APPENDIX C

RELATION OF TOTAL FUR EXPORTS TO NET FUR IMPORTS

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Year	Total fur imports	Re-exports	Net imports	Total fur exports	Ratio of exports to net imports (percent)
1950	$109.320	$13.498	$95.822	$24.459	25.53
1959	107.798	16.788	91.010	39.577	43.49
1960	109.196	15.736	93.460	46.944	50.23
1965	125.602	10.695	114.907	67.023	58.33
1967	102.585	7.291	95.294	65.320	68.54

Note: The totals include raw and dressed furs and made-up fur garments.

Source: Compiled from U.S. Department of Commerce reports.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sorry to tell you that you don't have any extra time.

Mr. Sharp, I think it would be better if we recognize you now for the time allotted to you and let you make your statement, then we will question all of you.

You are recognized.

STATEMENT OF JAMES R. SHARP, COUNSEL, THE SCANDINAVIAN FUR AGENCY, INC.; ACCOMPANIED BY B. H. HESSEL, PRESIDENT

Mr. SHARP. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, my name is James R. Sharp. I am an attorney with offices at 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C., a member of the firm of Sharp, Partridge, Gants, & Perkins. I appear here as counsel for the Scandinavian Fur Agency, Inc., of New York, a New York corporation which has the responsibility of clearing the bulk of the raw mink fur skins shipped to the United States for the account of U.S. fur manufacturers, dealers, and brokers. Those buyers acquire the skins in the open auctions held in Scandinavia. Mr. Hans Hessel, president of Scandinavian Fur Agency, Inc., and a dealer and broker in fur skins of many kinds, sits with us here at the table in order to aid in answering any questions the committee may have.

REASONS FOR OPPOSITION TO QUOTAS ON IMPORTS OF RAW MINK SKINS

My client is opposed to the various bills now pending before this committee which would impose quotas on the importation of mink fur skins. This opposition encompasses not only the specific quota bills, but H.R. 16936 as well, the bill introduced by Representative Herlong, which contains formulas for applying quotas "across the board" on all imported products which come within the percentage tests set forth in the bill.

We oppose these bills because they would be harmful to the fur trade and eventually cost New York its eminent position in the world fur market. Furthermore, the reasons given by the domestic ranchers for the adoption of quota legislation have no validity. All mink quota bills—they would limit imports of raw mink fur skins to a maximum of either 30 or 40 percent of U.S. consumption as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture—were introduced on the basis of claims made