3. *Mink is a world commodity and part of the international fur trade.*—The Commission recognized that mink is a world commodity traded in auctions at a world price. Accordingly, it warned against artificially high U.S. prices which could impede exports of domestically produced skins which make up more than one-sixth of sales of domestic production.

4. *The domestic production has expanded rapidly.*—It found that the domestic ranch industry has expanded at a substantial rate from 4.3 million skins in 1963 to 6 million in 1967; that U.S. consumption rose from 8 million skins in 1963 to 10.2 million in 1967.

5. *The domestic industry has generally been a profitable one.*—The Commission's analysis of financial reports gathered from the industry showed that profitability of the U.S. industry rose from 11.3 percent of gross income in 1963 to 15.7 percent in 1966—I might say that in many businesses that is a pretty good margin of profit—and that despite the substantial increase in imports over the past 10 years, the domestic commercial mink industry enjoyed an increase in gross income from $77 million in 1963 to $104 million in 1966, a period during which the number of commercial producers was steadily increasing at the expense of the small backyard producers.

These facts taken together certainly do not spell out a case in which this committee should intervene to provide legislative relief. If the domestic mink ranching industry should be subsidized by the Federal Government—and the cost thereof thereby spread among our taxpayers generally—it should be for some reason other than the impact of imports upon that industry.

6. *Imports are largely commercial grades used in the trimming trade.*—Another fact is brought out in the Tariff Commission report which I think is worthy of note by this committee. It is reported in the first full paragraph on page 4 of the Tariff Commission report that—

> The market for mink has broadened substantially. More mink than previously is used for trim and in new styles that differ significantly from the traditional. Mink-trimmed garments utilize furskins of lower quality and smaller size. The new styles require fewer furskins and less labor per unit, thus lowering the cost of a mink garment to the consumer. The broadening market is, at the same time, both a result of and a factor contributing to lower average prices. In the United States imports have been particularly important in furnishing furskins for this segment of the market.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the growth of imports over the past few years has approximately paralleled the growth in the United States of the production of fur-trimmed cloth coats over the period 1956 to 1965. Since mink furskins imported from Scandinavia are used largely in the trimming trade it is obvious that most of the imports have gone into the manufacture of fur-trimmed cloth coats where they are used primarily for collars and on occasion for cuffs.

One knowledgeable witness on this score who appeared before the Tariff Commission was Mr. Abe Feinglass, vice president of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL–CIO, who heads the fur and leather department of the Union and represents practically all the labor force in the fur industry. He testified (p. 441–2, Tariff Commission transcript):

> We believe a quota (of the type proposed) would ruin the industry's present prosperity and drastically alter its pattern of long run growth. First, it would