

Mr. HERLONG. Thank you both very much for your appearance before the committee.

Mr. BECKMANN. Thank you.

Mr. GOLDEN. Thank you.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. James R. Sharp.

Mr. Sharp, if you will please identify yourself for the record and proceed we will be happy to hear from you.

**STATEMENT OF JAMES R. SHARP, ATTORNEY, ON BEHALF OF
HARDBOARD MANUFACTURERS**

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I am James R. Sharp, attorney for several U.S. companies who for some years past have imported substantial quantities of hardboard.

Hardboard is a wood product made of imploded or ground-up wood, the fibers of which are thereby torn apart and put back together by a wet matting and pressing process.

The companies I represent here are: Elof Hansson, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Pan Pacific Trading Corp., New York, N.Y. and Robinson Export-Import Corp., of Alexandria, Va., one of our local Washington area companies.

I am going to cut the statement short.

Mr. HERLONG. Your entire statement will appear in the record.

Mr. SHARP. On behalf of these clients I support the international dumping code formulated in the course of the Kennedy round negotiations and I oppose the bills pending before this committee which would amend the Antidumping Act of 1921 in a very substantial manner. The principal bills now pending before you are H.R. 8510 introduced by Representative Herlong of Florida, and H.R. 16332 introduced this session by Representative Saylor of Pennsylvania.

Dumping is an unfair trade practice. However, the term has been loosely used to apply to all sorts of marketing practices—fair ones as well as unfair ones.

The concept of dumping as spelled out in our 1921 Act is the sale of goods produced abroad to U.S. buyers at a lower f.o.b. mill price than the price charged for the same goods on an f.o.b. mill basis for consumption in the producing country involved.

In the recent Kennedy round the diversity in the statutes applicable to duping practices in the major trading nations led to the desirability of negotiating a common code providing uniformity in the rules to be applied in determining when dumping penalties should be applied.

Of additional importance was the fact that in the United States we have developed a system of administrative practice before agencies of the Government which provides fair and equitable investigations, open hearings and the adoption of orders under the dumping statute only after all interested parties had been given an adequate hearing on the factual and legal issues involved.

In other countries the dumping proceedings have historically been conducted in camera with neither the accused or the accusers being provided the opportunity of hearing the other side of the story or knowing the factors taken into consideration by the administrator of the dumping law in arriving at a proposed decision.