

Forty-first
Annual Report
of the
United States Tariff Commission
1957



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1958

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

EDGAR B. BROSSARD, *Chairman*

JOSEPH E. TALBOT, *Vice Chairman*

WALTER R. SCHREIBER

GLENN W. SUTTON

J. WELDON JONES

WILLIAM E. DOWLING

DONN N. BENT, *Secretary*

**Address all communications
UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION
Washington 25, D. C.**

**For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D. C. - Price 25 cents**

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,

Washington, January 7, 1958.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit to you the Forty-first Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission, in compliance with the provisions of section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Respectfully,

EDGAR B. BROSSARD,
Chairman.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	vii
Part I. Public investigations.....	1
Section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.....	2
Section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.....	3
Status of investigations pending during 1957.....	4
Investigations completed or dismissed during 1957:	
Groundfish fillets (third investigation).....	8
Velveteen fabrics.....	9
Cotton pillowcases.....	10
Straight pins (second investigation).....	10
Safety pins (second investigation).....	10
Certain cotton cloth (gingham).....	11
Violins and violas.....	11
Certain jute fabrics.....	12
Toyo cloth caps.....	12
Spring clothespins (fourth investigation).....	13
Bicycles (third investigation).....	13
Reports made under Executive Order 10401 during 1957.....	14
Hatters' fur.....	14
Alsike clover seed.....	15
Watch movements.....	16
Bicycles.....	16
Dried figs.....	17
Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.....	17
Cotton and cotton waste (continuing investigation).....	18
Wheat and wheat flour (continuing investigation).....	19
Dried figs and fig paste (first investigation).....	19
Dates (first investigation).....	20
Butter oil and butter substitutes.....	21
Tung oil.....	21
Rye, rye flour, and rye meal.....	22
Certain articles containing butterfat.....	23
Almonds.....	24
Dried figs and fig paste (second investigation).....	24
Dates (second investigation).....	25
Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930.....	25
Whiskey.....	25
Tuna fish.....	26
Section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930.....	26
Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930.....	27
Electron tubes and component parts thereof.....	27
Household canisters.....	28
Badminton rackets.....	28
Slip-resistant hanger covers.....	28
Certain expansion bracelets and parts thereof.....	29
Phonograph pickup cartridges, elements, and needles.....	29
Section 201 (a) of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended.....	29
Public Law 38, as amended.....	32

	Page
Part II. Special reports and activities.....	33
Summaries of tariff information.....	33
Information on United States import duties.....	34
Reports on synthetic organic chemicals.....	35
Preliminary report on production and sales, 1956.....	35
Final report on production and sales, 1956.....	36
Specified synthetic organic chemicals: Monthly releases on production.....	37
Synthetic plastics and resin materials: Monthly releases on pro- duction and sales.....	37
<i>Imports of Coal-Tar Products, 1956</i>	37
Tariff classification study.....	38
Report on groundfish.....	40
Revision of <i>Trade Agreements Manual</i>	40
Compilations of information on status of investigations.....	41
Trade-agreement activities.....	41
Report on operation of the trade agreements program.....	42
Part III. Furnishing technical information and assistance.....	45
Work for the Congress.....	45
Reports to committees on proposed legislation.....	45
Special services to committees of the Congress.....	47
Services to individual Senators and Representatives.....	47
Cooperation with other Government agencies.....	48
Work for defense and emergency agencies.....	48
Work for other Government agencies.....	49
Work on statistical classification of imports and exports.....	50
Assistance to nongovernmental research agencies.....	51
Assistance to business concerns and the public.....	52
Part IV. Other activities:	
General research and assembling of basic data.....	53
Fieldwork.....	54
Work of the Invoice Analysis Section and the New York office.....	54
Part V. Administration and finances:	
Membership of the Commission.....	57
Staff of the Commission.....	57
Finances and appropriations, fiscal year 1957.....	58

INTRODUCTION

This—the Forty-first Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission¹—covers the period October 1, 1956, through September 30, 1957. When the year 1957 is mentioned in this report, therefore, it should be taken to mean the period October 1, 1956, through September 30, 1957, rather than the calendar year 1957.

For the purposes of this report, the current work of the Tariff Commission—described in parts I, II, III, and IV—has been classified under the following headings: Public investigations; special reports and activities; furnishing technical information and assistance; and other activities. Part V of the report deals with the membership and the staff of the Commission, and its finances and appropriations. As required by law, summaries of all reports that the Commission made during 1957 appear under the appropriate headings in parts I and II of this report.

¹The Tariff Commission was created by act of Congress approved September 8, 1916 (39 Stat. 795), and was formally organized on March 31, 1917.

PART I. PUBLIC INVESTIGATIONS

Specific provisions of law and certain Executive orders direct the United States Tariff Commission to conduct various investigations and to make certain studies and reports. These directives are contained in sections 3¹ and 7² of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended; Executive Orders 10082³ and 10401;⁴ sections 322,⁵ 336,⁶ and 337⁷ of the Tariff Act of 1930; section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended;⁸ section 201 (a) of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended;⁹ and Public Law 38 (82d Cong.), as amended.¹⁰

During 1957 the Commission undertook or continued investigations under all these statutes and Executive orders except section 201 (a) of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended. In 1957, as in the preceding several years, activities relating to public investigations continued to account for a major part of the work of the Commission.

Heretofore, reports by the Commission to the President of the results of its investigations under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, under paragraphs 1 and 2 of Executive Order 10401, under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, and under sections 336 and 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 have not been released to the public until the President authorized their release. Actually, release generally coincided with the President's announcement of his action on the Commission's recommendations in a particular investigation.

Section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 amended section 7 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 to require the Commission to make public its reports to the President in escape-clause investigations at the time it submits such reports to the President. In a letter to the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, dated September 24, 1956, the President authorized the Commission—except in specific cases where, for reasons of the national interest, circumstances may indicate otherwise—to make public all future reports

¹ 65 Stat. 72; 19 U. S. C. 1360.

² 65 Stat. 74; 67 Stat. 472; 69 Stat. 166; 19 U. S. C. 1364.

³ 14 F. R. 6105; 3 C. F. R., 1949 Supp., 125.

⁴ 17 F. R. 9125; 3 C. F. R., 1952 Supp., 105.

⁵ 46 Stat. 698; 19 U. S. C. 1332.

⁶ 46 Stat. 701; 70 Stat. 946; 19 U. S. C. 1336.

⁷ 46 Stat. 703; 54 Stat. 724; 19 U. S. C. 1337, 1337a.

⁸ 64 Stat. 261; 65 Stat. 75; 67 Stat. 472; 7 U. S. C. 624.

⁹ 68 Stat. 1138; 19 U. S. C. 160.

¹⁰ 65 Stat. 44; 67 Stat. 4; 68 Stat. 330; 69 Stat. 170.

to the President of investigations made pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 2 of Executive Order 10401, subsections (a) and (d) of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, and sections 336 and 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, at the time the Commission submits such reports to the President.

Section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951

Sections 3 and 4 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, set forth the statutory requirements for so-called peril-point determinations with respect to proposed trade-agreement negotiations. The peril-point provisions of the 1951 act require the President, before entering into any trade-agreement negotiation, to transmit to the Tariff Commission a list of the commodities that may be considered for possible concessions. The Commission is then required to make an investigation, including a public hearing, and to report its findings to the President on (1) the maximum decrease in duty, if any, that can be made on each listed commodity without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products, or (2) the minimum increase in the duty or the additional import restrictions that may be necessary on any of the listed products to avoid serious injury to such domestic industry.

The President may not conclude a trade agreement until the Commission has made its report to him, or until 120 days from the date he transmits the list of products to the Commission. If the President concludes a trade agreement that provides for greater reductions in duty than the Commission specifies in its report, or that fails to provide for the minimum increase in duty or the additional import restrictions specified, he must transmit to the Congress a copy of the trade agreement in question, identifying the articles concerned and stating his reason for not carrying out the Tariff Commission's recommendation. Promptly thereafter, the Commission must deposit with the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means a copy of the portions of its report to the President dealing with the articles with respect to which the President did not follow the Commission's recommendations.

During 1957 the Commission completed two peril-point investigations under the provisions of section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended. On October 8, 1956, the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements issued public notice that the United States intended to engage in limited trade-agreement negotiations with Cuba under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. On the same day, the President transmitted to the Tariff Commission a list of the commodities that were to be considered for concessions in the proposed negotiations. The President's list involved 2 tariff paragraphs and covered 5 statistical (schedule A)¹¹

¹¹ U. S. Department of Commerce, *Schedule A, Statistical Classification of Commodities Imported Into the United States*.

classifications. The Commission instituted the required peril-point investigation on October 8, 1956, and held a public hearing on November 14 and 15, 1956. The Commission submitted its report to the President on December 7, 1956.

On March 18, 1957, the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements issued public notice that the United States intended to engage in limited trade-agreement negotiations with the United Kingdom and Belgium under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.¹² On the same day the President transmitted to the Tariff Commission a list of the commodities that were to be considered for concessions in the proposed negotiations. The President's list involved 11 tariff paragraphs and covered 14 statistical (schedule A) classifications. The Commission instituted the required peril-point investigation on March 18, 1957, and held a public hearing on April 24, 1957. The Commission submitted its report to the President on May 2, 1957.

Section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951

Section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (which established a statutory escape-clause procedure), provides that the Tariff Commission, upon the request of the President, upon resolution of either House of Congress, upon resolution of either the Senate Committee on Finance or the House Committee on Ways and Means, upon its own motion, or upon application by any interested party, must promptly conduct an investigation to determine whether any product on which a trade-agreement concession has been granted is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products. The Commission must complete its investigation and make a report thereon within 9 months of the date it receives the application. As a part of each investigation, the Commission usually holds a public hearing at which interested parties are afforded an opportunity to be heard. Section 7 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, requires the Commission to hold such a hearing whenever it finds evidence of serious injury or threat of serious injury, or whenever so directed by resolution of either the Senate Committee on Finance or the House Committee on Ways and Means. In arriving at its findings and conclusions, the Commission is required to consider several factors expressly set forth in section 7 (b) of the extension act of 1951, as amended.

Should the Commission find, as a result of its investigation, the existence or threat of serious injury as a result of increased imports, either actual or relative, due, in whole or in part, to the customs treatment reflecting the concession, it must recommend to the President, to

¹² The negotiations were held in connection with requests by those countries for compensatory tariff concessions on the basis of the 1956 increase in the United States rate of duty on certain linen toweling.

the extent and for the time necessary to prevent or remedy such injury, the withdrawal or modification of the concession, or the suspension of the concession in whole or in part, or the establishment of an import quota. The Commission must immediately make public its findings and recommendations to the President, including any dissenting or separate findings and recommendations, and must publish a summary thereof in the *Federal Register*. When, in the Commission's judgment, there is no sufficient reason to recommend to the President that a trade-agreement concession be modified or withdrawn, the Commission must make and publish a report stating its findings and conclusions.

Status of investigations pending during 1957

Work on escape-clause investigations under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, constituted a very important activity of the Tariff Commission during 1957, as it has for a number of years. On October 1, 1956, a total of 7 escape-clause investigations were pending before the Commission. During the ensuing 12 months the Commission received 9 additional applications, and instituted an investigation in response to each of them.¹³ Of a total of 16 escape-clause investigations that were pending before the Commission at one time or another during the period October 1, 1956, to September 30, 1957, the Commission, at the close of that period, had completed 9 investigations, had discontinued and dismissed 1 investigation at the applicant's request, and had terminated 1 investigation without formal findings; the remaining 5 investigations were in process.¹⁴

With respect to the 9 completed investigations, the Commission took the actions indicated below:

Commodity	Vote of the Commission	
	For escape action	Against escape action
Groundfish fillets (3d investigation).....	6	0
Velveteen fabrics.....	6	0
Cotton pillowcases.....	2	3
Straight pins (2d investigation).....	4	2
Safety pins (2d investigation).....	4	2
Violins and violas.....	3	2
Certain jute fabrics.....	0	5
Bicycles (3d investigation).....	0	6
Spring clothespins (4th investigation).....	4	1

¹³ Between April 20, 1948, when it received the first application for an escape-clause investigation, and September 30, 1957, the Commission received a total of 83 applications.

¹⁴ The Commission's reports on the completed investigations—all of which have been released—are summarized in the section of this report following the list.

The nature and status of the individual escape-clause investigations that were pending before the Commission at one time or another during the period October 1, 1956, through September 30, 1957, are shown in the following compilation.¹⁵

Escape-clause investigations pending before the United States Tariff Commission at one time or another during the period Oct. 1, 1956-Sept. 30, 1957

Commodity	Status
<p>1. Fresh or frozen groundfish filets (3d investigation). (Investigation No. 47; sec. 7)</p>	<p><i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by Massachusetts Fisheries Association, Inc., Boston, Mass., and others. <i>Application received:</i> Jan. 12, 1956. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> Jan. 16, 1956. <i>Hearing held:</i> June 5-8, 1956. <i>Investigation completed:</i> Oct. 12, 1956. <i>Recommendation of the Commission:</i> Modification of concession. <i>Vote of the Commission:</i> 6-0. <i>Action of the President:</i> Recommendation rejected by the President Dec. 10, 1956. <i>Reference:</i> U. S. Tariff Commission, <i>Groundfish Fillets (1956): Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 47</i> . . . , 1956 [processed].</p>
<p>2. Velveteen fabrics (not including ribbons) cut or uncut, whether or not the pile covers the entire surface, wholly or in chief value of cotton. (Investigation No. 49; sec. 7)</p>	<p><i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by Crompton Co., West Warwick, R. I., A. D. Julliard & Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., and Merrimack Manufacturing Co., Inc., Lowell, Mass. <i>Application received:</i> Jan. 24, 1956. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> Jan. 26, 1956. <i>Hearing held:</i> June 19-21, 1956. <i>Investigation completed:</i> Oct. 24, 1956. <i>Recommendation of the Commission:</i> Modification of concession. <i>Vote of the Commission:</i> 6-0. (Commissioner Jones dissented on the remedy recommended by the Commission.) <i>Action of the President:</i> The President announced on Dec. 21, 1956, that he was extending the period of his consideration of the Commission's report. On Jan. 22, 1957, the President announced that, in view of Japan's announcement of a broad program for the control of its exports of cotton textiles to the United States, he had decided not to take action on the Commission's recommendations. <i>Reference:</i> U. S. Tariff Commission, <i>Cotton Velveteen Fabrics: Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 49</i> . . . , 1956 [processed].</p>

¹⁵ This compilation shows the status of only those escape-clause investigations that were pending before the Commission at one time or another during the period covered by this report. Lists of applications received before the period covered by this report, and their status on various dates, are given in earlier annual reports of the Commission. For a résumé of the status of all escape-clause applications filed with the Commission between April 20, 1948, and August 21, 1957, see U. S. Tariff Commission, *Investigations Under the "Escape Clause" of Trade Agreements: Outcome or Current Status of Applications Filed With the United States Tariff Commission for Investigations Under the "Escape Clause" of Trade Agreements, as of August 21, 1957*, 8th ed., 1957 [processed].

