the quarterly average for mutton would be 12.9 million pounds. Therefore, mutton imports exceeded this amount in the first quarter of this year by 6.4 million pounds or almost 50 percent. It appears that the present law is almost meaningless. To be of any value, quotas must be set on a specie basis.

We appreciate the fact that H.R. 9475 authorizes the Administration to impose quotas on lamb and other meats not covered by quotas "to prevent unwarranted increases" in these meats. However, past experience would indicate that the Administration is not likely to exercise its authority to impose quotas unless required to do so by law. In view of this and the circumstances I have outlined, we would like to see the same type of quota arrangement provided on lamb as on other species, and as was provided in the original bill passed by a substantial majority of the Senate in 1964.

In summarizing our position on H.R. 9475, we endorse the bill strongly and urge that it be amended as follows:

1. Providing quotas by species of meat as in the 1964 Senate-passed bill.
2. Providing reasonable import quotas for lamb meat as in the 1964 Senate-passed bill.

H.R. 11578—IMPORT QUOTAS ON TEXTILES

We also strongly endorse H.R. 11578, introduced by Chairman Mills, to impose quotas on importation of certain textile articles. Our particular concern is, of course, the heavy expansion of imports of wool textiles. These imports have caused considerable contraction of domestic mills which are the only customers for domestic wool. However, in the interest of conserving hearing time, as requested by the Committee when these hearings were announced we will simply say at this point that we strongly endorse the testimony presented to this Committee last week on behalf of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers and other textile associations in support of H.R. 11578.

H.R. 17551—PROPOSED "TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1968"

We oppose H.R. 17551 to renew authority to cut tariff duties up to 50 percent.

We maintain that the Administration does not need and should not be granted further tariff cutting authority when we already have a serious imbalance of trade. U.S. commercial trade (excluding agriculture) ran a deficit of $641 million in 1967, adding to our balance of payments problem.

We understand that the Australian Prime Minister, when he recently conferred with President Johnson, renewed the request for a further reduction in the U.S. tariff duty on raw wool. Passage of H.R. 17551 would, of course, permit a slash in this duty, to the detriment of our domestic wool industry.

For 10 straight years the United States has spent, loaned and given away abroad far more than it has earned from its trade and investment overseas. In our present financial crisis, when the country apparently needs higher taxes and less Federal spending, we should certainly go very slow in granting authority to make further reductions in tariff duties that we have been cutting for the past 34 years. We strongly oppose enactment of H.R. 17551.