

mittee on Labor, on the impact of imports and exports on unemployment.

The second time was during the September and October 1966, hearings of that same subcommittee on the effect of imports and exports on American labor.

Such efforts were in support of legislation to strengthen the Anti-dumping Act of 1921.

Representatives of the cement industries have also pursued the currently available remedies in a series of proceedings under the act, which have involved no less than 15 foreign countries over the last 10 years.

It is most important that our ability to deal with these recurring instances of dumped imports, with substantial amounts of employment and unemployment caused thereby will not be undermined by implementation of the International Antidumping Code.

My union feels that the new code procedures for combating such dumping would inevitably and substantially increase the exposure of workers in general, and our members in particular, to lost jobs in the underemployment as a result of dumping.

This would be particularly true in the cement industry, which under the new code provisions could hardly ever expect to qualify as a regional industry, therefore exposing our members working along the gulf coast, the east coast, and the Great Lakes to meet loss of jobs without ever satisfying the new very difficult code standards for finding injury to a domestic industry.

We also particularly object to the fact that the new provisions do away with any effective interim relief while an investigation takes place.

Our experience has been that such investigations take anywhere from 6 to 18 months, a period of time during which domestic workers can well be, and often have been, entirely thrown out of work.

Even though the eventual result of the legal jousting is to find that injurious dumping has been taking place, once again, this is a highly unfair, intolerable, vulnerable position into which to place American workers.

The unrealistic standards and complex procedures of determining injury under the International Anti-Dumping Code are unhappily similar to the provisions for determining injury now contained in the adjustment assistance section of the 1962 Trade Expansion Act.

As you know, no American worker has ever successfully petitioned for relief under these provisions.

In his message of May 28, 1968, the President has recommended that these sections be amended, and that the relief be substantially broadened, so that it would be available to all American workers whenever imports are a substantial cause of injury.

It is difficult for my union to understand why we should allow standards for relief under the antidumping laws to become more limited and less available at the same time that we are trying to liberalize these adjustment assistance provisions.

Most important of all, such steps should never be taken without the regular or due consideration of Congress.

Once again, we urgently request this committee to support House Concurrent Resolution 447, and to oppose any weakening of our domestic unfair trade practice laws.