Escape-clause investigations pending before the United States Tariff Commission at one time or another during the period Oct. 1, 1956—Sept. 30, 1957—Continued

Commodity	Status
<p>3. Pillowcases, wholly or in chief value of cotton. (Investigation No. 51; sec. 7)</p>	<p><i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by Riegel Textile Corp., New York, N. Y. <i>Application received:</i> Feb. 21, 1956. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> Mar. 6, 1956. <i>Hearing held:</i> Sept. 11, 1956. <i>Investigation completed:</i> Nov. 21, 1956. <i>Recommendation of the Commission:</i> No modification of concession. <i>Vote of the Commission:</i> 3-2. <i>Reference:</i> U. S. Tariff Commission, <i>Cotton Pillowcases: Report on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 51 . . .</i>, 1956 [processed].</p>
<p>4. Straight (dressmakers' or common) pins (2d investigation). (Investigation No. 52; sec. 7)</p>	<p><i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by Vail Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill., and others. <i>Application received:</i> Apr. 30, 1956. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> May 10, 1956. <i>Hearing held:</i> Sept. 18-19, 1956. <i>Investigation completed:</i> Jan. 30, 1957. <i>Recommendation of the Commission:</i> Modification of concession. <i>Vote of the Commission:</i> 4-2. <i>Action of the President:</i> Recommendation rejected by the President Mar. 29, 1957. <i>Reference:</i> U. S. Tariff Commission, <i>Straight (Dressmakers' or Common) Pins: Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 52 . . .</i>, 1957 [processed].</p>
<p>5. Safety pins (2d investigation). (Investigation No. 53; sec. 7)</p>	<p><i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by DeLong Hook & Eye Co., Philadelphia, Pa., and others. <i>Application received:</i> Apr. 30, 1956. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> May 10, 1956. <i>Hearing held:</i> Sept. 19-20, 1956. <i>Investigation completed:</i> Jan. 30, 1957. <i>Recommendation of the Commission:</i> Modification of concession. <i>Vote of the Commission:</i> 4-2. <i>Action of the President:</i> The President on Mar. 29, 1957, requested that the Commission supply additional information. <i>Supplemental report submitted to the President:</i> Sept. 30, 1957. <i>Action of the President:</i> The President has not yet acted.</p>
<p>6. Certain cotton cloth (gingham). (Investigation No. 54; sec. 7)</p>	<p><i>References:</i> U. S. Tariff Commission: <i>Safety Pins: Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 53 . . .</i>, 1957 [processed]; <i>Safety Pins: Supplemental Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 53 . . .</i>, 1957 [processed]. <i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by Association of Cotton Textile Merchants, New York, N. Y. <i>Application received:</i> June 5, 1956. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> June 12, 1956. <i>Hearing scheduled:</i> Oct. 23, 1956; postponed to Dec. 4, 1956. <i>Hearing held:</i> Dec. 4-6, 1956. <i>Investigation discontinued and dismissed, at applicant's request:</i> Jan. 29, 1957. <i>Vote of the Commission:</i> 5-0.</p>

Escape-clause investigations pending before the United States Tariff Commission at one time or another during the period Oct. 1, 1956-Sept. 30, 1957—Continued

Commodity	Status
7. Violins and violas----- (Investigation No. 55; sec. 7)	<p><i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by Jackson-Guldan, Inc., Columbus, Ohio. <i>Application received:</i> June 19, 1956. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> June 22, 1956. <i>Hearing held:</i> Sept. 6, 1956. <i>Investigation completed:</i> Jan. 29, 1957. <i>Recommendation of the Commission:</i> Modification of concession. <i>Vote of the Commission:</i> 3-2. <i>Action of the President:</i> Recommendation rejected by the President Mar. 30, 1957. <i>Reference:</i> U. S. Tariff Commission, <i>Violins and Violas: Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 55 . . .</i>, 1957 [processed].</p>
8. Certain jute fabrics----- (Investigation No. 56; sec. 7)	<p><i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by Patchogue-Plymouth Corp., New York, N. Y. <i>Application received:</i> Nov. 2, 1956. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> Nov. 8, 1956. <i>Hearing held:</i> Mar. 19, 1957. <i>Investigation completed:</i> May 15, 1957. <i>Recommendation of the Commission:</i> No modification of concession. <i>Vote of the Commission:</i> 5-0. <i>Reference:</i> U. S. Tariff Commission, <i>Certain Jute Fabrics: Report on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 56 . . .</i>, 1957 [processed].</p>
9. Spring clothespins (4th investigation). (Investigation No. 57; sec. 7)	<p><i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by Clothespin Manufacturers of America, Washington, D. C., and others. <i>Application received:</i> Dec. 20, 1956. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> Jan. 2, 1957. <i>Hearing held:</i> May 7, 1957. <i>Investigation completed:</i> Sept. 10, 1957. <i>Recommendation of the Commission:</i> Modification of concession. <i>Vote of the Commission:</i> 4-1. <i>Action of the President:</i> The President has not yet acted. <i>Reference:</i> U. S. Tariff Commission, <i>Spring Clothespins: Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 57 . . .</i>, 1957 [processed].</p>
10. Bicycles (3d investigation)-- (Investigation No. 58; sec. 7)	<p><i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, New York, N. Y. <i>Application received:</i> Jan. 11, 1957. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> Jan. 28, 1957. <i>Hearing held:</i> Apr. 9-11, 1957. <i>Investigation completed:</i> Aug. 19, 1957. <i>Recommendation of the Commission:</i> No modification of concession. <i>Vote of the Commission:</i> 6-0. <i>Reference:</i> U. S. Tariff Commission, <i>Bicycles: Report on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 58 . . .</i>, 1957 [processed].</p>

Escape-clause investigations pending before the United States Tariff Commission at one time or another during the period Oct. 1, 1956—Sept. 30, 1957—Continued

Commodity	Status
11. Toyo cloth caps----- (Investigation No. 59; sec. 7)	<i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by Empire State Hat and Cap Association, Inc., New York, N. Y. <i>Application received:</i> Apr. 1, 1957. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> Apr. 5, 1957. <i>Hearing scheduled:</i> Aug. 20, 1957. <i>Investigation discontinued and dismissed and hearing canceled:</i> June 21, 1957. <i>Vote of the Commission:</i> 4-0.
12. Wool felts, nonwoven----- (Investigation No. 60; sec. 7)	<i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by American Felt Co., Glenville, Conn., and others. <i>Application received:</i> Apr. 8, 1957. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> Apr. 12, 1957. <i>Hearing held:</i> July 23-25, 1957. <i>Investigation in process.</i>
13. Stainless steel flatware----- (Investigation No. 61; sec. 7)	<i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by Stainless Steel Flatware Manufacturers Association, Englishtown, N. J. <i>Application received:</i> Apr. 11, 1957. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> Apr. 18, 1957. <i>Hearing held:</i> July 16-19, 1957. <i>Investigation in process.</i>
14. Umbrella hardware----- (Investigation No. 62; sec. 7)	<i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by Umbrella Frame Association of America, Inc., of Philadelphia, Pa., and individual members thereof. <i>Application received:</i> Apr. 22, 1957. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> Apr. 25, 1957. <i>Hearing held:</i> July 30-31, 1957. <i>Investigation in process.</i>
15. Clinical thermometers----- (Investigation No. 63; sec. 7)	<i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by American Clinical Thermometer Guild, Inc., New York, N. Y. <i>Application received:</i> May 23, 1957. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> May 29, 1957. <i>Hearing held:</i> Sept. 4-5, 1957. <i>Investigation in process.</i>
16. Garlic (2d investigation)----- (Investigation No. 64; sec. 7)	<i>Origin of investigation:</i> Application by California Garlic Growers Association, Gilroy, Calif. <i>Application received:</i> July 9, 1957. <i>Investigation instituted:</i> July 12, 1957. <i>Hearing scheduled:</i> Dec. 3, 1957. <i>Investigation in process.</i>

Investigations completed or dismissed during 1957

Groundfish fillets (third investigation).—In response to an application by the Massachusetts Fisheries Association, Inc., of Boston, Mass., and others, the Tariff Commission on January 16, 1956, instituted a third escape-clause investigation of fresh or frozen groundfish fillets provided for in paragraph 717 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930.¹⁶ The Commission held a public hearing June 5-8, 1956.

¹⁶ Cod, haddock, hake, pollock, cusk, and rosefish, fresh or frozen (whether or not packed in ice), all the foregoing, filleted, skinned, boned, sliced, or divided into portions.

In this investigation, a report on which was submitted to the President on October 12, 1956,¹⁷ the Commission unanimously found that escape-clause relief was warranted with respect to the specified products. The Commission also found that in order to remedy the serious injury to the domestic industry concerned it was necessary that the duty on imports that enter under the tariff quota be increased from 1 $\frac{7}{8}$ cents per pound to 2.8125 cents per pound and that the duty on imports in excess of the quota be increased from 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound to 3.75 cents per pound. Accordingly, the Commission recommended that the President modify the tariff concession that the United States had granted on these products in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

On December 10, 1956, the President announced that he had decided not to increase the import duties on groundfish fillets.

Velveteen fabrics.—On January 26, 1956, in response to an application by the Crompton Co., of West Warwick, R. I., A. D. Julliard & Co., Inc., of New York, N. Y., and the Merrimack Manufacturing Co., Inc., of Lowell, Mass., the Tariff Commission instituted an escape-clause investigation of velveteen fabrics classifiable under paragraph 909 of the Tariff Act of 1930.¹⁸ The Commission held a public hearing June 19–21, 1956.

In this investigation, a report on which was submitted to the President on October 24, 1956,¹⁹ the Commission unanimously found that escape-clause relief was warranted with respect to the specified cotton velveteen fabrics. The Commission also found (Commissioner Jones dissenting) that in order to remedy the serious injury to the domestic industry concerned it was necessary that the duty on imports of plain-back velveteens be increased to 46 $\frac{7}{8}$ percent ad valorem and the duty on imports of twill-back velveteens be increased to 56 $\frac{1}{4}$ percent ad valorem. (Commissioner Jones found that an adequate remedy for the serious injury would be provided if a duty of 44 percent ad valorem was imposed on imports of all cotton velveteens, plain-back as well as twill-back.) Accordingly, the Commission recommended that the President modify the tariff concession that the United States had granted on these products in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

On December 21, 1956, the President informed the chairmen of the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means that he was extending the period of his consideration of the escape-clause case relating to cotton velveteen fabrics.

¹⁷ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Groundfish Fillets (1956): Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 47*. . . 1956 [processed].

¹⁸ Velveteen fabrics (not including ribbons), cut or uncut, whether or not the pile covers the entire surface, wholly or in chief value of cotton.

¹⁹ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Cotton Velveteen Fabrics: Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 49* . . . , 1956 [processed].

On January 22, 1957, the President announced that, in view of Japan's announcement of a broad program to control its exports of cotton textiles, including cotton velveteen fabrics, to the United States, he had decided not to act on the Tariff Commission's recommendations with respect to cotton velveteen fabrics.

Cotton pillowcases.—In response to an application by the Riegel Textile Corp., of New York, N. Y., the Tariff Commission on March 6, 1956, instituted an escape-clause investigation of pillowcases, wholly or in chief value of cotton, provided for in paragraph 911 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930. The Commission held a public hearing on September 11, 1956.

In this investigation, the report on which was issued on November 21, 1956,²⁰ the Commission found (Commissioners Brossard and Schreiber dissenting)²¹ that escape-clause relief was not warranted with respect to the specified cotton pillowcases and that, accordingly, no sufficient reason existed for a recommendation to the President under the provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended.

Straight pins (second investigation).—On May 10, 1956, in response to an application by the Vail Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill., and others, the Tariff Commission instituted a second escape-clause investigation of straight (dressmakers' or common) pins provided for in paragraph 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The Commission held a public hearing on September 18 and 19, 1956.

In this investigation, a report on which was submitted to the President on January 30, 1957,²² the Commission found (Commissioners Schreiber and Sutton dissenting) that escape-clause relief was warranted with respect to straight pins. The Commission also found that in order to prevent serious injury to the domestic industry concerned it was necessary that the duty on straight pins be increased to 35 per cent ad valorem. Accordingly, the Commission recommended that the President modify the tariff concession that the United States had granted on such pins in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

On March 29, 1957, the President rejected the Commission's recommendation for an increase in the existing import duties on straight pins.

Safety pins (second investigation).—In response to an application by the DeLong Hook & Eye Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., and others, the Tariff Commission on May 10, 1956, instituted a second escape-clause

²⁰ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Cotton Pillowcases: Report on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 51 . . .*, 1956 [processed].

²¹ Commissioner Talbot was absent on leave during the hearings in the investigation and did not participate in the Commission's decision or in the preparation of the report.

²² U. S. Tariff Commission, *Straight (Dressmakers' or Common) Pins: Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 52 . . .*, 1957 [processed].

investigation of safety pins provided for in paragraph 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The Commission held a public hearing on September 19 and 20, 1956.

In this investigation, a report on which was submitted to the President on January 30, 1957,²³ the Commission found (Commissioners Schreiber and Sutton dissenting) that escape-clause relief was warranted with respect to safety pins. The Commission also found that in order to prevent serious injury to the domestic industry concerned it was necessary that the duty on safety pins be increased to 35 percent ad valorem. Accordingly, the Commission recommended that the President modify the tariff concession that the United States had granted on safety pins in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

On March 29, 1957, the President asked the Commission to supply additional information on a number of points raised by its report on safety pins. The Commission transmitted its supplemental report to the President on September 30, 1957.²⁴ Since the supplemental report contains information revealing the operations of individual companies, and since the Commission is not authorized to disclose such information to the public, only that part of the report which does not contain such information was released for general distribution.

Certain cotton cloth (gingham).—On June 12, 1956, in response to an application by the Association of Cotton Textile Merchants, of New York, N. Y., the Tariff Commission instituted an escape-clause investigation of certain cotton cloth (gingham)²⁵ provided for in paragraph 904 (c) and (d) of the Tariff Act of 1930. The Commission originally scheduled a public hearing for October 23, 1956, but postponed it until December 4, 1956. The Commission held the public hearing December 4–6, 1956.

On January 29, 1957, the Commission announced that it had voted unanimously²⁶ to grant the request of the Association of Cotton Textile Merchants that the Commission discontinue its escape-clause investigation of ginghams. The association's request resulted from Japan's voluntary 5-year program of quota limitation on exports to the United States of cotton textiles and cotton-textile products, including specific annual quotas on shipments of gingham.

Violins and violas.—In response to an application by Jackson-Guldan, Inc., of Columbus, Ohio, the Tariff Commission on June 22, 1956, instituted an escape-clause investigation of violins and violas provided

²³ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Safety Pins: Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 53 . . .*, 1957 [processed].

²⁴ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Safety Pins: Supplemental Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 53 . . .*, 1957 [processed].

²⁵ Cotton cloth, printed, dyed, or colored, containing yarns the average number of which exceeds 20 but does not exceed 50, woven with 2 or more colors or kinds of filling.

