

**UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION**

**INVESTIGATIONS UNDER SECTION 332  
OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930**

**Outcome or Current Status of Investigations  
Conducted by the United States Tariff Commission  
Under the Provisions of Section 332 of the  
Tariff Act of 1930 Between January 1, 1952,  
And July 1, 1963**



**Fifth Edition  
TC Publication 97**

**Washington  
July 1963**

*UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION*

Ben Dorfman, *Chairman*

Joseph E. Talbot

Walter R. Schreiber

Glenn W. Sutton

James W. Culliton

Donn N. Bent, *Secretary*

-----  
Address all communications to  
United States Tariff Commission  
Washington 25, D. C.  
-----

## INTRODUCTION

This compilation summarizes information on the investigations that the U.S. Tariff Commission has conducted under the provisions of section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, since January 1, 1952. <sup>1/</sup>

Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 <sup>2/</sup> directs the Tariff Commission to place at the disposal of the President, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, 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.

---

<sup>1/</sup> From 1930 through 1951 the Commission conducted a number of investigations under the provisions of sec. 332, but those investigations are outside the scope of this compilation.

<sup>2/</sup> 46 Stat. 698.

Outcome or current status of investigations conducted by the U.S. Tariff Commission under the provisions of sec. 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, Jan. 1, 1952-July 1, 1963

Subject <sup>1/</sup>	Status
Tuna fish (1953)----- (Investigation No. 25, sec. 332).	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the Senate Committee on Finance, approved June 26, 1952.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make a thorough investigation of the domestic tuna industry, including the effect of imports of fresh or frozen tuna fish on the livelihood of American fishermen. The report on the investigation was to include the facts relating to the production, trade, and consumption of tuna fish in the United States, taking into account all relevant factors affecting the domestic economy, including the interests of consumers, processors, and producers. It was also to include a statement of findings as to the effect upon the competitive position of the domestic tuna fishing industry of the free entry of foreign tuna, so as to assist the Congress in determining what change, if any, should be made in the tariff status of fresh and frozen tuna. The Commission was directed to make its report to the Committee on or before Mar. 1, 1953. (The date for submittal was subsequently changed to Mar. 20, 1953.)</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> June 30, 1952.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Nov. 17-21, 1952.</p> <p><u>Report sent to the committee:</u> Mar. 20, 1953.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report discussed tuna fishing, canning, and distributing in the United States; the tuna industries in Japan and Peru; the foreign trade of the United States in tuna and tunalike fishes and their products; and the size and character of U.S. consumption of tuna and its products. The Commission</p>

<sup>1/</sup> The year shown in parentheses is the year that the Commission completed, or was due to complete, the particular investigation.

Subject	Status
Tuna fish (1953)-- Continued.	<p>drew certain conclusions from its investigation, and incorporated them in its report. Commissioner Brossard did not approve the conclusions of the report.</p> <p><u>Reference: U.S. Tariff Commission, Tuna Fish: Report on Investigation Conducted Pursuant to a Resolution by the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, Dated June 26, 1952, 1953 (processed).</u></p>
Lead and zinc industries (1954). ✓ (Investigation No. 26; sec. 332)	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolutions of the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means, adopted July 27 and 29, 1953, respectively.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolutions directed the Commission to make a thorough investigation of the domestic lead and zinc industries, including the effect of imports of lead and zinc on the livelihood of American workers. The report on the investigation was to include the facts relating to the production, trade, and consumption of lead and zinc in the United States, taking into account all relevant factors affecting the domestic economy, including the interests of consumers, processors, and producers. It was also to include a statement of findings as to the effect upon the competitive position of the domestic lead and zinc industries of the tariff status of imported lead and zinc, so as to assist the Congress in determining what changes, if any, should be made in that tariff status. The Commission was directed to make its report to the committees on or before Mar. 31, 1954. (The date for submittal was subsequently changed to Apr. 20, 1954.)</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> July 29, 1953. (The investigation was conducted concurrently with an escape-clause investigation of lead and zinc.)</p>

Subject	Status
<p>Lead and zinc industries (1954)-- Continued.</p>	<p>Hearing held: Nov. 3-6, 1953.  <u>Report sent to the committees: Apr. 19, 1954.</u>  <u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report, which included a comprehensive statistical appendix, presented information on many aspects of the domestic lead and zinc industries in relation to U.S. imports and the tariff status of imported lead and zinc. Besides the information generally available on production, consumption, foreign trade, stocks, and prices of lead and zinc, the report provided new information on the value of products and the principal expenses in lead and zinc mining and milling in the United States and in some foreign countries; on the grade of ore mined; on profit and loss in mining, milling, smelting, and refining; on costs of transporting lead and zinc in the United States and from foreign countries to the United States; and on recent changes in employment at lead and zinc mines and primary smelters and refineries. The Commission drew certain conclusions from its investigation, and incorporated them in its report. Commissioners Ryder and Edminster made additional separate statements.  <u>Reference: U.S. Tariff Commission, Lead and Zinc Industries: Report on Investigation Conducted under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 . . . , Rept. No. 192, 2d ser., 1954.</u></p>

