parable to those of the steel industry, the textile industry, the shoe industry, and others. Probably, our industry, the textile industry the shoe industry, and others. Probably, our industry has felt more sharply the consequences of this unfair import competition. Had broadtariff cutting authority been dropped before the 1962 Trade Expansion Act, instead of authorizing much greater power in the 1962 act, we believe that the United States today would be much better off in our national economy, in our balance of trade, and in our balance of payments. Whatever our mistakes may have been in the past and whatever else needs to be done at this time to correct our international trade problems, the first step is not to authorize any further tariff cutting authority. While it is recognized that H.R. 17551 would only provide permission to exercise unused authority granted under the 1962 act, one mistake does not justify another. Please understand this continued authority if granted would have no direct meaningful significance to the U.S. rolled zinc manufacturing industry because the tariffs on all of our rolled zinc products were cut the maximum of 50 percent under the Kennedy round, notwithstanding the ruinous import competition with which our industry has been encountering for some years.

We believe that the administrative authorities under the Kennedy round acted without sufficient regard for the interest of efficient U.S. manufacturers. We believe they should have no further authority to cut duties.

ANTIDUMPING LAW SHOULD BE STRENGTHENED

We consider the U.S. antidumping law to be responsible for some of our problems. One of our members had occasion to make a sale in Canada. Shortly after the merchandise was delivered, the company received a communication from Canadian authorities inquiring if the goods in question had been sold in Canada at a price which was lower than the price for which the product was sold in the United States. The communication notified the U.S. producer that additional duty would be levied in Canada unless the Canadian Government could be supplied with copies of invoices showing the sale of the item on comparable terms in the United States. The company did provide the invoices which closed the matter. We have no criticism of this Canadian procedure but instead agree with it, and believe the policy of our Government should be the same as the Canadian policy rather that that which is the U.S. policy of requiring proof of injury even after dumping has been shown.

Another experience involved an offer from a foreign source to sell to one of our companies zinc metal over a long contract period with the sale price to be a specific amount below whatever might be the current U.S. price for zinc metal. When asked about this offer in relation to its application to antidumping regulations, the foreign source indicated it did not take seriously the possibility of antidumping action by the U.S. Government. We realize that at the Kennedy round new international dumping arrangements were negotiated, and we understand that it is contended that administrative authorities do not need congressional permission for the United States to accept the international arrangements because they would not require