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This area. I hope that we can devise some means to do it. I hope if we do this will improve negotiations between the colleges and the rest of the country, and may perhaps lead to a lowering of the temperature, even in the Ivy leaguer, causes our "elites" in this country are students, and our affluent who should be happy are actually the most discontented of all our citizens.

I hope we ought to remove one of the root causes of that alleged discontent and then see what continues to bug them, and perhaps we can get to the treatment of whatever is the underlying cause of all our citizens.

I hope we give careful consideration to this suggestion. It does not bear an ideological mark; it was suggested as recently as yesterday by Mr. Buckley, a conservative columnist, and it has been suggested by liberals and moderates. I think chiefly it is being suggested by people who are wondering what has gone wrong with today's youth, and in their search for whatever is the underlying irritations. This is one of the proposals which has surfaced and which I think deserves careful consideration.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Michael J. Kirwan, late a Representative from the State of Ohio, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2601) to reorganize the courts of the District of Columbia, to revise the procedures for handling suits by individuals against the United States, to codify title 23 of the District of Columbia Code, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Aiken).

DEATH OF MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, REPRESENTATIVE FROM OHIO

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I know the Senate joins in sorrow for the death of the distinguished dean of the Ohio delegation, Representative Kirwan, of Ohio, and with whom I served in the House of Representatives.

DEATH OF JOHN KUNKEL, FORMER REPRESENTATIVE FROM PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yesterday brought news of the death of another former colleague, the Honorable John G. Kunkel, of Pennsylvania, great-grandson of many Members of Congress, one of whom ran on the ticket for vice president with Henry Clay, and another was a Member of the First Congress.

John Kunkel was a very distinguished man, indeed, who was very much beloved by all. I join by saying that we extend our condolences to his widow, Kitty, and the family, in saying the last sad goodbye to a friend.

RECESS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the Chair.

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

Thereupon, at 10:29 a.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 10:41 p.m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Allen).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Hruska) and I be permitted to proceed for an indefinite period of time during morning hour.

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

INSPECTION OF IMPORTED LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the well-known columnists, Roseoe and Geoffrey Drummond, in one of their columns of recent date, headlined "Is Hruska Beef Bill for Health or Protectionism?" referred to "special-interest Congressmen" who are going to fantastic lengths to take advantage of the high protectionist madness now gripping both the House and the Senate.

This is a direct quotation from the Drummonds' article.

They also say that: Politicians are lining up to hand out the goodies, and they see votes at home when they do.

Again quoting the Drummonds: Just when you think that the worst is over, it isn't. Something more comes out of the legislative cauldron now running a higher speed for no good purpose and oiled for the coming elections.

And who is fashioning the latest bit of high-protectionism gone berserk? None other than two of the normally most thoughtful and careful men in the Senate—the prestigious liberal majority leader, Mike Mansfield of Montana, and the distinguished Republican conservative, Roman Hruska of Nebraska.

They are proposing a restrictive trade measure which shows what can happen when two usually reasonable and responsible men get caught up in the home-industry, protectionism mania on the eve of a congressional election.

Mr. President, I assume that what the Drummonds are referring to is a bill (S. 3942), which was introduced by me some weeks ago, to provide for thorough health and sanitation inspection of all livestock products imported into the United States, and for other purposes.

That bill has nothing to do with imports per se, but it does have a great deal to do with endeavoring to make imported meat as sanitary, as healthful, and as safe as that produced by our domestic producers.

I appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary under date of July 16. I ask unanimous consent that my testimony at that time be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD:

Enforcement of Importation of Meats, July 16, 1970

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, for allowing me to appear before you in behalf of my bill, S. 3942, on inspection of imported meat.

Per capita consumption of beef has grown from 85 pounds in 1960 to 110 pounds last year. We still have an annual meat consumption of 83 pounds per person. The Department of Agriculture is forecasting continued growth, and this bill would be an assurance that the American consumer has confidence in our system of inspection and, therefore, in the quality of the meat allowed to be offered to the public.

In recent years, when proof was offered that some slipshod practices existed in handling of meat, Congress provided for poultry inspection and for improved meat inspection. We have voted the most rigid requirements considered desirable to ensure our own meat packing and processing establishments, and we have voted to require that meat imported into the United States be processed under sanitary conditions so it will meet standards of wholesomeness equal to ours.

We have confidence in the quality and thoroughness of inspection of imported meat was shaken when Dr. John Melcher, a Montana veterinarian who was elected to Congress just a year ago at a special election, described to me what he had learned as a result of a personal inspection into the nature of our inspection of foreign meat plants and of meat as it comes into the United States.

We have only 14 or 15 men who travel the globe to make sure that more than 1,100 foreign packing plants are designed and operated to meet our sanitation requirements, and that the day-to-day inspection of meat as it moves down the packing house lines is equal to the inspection standards and requirements we maintain. The annual report of the inspection branch at USDA shows that none of these men frequently inspect three plants a day, which certainly isn't enough.

