

imports not only add to our tonnage, but are able to undersell the same kind and quality of domestic products, thus exerting a two-pronged price depressing impact. In so doing, they counteract the very things we are trying to accomplish for the benefit of American producers.

Furthermore, imports enter the United States with considerable variation in volume from month to month, and thus tend to defeat the pattern of production and stabilization which we are trying to attain. Again we refer you to Charts I through IV showing the monthly imports of beef, veal, and mutton in the years 1964 through 1967. The top line in each chart traces total imports of beef, veal, and mutton in these months and years, whereas, the lower line shows the categories of these products covered by existing law. The lower line in the chart for 1964 represents the products that would have been covered had the law existed in that year.

We call attention to the rather wide swings in the volume of products received from month to month. The highest figure for products covered by the 1964 law is 100.2 million pounds during June of 1966, and the lowest figure is 28.2 million pounds in the month of January, 1965. In addition to the impact these imports have on our entire meat market, the irregularity of the receipts contributes to instability and varied tonnage in the total supply available. We wonder, therefore, how we can expect to achieve the goals we seek unless we at the same time can modify the volume of outside products entering our market and establish limitations on a quarterly basis that will tend to even out the flow that may be allowed.

These are the reasons and the arguments for tightening the existing quotas, providing for the establishment of quotas in the law and on a quarterly basis, and granting authority for discretionary quotas on those products not covered by the present law should there be unwarranted increases in the quantity.

CONCLUSION

We believe the reasons and arguments contained in these sections and paragraphs fully justify a definite change in the foreign trade policies of the United States whereby domestic industry is accorded consideration at least similar to that enjoyed by industries in foreign nations. We feel definitely we have substantiated the need for modifying the present meat import quota law of 1964 and making changes that are vital to the well-being of our livestock growing and feeding businesses.

Again, we are grateful for the opportunity to make this presentation. We respectfully hope that this Committee and the Congress will honor the recommendations that have been made, and will take favorable action as quickly as possible on the provisions contained in H.R. 9475.

TABLE I.—TOTAL BEEF, VEAL, AND MUTTON—U.S. IMPORTS (PRODUCT WEIGHT, 1957-67)

Year:	Million pounds	Year—Continued	Million pounds
1957.....	249.447	1963.....	1,185.286
1958.....	636.397	1964.....	834.707
1959.....	769.697	1965.....	731.166
1960.....	549.911	1966.....	953.823
1961.....	734.040	1967.....	1,033.304
1962.....	1,032.505		

[In millions of pounds]

Month	1964	1965	1966	1967
January.....	96.970	31.438	60.263	87.211
February.....	53.901	39.740	68.794	68.484
March.....	77.094	75.820	56.323	71.988
April.....	69.367	40.189	70.996	66.800
May.....	55.699	63.541	59.877	60.961
June.....	105.568	56.299	112.230	80.665
July.....	53.676	68.684	72.189	101.232
August.....	88.080	73.870	101.303	104.179
September.....	58.441	74.872	104.742	108.069
October.....	54.130	76.236	95.912	105.957
November.....	60.840	66.960	75.163	95.617
December.....	60.941	63.517	76.031	82.141
Total.....	834.707	731.166	953.823	1,033.304

Sources: Foreign Agricultural Service and Livestock-Meat-Wool Market News, U.S. Department of Agriculture.