

It either didn't go over good in the first place or the demand simply dropped. Obviously, the mink rancher wants to get as much as he can. But he has to guess as you can see 2, 3, 4, 5 years ahead to get the type of breeding stock which he thinks will be popular in the style and fashion world some years later.

Next, the problem has risen from the fact, as I said in my testimony, that mink is a worldwide product, the world consumption now is reaching around 23 million, with the U.S. producers producing about 6 million of that. Even the U.S. markets are world markets, however.

As economic conditions in a major mink consuming market like Germany go sour as they did in 1965 and 1966 it is bound to affect the farmer here for that substantial market loses its drive and there is more mink available for the rest of the mink consuming countries.

Finally, let's just take a real quick look for an answer to your question.

In 1966-67 there was a depressed market. The price decline suffered, as I said, was not the result of imports. It was a result of economic conditions according to the Tariff Commission, and two or three other factors named on page 4 of the statement none of which include imports.

The year before the U.S. producers received a very high general level of prices as compared with what they did in 1966-67. But this was an unusual situation in that latter year. There are price declines in certain colors almost every year.

One popular new pelt comes up and the price goes up and as the older colors become unpopular colors the prices go down. My answer really is that this industry, I don't think there is any question, was depressed for at least 1 year, I maintain for 1 year only. That was 1966-67 world conditions which depressed all mink and fur industries throughout the world, but it was a temporary one. There is a resurgence of prices currently.

The present market has been such that they have cleared their goods. There is no inventory holdover. As they reported themselves, there is apparently a scarcity of this commodity which we are now faced with.

Mr. BROYHILL. You made several comments about the Tariff Commission and so did Mr. Dreisin. I have heard some criticism of that report that they didn't make any direct comment on the impact of imports of the raw mink skins on the domestic mink producers.

I don't quite follow that criticism in light of what you said in your statement and Mr. Dreisin said in his statement. You were at the hearings. I imagine you testified. Were you not at the hearings?

Mr. SHARP. Well, maybe while the Commission failed to explicitly answer the question of what the impact was of imports on the domestic rancher, it is absolutely clear, Mr. Broyhill, to anyone who will take the time to read that 89-page report, that imports had little, if any, impact at all on the domestic growth, the growth of the domestic rancher's production, on the price, and the profitability and the employment.

The Commission made it clear that the market for mink was a world market with buyers from all over the world attending U.S. auctions and buyers from all over the world including a substantial number of U.S. buyers attending auctions abroad.

Mink isn't just imported into the United States like other products. It is raised abroad and sold abroad to whoever wants to go and buy.