ranchers out of business. The increased burden of advertising on the remaining ranchers, as more producers are forced out of business, becomes more and more difficult to bear.

Imports have increased over the years to where they now amount to over 50 per cent of the domestic consumption. If mink pelts remain on the free list, this trend will continue until there will be very few domestic producers left in this business which they created with their own effort, talent and money.

Import controls such as proposed in H.R. 6694 would be fair to all, would help correct our nation's balance of payments problems, and would help save, our self-reliant agricultural industry, mink forming

self-reliant, agricultural industry—mink farming.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, on behalf of EMBA and the domestic mink farming industry, I wish to thank you for this opportunity of bringing our problems to you.

I earnestly plead with you to give quick and favorable attention to the bills proposing imports controls on mink pelts, in order to save our industry. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF ANDREW BARTEL, PRESIDENT, GREAT LAKES MINK ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman, my name is Andrew Bartel and I live near Clinton, Wisconsin. I am President of the Great Lakes Mink Association which is a nationwide marketing cooperative for dark mink. I am here today to protest the vast numbers of cheap quality mink pelts being imported into this country quota and duty free. Others will testify as to the effects these imports are having on domestic ranchers, and I should like to turn your attention to what these cheap imports are doing to consumers.

Let me say that mink is an image. What sets it apart from fox, racoon, otter or other furs is the promotion done by the domestic mink ranchers to make this superior product desired by women. Over 25 years ago, the domestic mink ranchers started a program of creating the image of mink by means of publicity, promotion and an extensive advertising program. In each of the last 25 years, the domestic mink ranchers have spent over \$1,000,000. There is no question that our efforts have been successful. Mink is the fur most desired by women.

To keep pace with this wide promotion program, the domestic mink ranchers had to provide a very high quality product and they have done this. Many hundreds of thousands of dollars have gone into research to provide the women of America and the world the best quality mink genetics can provide

of America and the world the best quality mink genetics can provide.

Now, however, cheap inferior mink which are little better than rabbit or squirrel are being brought into this country under the name of mink with reckless abandon to the extent that the image of mink has been debased and defiled. We have become a dumping ground for the cheap inferior pelts the foreign producers do not want to put into their prime markets of Italy, West Germany, France and Switzerland. I know that the word "dump" is a word of art and should not be used loosely, but the figures bear out the fact that our main competitors for the American market—The Scandinavian producers—do sell their cheapest mink to American buyers. Last December, I appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission in behalf of the Great Lakes Mink Association. At that time, the American Fur Merchants Association, which is made up of pelt dealers and others presented to the Commission a very elaborate booklet concerning Scandinavian production and exports. I find it most significant that from 1958 through 1966, according to the figures in the booklet, that the prices of pelts shipped to the United States were generally three to five dollars cheaper than those pelts shipped to the Scandinavian primary markets. The chart is shown below with the price differentials computed.

COMPARATIVE AVERAGE RANCH MINK PRICES-DOMESTIC, IMPORTS, EXPORTS

	1958	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
Scandinavian producers	\$15.63	\$16.26	\$12.54	\$14.99	\$15.01	\$15.72	\$14.94	\$14.72
Exports to United States Exports to others	14. 73 17. 82	15. 25 18. 65	10. 84 16. 15	13. 49 17. 10	13. 32 17. 38	14. 30 17. 51	12. 63 17. 34	12. 82 16. 75
Difference	-3.09	<b>-3.4</b> 0	-5.31	-3.61	<b>-4.</b> 06	-3.21	-4.71	-3.92