²⁶ Commissioner Dowling was absent on leave and did not participate in the Commission's decision in this investigation.

for in paragraph 1541 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930.²⁷ The Commission held a public hearing on September 6, 1956.

In this investigation, a report on which was submitted to the President on January 29, 1957,²⁸ the Commission found (Commissioners Schreiber and Sutton dissenting)²⁹ that escape-clause relief was warranted with respect to the aforementioned violins and violas valued not over \$25 each. The Commission also found that in order to remedy the serious injury to the domestic industry concerned it was necessary that the duty on such violins and violas valued not over \$25 each be increased to \$1,875 each plus 52.5 per centum ad valorem. Accordingly, the Commission recommended that the President modify the tariff concession that the United States had granted on such violins and violas in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

On March 30, 1957, the President announced that he had decided that escape-clause action would be inappropriate with respect to violins and violas.

Certain jute fabrics.—On November 8, 1956, in response to an application by the Patchogue-Plymouth Corp., of New York, N. Y., the Tariff Commission instituted an escape-clause investigation of certain jute fabrics³⁰ classifiable under paragraph 1008 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The Commission held a public hearing on March 19, 1957.

In this investigation, the report on which was issued on May 15, 1957,³¹ the Commission unanimously found that escape-clause relief was not warranted with respect to the specified jute fabrics and that, accordingly, no sufficient reason existed for a recommendation to the President under the provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended.³²

Toyo cloth caps.—In response to an application by the Empire State Hat and Cap Association, Inc., of New York, N. Y., the Tariff Com-

²⁷ Violins and violas of all sizes, wholly or partly manufactured or assembled, made after the year 1800.

²⁸ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Violins and Violas: Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 55 . . .*, 1957 [processed].

²⁹ Commissioner Jones, who was absent on leave during the hearings on this investigation, did not participate in the Commission's decision or in the preparation of its report.

³⁰ Woven fabrics, wholly of jute, not specially provided for, not bleached, printed, stenciled, painted, dyed, colored, or rendered noninflammable: Wider than 114 inches, having a minimum thread count of 25 per square inch counting the warp and the filling, and weighing between 8 and 24 ounces per square yard. In the application, the above-described fabrics are referred to as jute backing for tufted rugs and carpets.

³¹ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Certain Jute Fabrics: Report on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 56 . . .*, 1957 [processed].

³² Commissioner Jones, who participated in the hearing in this investigation, was absent on leave when the Commission made its decision. He informed the Commission, however, that after a careful review of all the facts obtained in the investigation he was of the opinion that no sufficient reason existed for a recommendation to the President under the provisions of section 7.

mission on April 5, 1957, instituted an escape-clause investigation of caps, known as Toyo caps or Toyo cloth caps, classifiable under the provision in paragraph 1413 of the Tariff Act of 1930 for "manufactures of paper, or of which paper is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for." The Commission scheduled a public hearing for August 20, 1957.

In accordance with its usual practice in escape-clause investigations, the Commission submitted to the domestic producers of Toyo cloth and other summer-type caps questionnaires calling for information of a kind it considered necessary to formulate the findings it is required to make under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended. Of the large number of producers to whom the questionnaires were sent, only a small fraction responded, and even the responses that the Commission received were incomplete or otherwise inadequate. Urgent followup letters to the producers were ignored. Thus, in the opinion of the Commission, the domestic industry displayed a lack of interest and cooperation to a degree which warranted discontinuation and dismissal of the investigation without further consideration. On June 21, 1957, therefore, the Commission by unanimous vote ordered the investigation discontinued and dismissed and the hearing canceled.³³

Spring clothespins (fourth investigation).—On January 2, 1957, in response to an application by the Clothespin Manufacturers of America, of Washington, D. C., and others, the Tariff Commission instituted an escape-clause investigation on spring clothespins provided for in paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The Commission held a public hearing on May 7, 1957.

In this investigation, a report on which was submitted to the President on September 10, 1957,³⁴ the Commission found (Commissioner Sutton dissenting) that escape-clause relief was warranted with respect to spring clothespins.³⁵ The Commission also found that in order to remedy the serious injury to the domestic industry concerned it was necessary, for an indefinite period, to limit the quantity of spring clothespins that may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, to 650,000 gross a year.

On September 30, 1957, the end of the period covered by this report, the President had not yet acted on the Commission's recommendations with respect to spring clothespins.

Bicycles (third investigation).—In response to an application by the Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, of New York, N. Y., the Tariff Commission on January 29, 1957, instituted an

³³ Commissioners Schreiber and Dowling were absent on leave and did not participate in the Commission's decision in this investigation.

³⁴ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Spring Clothespins: Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 57 . . .*, 1957 [processed].

³⁵ Because of absence, Commissioner Jones did not participate in the hearing and findings in this investigation.

escape-clause investigation of bicycles provided for in paragraph 371 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The Commission held a public hearing from April 9 to 11, 1957.

In this investigation, the report on which was issued on August 19, 1957,³⁶ the Commission unanimously found that escape-clause relief was not warranted with respect to the specified bicycles and that, accordingly, no sufficient reason existed for a recommendation to the President under the provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended.

Reports made under Executive Order 10401 during 1957

The standard escape clause and section 7 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, provide that any escape-clause action taken by the President with respect to a particular commodity is to remain in effect only "for the time necessary to prevent or remedy" the injury.

By Executive Order 10401, issued October 14, 1952, the President established a formal procedure for reviewing escape-clause actions. Paragraph 1 of this Executive order directs the Tariff Commission to keep under review developments with respect to products on which trade-agreement concessions have been modified or withdrawn under the escape-clause procedure, and to make periodic reports to the President concerning such developments. The Commission is to make the first such report in each case not more than 2 years after the original escape-clause action, and thereafter at intervals of 1 year as long as the concession remains modified in whole or in part.

Paragraph 2 of Executive Order 10401 provides that the Commission is to institute a formal investigation in any case whenever, in the Commission's judgment, changed conditions of competition warrant it, or upon the request of the President, to determine whether, and, if so, to what extent, the withdrawal, suspension, or modification of a trade-agreement concession remains necessary in order to prevent or remedy serious injury or the threat thereof to the domestic industry concerned. Upon completing such an investigation, including a public hearing, the Commission is to report its findings to the President.

During 1957 the Commission reported to the President, under the provisions of Executive Order 10401, on developments with respect to hatters' fur, alsike clover seed, watch movements, bicycles, and dried figs.

Hatters' fur.—Effective February 9, 1952, after an escape-clause investigation and report by the Tariff Commission, the President modified the concession that the United States granted in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade on hatters' fur, and imposed on that product a duty of 47½ cents per pound, but not less than 15 percent nor more than 35 percent ad valorem.

As required by paragraph 1 of Executive Order 10401, the Commission on February 4, 1957, submitted to the President its fourth periodic

³⁶ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Bicycles: Report on Escape-Clause Investigation* No. 58 . . . , 1957 [processed].

report on developments with respect to the products involved in the escape-clause action. In its report,³⁷ the Commission unanimously concluded that the conditions of competition with respect to the trade in imported and domestically produced hatters' fur had not so changed as to warrant the institution of a formal investigation under the provisions of paragraph 2 of Executive Order 10401. On March 15, 1957, the President approved the Commission's conclusion.

Alsike clover seed.—On March 14, 1957, the President directed the Tariff Commission to conduct an investigation, under the provisions of paragraph 2 of Executive Order 10401, to determine whether, and if so, to what extent, the modification of the trade-agreement concession on alsike clover seed which became effective on June 29, 1955, would remain necessary after June 30, 1957. The President directed further that the Commission report its findings to him not later than May 15, 1957.

The President modified the trade-agreement concession on alsike clover seed under the escape-clause procedure, after investigation and report to him by the Tariff Commission. Alsike clover seed was originally dutiable under paragraph 763 of the Tariff Act of 1930 at the rate of 8 cents per pound. Pursuant to concessions granted in trade agreements the United States reduced the rate successively to 4 cents per pound and 2 cents per pound. The 2-cent rate became effective January 1, 1948, pursuant to a concession in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Subsequently the President modified this concession by escape-clause action, providing for a tariff quota during the 12-month period beginning July 1, 1954, of 1,500,000 pounds, subject to a duty of 2 cents per pound; imports in excess of that quantity during the quota year were to be subject to a duty of 6 cents per pound. For each of the two 12-month periods beginning July 1, 1955, and July 1, 1956, the tariff quota was 2,500,000 pounds, subject to a duty of 2 cents per pound; overquota imports were dutiable at 6 cents per pound. Under the proclamation of June 29, 1955, the tariff quota would expire at the close of June 30, 1957.

In accordance with the President's request, the Commission instituted an investigation of alsike clover seed on March 14, 1957, and held a public hearing on April 15, 1957. In its report to the President on May 8, 1957,³⁸ the Commission unanimously found³⁹ that continuation of the modification of the trade-agreement concession on alsike clover seed beyond June 30, 1957, as set forth in the proclamation of June

³⁷ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Hatters' Fur: Report to the President (1957) Under Executive Order 10401*, 1957 [processed].

³⁸ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Alsike Clover Seed: Report to the President on Investigation No. 1 . . . Under Paragraph 2 of Executive Order 10401*, 1957 [processed].

³⁹ Commissioner Jones, who participated in the hearing in this investigation, was unable to be present when the Commission made its finding. However, he informed the Commission that, after careful review of all the facts obtained in the investigation, he was of the opinion that no sufficient evidence existed for recommending to the President that the modification of the trade-agreement concession on alsike clover seed be extended beyond June 30, 1957.

29, 1955, would remain necessary to prevent serious injury to the domestic industry concerned.

On June 24, 1957, the President issued a proclamation extending in modified form the tariff quota on imports of alsike clover seed. In accepting the recommendation of the Tariff Commission that the existing tariff quota be extended after June 30, 1957, the President ordered a 2-year extension, and increased from 2.5 million to 3 million pounds the annual imports on which the duty will be 2 cents per pound. Annual imports in excess of that amount will be dutiable at 6 cents per pound.

Watch movements.—Effective July 27, 1954, after an escape-clause investigation and report by the Tariff Commission, the President modified the concession that the United States granted on watch movements in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and increased the import duties on such watch movements.

As required by paragraph 1 of Executive Order 10401, the Commission on July 25, 1957, submitted to the President its second periodic report with respect to the watch movements involved in the escape-clause action. In its report,⁴⁰ the Commission unanimously concluded that the conditions of competition with respect to the trade in imported and domestic watch movements had not so changed as to warrant the institution of a formal investigation under the provisions of paragraph 2 of Executive Order 10401. On September 30, 1957, the end of the period covered by this report, the President had not yet acted on the Commission's periodic report with respect to watch movements.

Bicycles.—After an escape-clause investigation and report by the Tariff Commission, the President modified the concession that the United States granted on bicycles in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and increased the import duties on such bicycles. The modification became effective August 18, 1955.

As required by paragraph 1 of Executive Order 10401, the Commission on August 19, 1957, submitted to the President its first periodic report on developments with respect to the bicycles involved in the escape action.⁴¹ The Commission reported to the President concurrently with the release of its report on the third escape-clause investigation of bicycles. In its letter to the President, the Commission unanimously concluded that the developments in the trade in bicycles that had transpired since the issuance of the proclamation of August 18, 1955, did not indicate such a change in the competitive situation as to warrant institution of a formal investigation under the provisions of paragraph 2 of Executive Order 10401. By September 30, 1957, the end of the period covered by this report, the President had not yet acted on the Commission's periodic report with respect to bicycles.

⁴⁰ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Watch Movements: Report to the President (1957) Under Executive Order 10401, 1957* [processed].

⁴¹ Letter from the Chairman of the U. S. Tariff Commission to the President, dated August 19, 1957. (See also U. S. Tariff Commission, *Bicycles: Report on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 58 . . . , 1957* [processed].)

Dried figs.—Effective August 30, 1952, after an escape-clause investigation and report by the Tariff Commission, the President modified the concession that the United States granted on dried figs in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and increased the import duty on such figs from 2½ cents to 4½ cents per pound.

Pursuant to paragraph 1 of Executive Order 10401, the Chairman of the Tariff Commission on September 17, 1957,⁴² advised the President that the Commission was unanimously of the view that developments in the trade in dried figs since August 30, 1956, did not indicate such a change as to warrant the institution of a formal investigation under paragraph 2 of Executive Order 10401.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended,⁴³ authorizes the President to restrict imports of any commodity, by imposing either fees or quotas (within specified limits), whenever such imports render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, programs of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to agricultural commodities or products thereof. Section 22 requires the Tariff Commission, on direction of the President, to conduct an investigation of the specified commodity, including a public hearing, and to make a report and appropriate recommendation to the President. Under subsection (f) of section 22, as amended by section 8 (b) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, no trade agreement or other international agreement entered into at any time by the United States may be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of section 22.

Section 8 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, sets up special procedures for invoking section 22 in emergency conditions due to the perishability of any agricultural commodity. When the Secretary of Agriculture reports to the President and to the Tariff Commission that such emergency conditions exist, the Commission must make an immediate investigation under section 22 (or sec. 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951), and make appropriate recommendations to the President. The Commission's report to the President and the President's decision must be made not more than 25 calendar days after the case is submitted to the Commission. Should the President deem it necessary, however, he may take action without awaiting the Commission's recommendations.

An amendment to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act by section 104 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1953⁴⁴ provides that the President may take immediate action under section 22 without

⁴² Letter from the Chairman of the U. S. Tariff Commission to the President, dated September 17, 1957. (See also U. S. Tariff Commission, *Dried Figs and Fig Paste: Report to the President on Investigation No. 18 Under Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as Amended, 1957* [processed].)

⁴³ 7 U. S. C. 624.

⁴⁴ 67 Stat. 472.

awaiting the Tariff Commission's recommendations whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines and reports to him, with regard to any article or articles, that a condition exists requiring emergency treatment. Such action by the President may continue in effect pending his receipt of, and his action on, the report and recommendations of the Commission after an investigation under section 22. Under section 8 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, the President's authority to act before he had received a report from the Commission was limited to perishable agricultural products. During 1957 no action was taken under either subsection (f) of section 22 or section 8 (a) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

During 1957 the Commission instituted 10 investigations under the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended. With respect to the 8 investigations that the Commission completed during the period covered by this report, it took the actions indicated below :

Commodity	Vote of the Commission	
	For imposition of import restrictions	Against imposition of import restrictions
Dried figs and fig paste.....	0	6
Dates.....	0	5
Butter oil and butter substitutes.....	5	1
Tung oil.....	5	0
Rye, rye flour, and rye meal.....	4	0
Certain articles containing butterfat.....	3	2
Almonds.....	4	2
Dried figs and fig paste.....	2	4

The individual section 22 investigations that were pending before the Commission at one time or another during the period October 1, 1956, through September 30, 1957, are discussed further below.

