by the President follows action last year of a similar nature. It was all intended to plug the loopholes through which foreign producers bypass our quotas. But the evasive tactics will undoubtedly continue.

MEAT, MINK, AND HONEY

Our dairy industry does not stand alone in the path of threatened imports. Our cattle raisers have felt the pinch throughout much of the sixties, as European and other countries closed the doors on beef through rigid quota systems and variable import levies. In 1960 we received 512 million pounds of imported beef, according to the Agriculture Secretary's testimony before this committee. But in fiscal 1967 we imported over 1.2 billion pounds of beef, even though the meat import law of 1964 was enacted. Our controls still do not nearly match those imposed by other nations.

The American mink industry is another example of what has happened on the farm and ranch scene as imports rose to such a level as to damage a domestic market. Through the years the mink industry, like other farmers, invested its own money to create a market for its product, only to see their effort usurped by foreign suppliers who then got on the band wagon at the expense of our own farmers.

Mink ranchers across the Nation lost nearly $40 million on the 1966 crops, due to the greatly reduced average prices at the auction houses. This had a great economic effect on an industry that normally has a return of some $160 million annually. There has been a sustained upward trend in U.S. imports of mink fur skins that began back in the late 1940s. In recent years, imports have averaged 53 percent of the U.S. consumption.

The recent Tariff Commission report on the U.S. mink industry shows conclusively that rising foreign imports of mink fur skins have seriously depressed prices in the United States, forcing our ranchers to the brink of bankruptcy, but unfortunately, the Tariff Commission all but ignored the imports in its conclusions.

Similar problems exist on other agricultural commodities, including honey. Many of these problems have been brought to your attention by others who have appeared before this committee.

IMPORT CONTROLS, OURS AND THEIRS

Mr. Chairman, the pendulum has swung entirely too far in the direction that offers little or no protection for American agricultural products while foreign nations offer a host of protectionist devices to control our exports. We have consistently relaxed controls over competitive imports over the years while other nations have imposed not only tariffs but all kinds of nontariff barriers such as quotas, licensing systems, variable import fees and the like. Other countries just don't buy anything they don't need. We have never learned this simple lesson.

The Secretary of Agriculture in his June 10 testimony before this committee inadvertently admitted this premise. In discussing the action to invoke section 22 last year on dairy products, he said:

> I use the word "evasions" because the supplying countries were sending us products, such as butter in the form of butterfat/sugar mixtures, in circumvention of then existing controls. This butter could not have gone to other potential markets, such as Japan, or the United Kingdom, or Canada; they had tight controls on imported butter. It came to the United States.