

eral Eisenhower wrote just a few days before his recent illness, and I quote:

United States foreign trade policy since World War II has been successful and consistent. It has succeeded in helping Western Europe, Japan, and North America achieve new levels of prosperity. It is consistent with our confidence in the private enterprise system and in cooperation among nations.

This policy of trade expansion under international rules has also contributed to our goal of a safer, more orderly and more humane world. Trade expansion has made it possible for Western Europe to move toward unity and for poorer nations to benefit from a growing world economy.

All this has been accomplished to the detriment of no nation and to the disadvantage of only a few producers hurt by changes that are familiar and inevitable in a dynamic economy.

Now, despite a commitment to the principle of freer trade, we are not appearing here as freer trade theorists, and I use the term "freer" rather than "free" deliberately.

I am under no illusion that trade can be totally free, nor would I argue that it should be. We are businessmen, not theorists, and we want to deal so far as we can in specifics.

Certainly we are well aware that some American producers are injured by competition from imports and that some of these imports may represent unfair competition. We also know that our own exports are sometimes discriminated against abroad, and I suspect that every member of the emergency committee could name specific examples where the exports of his own company were unfairly treated.

All this, notwithstanding the worldwide movement toward freer trade, has served us well and its reversal, we have not the slightest doubt, would injure us. We testify in our own self-interest, but we believe this self-interest is synonymous with that of the general public.

I want to emphasize this point of injury. Over the course of these hearings you will hear complaints of American manufacturers who feel they are hurt by imports and they will ask for protection of one kind or another. These cases can be made to appear very specific. Dollar figures can be assigned and jobs totaled. In a partial answer to them I want to report some of the general views of an international constituency.

Over the past year I have been president of the International Chamber of Commerce and have traveled over the world meeting with businessmen from other countries. Again and again I have had two things pointed out to me. Businessmen in the developing countries, the same countries we are trying to help with foreign aid, tell me they must have some reasonable access to this vast American market if they are to pay for the myriad of products they want to buy from us.

They need access for products they know how to make. You cannot manufacture a computer or a jet airplane in a small developing country. You may be able to manufacture products that do not require a great deal of capital or technology.

If we now decide to put up more barriers against this type of import we will be undercutting with one hand what our aid program and foreign policy is doing with the other.

There was a second point these businessmen abroad made to me. They told me as politely as they could that any trade barrier we erected would be met with retaliation from their own governments.

Thus, when your committee hears of alleged injury suffered by