require boning of virtually the entire carcass. This process utilizes skilled American laborers who justly demand and receive a fair wage. Unfortunately, there is a segment of American business that cares little for the welfare of American labor or for the investments of independent, tax-paying American cattlemen. They have, therefore, to their advantage incorporated into our processed meat manufacturing system frozen, boneless beef, a product prepared by foreign labor working at a fractional wage scale of its American counterpart, and so deliverable at American ports at a lower price than our domestic, higher quality, more wholesome product.

What this influx of frozen, boneless beef has done to the American "two-way" beef animal is record. What the removal of one entire purchasing segment of Mississippi's feeder calf customers has done to the cattle industry in this state is well known to Production Credit office managers and to bankers with cattle money out.

Mississippi has suffered in another way. Any cattle system centered around production of calves must certainly have as a major byproduct the sale of cows and bulls whose breeding efficiency is sub-standard. These animals are also primarily utilized as some form of process meat, and so obviously the price structure on this class of cattle has also been damaged.

Mississippi cattlemen are aware we cannot embrace isolationist policies and do not suggest the removal of the American market from foreign beef producers. We do, however, suggest a reappraisal of the law under which these beef imports are admitted and the enactment of corrective legislation necessary to insure this nation's future supply of high quality, wholesome meat.

Beef cattle production over the past several years has been a marginal business at best with several severe depressions a matter of record. While the beef import situation cannot be solely blamed for the dreary, current, economic level of the beef cattle business, certainly it has been an over all depressant with disastrous immediate effects when periods of peak imports coincided with weakening domestic markets. This Association, therefore, respectfully requests and recommends a five-point modification of the 1964 law:

1. We believe using 1959–63 as a base period projects an unreal image for average imports, for 1963 was one of the all time peak beef import years. We, therefore, recommend as more realistic a base period composed of the years 1958–62.

2. We further believe the records show the inclusion of the 10% allowable import margin has in fact simply given foreign producers a 10% larger share of our market than was intended. We believe they programme their exports, brazenly using this allowance originally designed solely as an over-ride, for their convenience.

3. We have observed further, importers make no attempt to regulate their annual flow of beef to coincide with our domestic production peaks and valleys, but rather, jam our ports as it fits their benefit with resulting periodic chaos to the American cattle market. We, therefore, believe an annual allowable import quota embraces too long a time unit and recommend the quota be broken into quarterly periods.

4. The current law includes only fresh, chilled or frozen meat, but our Congressional leaders need only refer to the devious "Colby Cheese" incident of dairy import history to realize we have naively left a vulnerable opening in our meat import quota law. To correct this inadequacy, we urge the inclusion of canned, cooked, and cured meat in our modified meat import quota law.

5. Every American is anxious for the day when our young men in uniform are not only out of combat areas but returned to these United States. Until that time, we urge the very best food possible for these heroic troops and believe any foreign-purchased meat fed to our American boys must logically be charged against the allowable quota.

We believe the time has come when our Congressional leaders must take a stand on this matter. Either our import quota law will be allowed to continue furnishing only token protection for American skilled labor, American beef cattle farmers, and American consumers, or a realistic statute will be placed on the books more favorable to our international balance of payments and our tax payers.

Allow the present meat import situation to continue to the benefit of meat imporers, or enact reform legislation to insure continuation in the strengthening of an American beef industry based on hope of reasonable return to investment. On this decision rests the meat selection in the American consumer's future.