

As an indication of the recency of the progress of the round, I would recall that, even as late as June 2, 1965, the antidumping agreement that was signed on June 30 had not even been discussed. The group—the Non-Tariff Barriers Committee of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—that was to be the forum for organizing the negotiations on nontariff barriers, had not even met, and its membership had not even been organized.

But very shortly thereafter, I believe the middle of June, the British Government submitted its paper deeply criticizing what it then considered the shortcomings of the U.S. administration of the Antidumping Act of 1921, an opinion shared by many other countries.

It is rather a surprise that, 2 years later, we have mollified our foreign critics first just by explaining the logic behind our antidumping administration, and second, making apparently minor changes in our administrative practices. Above all, we have succeeded in having the essence of much of our own procedure—open hearings with rebuttal, public explanations of antidumping actions, and the criteria for such actions, among other safeguards—adopted by all the major trading nations under article 6 of the new antidumping agreement.

It has seemed to me that such an international agreement harmonizing national practices is a very promising achievement, an important first step toward much broader agreement on other international business practices. For the record, I would like to cite my previous comments in the Congressional Record on the problem of dumping: June 1, 1965, pages 11645–11647; March 8, 1966, pages 5112–5116; August 24, 1966, pages 19554–19557.

The year from May 1965 to May 1966 will be remembered as perhaps the period of most frustration in a very frustrating 5-year negotiation. The long stalemate in the functioning of the Common Market from June 1965 through February 1966 prevented its participation in the negotiations—the negotiations could not proceed.

But by the spring of 1966, the negotiations had begun again. After my early May 1966 trip to Geneva, I was able to report on May 31, Congressional Record pages 11280–11293, about the opening of discussions in two critical industrial sectors, steel and chemicals, and the resumption of discussions on wheat and feed grains, among other matters. Later in the summer, the Community tabled additional agricultural offers and so, by the fall, real negotiations were at last well underway.

Time does not permit me to chronicle minutely the step-by-step development of the negotiations, and that is not my purpose here. Suffice it to say that by the time of my return to the Geneva negotiations in late November 1966, the major issues had been clearly delineated, initial assessments of the dollar value of the offers had been drawn up and these were being presented to other participating countries with lists of requests for additional offers and lists of possible withdrawals.

Key issues remained, however, and their solution, as we know, was a touch-and-go proposition until the very final weeks of the negotiations. These key issues—mainly steel, chemicals, American selling price, a grains agreement, dairy and meat sector problems, and other