

tinction between his unemployment and someone who is unemployed for another reason whatever it might be.

I would think that our unemployment insurance, our Manpower Development and Training Act, these general laws that are supposed to be hitting at the problems of unemployment, would be the way to take care of any unemployment that is created as a result of imports, rather than trying to do something special.

Do you have any reason, Mr. Secretary, why you think it is necessary for us to treat unemployment which results from imports differently than we treat unemployment for another reason?

Secretary WIRTZ. I have nothing to add to the record of 6 years ago.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, we have had some experience since then.

Secretary WIRTZ. We have had no experience. Twenty-five applications have all been turned down, every single one of them.

Mr. CURTIS. That is what I mean. We have had that experience. Now, in the light of that experience, was it because we didn't treat the problem of unemployment resulting from imports correctly or was it because there wasn't any reason to treat the problems differently because they were being adequately taken care of under unemployment insurance and the Manpower Development and Training Act?

Secretary WIRTZ. It is my judgment because we put the wrong words in the statute, and created an impossible burden of proof.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, what you are saying is that you do think that in light of experience there is a reason why we should treat unemployment resulting from imports in a different way than we treat unemployment that is caused by other reasons?

Secretary WIRTZ. I think the provision in the law is correct in that respect.

Mr. CURTIS. Could you explain why you think there is a special problem in unemployment that results from imports, as opposed to unemployment resulting from other causes?

Secretary WIRTZ. I only note, Mr. Curtis, that we went around and around on that, 6 years ago, I don't believe I have a word to add to it.

With due respect to the committee, and the recognition of the inadvisability of repeating it, I don't believe that argument has changed a bit.

Mr. CURTIS. This committee is a different committee in membership from 6 years ago. This is a different Congress. It is hard for me to believe that the administration stands pat on what it did 6 years ago.

I can believe it, though.

Mr. FULTON (presiding). Mr. Battin.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Smith, in your statement, on page 2, you say, and I quote:

In the area of consumer goods, other than automobiles, the total value of exports has grown from \$1.4 billion in 1960 to \$2.1 billion in 1967, an increase of about 50 percent.

In arriving at that figure, are we talking about constant dollars, or is this an adjustment figure?

Secretary SMITH. That is the dollar in whatever year. There is no adjustment of dollar value.

Mr. BATTIN. To get a true picture of the constant dollar, this figure would have to be adjusted?