

hamburger in the opening meal at Resurrection City. At 50 cents a pound, it is difficult for some to enjoy ground beef; at 99 cents it would be virtually impossible. I wish that Senator Hruska would reconsider the effects that such a bill would cause. To the poor who live on greens and corn-bread, hamburger is a luxury. If a meat quota bill is so important, why not raise the price of the more expensive cuts of meat? The rich people are not starving or undernourished. An increased price in the better cuts of meat would not have as detrimental an effect on the rich as an increase in hamburger would have on the less fortunate of our Nation.

JANE REYNOLDS DEAN
College Park [Maryland]

Meat entering the United States under P.L. 88-482, predominantly manufacturing beef, makes up a very small percentage of total U.S. supply. It can never be expected to reach a level where new non-tariff barriers would be necessary or desirable. Cattlemen and raisers, who already enjoy the ultimate form of tariff and non-tariff protection, should not be granted any additional advantage.

CONCLUSION

The cattlemen and feeders fail to make a case for additional meat import quota protection. Prices for live cattle are steadily rising. Retail and wholesale returns for meat and meat food products are up. Demand has increased regularly to record levels. Total supply is at an all-time high. Imports, a normal part of total supply, cannot be blamed for losses properly attributable to indiscriminate feeding and raising procedures.