

I can be in error. There are others besides yourself who have alleged that the new International Antidumping Code goes beyond the authority they had, but I am looking for the reasons you think so.

Mr. HUNT. In our case with Poland it was a classic example because in the first place the Treasury said that because it was in the Soviet bloc, it took an especially long time, they could not use figures from Poland.

In other words, they had to treat that country differently from any other country although the present law does not specify a difference between countries.

It seems to me, Mr. Curtis, that all we have to do is set a legal time limit on the Treasury Department's investigation in the same manner as is now set upon the Tariff Commission.

Mr. CURTIS. Well, the international agreement sought, as I understand it, to try to cut back these delays. In these other countries who have antidumping laws, too, if we have delays they have even more serious delays.

In fact, their antidumping actions are not even by law but are frequently by bureaucratic action.

Mr. HUNT. That is correct, and I know that Canada through their delegation to Geneva agreed in principle to this also they specifically stated it was subject to parliamentary approval.

Mr. CURTIS. I think in their instance it probably is because they do not have the damage aspect and the International Code does.

There I think there was a change in substance in respect to Canadian law but I don't see any change presently in substance between the International Antidumping Code and our present antidumping law.

The better way to answer this question, rather than to take the committee's time, is to submit a brief on this issue. Just explain why you think that we are exceeding the authority. I am also interested in this brief if you would set out why you think this new code isn't an improvement.

I think it is an improvement and would have benefited your industry in the process of your antidumping claim. Whether you won it or not at least it would have been certain and quicker.

Mr. HUNT. I think that we can show that a case like the one against Poland would not have improved our case but the main thing, Mr. Congressman is, getting back to the theory, who is under the Constitution regulating the international commerce of the United States. Is it a staff in the executive department or is it the Congress?

Mr. CURTIS. Well, it is obviously both. I am getting a little tired of this question because surely you recognize the answer.

Congress legislates and in legislating what we essentially are doing is giving power to the Executive under guidelines, but the Executive is the one who has to execute the laws.

Now, surely the witnesses who come before this committee recognize this. You are not asking Congress to get into the business of administering laws, are you? You are not.

Mr. HUNT. No, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. Then let's deal with this on the proper basis.

Mr. PERRY. I would like Mr. Hunt to come up with a brief on that to give you a clearer picture.