Cotton and cotton waste (continuing investigation)

Since 1939, under the provisions of section 22 and in accordance with recommendations of the Tariff Commission, the United States has restricted imports of most types of cotton and some types of cotton waste. During the period 1939-51, the Commission conducted a number of investigations to determine whether further restrictions were required (as on short harsh or rough cotton), whether supplemental import quotas were necessary for certain types of long-staple cotton, or whether certain minor changes were advisable to facilitate administration of the quotas. From 1952 through 1956 the Commission conducted no investigations relating to short-staple cotton, long-staple cotton, or cotton waste, but continued to observe the developments with respect to those products, with a view to further action when warranted.

On August 23, 1957, the Tariff Commission instituted an investigation of harsh or rough cotton having a staple of less than $\frac{3}{4}$ inch in length under the provisions of section 22. Such cotton was subjected to an annual absolute import quota of 70 million pounds by Presidential Proclamation 2715, dated February 1, 1947, after investigation under section 22 by the Tariff Commission. In the proclamation the President found that the imposition of this annual quota was then necessary to protect cotton programs of the United States Department of Agriculture. The purpose of the 1957 supplemental investigation was to determine whether there was in fact need for continuing the quota restrictions on the short harsh cotton described above. The Commission scheduled a public hearing in the investigation for November 13, 1957. On September 30, 1957, the end of the period covered by this report, the investigation was in process.

Wheat and wheat flour (continuing investigation)

Since 1941, under the provisions of section 22 and in accordance with recommendations of the Tariff Commission, the United States has restricted imports of wheat and wheat flour, semolina, crushed or cracked wheat, and similar wheat products, in order to prevent interference with programs of the Department of Agriculture to control the production or marketing of domestic wheat. Imports in any quota year are limited to 800,000 bushels of wheat and to 4 million pounds of wheat flour, semolina, and similar wheat products. The quotas are allocated by country; in general, they are in proportion to imports from the several countries in the 12-year period 1929-40. Since their adoption in 1941 the basic quotas have not been changed, but exceptions have been made for distress shipments, seed wheat, wheat for experimental purposes, and wheat imported during World War II by the War Food Administrator (virtually all of which was used for animal feed). Since 1943 the Commission has completed no investigations relating to wheat, wheat flour, and other wheat products, but has continued to observe the developments with respect to those products, with a view to further action when warranted.⁴⁵

Dried figs and fig paste (first investigation)

On October 2, 1956, at the direction of the President, the Tariff Commission instituted an investigation of dried figs and fig paste, under the provisions of section 22. The Commission held a public hearing on October 30 and 31, 1956.

The institution of the investigation was followed by litigation in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. On October 5, 1956, certain importers of dried figs and fig paste filed a motion in that court⁴⁶ for a preliminary injunction enjoining the Secretary of Agriculture—pending the final hearing and determina-

⁴⁵ Early in 1955 the Commission—at the applicant's request—discontinued and dismissed an investigation of durum wheat (class II) or flour, including semolina, produced from such wheat.

⁴⁶ Civil Action No. 4008-56.

tion of the case—from making any representations or presenting any evidence, factual data, or arguments to the Tariff Commission in its investigation, and enjoining the Commission from conducting its hearing and from reporting to the President the results of its investigation of dried figs and fig paste. Judge Morris, of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, heard the motion for a preliminary injunction on October 25, 1956. After hearing the arguments, the court denied the motion.⁴⁷

The Commission reported the results of its investigation of dried figs and fig paste to the President on December 17, 1956.⁴⁸ On the basis of its investigation, the Commission unanimously found that dried figs and fig paste were not practically certain to be imported during the 1956/57 crop year under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the Federal fig marketing-order program undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or to reduce substantially the amount of products processed in the United States from domestic figs or fig paste with respect to which that program is being undertaken. The Commission, therefore, made no recommendation to the President for the imposition of import restrictions on dried figs and fig paste under the provisions of section 22.

Dates (first investigation)

At the direction of the President, the Tariff Commission on October 2, 1956, instituted an investigation of dates, under the provisions of section 22. The Commission held a public hearing on November 1 and 2, 1956.

The Commission reported the results of its investigation to the President on February 5, 1957.⁴⁹ On the basis of its investigation, the Commission unanimously found⁵⁰ that dates were not practically certain to be imported during the 1956/57 crop year under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the Federal date marketing-order program and the Department of Agriculture program for the diversion of dates to new uses, or to reduce substantially the amount of products

⁴⁷ The plaintiff on October 9, 1957, filed a notice of appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

⁴⁸ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Dried Figs and Fig Paste: Report to the President on Investigation No. 12 Under Section 22 . . .*, 1956 [processed].

⁴⁹ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Dates: Report to the President on Investigation No. 13 Under Section 22 . . .*, 1957 [processed].

⁵⁰ Because of absence due to circumstances beyond his control, Commissioner Dowling did not participate in the Commission's decision in this case or in the preparation of this report. Before his departure, however, he reported in writing to the Commission that, having sat at the hearings in the investigation and having reviewed all the information obtained by the Commission in the investigation, he found that there was no material interference with the Department of Agriculture date program by reason of imports of dates and that accordingly, in his view, there was no basis for any recommendation to the President.

processed in the United States from domestic dates with respect to which such programs are being undertaken. The Commission, therefore, made no recommendation to the President for the imposition of import restrictions on dates under the provisions of section 22.

Butter oil and butter substitutes

On November 20, 1956, at the direction of the President, the Tariff Commission instituted an investigation of butter substitutes, including butter oil, containing 45 percent or more of butterfat, under the provisions of section 22. The Commission held a public hearing on January 15, 1957.

The Commission reported the results of its investigation to the President on March 11, 1957.⁵¹ In its report, the Commission found (Commissioner Jones dissenting) that butter substitutes, including butter oil, containing 45 percent or more of butterfat were practically certain to be imported under such conditions and in such quantities as to materially interfere with the price-support program undertaken by the Department of Agriculture with respect to whole milk and butterfat, and to reduce substantially the amount of products processed in the United States from domestic milk and butterfat. To prevent such interference, the Commission recommended to the President that imports of such butter substitutes be limited to 450,000 pounds for the period April 1 to June 30, 1957, and thereafter, to 1,800,000 pounds for each 12-month period beginning July 1.

On April 15, 1957, the President issued a proclamation limiting to 1,800,000 pounds the aggregate quantity of butter substitutes, including butter oil, containing 45 percent or more of butterfat, that may be imported during the calendar year 1957, and limiting to 1,200,000 pounds the aggregate quantity of such products that may be imported during each subsequent calendar year.

Tung oil

At the direction of the President, the Tariff Commission on March 22, 1957, instituted an investigation on tung oil, under the provisions of section 22. The Commission held a public hearing on May 2 and 3, 1957.

The Commission reported the results of its investigation to the President on May 31, 1957.⁵² On the basis of its investigation, the Commission unanimously found⁵³ that tung oil was being and was practically certain to continue to be imported under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the price-support program for tung nuts

⁵¹ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Butter Substitutes, Including Butter Oil, Containing 45 Percent or More of Butterfat: Report to the President on Investigation No. 14 . . . Under Section 22* . . ., 1957 [processed].

⁵² U. S. Tariff Commission, *Tung Oil: Report to the President on Investigation No. 15 Under Section 22* . . ., 1957 [processed].

⁵³ Because of absence, Commissioner Jones did not participate in this investigation.

and tung oil undertaken by the Department of Agriculture pursuant to section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and to reduce substantially the amount of products processed in the United States from domestically produced tung nuts and tung oil. To prevent such interference, the Commission recommended to the President that, for an indefinite period, an import fee of 3 cents per pound but not more than 50 percent ad valorem be imposed on imports of tung oil.

On September 9, 1957, the President issued a proclamation restricting imports of tung oil for the remainder of the crop year ending October 31, 1957, and for the 3 crop years ending October 31 of 1958, 1959, and 1960. In taking this action, the President accepted the unanimous finding of the Tariff Commission that imports were interfering with the price-support program for tung oil. However, instead of imposing the 3-cent-per-pound import fee that the Tariff Commission recommended, the President decided upon a quota restriction. The proclamation established 3 annual quotas of 26 million pounds each. The period covered by the first quota, however, includes the remainder of the current crop year as well as the crop year beginning November 1, 1957. In the first quota period, the proclamation provides for imports not in excess of a monthly rate of 1,154,000 pounds through January of 1958. For the second and third crop years, not more than one-fourth of the annual quotas may be imported during the first quarter of each year. Of the annual quotas of 26 million pounds, not more than 22,100,000 pounds may be imported from Argentina, not more than 2,964,000 pounds, from Paraguay, and not more than 936,000 pounds, from other countries.

Rye, rye flour, and rye meal

On May 13, 1957, at the direction of the President, the Tariff Commission instituted an investigation of rye, rye flour, and rye meal, under the provisions of section 22. The Commission held a public hearing on June 3, 1957.

The Commission reported the results of its investigation to the President on June 18, 1957.⁵⁴ On the basis of its investigation, the Commission unanimously found⁵⁵ that rye, rye flour, and rye meal were practically certain to be imported after June 30, 1957, under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the price-support program for rye undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, and to reduce substantially the amount of products processed from domestically produced rye. To prevent such interference, the Commission recommended to the President that a quota of 95,200,000 pounds (of which not more than 8,000 pounds might be rye flour or rye meal) be imposed for succeeding 12-month periods beginning July 1, 1957. The Com-

⁵⁴ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Rye and Rye Flour and Rye Meal: Report to the President on Investigation No. 9b Under Section 22 . . .*, 1957 [processed].

⁵⁵ Because of absence, Commissioners Sutton and Jones did not participate in the hearing and findings in this investigation.

mission also recommended that, of the total annual quota, 93,296,000 pounds be allocated to Canada and 1,904,000 pounds, to all other countries. The Commission further recommended that imports of certified or registered seed rye for seeding and crop-improvement purposes be exempted from the quota.

On June 27, 1957, the President issued a proclamation imposing for 2 years an annual quota of 186,000,000 pounds on imports of rye, rye meal, and rye flour. In its report, the Tariff Commission had recommended imposition of an annual quota of 95,200,000 pounds for an indefinite period. In accepting the Tariff Commission's finding that import restriction would remain necessary after June 30, 1957, the President decided to continue for 2 years the existing annual quota of 186,000,000 pounds. His proclamation continued the allocation of the quota on the historical basis—182,280,000 pounds for imports from Canada and 3,720,000 pounds for imports from other countries. The proclamation specified that, of the total permissible imports, not more than 15,000 pounds might be of rye flour or rye meal.

Certain articles containing butterfat

At the direction of the President, the Tariff Commission on May 21, 1957, instituted an investigation of certain articles containing butterfat,⁵⁶ under the provisions of section 22. The Commission held a public hearing on June 11, 1957.

The Commission reported the results of its investigation to the President on July 2, 1957.⁵⁷ On the basis of its investigation, the Commission found that certain articles containing 45 percent or more of butterfat or of butterfat and other fat and oil were being or were practically certain to be imported under such conditions and in such quantities as to materially interfere with the price-support program undertaken by the Department of Agriculture with respect to whole milk and butterfat, and to reduce substantially the amount of products processed in the United States from domestic milk and butterfat. To prevent such interference, the Commission recommended to the President (Commissioners Talbot and Dowling dissenting) that imports of such products be prohibited.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ The articles with respect to which the investigation related were articles containing butterfat, the butterfat content of which is commercially extractable, or which are capable of being used for any edible purpose for which products containing butterfat are used, but not including the following: (1) Articles the importation of which is restricted under quotas established pursuant to sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended; (2) cheeses the importation of which is not restricted by quotas established pursuant to the said sec. 22; (3) evaporated milk and condensed milk; and (4) products imported packaged for distribution in the retail trade and ready for use by the purchaser at retail for an edible purpose or in the preparation of an edible article.

⁵⁷ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Certain Articles Containing 45 Percent or More of Butterfat or of Butterfat and Other Fat or Oil: Report to the President on Investigation No. 16 Under Section 22 . . .*, 1957 [processed].

⁵⁸ Because of absence, Commissioner Jones did not participate in the hearing and finding in this investigation.

On August 7, 1957, the President issued a proclamation prohibiting further imports of articles containing 45 percent or more of butterfat, except articles already subject to quota under the provisions of section 22, cheeses, evaporated and condensed milk, and products imported in retail packages.

Almonds

On June 28, 1957, at the direction of the President, the Tariff Commission instituted an investigation of shelled almonds and blanched, roasted, or otherwise prepared or preserved almonds, under the provisions of section 22. The Commission held a public hearing on August 8 and 9, 1957.

The Commission reported the results of its investigation to the President on September 23, 1957.⁵⁹ On the basis of its investigation, the Commission found (Commissioners Jones and Dowling dissenting) that shelled almonds, and blanched, roasted, or otherwise prepared or preserved almonds (not including almond paste) are practically certain to be imported into the United States during the period October 1, 1957, to September 30, 1958, both dates inclusive, under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the United States Department of Agriculture marketing-agreement-and-order program with respect to almonds undertaken pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. The Commission also found that in order to prevent such interference it is necessary that a fee of 10 cents per pound, but not more than 50 percent ad valorem, be imposed on all such products entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the 12-month period beginning October 1, 1957, in excess of an aggregate quantity of 3,500,000 pounds. The fee recommended by the Commission would be in addition to the regular customs duties presently in effect, irrespective of the quantities imported, of 16½ cents per pound on shelled almonds and 18½ cents per pound on blanched, roasted, or otherwise prepared or preserved almonds.

On September 30, 1957, the end of the period covered by this report, the President had not acted on the Commission's recommendation with respect to almonds.

Dried figs and fig paste (second investigation)

At the direction of the President, the Tariff Commission on July 19, 1957, instituted an investigation of dried figs and fig paste, under the provisions of section 22. The Commission held a public hearing August 20-22, 1957.

The Commission reported the results of its investigation of dried figs and fig paste to the President on September 17, 1957.⁶⁰ On the basis of its investigation, the Commission found (Commissioners

⁵⁹ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Almonds: Report to the President on Investigation No. 17 under Section 22 . . .*, 1957 [processed].

⁶⁰ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Dried Figs and Fig Paste: Report to the President on Investigation No. 18 Under Section 22 . . .*, 1957 [processed].

Brossard and Schreiber dissenting) that dried figs and fig paste were not practically certain to be imported during the 1957/58 crop year under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, the marketing-agreement-and-order program and other programs with respect to figs and fig paste undertaken by the Department of Agriculture, or to reduce substantially the amount of products processed in the United States from domestic figs or fig paste with respect to which such programs are being undertaken. The Commission, therefore, made no recommendation to the President for the imposition of import restrictions on dried figs and fig paste under the provisions of section 22.

Dates (second investigation)

On August 7, 1957, at the direction of the President, the Tariff Commission instituted an investigation of dates, under the provisions of section 22. The Commission held a public hearing on September 10 and 11, 1957. On September 30, 1957, the end of the period covered by this report, the investigation was still in process.

Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930

Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 directs the Tariff Commission to place at the disposal of the President, the House Committee on Ways and Means, and the Senate Committee on Finance—whenever requested—all information at its command. It also directs the Commission to make such investigations and reports as may be requested by the President, by either of the above-mentioned committees, or by either House of Congress.

