

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

---

1-8-1964

### Cattle and Beef Imports

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

---

#### Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Cattle and Beef Imports" (1964). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 533.

[https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches/533](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/533)

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](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

Gaulle some years ago accepted this frontier as the proper Polish-German boundary.

"Our overall objective in Europe is the reduction of tensions so that the ground may be paved for the eventual reunification of Germany. In Berlin itself, the most sensitive boiling point, the key word with regard to the wall should be the achievement of what Mayor Willy Brandt, of West Berlin, described to me as 'porosity,' the freer flow of peoples back and forth in the divided city. And this flow unquestionably would be from East to West."

#### LETTERS OF COMMENT

On each occasion when the Senator has expounded his idea in the Senate, letters of comment have followed in great numbers. The trend of these from citizens in West Germany has persuaded him that, though politics and the fear of risking a good trading position with the Kremlin have restrained Washington and London from proposing practical measures to break the impasse, his plan is highly acceptable to the average German citizen. His private conversations with Western officials have convinced him that they would welcome moves to "rectify the sterility of our policy vis-a-vis Berlin and Germany" were it not for the inflexible opposition of the West German Government.

This, PELL told the Senate, cedes to the political majority at Bonn control of the policymaking of the United States toward a condition which will continue to endanger the entire world population until and unless it is relieved. Supplemental measures he has urged include the establishment in Berlin of various United Nations agencies—now operating in Geneva and in Paris.

#### POWERFUL OPPOSITION

But there are powerful factors in opposition to the ideas of the Rhode Island Senator. And, though he may succeed in his effort to call the President's attention to his formula before entering into the conference with Chancellor Erhard, that will probably be the end as well as the beginning. One of these adverse factors PELL himself acknowledged—that "no German politician can take the lead in advocating" an exchange of concessions, regardless of any potential of Western benefit they may possess. Another obstacle exists in the fact that President Johnson is greatly influenced in foreign policy by the views of former Secretary of State Acheson, who is adamant against even the slightest indication of a trade with the U.S.S.R. involving Germany. And American reactions to his proposal have evoked such responses as this: (From a citizen of Massachusetts) "I am ashamed that a Democratic Senator is so disregarding of the fate of 11 million people separated from their countrymen."

But the Senator's critics are most unlikely to have occasion for further disturbance by any reflection of the Senator's plan in the Peder-nales communique, whatever it may be called. The East-West impasse over Germany persists because the U.S. politicians who deal with it are captives of their own records, in which commonsense and statesmanship have been conspicuous by their absence.

#### CATTLE AND BEEF IMPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in recent weeks there has been an increasing and justified expression of concern about the importation of cattle and beef products and the effect that it is having on the domestic cattle industry. I have noted that more and more of our colleagues here in the Senate and House of Representatives are expressing their concern about the situation. The CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD contains a wealth of supporting information.

The cattle market is dropping, in fact in some areas the livestock interests are beginning to suffer economically. The increase in cattle and beef imports may not be the only cause, but in my observations they certainly are a major one. My distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] informed me that between 1956 and 1962 there was an average of 890 million pounds imported while in 1962 there were 1.9 billion pounds imported and this year the increase is even larger. This situation cannot be handled lightly when we are presented with such information as this.

In addition to the import situation the livestock producer is confronted with customer preferences and changing marketing patterns. These matters need attention but I feel that the most beneficial action at this time would be the establishment of a quota system on imports.

There has been quite a bit of talk about legislation. I do not think this is the quickest way; in fact it might confuse an already complex situation. I have discussed this matter with a number of officials in the administration and I feel that this can be done administratively under existing law.

Senator BURDICK was successful in getting the Senate Finance Committee to adopt a resolution directing the Tariff Commission to begin an investigation of the impact of foreign beef imports on the domestic market. I hope the Commission will act expeditiously in this matter. I believe there is sufficient authority under the Trade Expansion Act and through executive action to bring about some relief.

The livestock industry is one of our most basic industries in our country, it cannot be allowed to drift. I commend this matter of increased cattle and beef imports to the attention of our President and his counselors, and ask that it be given immediate attention and action at the executive level.

Mr. President, while I was in Montana, I received from the Secretary of Agriculture a message to the effect that a meeting would be called this afternoon—January 8 at 3 p.m.—to consider the difficult situation confronting the cattle industry. It was my understanding at that time that a number of Members of Congress would meet informally with the Secretary of Agriculture to consider ways and means to cope with the grave economic difficulty confronting the cattle industry and the Nation. As the Senate knows, imports of frozen beef from Australia and New Zealand have increased from 890 million pounds in 1956 to 1.9 billion pounds in 1962. This is a situation which does not call for tariffs, but does call for a reasonable quota system which will insure that the American cattle producer has the first and foremost claim on the American market.

Therefore, while understandable because of reasons beyond the Secretary's control, I was extremely disappointed to be informed by the Department of

Agriculture that the meeting scheduled for today, Wednesday, January 8, had been postponed. It would be my hope that this meeting will be rescheduled at the earliest possible moment, to the end that we may face up to the crisis confronting the cattle industry and that the necessary steps may be taken to insure to the American cattle producers every right, consideration, and protection to which they are entitled in maintaining their full share of this most important segment in our economy.

#### A TRIBUTE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the death of President Kennedy was a profound shock not only to this Nation but to people everywhere. Many in other lands shared the grief which we experienced. Some expressed this shock and grief with great sensitivity and very deep feelings.

In this connection, I invite the attention of Senators to an article by Mr. Eric Nicol on President Kennedy's death which was referred to me by Mr. James J. Flaherty of the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Nicol's tribute to Mr. Kennedy appeared as a column in the Vancouver Province which is published in Vancouver, British Columbia. It is a moving and eloquent comment which reveals not only the high esteem and affection in which the late President was held by our northern neighbors but also the sense of bitter loss, so similar to our own, which his death occasioned among Canadians.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial previously referred to be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### A TRIBUTE

"Never send to know for whom the bell tolls."

Our grief, this numbing November weekend, was sharpened I think by our sensing that violence has won out over reason.

The assassin's bullet sought the brain, the seat of man's only hope against the tyranny of superstition, hate, and the prodding demons of war. From President Kennedy's superb mind the missile sped on to lodge in the hearts of all of us.

The head that was doing its level best to lead us out of the primitivism of emotional response—in my judgment, was his characteristic preface to a statement—lost out to a bolt-action rifle as crude in its lethal purpose as a stone age club.

Because most of us identified ourselves gratefully with the young President's intellectual strength, his determination to make reason the master of the tumultuous forces threatening to sunder the world, the ripping away of that support by a sole agent of the powers of darkness has made the loss more than a matter of simple sorrow for the passing of a great nation's leader.

By extension we recognize the sniper's rifle as the symbol of nuclear war, triggered by some madman at the least expected moment.

In last Friday's triumph of extremism, of passion, of the irrational and irrevocable act, we see that America is not Harvard. It is also Dallas, Tex. It is the country where the gun is still more widely admired, as the