Subject	Status
<p>Tariff rates of 50 percent or higher (1954). (Investigation No. 27; sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the Senate Committee on Finance, adopted Mar. 8, 1954.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make an investigation with respect to each article being imported into the United States which, in the calendar year 1953, had an average equivalent duty rate of 50 percent ad valorem or higher, and report to the Senate Committee on Finance its findings "as to (1) the limit to which a modification, imposition, or continuance of such rate of duty may be made or extended without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles; and (2) if increases in duties or additional import restrictions are required to avoid serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles, the minimum increases in duties or additional import restrictions required." The committee directed the Commission to report the results of its study not later than Dec. 1, 1954. The resolution made no reference to procedure; a letter of the committee to the Commission, dated Mar. 11, 1954, however, stated that the committee "assumed that your Commission would follow its customary procedure with regard to public notice and hearings where advisable . . ."</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Mar. 15, 1954.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> July 13-28, 1954.</p> <p><u>Report sent to the committee:</u> Nov. 29, 1954.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> Although this investigation was similar to the investigations that the Commission was directed to conduct under sec. 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, the findings were not "peril point" findings for the purposes of that act.</p>

Subject	Status
<p>Hardboard industry (1955)-- (Investigation No. 28; sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the Senate Committee on Finance, adopted Aug. 9, 1954.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make a thorough investigation of the hardboard industry and of the import classification of hardboard. The report on the investigation was to include the facts relative to production, trade, imports, and consumption of hardboard in the United States, taking into account relevant factors affecting the domestic economy and national security, including the interests of consumers and producers. The Commission's report was also to include data on wage rates in the United States and abroad; data on costs of transportation to the principal consuming centers; data on other factors bearing on costs of production and distribution; a statement of findings as to the proper tariff classification of hardboard; and a statement of findings as to the effect upon the competitive position of the domestic hardboard industry of the tariff status of imported hardboard, so as to assist the Congress in determining what changes, if any, should be made in that status. The Commission was directed to make its report to the committee on or before Feb. 28, 1955. (The date for submittal was subsequently extended for 30 days.)</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Aug. 11, 1954.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Dec. 7-16, 1954.</p> <p><u>Report sent to the committee:</u> Mar. 30, 1955.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report presented information relative to the production, trade, imports, and consumption of hardboard in the United States, and took into account all relevant factors affecting the domestic economy and national security, including <u>inter alia</u> the interests of consumers.</p> <p>The majority of the Commission (Commissioners Brossard, Talbot, and Schreiber) found that hardboard was a distinctive article of commerce of sufficient importance to justify specific enumeration</p>



Subject	Status
<p>Hardboard industry (1955)-- Continued.</p>	<p>thereof in the tariff schedules, that such specific enumeration would be more appropriate in the tariff schedule covering wood products than in any other tariff schedule; that the desirability for establishing a specific enumeration might or might not indicate the appropriateness or desirability of a change in the rates of duty then applicable; and that no information developed in the course of the Commission's investigation supported the position that the rates then being applied were necessarily those best suited to afford the domestic hardboard industry the degree of protection which the Congress intended that it should have.</p> <p>The minority of the Commission (Commissioners Edminster and Sutton) were of the opinion that the reclassification of hardboard should be considered by the Tariff Commission in the general review which it was making of all tariff classifications in the conduct of its tariff simplification study. They recognized that a reasonable case could be made to justify a specific enumeration of hardboard in the tariff, but in their view hardboard could just as appropriately be enumerated in the tariff schedule covering paper products or in that covering sundries as in the schedule covering wood products. The minority found that the considerations which pointed to the desirability for establishing a specific enumeration in the tariff did not indicate the appropriateness or desirability of a change in the rates of duty applicable to imports of hardboard. No information which had come to their knowledge made them feel that there was a need for revising those rates at that time.</p> <p><u>Reference: U.S. Tariff Commission, Hardboard; Report on Investigation Conducted Pursuant to a Resolution by the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate Dated August 9, 1954, 1955 (processed).</u></p>

