

bills that they have introduced in support of our quota legislation, for the statements that they have filed with this committee, as well as the personal appearances.

We are also thankful for the many members who appeared before the Tariff Commission before and on behalf of the domestic mink ranchers. Before the quorum our former minority leader, Charles Halleck, was in the room. He was ready to make a statement on behalf of the domestic mink ranchers.

Time didn't permit him to make it so he asked me to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that he heartily endorses the various mink quota bills. He also stated that from his vast experience on trade agreements and the various trade acts in the past he is firmly convinced in his own mind that if there is to be any relief for the domestic ranchers it will have to come through legislation rather than through the peril point or the escape clause.

To save time, Mr. Chairman, I first want to present the various members of the industry who are appearing here for and on behalf of the industry and then to file their statements.

First of all, there is Mr. Wittig, who is the past president of Emba, to my left Dave Henderson, who is executive secretary of the National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, which incidentally represents about 95 percent of the industry itself.

Then we have Mr. Dick Westwood from Utah, who is president of Emba Mink Association, and then we have Mr. Bartel, Andrew Bartel of Wisconsin, of the Great Lakes Mink Association.

So at this time I would like to ask permission to file the prepared statements of all the gentlemen with the exception of Mr. Henderson so they may appear in the record at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

(The statements referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF HARLEY WITTIG, PAST PRESIDENT, EMBA MINK BREEDERS
ASSOCIATION

Chairman Mills and Distinguished Members of the Committee, my name is Harley Wittig. I live in Green Bay, Wisconsin and I am the immediate past-president of the Emba Mink Breeder's Association, a cooperative, which markets the bulk of all mutation mink pelts produced in the United States.

I have been a producer of farm raised fur for the past forty-five years, presently producing 8,000 mink pelts per year.

In my remarks I will point out the devastating effects of the presently depressed market for mink pelts and its damaging effect on the mink producing industry in the State of Wisconsin.

Wisconsin is the largest producer of mink pelts in the nation, presently raising 30% of the United States crop. By way of comparison the 1965 production of 2,300,000 mink pelts produced in the state were marketed in 1966 at an average gross selling price of \$19.48 per pelt. After deducting selling costs which include dressing, sales commission, and advertising deductions, the producer had a take home of \$16.62 per pelt.

The 1966 crop which was marketed in 1967, and with much difficulty, sold at an average gross price of \$14.62, per pelt. After deduction for selling cost of \$2.60, the rancher had the very low return of \$12.02 which is far below the cost of production.

The 1967 crop, which is 95% marketed at this time has followed the same pattern, market wise, as that of the previous crop. This unhealthy condition which exists in our industry is caused by the large amount of foreign pelts available to the United States fur market, on a duty free basis, and at prices below our cost of production.