the increasingly popular "hamburger". It was cheaper to buy this kind of meat on the World Market. Some establishments ceased boning altogether and let their skilled employees resign, retire or disappear by attrition. Not only has the nation suffered an almost irreparable loss in this area of skill, but the action forced the livestock industry into a whole new pattern of operation.

The cattle formerly going to slaughter from pasture are now going into feedlots for further finishing on grains into the kinds of beef already abundantly available as steaks and roasts. This further contributes to the production of fat which must then be blended with lean, manufacturing beef so that it becomes economically useful. Which, of course, means a desire for more imported lean beef. Yet, this cycle could easily be interrupted and reversed by legislated discouragement of major dependence on sporadic imports of lean beef. This could encourage domestic packers to actively bid on the vast numbers of "two-way" cattle which are and can be produced on this Nation's range and pasture lands suitable for no other use.

There are five major points included in HR 9475 and other similar measures to "tidy up" PL 88–482:

1. *Eliminate "Override" on Quotas.* No one could foresee the impact of delayed or speeded-up ship movements, the vagaries of statistical reporting through various departments of government, or the later revisions in statistics caused by the amounts of meat condemned or refused entry upon arrival here. Thus the import quota law allowed a 10% "flex", or override, over the actual quota before further shipments were curtailed. This has been far too lenient. The new legislation seeks to have the quota invoked on the exact amount established for that year or period. No longer can other nations aim at, say, 101%, 106.5% or 109.999% of a quota. They will have to gear their exports to an exact, known figure, which should help to stabilize their output and our own domestic industry's growth.

2. *More Realistic Base Period.* Another area needing change is that of the base period for figuring imports. The law calls for the import levels during 1959 through 1963 to be used as the base. This includes the *abnormally* high import year of 1963 and does not, then, recognize the more realistic, long-term, average offered by a 1958–1962 base period. We have not, of course, been required to invoke a quota since the law went into effect on January 1, 1965, simply because the base period was so generous as to make a quota meaningless to most exporting nations—their level of output was more normally geared to something near the averages for 1958–1962.

3. *Quarterly Quotas.* A yearly quota also seems necessary simply because of inexperience. However, the accompanying graph and tables clearly illustrate that few if any exporting nations are gearing their shipments to the time of light supplies of our manufacturing beef, in this case represented by domestic cow slaughter, and to avoid the traditional, seasonal marketing patterns for domestic cattle. Therefore, a quota allocated by quarters is almost mandatory to help the exporters—and the importers—police themselves. Most of the meat shipped to the United States is frozen; another few days in storage should make little difference. Further, balanced shipments throughout the year would tend to help stabilize the income of stockmen, here and abroad, while avoiding the ups and downs in supplies here which seemingly confuse consumers a great deal.

4. *Include Canned, Cooked and Cured Meats.* One of the most serious loopholes to be closed is that only fresh, chilled or frozen beef, veal, mutton and goat are included in PL 88–482. Congress reasoned in 1964 that the canned, cooked or cured imports were minor parts of total meat imports. However, Congress has since learned how ingenious some nations become, particularly regarding Colby Cheese and other dairy products, in avoiding the intent of our laws. There is nothing in PL 88–482 which would deter a nation from cooking, canning or curing its excess exports, above and beyond its quota allotments, and shipping them to us with a completely straight face.

5. *Include Military Offshore Purchases.* Another feature of H.R. 9475 that makes good sense is that of requiring, under certain circumstances, that offshore meat purchases of our Armed Forces be included in the amounts considered toward the quota. Domestic military purchases, of course, must be made of domestically produced and humanely slaughtered and inspected meat, just as each of the inter-state transactions must be, for public protection. We do not suggest in any way that the military effort in any area be hampered, but we do insist that any foreign meat purchases by our military be counted against the total quota. After all, that meat was being diverted from some nation's