dairy products would be affected by numerous bills now pending. Danish hams would be limited under the provisions of bills now pending. Numerous bills are also pending which propose to limit U.S. imports of raw mink skins.

The Herlong across-the-board import quota bill (H.R. 16936) would without question result in a curtailment in the importation of raw mink furskins and could now or in the future affect other U.S .imports from Denmark. Thus, we in the Danish-American Trade Council who do business with Denmark are vitally concerned with import quota proposals which would bring about a shrinkage in the two-way trade we have laboriously and at great cost built up over the years.

The mere possibility of the enactment of quota legislation now before this Committee has a debilitating effect on the Danish-American exporter and importer. For the past ten to fifteen years Danish exporters and American importers have spent considerable funds advertising and promoting Danish products in the American market and American exporters and Danish importers have done the same in Denmark. Now, however, with the possibility of road blocks being thrown up by this proposed legislation, able businessmen on both sides must begin to consider retrenchment in current expenditures in order to take care of a possible decline in future business. After all, if an important segment of Danish exports to the United States are placed in jeopardy by the legislation which the Congress enacts, Denmark could, by sheer necessity, have no alternative to a revision of its trade policy vis-a-vis the United States despite the fact that any such action would be completely foreign to Denmark's free trade philosophy.

Curtailment of the two-way trade between Denmark and the United States would also have certain side effects. Among other things, it would decrease the tonnage of that trade carried on U.S. ships and thereby cut back the labor force utilized by shipping companies, by transportation companies, customs houses, brokers, warehousers, etc., who now are employed in facilitating the movement of U.S. products to Denmark and Danish shipments to the U.S. U.S importers of Danish meats alone employ hundreds of people, contribute to the employment of hundreds of brokerage houses and food distributors who employ thousands of wage earners. U.S. companies promoting Danish products spend millions of dollars a year in the United States advertising and have invested millions in U.S. facilities to process and handle those products.

In the case of Denmark it is difficult to see why legislation blocking Danish sales of raw mink skins, canned meat products and cheeses is being proposed when you consider that the U.S. in 1967 sold 54.5% more goods in value to Denmark than Denmark sold that year to the U.S. and—as pointed out above—Danish purchases in the United States affect the manufacturing and farm products of all states—particularly those represented in this Committee.

And, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to trade by Denmark with the United States, it is not a matter of unfair competition and price cutting. In the case of hams and the bulk of Danish cheese, it is a matter of high quality Danish products which fetch higher prices from U.S. consumers than domestically produced products. This is justifiably so. In the case of raw mink furskins it is a case of supplying quantities and colors primarily used for the trimming trade as distinguished from the fur garment trade. There can be no doubt from a careful reading of the Tariff Commission report on raw mink furskins that U.S. production of such skins usable by the trimming trade is not adequate to satisfy the requirements of U.S. womens apparel manufacturers. In the case of most other commodities it is simply fair and square competition in quality products produced efficiently by Danish agriculture and industry. A further trade handicap as proposed by these quota bills is bound to severely damage a happy commercial relationship to the advantage of no one.

The advocates of import restrictions in the U.S. should realize that the imposition of such restrictions on a string of important commodity groups would, while providing temporary safeguards for this or that narrow branch of industry, constitute a breach with the fundamental principle of free international trade to which every administration has been committed during the postwar years. These advocates should ask themselves whether in the long run the U.S.A. will be well served by a reversal of the laboriously adopted principle of free trade. If this is what U.S. trade and industry want and get—the relapse to a restrictive import policy wil leave its mark on the United States and all of its trading friends in the free world. And in such case, U.S.A.'s exports will undoubtedly in the near future be faced with obstructions and quota arrange-