30. [7], p. 210.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 191.
32. *Ibid.*, pp. 258–59.
33. [1], p. 288, n. 3.
34. [7], pp. 258–59.
35. [6], p. 294.
36. [7], p. 294.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 192.
38. Quoted in [2], pp. 267–68.
39. Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 268.
40. Quoted in [8], p. 305.
41. A. L. Dunham, *The Industrial Revolution in France*, p. 399.
42. See, for example, the rest of the speech by M. Mayer, already cited above. "I add," he continues, "that when industrialists pursue another and progressive policy, they are capable of exporting."
43. [7], p. 7.
44. [10], p. 12.
45. This is obviously a quantity rather than a rate. Although the treaty was phrased in *ad valorem* rather than *ad rem* terms, the French were permitted to establish specific duties as long as their implied rate (using 1860 prices) was permissible under the treaty.
46. [7], pp. 172–73.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 173.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 141.
49. *Ibid.*, pp. 209–10.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 227.
51. See Dunham's chapters in [7] on these industries.
52. [7], p. 250.
53. This law, strikingly similar to the adjustment assistance provisions of the American Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (section 301), granted loans for modernization or relocation to firms having difficulty meeting foreign competition under the new tariff schedules.
54. Quoted in [7], pp. 157–58.
55. [7], p. 273.
56. [15], p. 258.

Appendix II

Steel Imports and Domestic Employment

Steel spokesmen claim that 11 million tons of imported steel "represents more than 70,000 steelworker jobs alone, and many thousands of additional jobs in supporting industries—all at a time when this nation is striving to achieve maximum employment." (L. B. Worthington, chairman of AISI, 8 February 1967) The implication is clear: steel imports reduce steel employment by 70,000-plus jobs.

Aside from the dubious techniques for arriving at this 70,000 figure,[1] the contention is defective for the following reasons:

(1) Sharply rising imports, starting in 1959, have been associated with significant increases in steel production—not only in the United States, but also in the European Coal and Steel Community. In neither case can unemployment be traced to rising imports. (See Table II–1.)

---

[1] The estimation seems to have been made on a purely mechanical basis. A simple division of steel shipments in 1966 by employment in the steel industry indicates that 156 tons were shipped for every person employed. Since 11 million tons valued at 1.2 billion were imported in 1966, dividing by average tonnage per employee gives a 70,000 figure. An alternative method of arriving at this estimate would be to consider that the 1965 imports of 10 million tons were equal to the combined shipments of Armco and Jones & Laughlin. These two companies employed about 79,000 people (Background Memorandum on American Iron & Steel Institute Steel Import Policy, Feb. 10, 1967). Using the first method assumes: (1) The industry could have filled the extra 11 million tons of demand; (2) The industry's present employees could have produced no more than they did in 1966; (3) The industry could have hired additional labor just as efficient as its existing labor force.