other agricultural products. The export market is an integral part of our normal marketing operation—it is not a surplus removal program. Certain varieties of fruit, and grades, sizes and specifications thereof, are grown especially for the export market. Trees and vines of certain varieties were planted specifically to fill the demand from foreign countries. Exports of U.S. fruits and fruit products during the fiscal year ending June 1967 amounted to over $319,869,403, sold entirely for cash. These shipments make a substantial and indispensable contribution to the U.S. balance of payments picture.

Our industry is concerned with the flurry of protectionistic activity which culminated in bills introduced in the Congress seeking to establish quotas and other restrictions on the importation of products into the United States. The U.S. cannot export unless it is willing to accept imports. Import quotas established by the United States, as proposed, would almost inevitably lead other countries to retaliate and establish additional barriers to the too many existing obstacles to United States trade. This procedure could result in increased governmental controls and would threaten individual enterprise in the export field.

While we recognize that, in some instances, import quotas may be needed and justified, such quotas should be established only under exceptional circumstances, as a temporary emergency measure and, under carefully established procedures, following thorough investigation and mature consideration.

We believe that the United States should carefully examine its current restrictive practices, including quotas, American Selling Price system, Buy-American legislation and other trade restrictive practices with a view to reducing the same to a bare minimum. The matter of U.S. subsidies should also be examined.

At the same time, the United States should forcefully insist that other countries which maintain many more non-tariff barriers than the U.S. should remove their unjustifiable non-tariff barriers in line with the Congressional decelaration in Section 252 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Some of these many foreign non-tariff barriers include:

1. Quotas and quantitative restriction.
2. Quota preferences.
3. Currency restrictions.
4. Minimum entry prices.
5. Reference prices.
6. Variable levies.
7. Border taxes.
8. Value added taxes.
9. Tariff preferences.
10. Container regulations as to size, label, etc.
11. Specialized label requirements.
12. Variant food standards.
13. Food additive controls.
14. Pesticide residue limitations.
15. Cumbersome documentation procedures.
16. Direct and indirect export subsidies.
17. Import licenses including the delayed issuance thereof and issuance to factors who are not importers.

The EEC's agricultural protectionism is contrary to the spirit, if not the letter, of the GATT. Under the guise of harmonizing agricultural markets, the EEC embodies a system of import protection devices and export subsidies that are inconsistent with established and recognized principles of competitive international trade. There is no question that the EEC agricultural policy is used to circumvent the provisions of GATT.

Export subsidies have recently been place in effect by some countries (including Italy and France) in contravention of GATT to the detriment of legitimate United States interests. The United States should take forceful action to correct this situation and should immediately implement the applicable antidumping procedures, which should be immediately withdrawn when corrective action is taken. Also, where appropriate, the United States should take effective steps to protect the trading position of American firms who are competing in world markets with products subsidized by other countries.

Uniform international food laws have been suggested as a possible answer to some of the discriminatory and protectionistic food laws and regulations invoked by some countries. These food laws and regulations constitute a serious