During 1957 the Commission instituted two investigations under the provisions of section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Whiskey

On February 7, 1957, pursuant to a resolution adopted by the Senate Committee on Finance on February 6, 1957, the Commission instituted an investigation—under the provisions of section 332—of the whiskey industry of the United States. The resolution directed the Commission to make a thorough investigation of the whiskey industry of the United States and, in its report, to set forth the facts affecting the relative competitive position of foreign-owned and domestically owned whiskey distilleries, including the impact of trade practices, methods of distribution, and imports on American-owned distilleries. The resolution also directed the Commission to make its report to the committee on or before July 1, 1957. On May 22, 1957, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance advised the Commission that the committee had rescinded the resolution directing the Commission to investigate the whiskey industry of the United States. Accordingly, on May 23, 1957, the Commission dismissed the investigation.

On August 14, 1957, pursuant to a resolution adopted by the Senate Committee on Finance on August 12, 1957, the Commission instituted an investigation, under the provisions of section 332, of the conditions of competition in the United States between whiskey produced in the United States and in foreign countries. The committee's resolution directed the Commission, in its report, to set forth a summary of the facts obtained in its investigation, including a description of the domestic industry, domestic production, foreign production, imports, consumption, channels and methods of distribution, prices, United States exports, United States customs treatment since 1930, and other factors affecting the competition between domestic and imported whiskey. The Commission was directed to make its report to the committee on or before March 31, 1958. On September 30, 1957, the end of the period covered by this report, the investigation was in process. A public hearing in the investigation was scheduled to be held beginning October 22, 1957, but was subsequently postponed until January 21, 1958.

Tuna fish

Pursuant to a resolution adopted by the Senate Committee on Finance on August 20, 1957, the Commission on August 26, 1957, instituted an investigation—under the provisions of section 332—with respect to tuna fish. The investigation is supplemental to the investigation the Commission made under section 332 pursuant to a resolution adopted by the Senate Committee on Finance on June 26, 1952.

On March 20, 1953, the Commission submitted to the committee a report of the results of its investigation with respect to tuna fish in response to the resolution of June 26, 1952. In its resolution of August 20, 1957, the committee instructed the Commission "to make a supplementary investigation similar in scope to the investigation made in accordance with the Committee resolution of June 26, 1952, and to report the results of its supplementary investigation to the Committee on or before February 1, 1958."

The resolution of August 20, 1957, directs the Commission to hold a public hearing in the course of the supplementary investigation. On September 30, 1957, the end of the period covered by this report, the investigation was in process.

Section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930

Section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930—the so-called flexible-tariff provision—sets forth the procedure under which the import duty on an article may be changed by proclamation of the President to equalize differences in costs of production at home and abroad after investigation and report by the Tariff Commission of the differences between the costs of production in the United States and in the country that is the principal foreign supplier. The Trade Agreements Act, however, made the provisions of section 336 inapplicable to any commodity on which a tariff concession is in effect pursuant to a trade agreement.

As the United States has progressively extended the coverage of trade-agreement concessions, it has correspondingly reduced the scope of possible action under the provisions of section 336.

During 1957 the Commission instituted one investigation under the provisions of section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

On August 30, 1957, in accordance with Senate Resolution 195, 85th Congress, 1st session, dated August 28, 1957, the Commission instituted an investigation, under the provisions of section 336, of the differences in the cost of production of domestically produced tungsten ore and concentrates and the cost of production of foreign-produced tungsten ore and concentrates provided for in paragraph 302 (c) of the Tariff Act of 1930. The Senate resolution directed the Commission to report the results of its investigation on or before March 1, 1958. On September 30, 1957, the end of the period covered by this report, the investigation was in process.

Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930

Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 authorizes the Tariff Commission to investigate alleged unfair methods of competition and unfair acts in the importation of articles or in the sale of imported articles in the United States. When the effect or tendency of such methods or acts is to destroy or substantially injure a domestic industry, efficiently and economically operated, or to prevent the establishment of such an industry, or to restrain or monopolize trade and commerce in the United States, the articles involved may, pursuant to Executive order, be excluded from entry into the United States.

At one time or another during 1957, 8 complaints under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 were pending before the Commission. Three complaints on which the Commission has suspended action—one on household canisters and two on certain expansion bracelets and parts thereof—will continue in suspension until final decisions are rendered in civil actions pending in the Federal courts.

Electron tubes and component parts thereof

On July 7, 1955, Eitel-McCullough, Inc., of San Bruno, Calif., filed with the Tariff Commission a complaint alleging violation of section 337 in the importation and sale of electron tubes and component parts thereof. The complaint charged that the imports infringed the complainant's patent.

On November 16, 1955, after a preliminary inquiry, the Commission by unanimous vote suspended action on the complaint pending a final decision in the case of *Eitel-McCullough, Inc. v. Wholesale Radio Parts Co., Inc., and Amperex Electronic Corp.*,⁶¹ a suit for patent infringement then pending in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland. The suit, which involved the complainant before the Commission and the importer of the tubes in question, was

⁶¹ Civil Action No. 8348.

dismissed by the United States district court on May 21, 1957. On June 26, 1957, the Tariff Commission dismissed the complaint filed under section 337.

Household canisters

On December 29, 1955, the Kromex Corp., of Cleveland, Ohio, filed with the Tariff Commission a complaint alleging violation of section 337 in the importation and sale of household canisters. The complaint charged that the imports infringed the complainant's design patent.

On April 23, 1956, after a preliminary inquiry, the Commission by unanimous vote suspended action on the complaint. The suspension of action on the complaint will continue until a final decision is rendered in the case of the *Kromex Corp. v. L. Batlin & Son, Inc.*,⁶² which is pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. The suit, which was brought against the importer by the complainant before the Commission, is for infringement of the patent in question.

Badminton rackets

On June 11, 1956, George A. Allward, doing business as H. & A. Manufacturing Co., of Lacombe, La., filed with the Tariff Commission a complaint alleging violation of section 337 in the importation and sale of certain badminton rackets. The complaint charged that the imports infringed the complainant's patent. On August 14, 1956, after a preliminary inquiry, the Commission ordered an investigation of the complaint. The Commission held a public hearing on December 11, 1956.

The Commission announced its findings with respect to badminton rackets on April 22, 1957. After a full investigation, including a public hearing, the Commission unanimously found no violation of section 337. The full Commission agreed that, if unfair methods of competition or unfair acts were present, it had not been established that their effect or tendency was to substantially injure or destroy a domestic industry. The majority of the Commission (Commissioners Talbot, Sutton, Jones, and Dowling) did not rule on the question of whether or not the imported article was made in conformity with the claims of the patent. However, Commissioners Brossard and Schreiber were of the view that the imported articles were made in accordance with the claims of the patent in question and that, therefore, unfair methods of competition and unfair acts were present but that no injury to a domestic industry was proved.

Slip-resistant hanger covers

On June 26, 1956, L. M. Leathers' Sons, of Athens, Ga., filed with the Tariff Commission a complaint alleging violation of section 337 in the importation and sale of slip-resistant hanger covers. The complaint charged that the imports infringed the complainant's pat-

⁶² Civil Action No. 106-222.

ent. After preliminary inquiry, the Commission held that the allegations in the complaint were insufficient to warrant a formal investigation, and, on October 23, 1956, dismissed the complaint.

Certain expansion bracelets and parts thereof

On October 23, 1956, the Speidel Corp., of Providence, R. I., filed with the Tariff Commission two complaints alleging violation of section 337 in the importation and sale of certain foreign expansion bracelets and parts thereof. The complaints charged that the imports infringed the complainant's patents.

On February 4, 1957, the Commission suspended action on the two complaints, pending the outcome of certain patent litigation. The Commission based its action in part on the fact that certain of the patents involved in the complaints are the subject of pending patent suits in the Federal courts.

Phonograph pickup cartridges, elements, and needles

On February 25, 1957, the Brush Electronics Co. (a division of Clevite Corp.), of Cleveland, Ohio, and The Astatic Corp., of Conneaut, Ohio, filed with the Tariff Commission 2 complaints alleging violation of section 337 in the importation and sale of certain foreign phonograph pickup cartridges, elements, and needles. The 2 complaints, involving a total of 13 patents, allege that the imported articles infringe 1 or more of the patents.

On March 15, 1957, the Commission ordered a preliminary inquiry into these complaints to determine whether the institution of an investigation under section 337 is warranted and whether the issuance of a temporary order of exclusion under section 337 is warranted. On September 30, 1957, the end of the period covered by this report, the preliminary inquiry was in process.

Section 201 (a) of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as Amended

Section 301 of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954⁶³ amended the Antidumping Act, 1921, and transferred to the Tariff Commission the function—formerly exercised by the Treasury Department—of making “injury” determinations for the purposes of the Antidumping Act. The transfer became effective October 1, 1954.

Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury determines that imports are entering or are likely to enter at less than their “fair value,” within the meaning of that term as used in the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended,⁶⁴ he must refer the matter to the Tariff Commission for determination as to whether a domestic industry is being or is likely to be injured, or is prevented from being established, by reason of the importation of such merchandise. If the Commission makes an affirmative finding, it so reports to the Secretary of the Treasury, who thereupon issues a “finding of dumping”; the antidumping duties are thenceforth collected.

⁶³ 68 Stat. 1138.

⁶⁴ 42 Stat. 11; 68 Stat. 1138; 19 U. S. C. 160.

Section 5 of the Customs Simplification Act of 1956⁶⁵ provided that the Secretary of the Treasury, after consulting with the Tariff Commission, should review the operation and effectiveness of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended, and report thereon to the Congress within 6 months after the date of enactment of the Customs Simplification Act of 1956. The act directed the Secretary of the Treasury to recommend to the Congress any amendment of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended, that he considers desirable or necessary to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in its enforcement. The Secretary of the Treasury—after consultation with the Tariff Commission—reported to the Congress on February 1, 1957. In his report, the Secretary of the Treasury recommended that the Congress amend the Antidumping Act to redefine “foreign market value.” He also recommended several other amendments to the act that he felt would make for greater efficiency in its administration.

During 1957 the Commission made no injury determinations under the provisions of section 201 (a) of the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended.

Litigation with respect to an injury determination that the Commission made in 1955—that on cast iron soil pipe from the United Kingdom—was terminated during the period covered by this report.

On August 1, 1955, in response to advice it received from the Secretary of the Treasury on July 27, 1955, the Tariff Commission instituted an investigation of imports of cast iron soil pipe from the United Kingdom, under the provisions of section 201 (a). The Commission held a public hearing on October 21, 1955.

In a notification sent to the Secretary of the Treasury on October 26, 1955, the Commission stated that, by a majority vote (Commissioners Brossard, Talbot, and Dowling), it had determined that a domestic industry in the United States was being, or was likely to be, injured by reason of the importation of cast iron soil pipe, other than “American pattern” cast iron soil pipe, from the United Kingdom at less than fair value. The domestic industry to which the Commission’s determination of injury related was held to consist of the producers of cast iron soil pipe in the State of California (Commissioner Sutton dissenting). Commissioners Sutton and Jones disagreed with the finding of the majority of the Commission that the California producers of cast iron soil pipe were being, or were likely to be, injured by reason of the importation of cast iron soil pipe from the United Kingdom at less than fair value.⁶⁶

On October 27, 1955, the Treasury Department announced a finding of dumping with respect to importations of cast iron soil pipe from the United Kingdom. The law requires that, under these circumstances, a special duty be levied on imports of cast iron soil pipe, other

⁶⁵ 70 Stat. 943.

⁶⁶ Commissioner Schreiber, who, after participating in the hearing, was called away because of illness in his family, advised the Commission of his views in this case; they were in accord with the views of the majority.

than "American pattern" cast iron soil pipe, from the United Kingdom that are sold at less than foreign market value as defined by the Antidumping Act.

The issuance of the above-mentioned finding of dumping was followed by litigation in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. On March 8, 1956, importers of British cast iron soil pipe and British producing companies filed a complaint in that court asking for a declaratory judgment that the Antidumping Act is unconstitutional, that certain procedures under the Antidumping Act or under the Administrative Procedure Act have not been complied with, and that certain findings of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the Tariff Commission are invalid. They also requested an injunction against the Secretary of the Treasury to prevent the assessment of dumping duties. On March 16, 1956, the complainants filed a petition for a preliminary injunction pending the outcome of the case on the merits. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Tariff Commission were both named as party defendants in these proceedings.⁶⁷

Because of the constitutional questions raised, a three-judge district court was convened to hear the case. Two constitutional questions were urged by the plaintiffs: (1) That the act operated retroactively in effect, and that the time when the dumping question is first raised or presented to the Secretary of the Treasury may be substantially before the importer first hears of the proceeding or of the possibility that a special dumping duty may be imposed. This, the plaintiffs contended, deprives them of their property without due process of law and is repugnant to the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution. (2) That the act fails to define important terms, rendering it an invalid delegation of legislative power because it leaves the Secretary of the Treasury and the Tariff Commission without any legislative standard to guide them.

The complainants charged, in effect, that the Secretary's initial determination that imports of cast iron soil pipe were being sold, or were likely to be sold, at "less than fair value" was a star-chamber proceeding and that provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, which were claimed to be applicable, were not complied with. The complainants further contended that the Tariff Commission's determination that imports of cast iron soil pipe were injuring an industry in the United States was made without following the requirements of allegedly pertinent provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

The defendants in this case were represented in court by the United States attorney, who filed a motion to dismiss the complaint on the ground that the court lacked jurisdiction over the subject matter. The defendants contended that exclusive jurisdiction over the subject matter of the complaint lay in the United States Customs Court and, on appeal, in the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. On June 20, 1956, the United States district court so held, and dis-

⁶⁷ *A. W. Horton, John C. Fryer, and Camarge Trading Co., Inc., plaintiffs, v. George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, and United States Tariff Commission, defendants* (Civil Action No. 1038-56).

missed the complaint.⁶⁸ After dismissal of the complaint, the importers appealed to the Supreme Court, which on December 3, 1956, affirmed the holding of the district court.⁶⁹

Public Law 38, as Amended

Public Law 38 (82d Cong.),⁷⁰ as amended by Public Law 91 (84th Cong.),⁷¹ suspends certain import taxes on copper until June 30, 1958. It provides, however, that the President must revoke the suspension of such taxes at an earlier date if the Tariff Commission determines that the average market price of electrolytic copper in standard shapes and sizes (delivered Connecticut Valley) has been below 24 cents per pound for any 1 calendar month during the period. When this market condition occurs, the Commission is required to advise the President within 15 days after the conclusion of such calendar month, and the President is required to reimpose the taxes not later than 20 days after the Commission has so advised him.

In 1951, upon the enactment of Public Law 38, the Commission established the necessary procedure for carrying out its responsibilities under the law. During 1957, as in previous years, it kept informed on current copper prices and competitive conditions. Inasmuch as the price of copper did not fall below 24 cents per pound during the year, the Commission had no occasion to make a report to the President.

⁶⁸ 146 F. Supp. 819, D. C. D. C. 1956.

⁶⁹ 352 U. S. 921, 1956.

⁷⁰ 65 Stat. 44.

