: I see Dr. Spriggs and Ms. Sanger-McLaughlin. You both had your hands up. I don't know if you wanted to answer the prior question or if you had something to add to this question. Either way, please go ahead.

MR. SPRIGGS: Well, I do want to answer the prior question. I mean, one of the reasons though is there were disparate impacts for black workers in particular is that the Chinese imports mainly affected manufacturing in the southeast, and in the research that we did, we put up heat maps so you could see the big impacts where were black workers live. So when you think about southwestern Virginia and the Piedmont of North Carolina, you think about the manufacturer or furniture, things that other lumber products that were hit very hard when Chinese imports -- and you think about textiles that had taken it on the chin, but tried to remain competitive in answer to the last question by going to the high road but couldn't find a way to stay competitive.

And so the loss of a lot of the industry in North Carolina and Virginia and then South Carolina hurt black workers deeply from -- this century. And a lot of that was variances in competitive with China. I think the manufacturers that have stayed in place a lot of what they're doing right is some of this is being protected because they are protected by our government procurement policies. We
still remain the world's leader in aerospace, and that has a lot to do with our government procurement policies that protect that industry.

We're backdoor engaging in industrial policy through a lot of our defense contracting, and then the superiority of a high end of auto assembly that still keeps assembly plants here in the U.S. plus this to the market that's what's encouraged the Japanese and the other transplants that have come to the United States to make automobiles here. We can encourage transplants, but you notice that American companies are unionized. The transplants are not, and the ability for these transplants to circumvent our labor laws has to be a huge train on us as a nation that we let other country's other manufacturers come here and not insist that they respect the right of American workers to organize.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: Thank you. Ms. Stanger-McLaughlin?

MS. STANGER-MCLAUGHLIN: I just wanted to add that we talk about or we've heard today issues of companies going international. Another option is to stay domestic and look at tribes and reservations and sovereignty and the jurisdiction that tribes have as another alternative where an example being Tesla. Tribes -- Indian tribes in the United States can create free trade zones, and there's advantages
such as exemptions from state and local inventory taxes, so I encourage us to look at tribes in protecting domestic workers and standing up their ability to continue domestically.

There is some fear working with tribes, and I think a lot of that has been overstated in the past. Most tribes today have modern economies. They have laws that are equivalent to state laws that can be used to protect worker's rights, but also I wanted to mention before the call's over we have a scholarship foundation that we just helped establish, and it's called the tribal agriculture fellowship, and that is closing today, so if you know anyone that's eligible for that, that includes funding for technical -- those that would like to pursue a technical education, so in any type of agricultural production.

But the last thing that I would like to say is that we need to all be part of conversations that exist in trade in the industry space. The Native American Agriculture fund attended the Tri-national Accord this year which is the agricultural agreement between Canada and Mexico where they talk about agricultural trade. I did not hear in that space from leaders in manufacturing or in general industry. It was the state departments of agriculture hosting it, but I encourage you all to take place in those types of conversations. The next accord will take place in Mexico, but we need more worker representatives in this meeting.
COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: All right. Very good point. Thank you so much. All right. Commissioner Karpel, we have not heard from you today. Do you have a question or would you like to make any comment before we wrap up here since we've kept everyone 45 minutes past the time?

COMMISSIONER KARPEL: No, I don't have a question. I think this has been a very rich conversation and very much appreciate everyone's willingness to participate and share their thoughts and views. It's really valuable and critical that we hear from you, so thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHMIDTLEIN: All right. Thank you very much. Well, I'd just like to thank all of you who are still with us for participating today. It has been a very enlightening and interesting constructive conversation. As I mentioned at the beginning, the ITC is going to have six more roundtables. The other four Commissioners will be hosting at least one of those each, and so I'd encourage you all to either, you know, if you're interested participate again or at the very least listen in, okay? So thank you all very much, and that will bring us to the end of our roundtable today.

ALL: Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 3:50 p.m., the roundtable in the above-entitled matter adjourned.)
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