

tralian agreed to "cease and desist" and the Tariff Commission then decided that there would be no injury.

By 1963, the importation of soil pipe and fittings had reached such proportions that some of the smaller American plants had to cease production, particularly on the west coast.

In 1964 Poland began exporting pipe and fittings to this country and at declared values which were so low they obviously were being dumped. On November 1, 1965, we petitioned the Commissioner of Customs to investigate these imports from Poland with respect to their fair value.

Twenty-two months later there was a finding of injury by the Treasury Department in the case of pipe but not in the case of fittings. How and under what regulation they could separate the two has never been explained. It was simply a matter of accepting a half loaf of 22-month-old stale bread or we presume we were at liberty to eat cake. Again the Tariff Commission found that there was injury in the case of pipe from Poland but they could not, under the adopted procedures, consider fittings. These two go together like a pitcher and a catcher on a ball team—one is useless without the other.

During the investigations into the Polish case we found that their exportation of fittings to this country were growing at an alarming rate. Normally in usage, the proportion by weight is approximately 25 percent to 30 percent fittings to 70 percent to 75 percent pipe. At one time their export ratio ran as high as 60 percent fittings to 40 percent pipe.

The reason for this is quite obvious when you consider that labor costs account for 70 percent to 75 percent of the total cost for manufacturing fittings whereas only 30 percent to 35 percent of the cost of manufacturing pipe is in the item of labor.

These people are not exporting pipe or fittings or nuts and bolts. They are exporting man-hours of labor in one form or another. We had no compunctions of conscience in setting rather low quotas on immigration to this country when our labor market became glutted. Ellis Island became a decaying monument to that period in our history. Why should we shy away from setting quotas on the products of this same labor which we prohibit as such?

In the antidumping case against cast iron soil pipe and fittings from Poland, the attorney for the Polish importer made this statement before the Treasury Department—"Polish pipe does not compete in the U.S. marketplace with French pipe." I might add there that they were comparing Polish prices with French prices which is the reason for that remark. "Polish pipe competes here with Indian pipe, which is much lower in price than the Polish pipe."

Again, I have a letter from the Dong Kwang Manufacturing Company of Seoul, Korea, which states:

We would like to draw your kind attention on our cheap and abundant labor resources in Korea. Therefore, we confidently assure you that our products can be competed against Yugoslavia and Italian products of the same in American markets for its price and quality.

Do either of them offer to compete with American industry and labor for the American market? How do the underprivileged occupants of the American ghettos benefit from this type of competition?