Subject	Status
Fluorspar industry (1955) -- (Investigation No. 29; sec. 332)	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the Senate Committee on Finance, adopted Aug. 14, 1954.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make a thorough investigation of the domestic fluorspar industry, including the effect of imports of fluorspar on the livelihood of American workers, and to report the results of its investigation to the Senate Committee on Finance. The report was to include the facts relating to production, trade, imports, and consumption of fluorspar in the United States, taking into account all relevant factors affecting the domestic economy, including the interests of consumers, processors, and producers. The report was also to include data on wage rates in the United States and abroad; data on costs of transportation to the principal consuming centers; data on other factors bearing on costs of production and distribution; and a statement of findings as to the effect of the tariff status of imported fluorspar on the competitive position of the domestic fluorspar industry. The Commission was directed to make its report to the committee as early as practicable in 1955.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Aug. 15, 1954.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Oct. 19-20, 1954.</p> <p><u>Report sent to the committee:</u> June 6, 1955.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report presented exhaustive information regarding conditions in the domestic fluorspar industry. Among other things, the report set forth the facts on production, trade, imports, consumption, and prices in the United States and included data on the profit-and-loss experience of domestic producers and on employment. It also presented detailed information on costs of transporting domestic and imported fluorspar to the principal consuming centers, on average delivered values of domestic and imported fluorspar in these markets, and on other matters</p>

Subject	Status
Fluorspar industry (1955)--Continued.	<p>bearing on the competitive position of the domestic fluorspar industry. Most of this information had not theretofore been available. On July 22, 1955, in response to a request from the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, dated June 27, 1955, the Commission transmitted to him a memorandum supplying additional information and commenting on certain questions raised with the Finance Committee by a committee representing certain domestic fluorspar producers.</p> <p><u>References: U.S. Tariff Commission, Fluorspar: Report on Investigation Conducted Pursuant to Resolution by the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate Dated August 14, 1954, 1955 (processed); Memorandum of the United States Tariff Commission on Fluorspar Prepared in Response to the Letter of June 27, 1955, from the Chairman of the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, 1955 (processed).</u></p>
Whisky (1957)----- (Investigation No. 30; sec. 332)	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the Senate Committee on Finance, adopted Feb. 6, 1957.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make a thorough investigation of the whisky industry of the United States, and to report the results of its investigation to the committee on or before July 1, 1957. The Commission was directed to set forth in its report the facts affecting the relative competitive position of foreign-owned and domestically owned whisky distilleries, including the impact of trade practices, methods of distribution, and imports on American-owned distilleries.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Feb. 7, 1957.</p> <p><u>Resolution rescinded by Senate Committee on Finance:</u> May 22, 1957.</p> <p><u>Investigation dismissed by the Commission:</u> May 23, 1957.</p>

Subject	Status
<p>Whisky (1958)-----            (Investigation            No. 31; sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the Senate Committee on Finance, adopted Aug. 12, 1957.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make an investigation of the conditions of competition in the United States between whisky produced in the United States and in foreign countries, and to report the results of its investigation to the committee on or before Mar. 31, 1958. The Commission was directed to set forth in its report 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, U.S. exports, U.S. customs treatment since 1930, and other factors affecting the competition between domestic and imported whisky.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Aug. 14, 1957.</p> <p><u>Hearing scheduled:</u> Oct. 22, 1957; postponed until Jan. 21, 1958.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Jan. 21-22, 1958.</p> <p><u>Report sent to the committee:</u> Mar. 31, 1958.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report described the structure of the domestic whisky industry; pointed out the differences in the various types of whisky produced in the United States and in foreign countries; gave information on a wide variety of other subjects, such as U.S. customs treatment and excise taxes, domestic production, bottling, stocks, imports, exports, consumption, channels and methods of distribution, prices, and world production and trade; and summarized competitive conditions that existed in the marketing of domestic and imported whiskies.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Whisky: Report on Investigation Conducted Pursuant to a Resolution by the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate dated August 12, 1957, 1958 (processed).</u></p>

Subject	Status
<p>Tuna fish (supplemental investigation) (1958). (Investigation No. 25; sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the Senate Committee on Finance, adopted Aug. 20, 1957.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make a supplementary investigation of the conditions of competition between domestic and imported tuna fish--similar in scope to the investigation that the Commission made in accordance with the Committee resolution of June 26, 1952--and to report the results of its investigation to the committee on or before Feb. 1, 1958. The committee subsequently extended to May 1, 1958, the date for submission of the report.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Aug. 26, 1957.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Dec. 11-13, 1957.</p> <p><u>Report sent to the committee:</u> May 1, 1958.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report discussed the consumption of tuna fish in the United States in recent years; provided general information on the domestic tuna fishery and detailed information on the operations of the bait-boat, purse-seine, and albacore fishing fleets; discussed at some length the operations of the domestic tuna-canning industry; and provided information on a number of other subjects, including tariff rates, imports of tuna, and the tuna fisheries of Japan and Peru. The report supplemented the factual data contained in the Commission's report of Mar. 20, 1953.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, Tuna Fish: Report on Investigation Conducted Pursuant to a Resolution by the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate Dated August 20, 1957, 1958 (processed).</p>

