ment. The availability of adjustment assistance offered in the Trade Expansion Act of 1968 to companies and workers injured by imports is, of course, important and desirable. It does not apply, however, to situations where the integrity of whole industries or substantial parts thereof is threatened, and where these industries are too important in the domestic economy to be liquidated by transfer of their management and workers to other fields. To provide for such situations, it is recommended that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 be amended in the following respects:

(A) Sec. 201(b)(2) and Sec. 351(b)(1) should be augmented by adding: "provided that a specific rate of duty existing on July 1, 1934 may be converted to its ad valorem equivalent based on the value of imports of the article concerned during the calendar year 1934, and the equivalent ad valorem rate of duty thus determined may be increased by not more than 50 percent."

This is quite essential to provide reasonable relief if this Section needs to be invoked on behalf of an industry like the brass mill industry whose products are largely on a specific duty basis. Taking as an example copper sheet and strip, in 1934 the average price of imports was 33 cents a pound and the duty 6.5 cents a pound. The ad valorem equivalent would be 19.7 percent. In 1967, because of inflation as well as reduction in duty, the average price of imports was 60 cents a pound and the duty 2.95 cents a pound, or an ad valorem equivalent of 4.9 percent. If the maximum 50 percent permissible increase in tariff provided by Sec. 201(b)(2) and Sec. 351(b)(1) as presently worded had to be invoked, the allowable increase in the tariff would be 3.25 cents, and the revised tariff would be 9.75 cents, which would be only 16.2 percent on an ad valorem basis, or less than in 1934. How discriminatory this would be if this same measure of relief were granted a product on an ad valorem basis to begin with is indicated by the fact that a 50 percent increase for that product would raise the tariff to 29.55 percent as against 19.7 percent in 1934, whereas for the brass mill product in this example, the ad valorem equivalent duty would actually be lowered from the same 19.7 percent in 1934 to 16.2 percent!

(B) In Sec. 301(b)(1) the words "as a result in major part of concessions granted under trade agreements" should be deleted for the same reason that it is in Sec. 301(c)(1) and Sec. 301(c)(2) in the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1968.

(C) To Sec. 301(b)(2) should be added, as one of the economic factors to be taken into consideration by the Tariff Commission as relevant to injury or threatened injury to a domestic industry from increased imports, the words: "decline in normal or prospective growth."

4. For certain industries, as appears to be the accepted fact for some of our agricultural products, quotas may be the only practical approach to prevent injury from unneeded imports. Provision should therefore be made for such relief, with certain criteria stated as presumptive evidence of actual or potential injury. Such criteria might include the percentage that imports have taken of the domestic market which the industry has the capacity to serve, and a ceiling for imports which if exceeded would be economically untenable. Such criteria might be incorporated in Sec. 352 (Orderly Marketing Agreements), by appropriate amendment, or by separate legislation.

5. In any further trade negotiations carried on under the Trade Expansion Act, appropriately selected representatives from industry should be consulted *while* the negotiations are in progress. They should preferably participate in some manner in these negotiations. Industry representatives cannot be of any practical service if they are not kept informed of the give and take during the negotiations. Our attitude in this respect should be as realistic and business-like as that of our foreign trading partners.

6. Prompt favorable action is needed in the amendment of the Antidumping Act of 1921, such as is proposed in H.R. 408 (Mr. Conte) and a number of identical bills which have been introduced in the House (similar to S. 1726 by Mr. Hartke and co-sponsors in the Senate). Such action is quite necessary to provide effective relief from the unfair trade practice of dumping, within the spirit and intent of the Antidumping Act of 1921.

7. Finally and most important, immediate action needs to be taken on H. Con. Res. 447 (companion resolution to S. Con. Res. 38) which states in effect that it is the sense of the Congress that the International Antidumping Code be sub-