

Drug Administration approval. When this comes, a vast new era in the fresh fish industry will emerge.

In endorsing H.R. 8048, Salvatore J. Favazza, executive secretary of the Gloucester Fisheries Commission, wrote to Chairman Mills of the Ways and Means Committee, in part, as follows:

Fortunately, the U.S. Congress at the start of the "fish stick era" enacted a 30 percent ad valorem tariff on prepared fish sticks, thereby preserving the processing segment of the American fish stick industry for the American processor. The American fisherman seeks by enactment of H.R. 8048 the same protection for himself that is accorded the American fish stick processor by the 30 percent ad valorem tariff on fish sticks.

Irradiated fresh fish imports would enter this country as fillets ready for marketing without further processing. Such a product will offer no gainful employment to either the producing or processing segments of our fisheries, while threatening the existence of the entire American fresh fish industry.

Michael E. Mineo, also of Gloucester and president of the Domestic Seafood Producers, wrote me registering unanimous support of H.R. 8048 by the members of his organization. Noting that "the frozen groundfish fillet market of the United States is completely lost by domestic producers to imports because of the present cost structures," he continued:

Fresh whole fish and fillet sales account for the economic majority of the New England producing industry. The irradiation process will enable fresh fillet producers to broaden their markets greatly, creating the opportunity for domestic growth in new vessels, producing facilities, and labor. Irradiation of seafood will also enable importers to market greater quantities of fresh fish fillets into the United States markets.

Should the domestic groundfish industry lose the fish market because of foreign price competition, as it has lost the frozen fillet market, it will have lost all its markets, and will cease completely as a producing industry.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I trust that the appropriate amendment can be made to the Tariff Schedules so that any quota controls applicable to the fishing industry will include imported irradiated fresh fish, as well as imported fish sticks.

My second bill is H.R. 10329, which would amend the Tariff Schedules so as to make certain fish glue free from import duty. It may seem unique at a time when so many industries are seeking import quota controls to call for doing away with an existing duty. However, in the days when the duty was established on fish glue, it was a highly competitive business. Today, I understand, there is no fish glue manufactured in the United States, but it still has many uses by various industries, who must depend on its importation—largely from Canada. Ironically, one of the chief domestic distributors of this product, LePage's of Gloucester, formerly was the largest producer of fish glue in the United States.

Even though the Kennedy round did cut the tariff on fish glue by 50 percent, it is still at a disadvantage in competing with other adhesives. The fish glue duty has long since served its purpose of providing protection for domestic industry, and should, therefore, be repealed. Accordingly, I hope that any tariff changes your committee may now recommend will include this provision.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for considering my views on these matters related to fish product imports.