Subject	Status
<p>Mercury (quicksilver), (1958). (Investigation No. 32; sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the Senate Committee on Finance, adopted Mar. 17, 1958.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make an investigation of the conditions of competition in the United States between mercury (quicksilver) produced in the United States and in foreign countries. The Commission was directed to set forth in its report on the investigation a summary of the facts obtained in the investigation, including a description of the domestic industry; domestic production; foreign production; comparative costs of domestic and foreign production, including labor costs; imports; consumption; channels and methods of distribution; prices, including comparative London and New York prices quoted by foreign producers; U.S. exports; U.S. customs treatment since 1930; the impact of the Government purchasing program authorized under Title III of the Defense Production Act of 1950 on domestic production and the possible effect of the termination of that program on world prices and domestic production; and other factors affecting the competition between domestic and imported mercury.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Mar. 19, 1958. <u>Hearing held:</u> Aug. 5, 1958.</p>

Subject	Status
Mercury (quicksilver) (1958)--Continued.	<p>Report sent to the committee: Dec. 1, 1958.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report discussed production, exports, imports, and consumption of mercury in the United States; provided data on costs of production of mercury in the United States; described the Government purchase and assistance programs for the domestic industry; and presented data on employment and wages in the mercury industry, on inventories, on marketing practices, and on prices. The report also provided general information on the mercury mining industries of the principal foreign producing countries and indicated the position of the United States in world production.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Mercury (Quicksilver): Report on Investigation No. 32 Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Made Pursuant to a Resolution of the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, 1958 (processed).</u></p>

Subject	Status
<p>Tungsten ore and concentrates (1958), (Investigation No. 33; sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the Senate Committee on Finance, adopted Mar. 19, 1958.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make an investigation of the conditions of competition in the United States between tungsten ore and concentrates produced in the United States and in foreign countries. The Commission was directed to set forth in its report on the investigation a summary of the facts obtained in the investigation, including a description of the domestic industry; domestic production; foreign production; comparative costs of domestic and foreign production, including labor costs; imports; consumption; channels and methods of distribution; prices, including comparative London and New York prices quoted by foreign producers; U.S. exports; U.S. customs treatment since 1930; the impact of the Government purchase program authorized under Title III of the Defense Production Act of 1950 on domestic production and the possible effect of the termination of that program on world prices and domestic production; and other factors affecting the competition between domestic and imported tungsten ore and concentrates.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Mar. 20, 1958.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> July 29, 1958.</p>



Subject	Status
Tungsten ore and concentrates (1958)--Continued.	<p>Report sent to the committee: Nov. 11, 1958.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report discussed production, exports, imports, and consumption of tungsten ore and concentrates in the United States; described the Government purchase and assistance program for the domestic industry; and presented data on employment and wages in the tungsten industry, on inventories, on marketing practices, and on prices. The report also provided general information on the tungsten-mining industries of the principal foreign producing countries and indicated the position of the United States in world production.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Tungsten Ore and Concentrates: Report on Investigation No. 33 Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Made Pursuant to a Resolution of the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, 1958 (processed).</u></p>

Subject	Status
<p>Carpet wool and wool for papermakers' felts (1959). (Investigation No. 34; sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the Senate Committee on Finance, adopted Apr. 28, 1958.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make an investigation of the grades and qualities of wool imported into the United States for use in the manufacture of both carpets and papermakers' felts, and of domestic wools which are similar in grade and character, and to report the results of its investigation to the committee on or before Sept. 30, 1959.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Apr. 29, 1958.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> June 30, 1959.</p> <p><u>Report sent to the committee:</u> Sept. 30, 1959.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report described the types and characteristics of wools used in the manufacture of floor coverings and papermakers' felts; contained data on U.S. production and imports and on foreign production and supplies of coarse wool available to the United States; described the factors controlling the use of domestic wool in carpets; and analyzed the present method, and an alternative method, of grading and sampling imported wool for customs purposes.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Wools for Carpets and Papermakers' Felts: Report on Investigation No. 34 Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Pursuant to a Resolution of the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, 1959</u> (processed).</p>
<p>Micron grading of wool (supplemental report) (1962). Investigation No. 34; sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Occasion for supplemental report:</u> In its consideration of an alternative (the micron method) to the visual method of grading imported wool, the Commission in its earlier report on carpet wool and wool for papermakers' felts covered, because of the limitation of time, part of the micron test results from only</p>

Subject	Status
<p>Micron grading of wool (supplemental report) (1962)--Continued.</p>	<p>one laboratory. In view of the interest expressed, following publication of the 1959 report, by individuals both in private industry and in various Government agencies, the Commission decided to make available its analysis of all the micron test data received from the three laboratories provided with the wool samples.</p> <p><u>Supplemental report sent to the committee:</u> Nov. 1, 1962.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's supplemental report:</u> The Commission's supplemental report described the present method of grading imported wool and compared it with the micron method, examined the distinction between improved and unimproved wools, and assessed the reliability of micron grading.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Micron Grading of Wool: Report on Investigation 332-34 (Supplemental) Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930</u>, TC Publication 74, 1962 (processed).</p>

