

I am most anxious that they be held. Another thing that we have done is we participated in this dumping case against Canada in 1964, Oregon rolling mills of Portland, Oreg., and our company, and I testified back here twice, once in February and once again in March. This was a very lengthy, expensive operation to small people like ourselves.

We are the only case that was ever won by the steel industry since that law was enacted in 1921.

Now, the interesting thing about this is it seems that 2 years after the ruling was set down that they were dumping and we were being injured, and arbitrarily it provides that in the law that this be thrown out, that they have a dump for 2 years, so now we can forget that ruling that we spent so much money to prove.

Now, what is going to stop them from dumping again. The reason they were dumping is their overproduction. They couldn't consume their production in western Canada so they dumped it into Washington and Oregon. This same situation, by the way, is going on in Japan right now. In Japan it is extremely difficult to prove because they move through cartels, so how are we going to know what the steel mill is charging for steel in Japan. There is no way.

The only way we can look at this is this remark that Mr. Abel made this morning, which frankly we observed also, that the Japanese metal trade bulletin of January 11 said:

If you don't export ten percent more in 1968 than you did in 1967 we are going to fine you \$28 a ton and cut off your coking coal.

Naturally if they can sell it for \$25 a ton less they are going to save \$3 a ton and maintain the capacity and save their coking coal, so that is exactly what they are doing.

The steel that came into Seattle ports in January of 1968 against January of 1967 is double, gentlemen, double. By the way, we now have a case that the Tariff Commission will be on very soon—dumping—against Australia. We have a better case against them by the way than we had against Canada.

Another question was asked this morning about has anybody ever gone to the administration. Yes; I did. I wrote them a letter in November of 1967. I received a very courteous answer from the Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations and as yet that is all I have received.

Now, the last point I would like to bring out is I met with some of you Congressmen on March 12 of this year, the ad hoc committee of the Congress on this problem chaired by Congressmen Tunney and Pettis, and there were six, I believe, or seven of us men of industry from the West and we gave a little story about what our problem was and then we had questions from these Congressmen.

One of these Congressmen asked me how we could feel that the State Department or the administration could change their position now after these many years of the Marshall plan, et cetera.

My remark to him was this: That in my opinion the problem is now, but prior to World War II Japan's ingot capacity was less than 9 million tons. I have heard 7 million and 9 million so let's give them the benefit of the doubt and say 9 million tons; this when they are preparing for war with our country.

Naturally when the war came the first thing we have to do is destroy their instruments of war so we bombed all their plants naturally as