Furthermore, such domestic conditions do most emphatically affect U.S. price structures for all beef. On the other hand, fluctuations in fresh frozen beef imports cannot have any significant effect on market prices at the time of entry through our ports because in 90 cases out of 100 that meat was sold, yes, priced and sold, prior to the time it left the country of origin and in fact over 60 days or more leadtime is required to bring manufacturing beef into this country.

Such meat is not generally exported prior to an actual sale. Allegations that peaks in the form of several meat refrigerated ships arriving at U.S. ports at one time disrupt this market are in our opinion pure bunk.

If indeed there is any hardship due to imports, which I doubt, perhaps the cattlemen should consider another factor, such as increased imports of live cattle.

MIC members are doing their very best to assure that imports relate only to domestic demand and not to any external force. We have, over the past year and, in fact, ever since the import quotas and the Tariff Commission investigation, cooperated by controlling import supplies to moderate all shipments on a supply and demand basis. We know that the fate of our entire meat industry determines the fate of the meat import segment of that same industry.

But what about the U.S. cattleman?

There is presently no absolute quantitative restriction on imports of live cattle, and we do not support one. However, live cattle imports have consistently accounted for 2 percent to 3 percent of U.S. consumption. Since 1960, imports have averaged over 900,000 head annually. The vast majority of these fall into the 200–699 pound range suitable as "stockers" or "feeders" to be placed on market feedlots and to compete directly with the produce of American cattlemen. The Tariff Commission estimates that three-fourths of the animals weighing between 200–699 pounds are placed on feedlots. Apparently certain interests have no objection to these types of imports, from which they profit.

Since enactment of Public Law 88–482 in 1964, live cattle imports from Canada and Mexico have risen. According to Bureau of Census Reports, live cattle imports in March 1968 were up to 98,689 head from 60,233 during March 1967—a whopping increase of 64 percent. Comparing the period January to March, 1967–68, the figures were up 39.5 percent from 160,251 to 224,122 head. With this situation one might ask: What are importer-feeders doing to help the cattlemen? It may be that the importation of live cattle helps keep some feeders going strong, but by increasing the supply of cattle on feed, without increasing the return at the ranch, what benefit do U.S. cattle raisers find in an exploding output at the feedlot since any such increases on the number of cattle are from outside the U.S.A. We submit this is no benefit to raisers, least of all to the cattle farmer.

The Meat Importers Council also opposes any attempt to place imports on specific allotment under Public Law 88–482 or any other law. We have demonstrated that alleged price and supply problems blamed on so-called unpredictable peaks and valleys are without basis in fact. To further restrict import levels, or enforce periodic limita-