Subject	Status
<p>Iron ore (1959)-----            (Investigation            No. 35; sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the Senate Committee on Finance, adopted July 29, 1958.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make an investigation of the conditions of competition in the United States between iron ore produced in the United States and in foreign countries. The Commission was directed to set forth in its report on the investigation a summary of the facts obtained in the investigation, including a description of the domestic industry, domestic production, foreign production, imports (including sources of imports), consumption, channels of distribution, U.S. exports, prices of domestic and imported ore, and the U.S. customs treatment (including trade-agreement obligations with respect to such treatment) since 1930.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Aug. 4, 1958.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Jan. 6, 1959.</p> <p><u>Report sent to the committee:</u> Mar. 2, 1959.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report described the domestic industry and discussed domestic and foreign production of iron ore, imports, exports, domestic consumption, channels of distribution, prices of domestic and imported ore, and U.S. customs treatment of iron ore since 1930.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Iron Ore: Report on Investigation No. 35 Under Section 332, Tariff Act of 1930, Made Pursuant to a Resolution of the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, 1959</u> (processed).</p>

Subject	Status
<p>Spring clothespins (1958). (Investigation No. 36; sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the Senate Committee on Finance, adopted July 30, 1958.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make an investigation of the conditions of competition in the United States between spring clothespins produced in the United States and in foreign countries. On Sept. 10, 1957, the Commission had reported to the President the results of its fourth escape-clause investigation of spring clothespins under sec. 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended. By a proclamation, effective Dec. 10, 1957, the President increased the duty on such clothespins from 10 cents to 20 cents per gross.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Aug. 4, 1958.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> The committee's resolution did not require a public hearing and the Commission did not consider it necessary to hold one.</p> <p><u>Report sent to the committee:</u> Oct. 28, 1958.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report discussed the domestic spring clothespin industry, and provided recent information on production and sales of spring clothespins, imports, consumption, inventories, prices, and employment. The investigation ordered by the Senate Committee on Finance was not a new escape-clause investigation, and the Commission's report to the committee did not include any recommendations for changes in existing import restrictions on spring clothespins. The report was limited to a summary of the facts regarding developments in conditions of competition in the United States between imported and domestic spring clothespins after the rate of duty was increased on Dec. 10, 1957.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Spring Clothespins: Report on Investigation No. 36 Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Made Pursuant to a Resolution of the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, 1958</u> (processed).</p>

Subject	Status
<p>Trend of imports of various lead and zinc products not subject to quota restrictions (1960).</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> The Tariff Commission instituted the investigation on its own motion.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> Absolute import quotas on unmanufactured lead and zinc have been in effect since Oct. 1, 1958. The quotas were imposed by Presidential proclamation following an escape-clause investigation by the U.S. Tariff Commission. There had been reports from various sources that, since the quotas on unmanufactured lead and zinc became effective, rapidly rising imports of lead and zinc products, said to be attributable primarily to the existence of the quotas on unmanufactured lead and zinc, had been rendering those quotas ineffective. With a view to ascertaining the facts, the Tariff Commission initiated a study, under the authority of sec. 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, of the trend of imports of various lead and zinc products not subject to the quota restrictions and announced that it would issue a report on the results of the study as soon as the study was completed.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Aug. 4, 1959.</p> <p><u>Investigation combined with that of lead and zinc industries:</u> On Sept. 1, 1959, pursuant to Senate Resolution 162, 86th Congress (adopted Aug. 21, 1959), the Commission instituted a sec. 332 investigation of the domestic lead and zinc industries (see below). With the institution of that investigation, the Commission's study of imports of lead and zinc products was combined with the investigation of the domestic lead and zinc industries.</p>

Subject	Status
<p>Lead and zinc industries (supplemental investigation) (1960). (Investigation No. 26, sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Senate Resolution 162, 86th Congress, adopted Aug. 21, 1959.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make a further investigation of the lead and zinc industries, along the lines of the Commission's previous (1954) investigation, and to submit a supplemental report to the Congress on or before Mar. 31, 1960. The Commission was directed to include in its report specific findings with regard to the current condition of the lead and zinc mining industries and as to what additional import restrictions, if any (by way of increased duties or import quotas, or both), needed to be imposed upon articles dutiable under pars. 72, 77, 391, 392, 393, and 394 of the Tariff Act of 1930, on zinc fume or zinc flue dust dutiable under par. 214 of the tariff act, on zinc wire dutiable under par. 316(a) of the tariff act, on zinc engravers' plates dutiable under par. 341 of the tariff act, and on zinc alloys and lead and zinc mill products dutiable under par. 397 of the tariff act, in order that lead and zinc mining operations in the United States might be conducted on a sound and stable basis.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Sept. 1, 1959.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Jan. 12-15, 18, 1960.</p> <p><u>Report transmitted to the Congress:</u> Mar. 31, 1960.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report discussed production, exports, imports, prices, and consumption of lead and zinc in the United States; described the Government purchase and assistance programs for the domestic lead and zinc industries; presented data on employment, wages, inventories, and marketing practices for the domestic industries; gave information on the production of lead and zinc in the principal foreign producing countries; and indicated the position of the United States in world production.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S Tariff Commission, <u>Lead and Zinc: Report to the Congress on Investigation No. 332-26 (Supplemental) Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Made Pursuant to Senate Resolution 162, 86th Congress, Adopted August 21, 1959, 1960 (processed).</u></p>

