steers in 1966 alone. Multiplication of the estimated loss per head and 1966 steer marketings reveals an opportunity cost of $471,000. This is revenue which would have accrued to our state's economy had imports been restricted to 1958–62 levels.

UTILITY COWS

Utility cows are the type of beef which is in closest competition with imported beef. This can be seen by the magnitude of the price depressing effect on the previous page. In making a similar calculation for utility cows, we found that the opportunity cost of imports in 1966 was $0.48 per hundredweight or $4.32 per 900 pound cow. North Dakota markets an estimated 150,000 of these cows annually with a 1966 estimated loss of $648,000.00.

When this loss is added to the previously calculated loss on choice steers, we arrive at an average annual loss of $1,119,000 to the North Dakota beef industry and to our state's economy.

OHIO CATTLE FEEDERS ASSOCIATION,
Delaware, Ohio, June 17, 1968.

Congressman WILBUR D. MILLS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLS: It is the wish of the Ohio Cattle Feeders Association that you support the proposed amendments to the present Meat Import Law with your influence and your vote.

The economic loss to the cattle and beef industry and all agribusiness in this country because of the presently permitted volume of beef imports is briefly set forth on the accompanying schedule.

Why should we import the equivalent production of 20,000,000 acres of average Ohio farm land?

Why should we import millions of hours of cheap labor and deny this volume of labor to our own citizens?

Why should we import a meat product already in sufficient abundance to depress prices and that denies all agribusiness in all areas of this country an opportunity to share in production?

Why does the Congress enact laws and appropriate large sums of money to improve the income and poverty of this great country in rural areas and then at the same time permit an unnecessary meat import product to not only conceal this effort but to eliminate our own future expansion?

You are challenged to study the economic implications of the attached.

Thank you and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL FORSYTHE, *President.*
JAMES H. WARNER, *Secretary.*

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED TO CHAIRMAN WILBUR MILLS AND MEMBERS OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

We were informed by the U.S.D.A. last January that the present Meat Import Law would permit 1,045,300,000 pounds of beef imports in 1968.

A 1000 pound steer will yield about 400 pounds of deboned, defatted beef comparable to the lean import product. It would take 2,613,250 live 1000 pound cattle to produce this quantity.

The economic loss in cattle production in the U.S., as estimated by Ohio animal scientists under Ohio production conditions, follows:

Cattle in the feed lot, annually	2, 613, 250
Cows to produce these slaughter cattle	3, 186, 890
Bulls for breeding these cows	159, 345
Cows and bulls to maintain necessary replacement calves	583, 550
Necessary replacement calves, annually	478, 511
Necessary replacement yearlings, annually	478, 511
Necessary replacement 2-yr. olds, annually	478, 511
Total cattle replaced by the present import level	7, 980, 568

Why should this be? Why should it be permitted to increase?