barriers in 1930. We cut down our imports, but we lost even more in exports. There followed a catastrophic decline in the world market in which our import restrictions did not help us to preserve our own prosperity.

It is also relevant to point out that the concessions which countries have extended to each other in trade negotiations in the form of agreed tariff reductions are based on the assumption that the other countries which will benefit from those reductions will go on in good faith to implement their side of the bargain. However, it renders the negotiations and agreements reached largely meaningless when one of the contracting parties subsequently impairs the bargain by unilaterally imposing import quotas, with the object of restricting access to its market.

The notion of setting aside a predetermined section of the market for imports and imposing a rigid ceiling above that level also seems to us to be wrong for the following reason. Trade is never static. It is dynamic and constantly changing. Many of the items which are now of major importance to the United States as an exporting country had hardly been heard of 25 years ago. It is safe to predict that in another 10 or 15 years time we shall be exporting technologically advanced products which are not yet even on the drawing-board. It would be our hope, that as the United States maintains its present position of technical leadership, many of these products will secure a dominant place in world markets. Other countries must also be expected to have and allowed to have successes in their own areas of excellence. The concept of imposing a ceiling on any import which takes more than a set percentage of the market runs directly counter to this prospect and, if it were widely adopted, would hit the United States harder than anyone else. For a nation which leads the world in innovation and the dynamic pursuit of new opportunities it appears inconceivable to adopt and foster a policy of putting trade in a straitjacket.

The United States and the world have gained much from the persistent efforts which our Nation has made, since the end of World War II, to expand and liberalize international trade. We earnestly urge the continuation of these policies.

On behalf of the British-American Chamber of Commerce, we thank this eminent Committee for this opportunity to appear and for your consideration of our views.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Kintner, for bringing to us the views of the British-American Chamber of Commerce.

Are there any questions?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Byrnes.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Kintner, your group is basically interested, as I understand it, in the trade between this country and the United Kingdom.

Mr. KINTNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BYRNES. What has your group done on the difference in the freight rate structure which is weighted against American trade going to Britain?

Mr. KINTNER. We have not intervened directly in this matter but we understand that the chamber is very much concerned in securing an equalization of freight rates east and west.

Mr. BYRNES. Why haven't you intervened? Why didn't you intervene, for instance, in the proceeding before the Maritime Commission which was concluded last January? You are against discrimination, and want to facilitate trade.

Here is a definite area of discrimination. The Examiner found that the rates were so unreasonably high as to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States, contrary to the public interest, and in violation of the Shipping Act.

These were hearings of the Maritime Commission. What I am trying to find out is why the chamber, which is interested in this matter, didn't interest themselves in this proceeding?