

tions within the quota, would only create an artificial market with the consumer being the one who would suffer. If domestic manufacturers, for example, were required to slaughter only a specific number of head each month, or quarterly period, and imports were required to enter for consumption, specific amounts for storage in costly and largely unavailable storage space, without regard to supply and demand, the cost would skyrocket down the line; however, ranch and farm profits we submit would remain untouched by the exercise. Administrative burdens created by such a proposal would raise Government inspection and customs clearance costs needed to police the market. Storage and handling costs would drive up the costs to manufacturers to the point where low-income families might be prompted to turn to meat food substitutes. Would the resulting surplus of high-cost, high-storage cost meat help anyone? Of course not.

Again I would like to step aside from the text and say that the Meat Importers Council endorses the conclusions reached by the President's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, Miss Betty Furness, which were presented to this committee on June 10.

New or modified meat quotas will be paid for by the consumers, poor, middle class, and rich, and lamentably I believe in that order.

Dependable supplies of manufacturing beef have helped stabilize average retail prices paid by consumers for hamburger meat, frankfurters and sausage products, while prices paid for round steak and roasts continue to rise. Any further restrictions on total supplies of manufacturing meat might raise retail prices by 20 to 50 percent and thereby as we have said, deprive consumers of reasonably priced basic meat food products. A new quota would be inflationary and contrary to the national interest.

We believe that special interests can no longer afford positions which do not take into account the needs of the entire American community. To put tighter annual restrictions on imports or to compartmentalize heretofore normal business and farm cycles would be disastrous.

For all of the foregoing reasons it is respectfully urged that Congress should reject the additional restrictions on meat imports contemplated by H.R. 9475, H.R. 9903, and similar proposals.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this brief that was prepared could appear in the record following this oral presentation.

Mr. ULLMAN (presiding). Without objection it will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The brief referred to follows:)