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BEEF IMPORT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Monday, the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture announced a voluntary agreement with Australia and New Zealand on beef imports. These two countries provide approximately 80 percent of our imports of fresh, frozen, and canned beef and veal. This agreement, as I understand it, is subject to review after 3 years.

In brief, the agreement guarantees foreign exporters of beef to the United States approximately 11 percent of our domestic market, holding Australian and New Zealand exports to the United States at the 1962-63 average, allowing for consumption growth.

Mr. President, this is a small step—a very small one—in the right direction; but it is not enough. It provides little protection for our domestic industry at a time when prices are down. During the current calendar year, it will provide a 6-percent reduction, as compared with 1963 imports.

The idea of a voluntary negotiated agreement with these two major beef exporting countries is excellent—but certainly not one that guarantees foreign suppliers such a major foothold on our beef market. We cannot blame Australia and New Zealand when they can get an agreement which will permit them to continue to export to the United States at a rate comparable to those of the two highest years in history. The American cattle industry is the one that is being hurt. It would have been far more realistic if the average imports had been computed over the past 5 years, instead of the last 2 years.

In addition, I am somewhat concerned about the effect such an agreement will have on efforts to aid the domestic live-stock industry, in light of the delicate state of our international trade negotiations. Frankly, I am anxious to see a much more realistic quota established, either through U.S. Tariff Commission recommendations or congressional action. It is for this reason that my colleague (Mr. METCALF) and I have prepared, for introduction, legislation which would establish a quota system on beef imports, based on the past 5-year average.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Mr. President, I introduce this bill, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senators from North Dakota (Mr. Young, and Mr. Bonham), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern), and the Senators from Iowa (Mr. Hickenlooper and Mr. Miller); and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a letter on the same subject which my colleague, the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) and I addressed to the U.S. Tariff Commission.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have the bill held at the desk, for additional cosponsors, until Monday, February 24.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, until Monday, February 24.

The Acting President pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. President, I am somewhat concerned that the one remaining serious border problem—that of dealing with the Wall of Water between our two countries. However, history also shows that no problem between nations can long defy solution when negotiations are entered into with a spirit of friendship and good faith and a genuine desire to succeed. Fortunately, this has been the tenor of United States-Mexican relations over the last three decades, beginning with the good neighbor policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and reaching a high point under the administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Recent approval of the Chamillo Treaty—whereby a longstanding border grievance was settled—removes a great barrier to further understanding of the Mexican problem, which has been a divisive factor between our countries for nearly a century, could not have been settled without the friendship and statesmanship of the Mexican Government; and we are most appreciative of the role played by its great President, Adolfo Lopez Mateos. I am confident that the one remaining serious border problem—that of dealing with the Wall of Water between our two countries. However, history also shows that no problem between nations can long defy solution when negotiations are entered into with a spirit of friendship and good faith and a genuine desire to succeed. Fortunately, this has been the tenor of United States-Mexican relations over the last three decades, beginning with the good neighbor policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and reaching a high point under the administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Recent approval of the Chamillo Treaty—whereby a longstanding border grievance was settled—removes a great barrier to further understanding of the Mexican problem, which has been a divisive factor between our countries for nearly a century, could not have been settled without the friendship and statesmanship of the Mexican Government; and we are most appreciative of the role played by its great President, Adolfo Lopez Mateos.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today President Johnson will fly to Calexico, California, where he will hold two days of meetings in Palm Springs with President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, of Mexico. The Chiefs of State will discuss problems of mutual concern to our two countries, as well as of concern to the hemisphere and the world.

A quick glance at history reveals that this is not an unusual meeting of our two countries. However, history also shows that no problem between nations can long defy solution when negotiations are entered into with a spirit of friendship and good faith and a genuine desire to succeed. Fortunately, this has been the tenor of United States-Mexican relations over the last three decades, beginning with the good neighbor policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and reaching a high point under the administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Recent approval of the Chamillo Treaty—whereby a longstanding border grievance was settled—removes a great barrier to further understanding of the Mexican problem, which has been a divisive factor between our countries for nearly a century, could not have been settled without the friendship and statesmanship of the Mexican Government; and we are most appreciative of the role played by its great President, Adolfo Lopez Mateos. I am confident that the one remaining serious border problem—that of dealing with the Wall of Water between our two countries. However, history also shows that no problem between nations can long defy solution when negotiations are entered into with a spirit of friendship and good faith and a genuine desire to succeed. Fortunately, this has been the tenor of United States-Mexican relations over the last three decades, beginning with the good neighbor policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and reaching a high point under the administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Recent approval of the Chamillo Treaty—whereby a longstanding border grievance was settled—removes a great barrier to further understanding of the Mexican problem, which has been a divisive factor between our countries for nearly a century, could not have been settled without the friendship and statesmanship of the Mexican Government; and we are most appreciative of the role played by its great President, Adolfo Lopez Mateos.
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Mr. President, on Monday, the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture announced a voluntary agreement with Australia and New Zealand on beef imports. These two countries provide approximately 80 percent of our imports of fresh and frozen beef and veal. The agreement, as I understand it, is subject to review after three years.

In brief, the agreement guarantees foreign exporters of beef to the United States approximately 11 percent of our domestic market, holding Australian and New Zealand exports to the United States at the 1962-63 average, allowing for consumption growth.

Mr. President, this is a small step in the right direction, but it is not enough. It provides little protection for our domestic industry at a time when prices are down. During the current calendar year, it will provide a 6 percent reduction as compared with 1963 imports.

The idea of a voluntarily negotiated agreement with these two major beef exporters is excellent but certainly not one that guarantees foreign suppliers such a major foothold on our beef market. You can't blame Australia and New Zealand when they can get an agreement which will permit them to continue to export to the United States at a rate comparable to the two highest years in history. The American cattle industry is the one that is being hurt. It would have been far more realistic if the average imports had been computed over the past five of years instead of the last two years.
In addition, I am somewhat concerned about the effect such an agreement will have on efforts to aid the domestic livestock industry in light of the delicate state of our international trade negotiations. Frankly, I am anxious to see a much more realistic quota established, either through U. S. Tariff Commission recommendations or Congressional action. It is for this reason that I have prepared for introduction legislation which would establish a quota system on beef imports, based on the past five year average.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of this legislation and a letter my colleague, Senator Lee Metcalf, and I addressed to the U. S. Tariff Commission on this same issue.