⁷¹ 69 Stat. 170.

PART II. SPECIAL REPORTS AND ACTIVITIES

Besides the public investigations that it conducts and the services that it renders to the Congress, to the President, and to other Government agencies, the United States Tariff Commission is directed by law and by Executive orders to make certain special reports and to engage in certain special activities.

Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, which sets forth the general powers of the Tariff Commission, directs the Commission to investigate and report on a wide range of subjects related to tariffs, commercial policy, and international trade. These subjects include, among others, the fiscal and industrial effects of, and the operation of, the customs laws; the effects of various types of import duties; tariff relations between the United States and foreign countries; commercial treaties; the volume of imports compared with domestic production and consumption; and the competition of foreign industries with those of the United States. Over the years the Commission has, under the provisions of section 332, issued various editions of its *Summaries of Tariff Information*; various editions of its compilation of information on United States import duties; periodic reports on synthetic organic chemicals; reports on the commercial policies of certain foreign countries; and other special reports, including those on specific commodities and industries.

The Tariff Commission is one of the agencies from which the President seeks information and advice in negotiating trade agreements with foreign countries. Executive Order 10082, of October 5, 1949, requires the Commission to supply to the interdepartmental trade agreements organization factual data on all articles on which the United States proposes to consider granting concessions in trade agreements.

Beginning in 1947, various Executive orders have directed the Commission to keep informed concerning the operation and effect of provisions relating to duties and other import restrictions of the United States contained in trade agreements, and to submit a factual report to the President and to the Congress, at least once each year, on the operation of the trade agreements program. Under section 350 (e) (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, this function is made mandatory by statute.

Summaries of Tariff Information

Under its general powers, the Tariff Commission's most extensive work is the preparation of its summaries of tariff information, which

are designed to provide the Congress and the executive agencies with complete and up-to-date information on the commodities listed in the tariff act. These summaries contain the tariff history of the commodities in each classification specified in the tariff act; a discussion of the nature and uses of each commodity; an analysis of the trends in United States production, imports, and exports; data on output and the conditions of production in foreign countries; and an analysis of the factors affecting the competition of imports with the domestic product. Continuous revision of these summaries, which were first published in 1920, is an important activity of the Commission.

The Commission issued its most recent complete edition of *Summaries of Tariff Information* in 1948-50. This edition, which consists of some 2,300 separate summaries and comprises a total of 44 volumes, has been widely used by the Congress and other Government agencies, and by industrial, agricultural, commercial, labor, and other organizations.

Because of budgetary limitations and the pressure of high-priority work, the Commission has been unable to maintain a regular schedule for publishing revisions of *Summaries of Tariff Information*. During 1957, as in previous years, the statistical and certain other information in several hundred of the summaries was brought up to date and made available to defense and other Government agencies. Besides this regular work of keeping the summaries current, the Commission during 1957 initiated a project for publishing a substantial number of completely revised summaries on selected commodities. By September 30, 1957, despite interruptions by such high-priority work as the tariff classification study and escape-clause investigations, considerable work had been done on this project. The Commission hopes to be able to publish the selected group of summaries sometime during 1958.

Information on United States Import Duties

To supply in convenient form information regarding changes made in the duties on imported articles since the passage of the Tariff Act of 1930, for the use of the customs service, the public, and the Congress, the Tariff Commission issued documents periodically—from the late thirties until 1948—showing these changes. In 1948, after the multilateral trade-agreement negotiations that resulted in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the Commission issued a complete restatement of the Tariff Act of 1930, as modified and amended, including the special and administrative provisions. In 1950 the Commission issued a revised edition and in 1952, a second revision. These compilations, which the Commission prepares in cooperation with the Bureau of Customs, are furnished to appropriate congressional committees and to reference libraries throughout the United States, and are distributed by the Bureau of Customs to all its field offices.

The latest revision, *United States Import Duties (1952)*,¹ is a looseleaf publication consisting of two sections. Section I presents the rates of duty that are applicable to imported commodities, a list of the items that are free of duty, a list of the items that are subject to import-excise taxes under the Internal Revenue Code, and references to various statutes that provide for special and additional import duties or for special exemptions from duty under certain circumstances. Section II presents the special and administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930. Supplement I to the 1952 edition, which consists of new pages for insertion in the original publication, was issued in November 1953. Supplement II, which incorporates the changes that resulted from United States trade-agreement negotiations in 1955 with Japan and other countries, and with Switzerland, and from legislative action, was issued in January 1956. Supplements III and IV, which incorporate the changes that resulted from United States trade-agreement negotiations with 21 countries during 1956, were issued in October 1956 and July 1957, respectively.

Reports on Synthetic Organic Chemicals

In accordance with its usual procedure, the Tariff Commission in 1957 released preliminary and final reports of United States production and sales of synthetic organic chemicals in 1956. These reports continue the annual series that the Commission has published since 1918.

Preliminary report on production and sales, 1956

The Tariff Commission's preliminary report on production and sales of synthetic organic chemicals in 1956 consisted of 14 separate sections, each of which dealt with a segment of the industry. Each section was released as soon as the statistics were substantially complete. The information was thus made available to industry and to Government agencies at the earliest date possible, a fact which enhanced its usefulness. The first section, covering elastomers (synthetic rubbers) was released in May 1957, and all sections had been released before the end of August 1957. The preliminary report covered production and sales of tars and tar crudes; crude products from petroleum and natural gas; cyclic intermediates; coal-tar dyes; toners and lakes; bulk medicinal chemicals; flavor and perfume materials; plastics and resin materials; rubber-processing chemicals; elastomers (synthetic rubbers); plasticizers; surface-active agents; pesticides and other agricultural chemicals; and miscellaneous chemicals.

¹ U. S. Tariff Commission, *United States Import Duties (1952)*, misc. ser., TC 1.10: Im 7/4/952. Subscriptions to this publication, which may be placed with the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., include Supplements I, II, III, and IV. The subscription price is \$4.25 if the document is mailed to a domestic address and \$5.25 if it is mailed to a foreign address.

Final report on production and sales, 1956

The statistics given for each segment of the industry in the Tariff Commission's final report on United States production and sales of synthetic organic chemicals in 1956² were compiled from data—supplied by 620 companies—on approximately 6,000 individual chemicals and chemical products. Also included in the report are a directory of manufacturers, which identifies the producers of the individual products covered in the report; statistics on United States imports of coal-tar products under paragraphs 27 and 28 of the Tariff Act of 1930; and statistics on the number of persons engaged in research by the reporting companies, as well as on the expenditures for such research.

Production of tar in the United States from all sources in 1956 was 891 million gallons—2.5 percent less than the 914 million gallons reported for 1955. Of the output in 1956, coal tar accounted for 833 million gallons, and water-gas and oil-gas tars accounted for 58 million gallons. The most important products recovered from coke-oven gas and from coal tar are benzene, toluene, xylene, creosote oil, naphthalene, and tar pitches. The section of the report covering crude products from petroleum and natural gas includes some products derived from petroleum that are identical with those produced from tar (e. g., benzene, toluene, and xylene). The output of crude products from petroleum and natural gas in 1956 amounted to 18 billion pounds, compared with 16 billion pounds in 1955.

The output of cyclic intermediates in 1956 amounted to 6,600 million pounds—an increase of 9.7 percent over the 6,016 million pounds reported for 1955. In 1956 about 61 percent of the total quantity of intermediates produced was used by the same manufacturers in the production of more advanced products such as dyes, medicinal chemicals, plastics, surface-active agents, and agricultural chemicals. In 1956 production of all intermediates and finished products covered in the report amounted to 40,752 million pounds, compared with 35,206 million pounds in 1955. Cyclic intermediates and cyclic finished products accounted for 13,069 million pounds of the total output in 1956, and acyclic intermediates and finished products, for 27,684 million pounds.

Compared with production in 1955, the output of nine individual groups of finished products was greater in 1956, and the output of three groups was smaller. In the order of the magnitude of the percentage increase, the groups for which production increased were miscellaneous chemicals, 20.6 percent; medicinals, 13.5 percent; pesticides and other agricultural organic chemicals, 12.6 percent; surface-active agents, 11.4 percent; elastomers, 11.1 percent; cyclic intermediates, 9.7 percent; flavor and perfume materials, 6.4 percent; plastics and resin materials, 6.4 percent; and plasticizers, 5.2 percent. The

² U. S. Tariff Commission, *Synthetic Organic Chemicals, United States Production and Sales, 1956*, Rept. No. 200, 2d ser., 1957. The final report was issued in November 1957.

groups for which production declined in 1956 compared with 1955, in the order of the magnitude of the percentage decline, were dyes, 9.8 percent; toners and lakes, 7.8 percent; and rubber-processing chemicals, 5.6 percent.

Specified synthetic organic chemicals: Monthly releases on production

During 1957 the Tariff Commission continued to conduct a monthly survey of United States production of a selected list of synthetic organic chemicals. The statistics, which are collected from about 160 companies, cover approximately 80 different chemical items. Upon request, the Commission furnishes the Business and Defense Services Administration with reported data that are necessary to its operations. The releases on production of selected synthetic organic chemicals, designated as Facts for Industry Series 6-2 and published jointly with those on production and sales of plastics and resins (Facts for Industry Series 6-10) are obtainable from the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, on a subscription basis.

Synthetic plastics and resin materials: Monthly releases on production and sales

During 1957 the Tariff Commission also continued to issue reports on United States production and sales of synthetic plastics and resin materials. This monthly report, Facts for Industry Series 6-10, which is issued in conjunction with the above-mentioned report on production of specified synthetic organic chemicals, covers production and sales of synthetic plastics and resins grouped according to chemical composition and broad end uses. The chemical classes for which statistics are given include cellulose plastics, phenolic and other tar-acid resins, styrene resins, urea and melamine resins, alkyd resins, vinyl resins, polyester resins, polyethylene resins, and miscellaneous plastics and resins. Some of the end uses covered are molding, extruding, casting, textile treating, and paper treating. Synthetic plastics and resins are also used for sheeting and film, adhesives, and protective coatings.

Imports of Coal-Tar Products, 1956

In July 1957 the Tariff Commission released its annual report on United States imports of coal-tar intermediates entered under paragraph 27 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and on coal-tar dyes, medicinals, pharmaceuticals, flavor and perfume materials, and other coal-tar products entered under paragraph 28.³ The data in the report, which covers imports through all United States customs districts, were obtained from invoice analyses made by the Commission's New York office.

The report shows that in 1956 general imports of coal-tar chemicals under paragraph 27 totaled 6.7 million pounds, with a foreign invoice value of 4.8 million dollars, compared with imports of 6.4 million

³ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Imports of Coal-Tar Products, 1956, 1957* [processed].

pounds, valued at 4.5 million dollars, in 1955, and 8.6 million pounds, also valued at 4.5 million dollars, in 1954. More than two-thirds of all imports of intermediates in 1956 came from West Germany and the United Kingdom. Imports from West Germany totaled 3.2 million pounds in 1956, compared with 3 million pounds in 1955. Imports from the United Kingdom were 1.3 million pounds in 1956, compared with 822,000 pounds in 1955. In 1956 sizable quantities of intermediates also were imported from Switzerland (406,000 pounds), France (382,000 pounds), the Netherlands (337,000 pounds), and Denmark (331,000 pounds); lesser quantities came from Canada, Belgium, and Sweden.

In 1956 imports of all finished coal-tar products that are dutiable under paragraph 28 comprised 1,515 items, with a total weight of 5.1 million pounds and a foreign invoice value of 10.4 million dollars. In 1955 imports consisted of 1,128 items, with a total weight of 5.4 million pounds and a foreign invoice value of 11.1 million dollars. As in previous years, dyes were the most important group of finished coal-tar products imported during 1956. In that year imports of dyes amounted to 4.8 million dollars (foreign invoice value), or 46 percent of the total value of all imports under paragraph 28. In 1955 imports of dyes amounted to 6.2 million dollars (foreign invoice value), or 56 percent of the total value of all imports under paragraph 28.

Medicinals and pharmaceuticals were the next most important group of products imported under paragraph 28 during 1956. In that year imports of these products were valued at 4.3 million dollars, or 41 percent of the total value of all imports under paragraph 28. In 1955 imports of medicinals and pharmaceuticals were valued at 3.3 million dollars, or 30 percent of the total value of all imports under paragraph 28. Imports of flavor and perfume materials declined slightly in value to \$500,000 in 1956 from \$514,000 in 1955. Imports of other coal-tar products under paragraph 28 declined in value to \$843,000 in 1956 from 1 million dollars in 1955.

Tariff Classification Study

Title I of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954⁴ which was approved on September 1, 1954, directs the Tariff Commission to make a comprehensive study of United States laws prescribing the tariff status of imported articles, and to submit to the President and to the chairmen of the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance, within 2 years,⁵ a revision and consolidation

⁴ 68 Stat. 1136.

⁵ Public Law 934, 84th Cong. (70 Stat. 955), which was approved August 2, 1956, extended the time for completion of the study to March 1, 1958. In response to a request from the Commission, the two congressional committees in August 1957 agreed that the Commission might have additional time—up to June 1, 1958—if such time were necessary to complete the study.

of those laws that, in the Commission's judgment, will accomplish to the extent practicable the following purposes:

(1) Establish schedules of tariff classifications which will be logical in arrangement and terminology and adapted to the changes that have occurred since 1930 in the character and importance of articles produced in and imported into the United States and in the markets in which they are sold.

(2) Eliminate anomalies and illogical results in the classification of articles.

(3) Simplify the determination and application of tariff classifications.

On March 15, 1955, in accordance with section 101 (d) of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954, the Commission submitted an interim progress report on the tariff classification study to the President and to the chairmen of the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means.⁶ The interim report was confined to a treatment of the fundamental problems underlying the simplification of the tariff schedules, the principles that the Commission will follow in formulating the proposed revision of them, and methods for putting the proposed revision into force and effect.

Because of pending trade-agreement negotiations that involved numerous changes in rates and tariff classifications, the Commission was unable to make any substantial progress on the tariff classification study during 1955 and 1956. During 1957, however, considerable progress was made on the study. A member of the Commission's legal staff and a member of the staff of its Technical Service were assigned full time to the project, and the specialists from the Commission's commodity divisions are participating in the study on a part-time basis. In January 1957, the Commission arranged with the Bureau of Customs of the Treasury Department for the part-time assignment to the Commission of the Appraiser of Merchandise at Detroit for work on this project; his practical field experience has been of material assistance. In addition, the Commission made arrangements with the Bureau of Customs for the Commission's staff to consult informally with other customs field officers—particularly the customs appraising and classification officers stationed at the port of New York.

The Commission expects that draft revised tariff schedules will be completed and published before the end of 1957 and that the required public hearings will begin in January 1958. As soon as possible after the public hearings are completed, the proposed revised tariff schedules and related material will be submitted to the President and to the chairmen of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Committee on Finance.

⁶ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Tariff Simplification Study: Interim Report to the President and to the Chairmen of the Committee on Finance of the Senate and of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House Pursuant to Section 101 (d) of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954, 1955* [processed].