In his hour or two visit, he cannot, of course, assure himself that there is pre-mortem and post-mortem examination of all animals butchered around the year, or that there is thorough post-mortem inspection of every carcass on the packing line 365 days a year—that has to be taken on faith that the governments in Central and South America, Oceania, Europe and the East all provide rigid day-to-day inspection equal to ours.

We run a check on the results of the inspection on foreign packing lines as meat arrives in the United States. The equivalent of about 78 man years is devoted to sampling the 1.6 billion pounds of meat imports to make sure that defects in & do not exceed certain tolerances: one minor defect per 390 pounds, one major defect per 400
I have subsequently put into the House Rec-
ord an article from a Melbourne, Australia
paper, reporting a discussion of the inade-
quacy of meat inspection and procedures in
Australia—particularly in the meat pack-
ning industry. Also, an article from the Western Live-
stock Reporter, published at Billings, Mon-\ntana, indicates that the wholesale meat
industry, particularly in the meat pack-
ning plants, is concerned over the idea
that none of the meat produced in the
United States can be inspected, if it is
slaughtered in Argentina and then
transported to the United States.

I would like to make clear at the outset
that, while I am concerned about the volume
of meat, dairy and henny imports into the
United States, the problem of adequate in-
spection of what does come is separate from
any quota problem. If there is a relationship
between volume of imports and inspection,
as distinct from economic consideration in-
volved in imports, then it is that quantity
should be regulated or controlled to the volume
we are equipped to certify for sanitary pro-
tection and, thoroughly inspect before
use in this country.

Certainly this is no time to expand and
equip inspecting plants that we cannot
make sure, of the safety, wholesomeness and sanitation of
what we are getting, for it is presently
questionable.

The bill introduced calls for "thorough
examination and inspection" of animal prod-
ucts, including "all fresh or frozen or chilled
meats after thawing" and before use in this
country. The language is intended to cause the
Secretary of Agriculture and others con-
cerned—members of Congress—also to look
not only at the adequacy of our in-
spection of fresh and frozen meat but also
the wholesomeness and sanitation of the
whole list of animal product imports and be
certain that they meet proper standards.

The phrase "thorough examination and in-
spection" has been used because some
latitude is necessary as to inspection of vari-
ous products: cheese, butter, dairy mixes,
logs and canned meats, eggs and canned
meats. It is the intention of the author of the bill that,
in the case of meats, "thorough examination and
inspection" be done by piece by piece in-
spection of all chilled and uncooked meat,
piece by piece inspection of cooked meat
which arrives here, piece by piece, canned and
bulk cans. piece by piece inspection of meat
in bulk cans after they are opened and before
consumption, and sampling of the contents of
consumer packages, including canned meats.

If legislative history to that effect isn't
enough to make it binding, then the bill
should be amended to make that explicit.

Our surveillance of foreign packing and
processing plants licensed to export to the
United States is not adequate to give us
very positive assurance that the processing
has always been subject to standards for whole-
soteness and sanitation truly equal to ours.

The requirement that consumer packages
indicate the country or origin provides some
warning to consumers, but I think we owe
them more. If we make them re-
(Continued on page 4)

I have spent some time trying to
familiarize myself with details, including
the dockside tests of the United States
authorities on a cargo of meat when it arrives, and I
could easily impose on your time. I will try not to
Because I would like to point out a few
major facts.

In my House remarks, I said that we have
10 "insignia, review offices" also travel
the globe to make sure that regulations, plants,
procedures, sanitary conditions and other
matters of meat production and inspection
are equal to ours, as required by law. I am
now told it is 14 inspectors, a reduction of one
that one is a 6.5% reduction in the size of the
total force! In addition the foreign review officers
listed in the West are not permitted by a State Department ruling to
live abroad in the countries whose plants
they have been designated to inspect. They
consequently are in travel status back and forth
most of the time.

I received a private communication that
the equivalent of 75 man-years of time is devoted to inspecting
meat as it arrives at our docks, and we
have had no change in that figure.

I was supplied figures indicating that we
have about 7,060 full-time and part-time inspect-
ors serving 1,052 meat and poultry proc-
essing plants in the United States. Thereafter I
have been given revised data.

It indicates the following:

It indicates that we have
734 plants in the United States where raw meat is
slaughtered and a 3,224 which slaughter and/or process
red meats, served by 4,637 inspectors. Then
there are 1,004 poultry slaughter and/or process-
ing plants served by 2,750 inspectors. The
meat inspection staff totals 7,807
and 8,057 who are administra-
tors here in Washington or laboratory people,
bringing the grand total personnel involved in

I cannot believe that 14 men, operating
separately, who are not allowed to live abroad
but must commute from the United States
and have to drive three and even four foreign
plants a day in order to visit all of
them at least once a year, can possibly
so travel the globe to make sure that
regulations, plants, procedures, sanitary condi-
tions and other matters of meat production and inspection
are equal to ours.
I don't think the Department of Agriculture believes it either. I have here the ledger showing the import of meat from foreign countries, and there has been kept on imported meat rejections, indicating rejections for one year, the shipping plant number, size of lots, kind of rejection, and the port of rejection. I understand the Department is now computerizing this record, and if there is any number of rejections from which rejections regularly run high, or other coincidences or data in these records which indicate double spots, I believe which our review officers have missed in their hurried visits to the foreign establishments.