Subject	Status
<p>Fluorspar industry (Supplemental investigation) (1960). (Investigation No. 29, sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Senate Resolution 163, 86th Congress, adopted Aug. 21, 1959.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make a further investigation of the fluorspar industry, along the lines of the Commission's previous (1955) investigation, and to submit a supplemental report to the Congress on or before Feb. 29, 1960. The Commission was directed to include in its supplemental report specific findings with regard to the current condition of the fluorspar mining industry and as to what additional import restrictions, if any (by way of increased duties or import quotas, or both), needed to be imposed upon articles dutiable under par. 207 of the Tariff Act of 1930 in order that fluorspar mining operations in the United States might be conducted on a sound and stable basis. The Commission was also directed to determine what action, if any, should be taken to correct the disparity in the existing rates of duty.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Sept. 1, 1959.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Dec. 15-17, 1959.</p> <p><u>Report transmitted to the Congress:</u> Feb. 29, 1960.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report discussed the production, exports, imports, and consumption of fluorspar in the United States; described the Government purchase and assistance program for the domestic industry; and presented data on employment and wages in the fluorspar industry, on inventories, on marketing practices, on prices, and on the financial experience of the domestic industry. The report also contained general information on the fluorspar mining industries of the principal foreign producing countries and indicated the position of the United States in world production.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Fluorspar: Report to the Congress on Investigation No. 332-29 (Supplemental) Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Made Pursuant to Senate Resolution 163, 86th Congress, Adopted August 21, 1959, 1960 (processed).</u></p>



Subject	Status
Starch (1960)----- (Investigation No. 37; sec. 332)	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the Senate Committee on Finance, adopted Sept. 2, 1959.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make an investigation of the conditions of competition in the United States between starch produced in the United States and in foreign countries, and to report the results of the investigation to the committee on or before Mar. 31, 1960. The Commission was directed to set forth in its report a summary of the facts obtained in the investigation, including a description of the domestic industry, domestic production, foreign production, comparative costs of domestic and foreign production, including labor costs, imports, consumption, channels and methods of distribution, U.S. exports, U.S. customs treatment since 1930, and other factors affecting the competition between domestic and imported starch.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Sept. 4, 1959.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Jan. 26-28, 1960.</p> <p><u>Report sent to the committee:</u> Mar. 25, 1960.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report described the respective domestic industries engaged in the production of cornstarch, potato starch, and wheat starch; contained statistical and other information on raw materials used, employment and wages, prices, U.S. production, exports, imports, and consumption; and gave general information on the manufacture of starches in the principal foreign exporting countries.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Starch: Report on Investigation No. 332-37 Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Pursuant to a Resolution of the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate Adopted September 2, 1959, 1960 (processed).</u></p>

Subject	Status
Shrimp (1960)----- (Investigation No. 38; sec. 332)	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the House Committee on Ways and Means, adopted Feb. 9, 1960.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make an investigation to determine whether shrimp, as a result of the existing customs treatment thereof as provided for by par. 1761 of the Tariff Act of 1930, were being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative to domestic production, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic shrimp industry, and to report the results of its investigation to the Committee on Ways and Means not later than May 9, 1960. The resolution further directed that, in the event of an affirmative determination, the Commission specify in its report the rate or rates of duty (not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem) which it determined to be necessary to remedy or prevent serious injury, and that in making its determination it take into consideration the factors set forth in sec. 7(b) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Feb. 11, 1960.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Mar. 16-18, 1960.</p> <p><u>Report sent to the committee:</u> May 9, 1960.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report described the domestic shrimp fishery and the processing of shrimp in the United States; discussed domestic production, exports, imports, and consumption of raw shrimp and shrimp products; and provided data on prices and cold-storage holdings.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Shrimp: Report on Investigation No. 332-38 Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Pursuant to a Resolution of the Committee on Ways and Means of the United States House of Representatives Adopted February 9, 1960, 1960 (processed).</u></p>

Subject	Status
<p>Certain fresh fruits and vegetables (1961). (Investigation No. 39; sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the House Committee on Ways and Means, received July 5, 1960.</p> <p><u>Purpose of the investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make an investigation of the conditions of competition in the market areas served by the producers in the Imperial, Palo Verde, and Coachella Valleys and adjoining areas of southern California between fresh fruits and vegetables produced in such areas and those produced in foreign countries. The resolution directed the Commission to include in its report of the results of the investigation a summary of the facts obtained in the investigation with regard to domestic production, imports, domestic consumption, U.S. exports, comparability of the domestic and imported products, and the degree of competition between them with respect to the particular products and geographic areas referred to, and a statement of U.S. customs treatment since 1930, with special reference to seasonal rates of duty.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> July 7, 1960.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> No hearing held.</p> <p><u>Report sent to the committee:</u> Sept. 6, 1961.</p>