Report on Groundfish

In May 1957 the Tariff Commission issued a report entitled *Groundfish: Fishing and Filleting, Information on the Domestic Industry, Production, Consumption, Foreign Trade, and Industries in Foreign Countries*. The report presents detailed, factual information that the Commission assembled in 1956 in connection with its third escape-clause investigation of groundfish fillets.⁷

Among other things, the report contains extensive information on United States groundfish-fishing operations, including fishing areas, the sale of fish at dockside, employment and earnings of fishermen, and the financial experience of vessel owners, as well as summary data on the recent Government loan program that is designed to assist the domestic fishing industry. With respect to filleting operations, the report provides information on production, prices, stocks, employment, wage rates, and the recent financial experience of filleting plants. It also includes information on the consumption of groundfish fillets and discusses the effect of the consumption of fish sticks on the total consumption of groundfish fillets in all forms. The report reviews the foreign trade of the United States in groundfish fillets and includes information on foreign sources, the volume of imports, and the species imported. The report also reviews recent developments in the groundfish-fillet industries of the principal foreign supplying countries—Canada, Iceland, and Norway—and discusses the comparative quality of imported and domestic fillets.

Revision of Trade Agreements Manual

In March 1957 the Commission issued the second edition of its *Trade Agreements Manual*.⁸ Designed to provide the answers to certain common questions about United States trade agreements, the *Manual* is a summary of selected data relating to the various trade agreements that the United States has entered into under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and the subsequent extensions of that act. The *Manual* was originally issued in March 1955; the revised edition brings it up to date as of March 1, 1957.

Part I of the *Manual* considers United States trade-agreement obligations, past and present. Among other things, it includes a list of the countries with which the United States had trade-agreement obligations in effect on March 1, 1957; a master list of all trade agreements that the United States has concluded under the Trade Agreements Act, whether or not those agreements are still in force; and a brief legislative history of the trade agreements program.

⁷ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Groundfish Fillets (1956): Report to the President on Escape-Clause Investigation No. 47 . . .*, 1956 [processed].

⁸ U. S. Tariff Commission, *Trade Agreements Manual: A Summary of Selected Data Relating to Trade Agreements That the United States Has Negotiated Since 1934* (2d ed.), 1957 [processed].

Part II of the *Manual* is devoted to information about the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Among other things, it includes a list of the countries that were contracting parties to the General Agreement on March 1, 1957; a master list of all accessions to, and withdrawals from, the General Agreement between October 30, 1947, and March 1, 1957; and a list of the conferences and sessions pertaining to the General Agreement that have been held since 1947.

Compilations of Information on Status of Investigations

During 1957 the Commission continued to issue a series of compilations showing the outcome or current status of the various types of investigations that the Commission is directed by law to conduct. These compilations, which are brought up to date from time to time, are as follows: (1) Investigations under the "escape clause" procedure; (2) investigations under the "peril point" provision; (3) investigations under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended; (4) investigations under section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; (5) investigations under section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930; (6) investigations under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930; and (7) injury determinations under the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended.

Trade-Agreement Activities

Not only is the Tariff Commission the agency directed to make peril-point and escape-clause investigations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, and Executive Order 10401, but it is also one of the agencies from which the President seeks information and advice before concluding trade agreements with foreign countries. Executive Order 10082, of October 5, 1949, requires the Commission to supply to the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements factual data concerning the production and consumption of, and trade in, all articles on which the United States proposes to consider granting concessions in trade agreements. When trade-agreement negotiations are in progress the Commission furnishes such information to the Trade Agreements Committee and to its "country" committees. The Chairman of the Tariff Commission serves as a member of the Trade Agreements Committee, and also as chairman of the interdepartmental Committee for Reciprocity Information; the Vice Chairman of the Commission serves as his alternate on both Committees.

During 1957 Commissioners and members of the Tariff Commission's staff assisted the Trade Agreements Committee as consultants and technical advisers in dealing with a variety of problems. Principal among these were preparations for United States participation in the 11th and 12th Sessions of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement; preparations for the limited trade-agreement negotiations between the United States and Cuba; and preparations for the

limited trade-agreement negotiations between the United States and the United Kingdom and Belgium.

Report on Operation of the Trade Agreements Program

Section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 directs the Tariff Commission to keep informed at all times concerning the operation and effect of provisions relating to duties or other import restrictions of the United States contained in trade agreements heretofore or hereafter entered into by the President, and to submit to the Congress, at least once a year, a factual report on the operation of the trade agreements program.

Before the passage of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, various Executive orders had directed the Commission to prepare similar reports annually and to submit them to the President and to the Congress. The latest of such orders—Executive Order 10082, of October 5, 1949—is still in effect. The nine reports that the Commission has issued in compliance with these directives provide a detailed history of the trade agreements program since its inception in 1934. The Commission's first eight reports on the operation of the trade agreements program cover developments from June 1934 through June 1955.

The ninth report, which was issued in March 1957, covers the period from July 1955 through June 1956.⁹ During all or part of this period the United States had trade-agreement obligations in force with 43 countries. Of these, 33 countries were contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and 10 were countries with which the United States had bilateral trade agreements.

During the period covered by the ninth report the United States and the other contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade met at Geneva, Switzerland, for the fourth round of multilateral tariff negotiations sponsored by the Contracting Parties. The report describes the negotiations at Geneva and analyzes the concessions that the United States granted and obtained in those negotiations. The ninth report also describes other important developments respecting the trade agreements program during 1955-56. These developments include the proposed legislation concerning United States participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC) and matters relating to the general provisions and administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The report also describes, for the last half of 1955 and the first half of 1956, United States actions relating to its trade agreements program. Among the matters discussed are the following: The withdrawal or modification of United States trade-agreement concessions; activities under the peril-point provision; the status of escape-clause investi-

⁹ First released in processed form, the report was subsequently printed as *Operation of the Trade Agreements Program: Ninth Report, July 1955-June 1956*, Rept. No. 199, 2d ser., 1957.

gations pending before the Tariff Commission; and the status of United States quantitative restrictions on imports, including those imposed under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, and under the sugar act.

Like the earlier reports on the operation of the trade agreements program, the ninth report also discusses such matters as changes in tariffs, exchange controls, and quantitative restrictions on imports by countries with which the United States has trade agreements. The trade controls employed by most of the countries with which the United States has trade agreements tend to conform to certain patterns, depending on whether the countries fall into one or another of the following four groups (with some overlapping): (1) Countries that are members of the European Payments Union (EPU); (2) countries that are members of the sterling area; (3) various nondollar countries (other than those in (1) and (2)), most of which rely heavily on multiple-exchange-rate systems for control of their trade; and (4) certain dollar countries (including Canada and several countries in Latin America) that now exercise a minimum of control over their trade with other countries. The report discusses the pattern of trade controls within each of these groups, the changes in the controls imposed by individual countries, and the tariff changes they made during 1955-56.

PART III. FURNISHING TECHNICAL INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE

A considerable part of the work of the United States Tariff Commission relates to furnishing technical information and assistance to the Congress and to other agencies of the United States Government, as required by law, and to furnishing information to industrial and commercial concerns and to the general public. Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 directs the Commission to gather information relating to the tariff and commercial policy and to place it at the disposal of the President, the Senate Committee on Finance, and the House Committee on Ways and Means, "whenever requested." Section 334 of the Tariff Act of 1930 directs the Commission to cooperate with other Government agencies in appropriate matters.

Work for the Congress

During 1957, as in previous years, the Commission's work in response to directives or requests from the Congress, congressional committees, and individual Members of Congress constituted an important part of its activities. This section of the report deals only with direct requests from congressional committees and from Members of Congress for information or comments on proposed legislation, and for assistance at congressional hearings. Other phases of the Commission's work, even though based directly or indirectly on congressional directives or requests, are discussed in other sections of this report.

Reports to committees on proposed legislation

The Congress regularly requests the Tariff Commission to analyze proposed legislation relating to tariff and trade matters. Most of the requests come from the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means. Preparation of comments on bills and resolutions usually involves considerable work by the Commission, and the reports required often are extensive.

At the request of the Senate Committee on Finance or the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Commission during 1957 prepared analyses of an exceptionally large number of bills and resolutions.¹ These bills and resolutions related to a wide variety of subjects, as the following list of representative titles indicates:

To amend certain provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relative to the import duties on wool;

¹ During the period covered by this report, the Commission prepared analyses of, or comments on, 82 bills and resolutions.

- To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place certain handmade and moldmade paper on the free list;
- To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to transfer casein from the dutiable list to the free list;
- To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to modify the duty on the importation of veneers of wood;
- To provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States;
- To suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys;
- To establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil;
- To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 by including tanning material extracts on the free list;
- To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to articles of corduroy;
- To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that the duty imposed on the importation of wool shall be payable in all cases, regardless of the purpose for which the wool is to be used;
- To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wire which is to be used in automatic baling machines for baling hay and other farm products;
- To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place marine sextants on the free list;
- To continue until the close of June 30, 1958, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap;
- To suspend for 2 years the duty on crude chicory and to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to chicory;
- To permit the importation of a trademarked article without the consent of the owner of the trademark when such article is for the personal use of the person importing such article;
- To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of primary nickel;
- To protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile-fiber products;
- To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the classification of and rate of duty on certain footwear;
- To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to impose a duty upon the importation of montan wax produced in certain Communist-controlled countries;
- To amend the Antidumping Act, 1921;
- To repeal the 3-cent-per-pound processing tax on coconut oil;
- To establish quantitative restrictions on the importation of hardwood plywood;

- To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to unmanufactured mica and certain mica films and splittings;
- To establish quantitative restrictions on the importation of wood screws of iron and steel;
- To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose an import tax on natural gas;
- To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of amorphous graphite; and
- To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose import taxes on lead and zinc.

Special services to committees of the Congress

In considering proposed legislation, congressional committees often ask the Tariff Commission not only for reports, but also for the services of Commission experts. The experts are frequently requested to assist the committees at congressional hearings, or to supply technical and economic information orally in executive sessions of the committees.

During 1957, at the request of the House Committee on Ways and Means, members of the Commission's staff appeared before the committee to supply technical assistance during consideration of proposed legislation on a number of the subjects mentioned in the immediately preceding section of this report.

During the year the Commission also continued to furnish the Senate Committee on Finance monthly and cumulative monthly statistics, prepared by its Textiles and Statistical Divisions, on imports of wool tops, yarns of wool, and woolen and worsted fabrics.

At the request of the Subcommittee on Customs, Tariffs, and Reciprocal Trade Agreements of the House Committee on Ways and Means (the "Boggs" subcommittee), the Commission granted its then Director of Investigations a leave of absence for the period August 27, 1956, to January 31, 1957, so that he might serve as chief economist of the subcommittee.

During the spring of 1957 the Commission's Editorial Section assisted the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations by preparing an index for the committee's hearings on the 1958 appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies.

Services to individual Senators and Representatives

Each year the Commission receives many requests from individual Senators and Representatives for various types of information.² Some of these requests can be answered from data that are readily available in the Commission's files; others require research and often the prep-

² During the period covered by this report, the Commission received nearly 700 congressional letters requesting information on various matters. In addition, the Commission received a large number of congressional telephone requests for information. Many of these requests, like those contained in congressional letters, involved considerable work by the Commission and its staff.

aration of extensive statistical compilations and trade analyses. Many of the requests relate to investigations that are pending before the Commission.

During 1957 the Commission continued to furnish to several Members of Congress, at their request, tabulations prepared by its Ceramics Division on a quarterly basis showing United States imports (for consumption) of glassware and pottery, by kinds and by principal sources.

The Commission also regularly furnishes information to the interdepartmental Committee for Reciprocity Information to help that Committee in responding to inquiries by Members of Congress.³

Cooperation With Other Government Agencies

Over the years, cooperation with other Government agencies has accounted for a considerable part of the Commission's activity. Among the more important instances of such cooperative work is the Commission's continuing collaboration with the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Customs, and the Department of State.

During 1957 the Commission carried on various kinds of work in cooperation with a score of other Government agencies. Including the various trade-agreement committees, Commissioners and staff members serve on about 25 interdepartmental committees. The assistance that the Commission gives to other Government agencies ranges from handling simple requests for factual information to executing projects that require considerable research and sometimes as much as several hundred man-hours of staff work. At times cooperation with other Government agencies involves detailing members of the Commission's staff to other agencies for short periods.

Selected aspects of the work that the Commission conducted in cooperation with other Government agencies during 1957 are reviewed below.

Work for defense and emergency agencies

During 1957 the United States Government agencies concerned with the problems of defense continued to call upon the Tariff Commission for needed information on strategic and critical materials. All the technical divisions of the Commission supplied such information.

The Commission's commodity divisions continued to furnish the Office of Defense Mobilization with information on strategic and critical materials similar to that which the Commission furnished to the Munitions Board before it was abolished on June 30, 1953. Members of the Commission's commodity divisions served, at the specific request of the Office of Defense Mobilization, on each of the seven interdepartmental commodity advisory committees established by that agency.

³ The primary functions of the Committee for Reciprocity Information, created by Executive order in 1934, are (1) to hold hearings to provide an opportunity for all interested parties to present their views on proposed trade agreements, and (2) to see that those views are brought to the attention of the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements.

These committees are concerned with the following groups of commodities: Iron, steel, and ferroalloys; light metals; nonferrous metals; nonmetallic minerals; chemicals and rubber; forest products; and fibers. In addition, members of the Commission's commodity divisions served as chairmen of several of the commodity subcommittees established by the interdepartmental commodity advisory committees.

During the year most of the Commission's commodity divisions furnished information to the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department of Commerce. For example, the Chemicals Division continued to supply that agency with monthly data on United States production and sales of the most important organic chemicals and plastics materials, and annual data on production and sales of synthetic organic chemicals. These data were used by the Business and Defense Services Administration for allocating chemicals, issuing certificates of necessity, and establishing normal consumption levels. The Ceramics Division also continued to supply the Business and Defense Services Administration with semiannual tabulations of invoice analyses of United States imports of mica.

Work for other Government agencies

Besides assisting the Department of State in trade-agreement matters, the Commission during 1957 furnished that Department with a wide range of data on United States tariffs and trade. A member of the Sundries Division served on the Rubber Panel, which is under the chairmanship of the Department of State.

During the year the Commission supplied the Department of Agriculture with considerable information on agricultural, chemical, and forest products, and exchanged information in connection with investigations that the Commission conducted under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended. During the year the Commission also assisted the interdepartmental sugar committee, which studies the operation of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, United States participation in the International Sugar Agreement, and other matters relating to sugar. Members of the Commission's Agricultural and Economics Divisions served during the year as members of the interdepartmental sugar committee.

The Commission during 1957 furnished assistance to the following bureaus of the Department of Commerce: The National Bureau of Standards, the Bureau of the Census, and the Bureau of Foreign Commerce (besides the Business and Defense Services Administration, mentioned in the preceding section of this report). The Commission's Ceramics Division and other commodity divisions assisted the Bureau of the Census in the analysis of "basket" classifications of import statistics and in matters concerning the proper coding and classification of imported articles for statistical purposes. The Agricultural, Ceramics, and Chemicals Divisions supplied the Bureau of Foreign Commerce with market and consumption data on certain articles of commerce for which they had unique information.

