of the production of chili products. Mr. Crane is an able representative and a great citizen of our community, as was his father before him. I want to apologize for the lack of members today but we got caught in a legislative bind so the House convened at 11 o'clock today instead of 12 and you are suffering from a lack of an audience. I assure you that the members of the committee will read carefully the statement that you make to us.

Thank you for coming.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Crane, we welcome you to the committee. If you will identify yourself and the gentleman with you for the record and proceed in your own way we will be glad to recognize you.

STATEMENT OF W. ED CRANE, IN BEHALF OF CAL-COMPACK FOODS, GENTRY CORP., SANTA MARIA CHILI, INC., AND UNIVERSAL FOODS CORP.; ACCOMPANIED BY LEWE B. MARTIN, COUNSEL

Mr. CRANE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and my friend Mr. Utt. I am W. Ed Crane, vice president of Cal-Compack Foods and I appear here today on behalf of the four domestic chili pepper and paprika producers listed below:

Cal-Compack Foods, Santa Ana, Calif.; Gentry Corp., Glendale, Calif.; Santa Maria Chili, Inc., Santa Maria, Calif.; and Universal Foods Corp., Westminster, Calif.

I have with me Mr. Lewe B. Martin of the law firm of Pope, Ballard & Loos.

Mr. Chairman, I would like permission to read portions of the testimony which you have and then speak extemporaneously to the balance of it but I would like it in the record as it is.

Mr. HERLONG. Without objection your entire statement will appear in the record.

Mr. CRANE. Thank you, sir. The four companies which I have spoken of account for 90 percent of the chili pepper and paprika products produced in the United States.

Our particular interest in these hearings is to oppose the further delegation by Congress to the President of the authority to negotiate trade agreements contained in section 201 of H.R. 17551.

Section 201 has been represented as necessary by the administration for housekeeping requirements in case the President should raise duties under section 351, the "escape clause" or if a tariff rate should be increased because of a customs reclassification.

The record shows that 12 industries have applied for relief under the escape clause and all have been rejected at the Tariff Commission level. H.R. 17551 while relaxing the criteria for firms and workers continues the same rigid requirements for industries and indeed as Ambassador Roth clearly stated in his address to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on May 21, 1968, the administration has no intention of according any industry tariff relief.

It is true that in some few rare cases an upward duty adjustment has resulted from a customs reclassification and in these cases the U.S. negotiators have bent over backwards to compensate complaining foreign countries.

However, the vast majority of judicial decisions or administrative reclassifications have resulted in tariff reductions for which no compen-