Subject	Status
Certain fresh fruits and vegetables (1961)--Con.	<p data-bbox="691 520 1279 1287"> <u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report contained detailed statistical data and other information on the fruits and vegetables that are produced in the region mentioned above and shipped in significant quantities to U.S. markets at the same time that corresponding imported fruits and vegetables are shipped to such markets. There were 11 such products: Cantaloups, watermelons, miscellaneous melons, snap beans, garlic, onions, tomatoes, cucumbers, eggplant, peppers, and squash. For each such product, the report provided information on the following subjects: U.S. customs treatment since 1930, including trade-agreement concessions; domestic production, including production by seasons, with special reference to the output in the specified region; the volume, trend, and seasonal pattern of imports; the relationship of imports to domestic production; U.S. exports; domestic consumption; market distribution of domestic and imported products; and prices. Given in the appendix of the report were statistics on production, imports, exports, and so forth for 12 additional fruits and vegetables produced in the specified region but not marketed to a significant extent in competition with imported products.         </p> <p data-bbox="691 1287 1252 1493"> <u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Certain Fresh Fruits and Vegetables: Report on Investigation No. 332-39 Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Pursuant to a Resolution of the Committee on Ways and Means of the United States House of Representatives Adopted July 1, 1960, TC Publication 33, 1961 (processed).</u> </p>

Subject	Status
Shrimp (1961)-----" (Investigation No. 40; sec. 332)	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Resolution of the Senate Committee on Finance, adopted in August 1960 and received Sept. 6, 1960.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make a thorough investigation of the domestic shrimp industry (including fishing, processing, and other related operations) and of imports of shrimp and shrimp products provided for in par. 1761 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and to report the results of its investigation to the Senate Committee on Finance not later than Mar. 1, 1961. (The committee subsequently extended the time for submission of the report until Apr. 1, 1961.) The Commission was directed to set forth in its report the facts relative to U.S. and world production and trade; imports; domestic supplies and consumption; the possibilities of world overproduction; the interests of consumers, processors, and producers; foreign and domestic wage rates; costs of transportation to principal consuming centers; supplies of shrimp available to domestic and foreign fishermen; and other pertinent factors. The resolution further directed the Commission to include in its report an analysis of the possible results of an imposition of duty of 35 percent on all imports of shrimp and shrimp products as provided for in par. 1761 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as well as an analysis of the possible results of a tariff quota under which all imports not in excess of the imports in the calendar year 1960 would enter free of duty and all imports in excess of those in 1960 would be dutiable at 50 percent ad valorem.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Sept. 12, 1960.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Jan. 9-13, 1961.</p>

Subject	Status
Shrimp (1961)--Continued	<p>Report sent to the committee; Mar. 30, 1961.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report described the domestic shrimp fishery and the processing of shrimp in the United States; discussed domestic production, exports, imports, and consumption of raw shrimp and shrimp products; gave data on prices, cold storage holdings, and wage rates in the United States; provided data on the shrimp fisheries of foreign countries and on the world trade in shrimp; considered the interests of domestic producers, processors, and consumers of shrimp; and discussed the probable results of the imposition of the import restrictions set forth in the resolution.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Shrimp: Report on Investigation No. 332-40 Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Pursuant to a Resolution of the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate Adopted in August 1960, [TC Publication 8/1961 (processed).</u></p>

Subject	Status
<p>Lead and zinc (supplemental investigation) (1962). (Investigation No. 26. (Supp. 2); sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Senate Resolution 206, 87th Congress, adopted Sept. 23, 1961.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make further studies and bring up to date the report on lead and zinc that it made in March 1960 in response to S. Res. 162, 86th Congress. The resolution also directed the Commission to make its report to the Congress on or before May 15, 1962.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Oct. 5, 1961.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Jan. 16-17, 1962.</p> <p><u>Report transmitted to the Congress:</u> May 15, 1962.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report discussed recent changes in U.S. supplies and distribution of lead and zinc, world production and consumption, the U.S. industry, domestic production, Government assistance programs, employment and wages, producers' stocks, and market prices; it also gave data on U.S. imports of unmanufactured lead and zinc and manufactured lead and zinc articles, U.S. exports, and industrial consumption of lead and zinc.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Lead and Zinc: Report to the Congress on Investigation No. 332-26 (Supplemental 2) Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Made Pursuant to Senate Resolution 206, 87th Congress, Adopted September 23, 1961, TC Publication 58, 1962 (processed).</u></p>