During 1957 the Commission participated in the preparation of a new edition of the *Standard Industrial Classification Manual*. Preparation of the new edition, by the interagency Technical Committee on Standard Industrial Classification, under the general supervision of the Office of Statistical Standards of the Bureau of the Budget, was undertaken to reflect changes in the structure of United States industry that had occurred since publication of the previous edition. Three members of the Commission's staff served as members and alternates on the Technical Committee on Standard Industrial Classification, and many of the Commission's commodity specialists served as consultants to the committee. The Commission also participated during the year in the revision of the *International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities*, issued by the Statistical Commission of the United Nations.

Other agencies assisted by the Commission during the year included the Bureau of Customs, the Division of Foreign Assets Control, and the Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department; the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior; the Department of Labor; the Department of Justice; the Bureau of the Budget; the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; the Federal Trade Commission; the Federal Supply Service of the General Services Administration; and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Work on statistical classification of imports and exports

Section 484 (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 provides for a statistical classification of imports, and authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Chairman of the Tariff Commission to direct its preparation. Under this provision the representatives of those officials on the Interdepartmental Advisory Committee on Foreign Trade Commodity Classification prepare, for statistical purposes, an enumeration of articles for reporting merchandise imported into the United States. A member of the Commission's Statistical Division serves on the Interdepartmental Advisory Committee.

Many factors—such as changes in description and rates of duty by reason of trade agreements, changes in the character of various products, the appearance of new products, and the need for recording separate statistics for some products previously included in groups of loosely related articles—make advisable the frequent revision of *Schedule A, Statistical Classification of Commodities Imported Into the United States*. During 1957 the Commission participated in the preparation of a July 1, 1957, reprint of the 1954 edition of *Schedule A*, which incorporated changes made since its publication in 1954. In this reprint the format of *Schedule A* was changed in order to show reduced rates of duty which will become effective on or after June 30, 1958. These reduced rates, which resulted from the concessions that the United States granted at Geneva in 1956, involved approximately 1,000 commodity classes.

During 1957 the Commission's representative on the Interdepartmental Advisory Committee reviewed, in terms of *Schedule A* categories, the proposals for changes in tariff classifications under the Customs Simplification Act of 1954, as amended; the review involved approximately 5,000 statistical items.

During 1957 members of the Commission's staff also cooperated with representatives of the Department of Commerce in establishing an enumeration of statistical requirements for reporting United States imports of cotton manufactures. Staff members of the Bureau of Foreign Commerce, the Business and Defense Services Administration, and the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; and the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, conferred with the commodity-industry analysts of the Commission's Textiles Division to determine what changes were necessary in the existing import schedule. These changes will enable those agencies to follow more closely the implementation of Japan's 5-year program for controlling exports of cotton textiles to the United States. These changes were incorporated in *Statistical Requirements for Reporting Imports of Cotton Manufactures*, which was issued as a supplement to *Schedule A* and which became effective July 1, 1957.

During the limited tariff negotiations that the United States conducted with Cuba, with the United Kingdom, and with the Benelux countries during 1957, the Commission furnished the United States delegations with statistical information—in terms of *Schedule A* classifications—relating to the items that were being considered for possible concessions.

During 1957 the Commission also continued to cooperate with the Department of Commerce in revising *Schedule B*, *Statistical Classification of Domestic and Foreign Commodities Exported from the United States*. Since the Department of Commerce had authorized a general revision of *Schedule B* for 1958, the Commission designated 11 of its commodity specialists to serve on the various subcommittees participating in this work. In addition, 25 of the Commission's commodity specialists served as consultants in this major undertaking. The member of the Statistical Division who serves on the Interdepartmental Advisory Committee assisted in coordinating the revisions and acted as liaison between the two agencies.

Assistance to Nongovernmental Research Agencies

During 1957 the Commission also assisted certain quasi-official organizations by providing information on trade and tariff matters. For example, two members of the Ceramics Division served during the year on committees of the American Society for Testing Materials, a national technical society composed of representatives of industry, the Federal Government, and engineering schools. The assistance given this society related chiefly to nomenclature and classification of ceramic products.

Assistance to Business Concerns and the Public

On specific matters within its field, the Tariff Commission furnishes information in response to many requests from outside the Federal Government. These requests come from industrial and commercial organizations, as well as from research workers, lawyers, teachers, editors, students, and others. Supplying the requested information entails a variety of work, such as preparation of appropriate letters and statistical compilations, and conferences with individuals and representatives of organizations. The Commission maintains no public relations staff for dealing with the public.

To assist individuals and organizations that are interested in studying recent developments in United States commercial policy, the Commission periodically issues a list of selected publications relating to the United States tariff and commercial policy and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The compilation lists certain pertinent publications of the Tariff Commission, the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Congress, special governmental boards and commissions, and the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and indicates where those publications may be obtained.⁴

⁴The latest edition of this compilation is U. S. Tariff Commission, *List of Selected Publications Relating to the United States Tariff and Commercial Policy and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade* (4th ed.), August 1957 [processed].

PART IV. OTHER ACTIVITIES

General Research and Assembling of Basic Data

Prerequisite to the varied activities of the United States Tariff Commission is the continuing task of assembling, maintaining, coordinating, and analyzing basic economic, technical, and statistical information pertinent to its work. Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 directs the Commission to gather such information and to place it at the disposal of the President, the House Committee on Ways and Means, and the Senate Committee on Finance, "whenever requested." It also directs the Commission to make such investigations and reports as may be requested by the President, by either of the above-mentioned committees, or by either branch of the Congress. Over the years the Commission's staff has devoted a large part of its time to such work.

Basic information on many thousands of individual commodities is collected by the Commission's various divisions. This basic information includes technical data on the nature of the commodities and their processes of production; on United States production, imports, exports, marketing practices, and prices; on production, imports, exports, and prices for the leading foreign producing and exporting countries; and on the conditions of competition between foreign and domestic products. Such information is obtained primarily through the assembly, collation, and analysis of data obtained from Foreign Service reports, from Government publications, from trade journals, and from individual firms, and through extensive fieldwork by the Commission's technical experts. On commodities involved in special investigations, the Commission also obtains data—through questionnaires and public hearings—on costs, profits, employment, and other pertinent subjects. Another major class of the Commission's basic data has to do with foreign countries—their exports, imports, industries, and resources; their economic, financial, and trade position; and their commercial policies.

The Tariff Commission Library, which contains an outstanding collection of material on the tariff, commercial policy, and international trade, primarily serves the Commission and its technical experts. This material, together with a large collection of foreign trade statistics from original sources, is also available to other Government agencies and to private organizations and individuals. The Legal Division's legislative reference service closely follows congressional legislation that is of interest to the Commission and its staff, and maintains a complete file of pertinent legislative documents.

Fieldwork

Fieldwork by the Commission's commodity and economic experts is essential to the gathering of information for the investigations that the Commission is charged with conducting. A substantial part of the data that the Commission uses in preparing its *Summaries of Tariff Information* and its other reports is obtained by personal visits of its staff members to manufacturers, importers, and other groups. Through years of experience the Commission has found that neither public hearings nor inquiries by mail can supply all the details needed for making decisions in its investigations and for verifying information on production, costs, industrial practices, and competitive factors.

In 1957, as in 1956, the Commission found it necessary to devote an exceptionally large amount of time to fieldwork. During 1957 the Commission's experts made field trips in connection with the investigations that the Commission conducted under the escape-clause provision, under sections 336 and 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended. In order to keep abreast of technical and trade developments, certain of the Commission's experts visited representative manufacturing and importing firms in their fields of specialization. Representatives of the Commission also attended several conferences of trade and technical associations in order to follow developments affecting competition in domestic markets.

Work of the Invoice Analysis Section and the New York Office

With respect to analyses of import invoices and other work carried on by the New York office, the Invoice Analysis Section of the Commission's Technical Service serves as liaison between the Washington office and the New York office, and also between the Commission and other Government agencies. This section coordinates all requests for invoice analyses, for special tabulations connected with the regular work and investigations of the Commission, and for special analyses the Commission makes for other Government agencies. The Invoice Analysis Section also compiles—from the invoice cards it receives from the New York office—such special tabulations as are required by other Government agencies.

The office that the Commission maintains in the customhouse at the port of New York performs several related functions. Through its invoice analyses, it assists in the field aspects of the Commission's investigations in the New York area and provides the Commission with more detailed information on imports of commodities than is available from the regular tabulations of import statistics. Through personal calls and interviews the New York office also maintains contacts with manufacturers, importers, exporters, customs examiners and appraisers, and others in the New York area. In this way it assists the Commission's specialists in maintaining up-to-date information in their respective fields.

In its analysis of imports entered through the customs district of New York, the New York office uses the original customhouse documents, to which are attached consular and commercial invoices that have been reviewed and passed upon by the appraisers and examiners. These invoices describe imports in detail with regard to type, grade, size, quantity, and value and provide other data not available elsewhere. The analysis of the statistical copies of import entries through customs districts other than New York is handled by personnel of the Invoice Analysis Section in Washington and at Suitland, Md. Should the Commission require additional detail for these entries from other districts, the Invoice Analysis Section obtains the customhouse documents that are on file at the other ports of entry.

During 1957 the New York office and the Invoice Analysis Section analyzed the data on more than 500 commodity classifications of imports. In addition, the New York office and the Invoice Analysis Section made special analyses for use in the Commission's investigations under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, under sections 332, 336, and 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, and under Executive Order 10401. It also made, for the defense agencies, several analyses of imports of certain critical and strategic materials, as well as special analyses for the use of other Government agencies.

PART V. ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCES

Membership of the Commission

Edgar B. Brossard, Republican from Utah, was designated by the President as Chairman of the Commission for the year beginning June 17, 1957.

Joseph E. Talbot, Republican from Connecticut, was designated by the President as Vice Chairman of the Commission for the year beginning June 17, 1957.

On April 12, 1957, the President nominated William E. Dowling, Democrat from Michigan, as a member of the Commission for the 6-year term that will expire on June 16, 1963. His nomination was confirmed by the Senate on May 13, 1957. Mr. Dowling, who entered on duty under his new appointment on June 17, 1957, has served as a member of the Commission since August 22, 1955, under previous appointments.

The other members of the Commission are Walter R. Schreiber, Republican from Maryland, Glenn W. Sutton, Democrat from Georgia, and J. Weldon Jones, Democrat from Texas.

Staff of the Commission

On June 30, 1957, the personnel of the Tariff Commission consisted of 6 Commissioners and 211 staff members. The total of 217 persons consisted of 119 men and 98 women.

The following tabulation shows the average size of the Commission's staff during successive 5-year periods from 1931 to 1955 and the number of persons on its staff on June 30 of the years 1951 through 1957:

<i>Period or year</i>	<i>Number on staff</i>
5-year average:	
1931-35.....	315
1936-40.....	306
1941-45.....	306
1946-50.....	233
1951-55.....	199
Annual:	
1951.....	211
1952.....	195
1953.....	196
1954.....	192
1955.....	199
1956.....	208
1957.....	217

On June 30, 1956, the number of persons on the roll of the Commission was 208; on June 30, 1957, it was 217. The size of the Commission's staff during 1956 and 1957 was somewhat larger than the average of 199 persons for the 5-year period 1951-55, but was still considerably below the average of 233 persons for the 5-year period 1946-50, and far below the averages of 315 persons for the 5-year period 1931-35 and of 306 persons for the 5-year prewar period 1936-40 and the 5-year war period 1941-45.

Although the Commission did not expand its staff during the war, it was required—as a part of across-the-board cuts in Federal personnel—to make sharp reductions in force in 1946 and again in 1950-51. These reductions coincided with a very heavy increase in the Commission's workload, especially that occasioned by (1) the multilateral trade-agreement negotiations that the United States conducted in 1947, 1949, and 1950-51, (2) the escape-clause functions assigned to the Commission by Executive orders during the period 1947-49, and (3) the escape-clause and peril-point functions assigned to it by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. Moreover, since the war the Commission has also been required to conduct an increasing number of investigations under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and—since 1954—has had the additional task of making injury determinations under the Antidumping Act.

As a result of the sharp reductions in the size of its staff and the heavy additional duties that have been given to it, the Commission for more than a decade has been able to devote its time only to current work of the very highest priority. During this period the Commission has managed to complete the many investigations required of it by law, and to fulfill its obligations under the trade agreements program; even keeping abreast of this high-priority work, however, has imposed a great strain on the Commission and its small staff. For more than a decade the Commission has had virtually no opportunity to undertake projects on other subjects that fall within the scope of its statutory functions, and that would be of great interest to the Congress, the Executive, and the public.

Finances and Appropriations, Fiscal Year 1957

The appropriated funds available to the Tariff Commission during the fiscal year 1957 amounted to \$1,575,000. Reimbursements received amounted to \$16,166. The total funds available to the Commission amounted to \$1,591,166. At the end of the fiscal year there was an unobligated balance of \$2,855.

Expenditures during the fiscal year 1957 were as follows:

Salaries:	
Commissioners	\$120,500
Employees:	
Departmental	1,326,839
Field	37,452
Overtime	2,572
Federal Insurance Contributions Act tax	211
Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act con- tributions	4,416
Travel expense	15,670
Transportation of things	20
Books of reference and publications	4,403
Communication service	7,781
Penalty mail	3,850
Contractual services	20,183
Office supplies and equipment	33,872
Printing and reproduction	10,542
	<hr/>
Total	1,588,311

The Commission does not own or operate any motor vehicles.



**RECENT REPORTS OF THE UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION
ON SYNTHETIC ORGANIC CHEMICALS**

- Synthetic Organic Chemicals, United States Production and Sales, 1951**
(Rept. No. 175, 2d ser.), 1952, 45¢
- *Synthetic Organic Chemicals, United States Production and Sales, 1952**
(Rept. No. 190, 2d ser.), 1953
- Synthetic Organic Chemicals, United States Production and Sales, 1953**
(Rept. No. 194, 2d ser.), 1954, 55¢
- Synthetic Organic Chemicals, United States Production and Sales, 1954**
(Rept. No. 196, 2d ser.), 1955, 60¢
- *Synthetic Organic Chemicals, United States Production and Sales, 1955**
(Rept. No. 198, 2d ser.), 1956
- Synthetic Organic Chemicals, United States Production and Sales, 1956**
(Rept. No. 200, 2d ser.), 1957, 65¢

FACTS FOR INDUSTRY SERIES

- 6-2 and 6-10. Organic Chemicals and Plastics Materials, 50¢ (annual sub-
scription price)**

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES

- United States Import Duties (1952), \$4.25 (subscription price)**

NOTE.—The reports preceded by an asterisk (*) are out of print. Those followed by a price may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. (See inside front cover for other available reports.) All U. S. Tariff Commission reports reproduced by the U. S. Government Printing Office may also be consulted in the official depository libraries throughout the United States.