

Mutton imports likewise increased 53.9 percent in the first quarter of this year. In fact, on the basis used for setting the overall quota in the present meat import law, the quarterly average for mutton would be 12.9 million pounds. Mutton imports exceeded this amount in the first quarter of this year by almost 50 percent. It would therefore appear that an overall quota is almost meaningless and that to be of any value quotas must be set on a specie basis.

While we realize that this bill gives the administration authority to impose quotas on lamb in order to prevent unwarranted increases, past experience would indicate the administration is not likely to exercise its authority to establish quotas unless required to do so by law.

In view of this, we would like to see the same type of quotas arrangement provided on lamb in H.R. 9475 as on other species and as was provided in the original bill passed by a substantial majority of the Senate in 1964.

In summarizing our position on H.R. 9475, we endorse the bill and urge that it be amended to provide quotas by species and to provide reasonable import quotas on lamb. We also strongly endorse H.R. 11578 which you have introduced, Mr. Chairman, to set reasonable quotas on importation of textile articles.

Mr. Morton Darman of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers spoke on our behalf last week so I will not burden the committee with any further testimony at this time except to say that we strongly endorse the position he presented.

In closing I would like to state briefly that we oppose H.R. 17551, the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1968. We feel that the administration does not need further tariff cutting authority when we already have a serious imbalance of trade. Australia is again pushing for a further reduction in the duty on raw wool. Passage of H.R. 17551 could result in a duty reduction on wool to the detriment of our domestic wool industry.

Mr. Chairman, that completes the summary of my testimony. I appreciate the opportunity of being heard.

(The statement and newspaper advertisements referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF EDWIN E. MARSH, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER, NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this statement is presented on behalf of the National Wool Growers Association, which has its principal membership in a 22-state area where 86 percent of the nation's sheep, lambs and wool are produced. The Association was organized 103 years ago and is recognized as the spokesman for the sheep farmers and ranchers of the United States. The two specific import commodities that our testimony will cover are meat and textiles.

H.R. 9475—IMPORT QUOTAS ON MEAT

Our organization strongly endorses the principles of H.R. 9475, introduced by the Chairman of this Committee, to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products. The present law covering quotas on meat imports, Public Law 88-482, was prepared rather hastily in a conference between the two Houses. It was a compromise which many House and Senate members were reluctant to accept but did approve only because they knew the Administration did not want a meat import quota bill and because they felt this was the only type of bill that the Administration would accept.

One of the changes which was adopted by the conference in 1964 was to set up an over-all annual quota of 725,400,000 pounds of beef, veal and mutton, instead of setting a quota on each specie of meat, as in the Senate-passed bill.