Subject	Status
<p>Fluorspar (supplemental investigation) (1962). (Investigation No. 29 (Supp. 2); sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Senate Resolution 206, 87th Congress, adopted Sept. 23, 1961.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make further studies and bring up to date the report on the fluorspar industry that it made in February 1960 in response to S. Res. 163, 86th Congress. The resolution also directed the Commission to make its report to the Congress on or before May 15, 1962.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Oct. 5, 1961.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Jan. 30, 1962.</p> <p><u>Report transmitted to the Congress:</u> May 2, 1962.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report described the U.S. fluorspar industry; discussed the production, imports, and consumption of fluorspar in the United States; described the Government stockpiling program; and presented data on employment and wages, inventories, marketing practices, prices, and the financial experience of the independent segment of the domestic industry. It also gave general information on the fluorspar industries of the principal foreign producing countries.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Fluorspar: Report to the Congress on Investigation No. 332-29 (Supplemental 2) Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Made Pursuant to Senate Resolution 206, 87th Congress, Adopted September 23, 1961, TC Publication 56, 1962 (processed).</u></p>



Subject	Status
Mercury (supplemental investigation) (1962). (Investigation No. 32 (Supp.); sec. 332)	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Senate Resolution 206, 87th Congress, adopted Sept. 23, 1961.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to make further studies and bring up to date the report on the mercury industry that it made in December 1958. The resolution also directed the Commission to make its report to the Congress on or before May 15, 1962.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Oct. 5, 1961.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Feb. 20, 1962.</p> <p><u>Report transmitted to the Congress:</u> May 9, 1962.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report described the U.S. mercury industry; discussed the production, imports, and consumption of mercury in the United States; described the Government procurement and assistance programs; and provided information on selling practices and channels of distribution, employment and wages, inventories, and market prices. It also gave general information on the mercury industries of the principal foreign producing countries and indicated the position of the United States in world production.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Mercury (Quicksilver): Report to the Congress on Investigation No. 332-32 (Supplemental) Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Made Pursuant to Senate Resolution 206, 87th Congress, Adopted September 23, 1961, TC Publication 57, 1962 (processed).</u></p>

Subject	Status
Beryllium (1962)----- (Investigation No. 41; sec. 332)	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Senate Resolution 206, 87th Congress, adopted Sept. 23, 1961.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to conduct an investigation of conditions in the industry producing beryllium, and to report to the Congress not later than Aug. 31, 1962.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Oct. 5, 1961.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> Apr. 17, 1962.</p> <p><u>Report transmitted to the Congress:</u> Aug. 29, 1962.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report discussed the domestic beryllium industry; U.S. production, capacity, and sales; domestic ore reserves; Government procurement and assistance programs; stocks, employment, wages, and prices; U.S. imports and exports; and foreign production and reserves of beryllium.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Beryllium: Report to the Congress on Investigation No. 332-41 Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Made Pursuant to Senate Resolution 206, 87th Congress, Adopted September 23, 1961, TC Publication 66, 1962</u> (processed).</p>

Subject	Status
Cobalt (1962)----- (Investigation No. 42; sec. 332)	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Senate Resolution 206, 87th Congress, adopted Sept. 23, 1961.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to conduct an investigation of conditions in the industry producing cobalt, and to report to the Congress not later than Aug. 31, 1962.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Oct. 5, 1961.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> May 15, 1962.</p> <p><u>Report transmitted to the Congress:</u> Aug. 15, 1962.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report discussed the domestic cobalt industry, Government purchase and assistance programs, U.S. consumption, marketing practices and prices, foreign trade, and foreign production and reserves of cobalt.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, Cobalt: <u>Report to the Congress on Investigation No. 332-42 Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Made Pursuant to Senate Resolution 206, 87th Congress, Adopted September 23, 1961, TC Publication 64, 1962 (processed).</u></p>

Subject	Status
<p>Manganese (1962)-----            (Investigation            No. 43; sec. 332)</p>	<p><u>Origin of investigation:</u> Senate Resolution 206, 87th Congress, adopted Sept. 23, 1961.</p> <p><u>Purpose of investigation:</u> The resolution directed the Commission to conduct an investigation of conditions in the industry producing manganese, and to report to the Congress not later than Aug. 31, 1962.</p> <p><u>Investigation instituted:</u> Oct. 5, 1961.</p> <p><u>Hearing held:</u> June 12, 1962.</p> <p><u>Report transmitted to the Congress:</u> Aug. 31, 1962.</p> <p><u>Nature of the Commission's report:</u> The Commission's report discussed U.S. mining and milling of manganese ore, production of manganese metallurgical products, Government purchase and assistance programs, domestic consumption, stocks, U.S. imports and exports, marketing, and world production and resources of manganese ore.</p> <p><u>Reference:</u> U.S. Tariff Commission, <u>Manganese Report to the Congress on Investigation No. 332-43 Under Section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930 Made Pursuant to Senate Resolution 206, 87th Congress, Adopted September 23, 1961, TC Publication 68, 1962 (processed).</u></p>