

As to the trend, hereinafter is a tabulation of two classifications of fish products showing the comparison of domestic production and imports of groundfish and fish meal during the past 8 years:

Year:	Groundfish domestic production	Groundfish imports	Fish meal domestic production	Fish meal imports
1960.....	93, 818	155, 550	290, 137	131, 561
1961.....	93, 039	195, 099	311, 265	217, 845
1962.....	93, 625	221, 420	312, 259	252, 307
1963.....	83, 419	231, 768	255, 907	376, 321
1964.....	75, 166	246, 569	235, 252	439, 143
1965.....	77, 180	294, 954	254, 051	270, 666
1966.....	75, 418	315, 097	223, 821	447, 784
1967.....	71, 032	283, 570	211, 514	651, 486

The figures clearly show the decline of domestic production and the substantial increase in imports during these past few years.

The fact should be recognized also that by foreign assistance and technical aid, we have subsidized and supported improvement and expansion of foreign fishing fleets and foreign industry and thereby encouraged and brought on ourselves the invasion and destruction of fishing resources on the very waters traditionally fished by our own American fishermen and much of these resources adjacent to our own coastal waters. As a result, the livelihood of American fishermen, as well as the national economy, is being detrimentally affected by the heavy flow of imported fish and seafood products.

The provisions of H.R. 17242 are a fair and reasonable basis of allowing imports, such as fishery products, to share in equal proportion to the growth of the American market and still allow our own industries to produce and continue to operate.

Take the case of groundfish, under section 5(d)3 of the bill, using previously cited figures; the 1960 imports supplied more than 40 percent (actually 81 percent) of domestic consumption, and imports since 1960 have increased by more than 15 percent.

Under this formula, as provided in the bill, the Tariff Commission would report to the President that the groundfish industry is at a serious competitive disadvantage in relation to imports and would set a ceiling to be applicable to imports of groundfish. The ceiling would be based on the average annual share of domestic consumption supplied by imports during the preceding 5 years which the President would proclaim as a future ceiling on imports for not more than 5 years.

Without going into too much detail, it should be mentioned that the bill contains safeguards, in the event of deficiency, or surplus for recalculation; there is a provision for new ceilings. In other words, this proposed legislation has a reasonable formula for establishing ceilings and, by the way, only then after investigation and public hearings by the Tariff Commission and certification of competitive disadvantage. It first establishes a fair share of domestic consumption to be available for imports where justified.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, speaking not only for the distressed fishing industry, but for other industries which employ American labor