

tive practices. I believe that laws are good if they lead to justice and equity. The proposed amendments to the Antidumping Act would lead to international reciprocity. Instead of being treated fairly our exporters may be crucified by dumping proceedings instituted against them abroad if the proposed amendments are adopted.

If they are adopted we will have adopted the most unfair trade code it is possible to imagine.

Finally—dumping is not a problem peculiar to our country. U.S. producers have probably been as guilty of the practice as have foreign producers. What we hand out we are bound to get slapped back at us possibly with compounded interest.

It makes no sense to start a protectionist international battle on this front, what with all the others we now have. Fair is fair—and square is square. The Treasury Department has done an outstanding job in developing an equitable approach to the dumping problem—fair to the foreign producers and fair to the U.S. industries the law is designed to protect. While I don't agree with all of the injury findings made by the Tariff Commission, I find it to have been objective—and at all times quite aware of the purposes the Act is intended to serve. Since the Congress as a practical matter cannot make dumping decisions it must delegate that authority. It has done so and has set reasonable standards for application of the dumping penalties to be exacted if certain circumstances are found to exist. The process is working well in my opinion and no change is required or needed. *Fair* hearings and confrontations between accuser and accused were adopted by the Treasury Department voluntarily and without any Congressional prods. The Tariff Commission has formulated sound criteria for the injury findings it must make.

I urge that you leave the system as it is. It works—works well and need not be encrusted with rules arbitrarily set. As in all determinations, *some* discretion must be left to *somebody* to prevent injustices. Based on 14 years experience in dumping matters I have absolute confidence in the Tariff Commission and the Treasury Department. I hope the Members of this Committee share that confidence.

Mr. BURKE (presiding). Thank you.

Are there any questions?

Mr. BATTIN. I was just wondering whether Canada has expressed herself on adopting any code?

Mr. SHARP. I know that Canada has not, but I am frankly not up to date on it. Canada I know must change its law in order for it to become a party to the code but I am frankly uninformed on what countries have or have not agreed to it.

Mr. BATTIN. I was wondering, where the code exists in the United States and doesn't exist in another country, for example, Canada or any other country that does not adopt a code but say the United States does, what forum do we work in there?

Mr. SHARP. What forum, you say?

Mr. BATTIN. Yes.

Mr. SHARP. Well, the code does not provide for any international hearing device or anything of that kind. Each country would still administer its own laws.

Mr. BATTIN. I agree. So that we are really talking just about domestic law then rather than any international code?

Mr. SHARP. We are except that as I pointed out in most other countries it has been an in-camera process and as I understand it in England and most of the other countries it is conducted where you don't know any rules.

In this country the Treasury Department has acted openly. It has these confrontations where the counsel and all sit around the table and everybody knows what is going on. They know the basis for the deter-