I would like to call the Committee's attention particularly to the figures in Tables IV and V. These tables show that American labor has lost well over 7 million man hours during the 1958–1967 period, an average of more than 700,000 man hours per year. Similarly, the equivalent wages lost have amounted to over $24,000,000, an average of almost $2.5 million a year. Surely American labor should not have to sustain such drastic injury from an importing practice that has been condemned as an unfair method of competition not only by the United States Congress but also by Article VI of GATT.

For these reasons my union strongly endorses and supports the position of the Cement Industry Committee in these hearings that the relief from dumping practices now available under the Antidumping Act of 1921, limited as it is, surely should not be further restricted by implementation of the International Antidumping Code and by the new implementing regulations issued by the Treasury Department to become effective on July 1. My union feels that these new procedures for combating the dumping of foreign imports would inevitably and substantially increase the exposure of American workers in general, and our members in particular, to lost jobs and underemployment as a result of dumping.

This would be particularly true in the cement industry, which under the new 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 complete 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 of injury 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 taken place. Once again, this is a highly unfair and intolerably vulnerable position in which to place American workers.

The unrealistic standards and mixed procedures for determining injury under the provisions of the International Antidumping Code are unhappily similar to the provisions for determining injury now contained in the adjustment assistance sections of the 1962 Trade Expansion Act. As you know, no American workers have

TABLE I

Country of exportation	Date of formal complaint	Treasury initial finding of reason to believe or suspect dumping	Nature of final determination by treasury department of Tariff Commission
Belgium	Oct. 2, 1959	Yes	Treasury found dumping and Tariff found injury to the domestic industry.
Canada	May 28, 1959	Yes	Treasury found dumping, but Tariff found no injury to the domestic industry in part because continuation of dumped sales seemed unlikely.
Colombia	Sep. 25, 1959	No	Treasury found no dumping.
Denmark	Apr. 28, 1960	Yes	Treasury found dumping but did not refer it to Tariff partly because of cessation of shipments.
Dominican Republic	Aug. 19, 1961	Yes	Treasury found dumping, but Tariff found no injury at the time to the domestic industry.
	May 4, 1962	Yes	Treasury found dumping and Tariff found injury to the domestic industry.
Israel	July 21, 1959	Yes	Treasury found no dumping partly because of a non-cost-justified quantity discount allowance.
Italy	June 7, 1962	No	Treasury found no dumping.
Japan	Dec. 1, 1961	None	Treasury found dumping but did not refer to Tariff partly because of assurances by the producer that dumping would not be resumed.
	Feb. 5, 1963	Yes	Treasury found dumping, but Tariff found no injury to the domestic industry.
	Aug. 26, 1965	No	Treasury found no dumping.
Norway	Sep. 15, 1958	Yes	Treasury found no dumping solely because of a non-cost-justified quantity discount allowance.
	Dec. 27, 1961	Yes	Do.
Poland	Dec. 29, 1960	Yes	Treasury found no dumping, but used a 3d-country price and not Polish as home market price.
Portugal	June 9, 1960	Yes	Treasury found dumping and Tariff found injury to the domestic industry.
Sweden	Nov. 25, 1958	Yes	Do.
Tunisia	Sep. 13, 1960	No	Treasury found dumping but did not refer it to Tariff on assurances by the producers that dumping would not be resumed.
West Germany	Aug. 13, 1959	Yes	Do.
Yugoslavia	Aug. 28, 1961	Yes	Do.