

Mr. BYRNES. Imports could prove injurious to the individual plants but not to the industry at large.

Mr. SOLTER. Three years ago General Plywood Corp. attempted to receive from the Tariff Commission a finding of eligibility for adjustment assistance as an individual company with several plants. They were turned down.

It just so happened that it was very embarrassing. Their statement for the year that they had to publish for the stockholders a couple of months after the Tariff Commission proceeding showed they made more money in that year than any year in recent history of the company.

The claims we find and believe have so often been exaggerated. We don't deny that there may have been from time to time certain cases.

Mr. BYRNES. It is easy to sit here in Washington, probably, and find excuses as to why these people are going out of business. But it is a little different when you see them right in your backyard and see the difficulty they encounter in terms of price.

I understand that people suggest if we can't make something as cheap as somebody else can, then they can better supply the market. I can understand this rationale, but to say that imports don't affect our domestic industry is to say that the market here is unlimited. That just doesn't strike a very good chord.

Mr. SOLTER. The market is large. The domestic industry, we believe, in a general sense, cannot supply the whole of the market. There are instances we will concede, at least the possibility of instances, where imports have been a contributing cause of some competitive difficulties in some individual cases.

We do recommend that the committee modify the criteria of eligibility of firms and groups and workers for adjustment assistance on an individual basis.

We do suggest, however, that there is no justification for industry-wide tariff adjustment assistance in the nature of quotas or increased duties on the products.

Mr. BYRNES. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HERLONG. Thank you very much.

We appreciate your appearance before the committee.

Mr. SOLTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(The following letter was received, for the record, by the committee:)

SHARP, PARTRIDGE, GANTS & PERKINS,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1968.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You will recall that Mr. Myron Solter testified before the Committee on Ways and Means on June 27, 1968 on behalf of the Imported Hardwood Products Association, Inc., of San Francisco, California. Mr. Solter was then Washington counsel for that Association. As of July 1st the undersigned was appointed as Washington counsel for the Association and I feel it necessary to correct one statement made by Mr. Solter on behalf of the Association in both his written brief and in his oral testimony.

Mr. Solter mistakenly stated that the section-by-section analysis of the proposed Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1968 constituted a Ways and Means Committee interpretation of the President's legislative proposal. He stated that