

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

7-28-1964

Congressional Record - Meat Imports - Wild Animals and Wild Birds

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Congressional Record - Meat Imports - Wild Animals and Wild Birds" (1964). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 532.
https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/532

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 110

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 28, 1964

No. 144

Senate

MEAT IMPORTS—WILD ANIMALS AND WILD BIRDS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States.

Mr. HRUSKA obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have consulted the leadership on the other side of the aisle and interested Senators on both sides of the aisle. I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of 1 hour on each amendment and 4 hours on the bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. When the Senator says "each amendment," is that confined to the amendments now at the desk or does it permit new amendments?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; it refers to any amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding.

If he will yield further, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, not taking the time out of the time under limitation.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will yield, I should like to yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the committee amendments will be considered en bloc, and they are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill as amended will be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill for the purpose of making a clarifying statement and inserting statements and other material in the RECORD.

During the week of July 6—specifically, on July 9—the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], raised a question as to the possibility of beef import legislation being brought before the Senate. At that time, I pointed out it had been my intention to take this legislation up during the week of July 6, but that because there was a "hold"—at least one "hold"—on the bill on the Republican side, because a certain Senator—and there may have been others—wanted to be at the Republican convention beginning on July 10, it was felt that the ordinary courtesies should be extended. Therefore, at that time, during the week of July 6, when the leadership initially had intended to bring up this proposal, it was considered not proper to do so. As a result, it was brought up yesterday, which gave the Senate the first available opportunity to consider this most important legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that statements of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself, under date of July 9, 1964, on page 15653 of the RECORD, in columns 2 and 3, under the heading "Amendment of Tariff Act of 1930—Regulation of Importation of Beef," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—REGULATION OF IMPORTATION OF BEEF

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader announced that in the week of July 20, the Senate would take up Calendar No. 1105, H.R. 1839, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States. I understand that the bill contains other items; and I thought that perhaps the majority leader would like to make a brief explanation of the rest of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, there is much more to H.R. 1839 than to provide for the free

importation of wild animals and wild birds.

The bill considers the question of the importation of beef into the United States, imports which reached an exorbitant level last year, so that they comprised 11 percent of the total.

This year, imports are down to approximately the amount I endeavored to bring them to under the Mansfield amendment; namely, the average of the past 5 years, 1959 to 1963, inclusive. This would reduce the amount of imports from 11 percent to around 6 percent. It is my understanding that the imports of beef will be below the 6-percent level for the rest of this year and that this situation will very likely continue into next year, as well. This is because Australia and New Zealand, principally have found that there is a demand in Western European markets, primarily, for their cutter stock, and also because, despite overproduction and overfeeding in this country, there happens to be a world shortage of meat, and we are finding new markets in France and Italy and, I believe, most recently, in Israel.

Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture is spending close to \$100 million in the buying of domestic beef. The Department of Defense has purchased on the order of 100 million pounds of domestically produced beef. All Defense Department purchases of beef for Western Europe, which used to be in the large part from the Western European countries, are now made in this country.

I believe the amendment I have submitted is better than the substitute adopted by the Committee on Finance and offered by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

It had been my intention, as the minority leader is well aware, to call up the bill this week, because it has been cleared by the Committee on Finance. On last Monday, the Democratic policy committee cleared it, as well. However, because a good many Republicans were interested, for some reason or other, in what is transpiring and will transpire in San Francisco, it was deemed not advisable to bring up the bill this week, and at their requests its consideration was postponed. However, as I announced earlier, sometime after the Senate reconvenes on July 20 the bill will be laid before the Senate for consideration and debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that correspondence which I have had with the Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Tariff Commission, and stock growers in the State of Montana, and certain other material be incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 110

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, AUGUST 18, 1964

No. 162

Senate

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum? I would hope the Senator from New York would let the Senate proceed, because other conference reports are waiting.

This subject has been discussed quite thoroughly. The conferees representing the Senate have done a splendid job, all things considered.

I suggest to the Senator from New York that it is my strong belief that most Senators have, in effect, made up their minds. We are approaching the climax of this most important question. I would not agree with some of the remarks made on the floor of the Senate to the effect that the State Department and the Department of Agriculture will seek loopholes, because on the basis of the history made during the course of the debate on the Hruska amendment at the time the wheat-cotton bill was under consideration, during the debate on the Curtis-Mansfield amendments, and during the consideration of the conference report today, the situation with respect to congressional intent is clear.

The executive department came a long way toward meeting the needs of the cattle industry, needs which I believe should have been looked after a long time ago, needs which are now being faced, needs to which I am quite certain, on the basis of the illustrations I have given, the State Department and the Department of Agriculture will pay careful attention now.

I hope we may get on with the conference report and move on to other business, as well.

Page 19405

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.