It is my understanding, incidentally, that this compilation of rejections was started after the advent of meat import quotas, in order to get a total on pounds rejected so imports to re-located the rejected lots could be entered into the United States.

The need to analyze the rejection data to find trouble spots is indicative of the Department's own belief that violations get by with the force of "review officers" who inspect abroad.

We get 1.8 billion pounds of chilled, cooked and processed meat from the 1100 plants inspected by the 14 review officers. After it arrives here, we put about 70% in meat inspection and pack it away very quickly, into this sanitary procedure based on mathematical probabilities—a sort of poker or roulette system—inspection at the 13% level. Because low cost of free refrigerator space is not available at most of our docks, even the smaller lots are handled with the same kind of inspection done under time pressure. They want to get the cargo moving before it begins to thaw out.

With it being lifted from the hold of a ship, it is assembled into lots on the dock. When a lot has been assembled, an inspection is made by selecting a prescribed number of samples from the 50 to 60 pound boxes of frozen meat in the lot. These are marked and transported to an inspection room, or station, by the importer. The balance of the lot is marked "inspected" and passed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and hurried to refrigerated railroad cars, trucks or storage space to be held until the samples have been inspected and the whole lot can be released—or it is rejected and ordered shipped back out of the United States.

The marked sample boxes are transported by the importer to the inspection station, located at the dock or nearby. There, normally 80-60 boxes of meat are placed with a band saw to take out two-inch cross cuts, or a 4-inch cut. These are then placed in a refrigerator, where they are frozen, thawed and inspected. The fate of the whole lot is decided on the basis of what is found in the slices which constitute about 5% of all the meat involved.

If the inspector finds less than a prescribed number of minor, major or critical defects in a lot, it goes through. If he finds more, up to the certain limit, a second batch of samples is inspected.

The number of samples taken from lots of various sizes and the exact number of defects permitted to pass is indicated in the table. The House remarks are undoubtedly supplied by the Department.

I am told that, statistically, the procedure allows a lot to get past like dirt, clots, blood clot, or certain benign cysts, to pass 50 or 500 pounds, one major defect like hair, blood clot or 400 pounds, and one critical defect, like a substantial dab of manure per 4000 pounds.

I have heard the statement made, Mr. Chairman, that the Inspector-General of the Department of Agriculture inspects the meat, that the meat is going to buy the meat sold.

It is my understanding that U.S. meat inspectors are not the only line to counting the number of defects passing them—they aren't just calling balls and strikes, but standards and sanitary or it is "tanked"—taken out of any line that goes into human food products. The objective is to get all defects out. If our inspectors are overworked, or haven't time to "catch" all the defects in this small percentage, let them be out of the line. Consider how to augment the force. We should not make their shortcomings the basis of the conclusion than thorough inspection of imported meat.

There is evidence that our inspection force needs strengthening—that veterinarians in the force is declining by attrition, at least—and that the force is inadequate to provide full service without excessive over-time. I ask your permission to put in the record a brief statement on this subject that I put in the House record.

At this point, I want to make an additional observation about the need for piece-by-piece inspection of foreign meat. Hour by hour, the inspection of imported meat is mixed with American meat. On the block, our market will decline precipitously. Our American product must be kept up to the highest standards.

And I am concerned about imports because the imported meat is mixed with American in hamburger, it goes into soups, cold cuts, and processed meats, sausage, cold cuts—and becomes indistinguishable from American.

I would beenable to obtain meat that the import inspections of imports might be allowed to undermine confidence in all meat offered at our stores, our markets, our kindergartens. The Department has been shocked by developments in relation to meat inspection since I made my first statement on this subject.

Shortly, afterward, imports of mutton from Austria, after the war, were unwholesome. At this time, a few years ago, I had some debate in the inspection division for two or three years about the need to do inspection again.

The revelations in the Queensland paper I have submitted make me believe that the Department has been doing quite well in this instance. The Minister of Primary Industry for Australia is quoted as saying their packing methods have not—cannot be some compromise between our standards and what they want accepted—simply can't meet the requirements of our law. The law says their plants, procedures and inspection must be "equal" to ours, otherwise one agreement between "dirty" and equal.

There has been tempering with process by this respectability. I would be extremely sensitive, the General Accounting Office report indicates tempering in some plants here at home which is just as unhealthy, for example, the single shoulder of beef or mutton than to reject tons and tons of meat because they found a defect or two too many. Even in instances where domestic inspectors check lots of 20-100,000 pounds of meat—16 tons—were to be rejected and ordered out of the country for a few too many minor defects.

They weren't making 164 decisions—they were making the 56,000 kind under the same conditions. I think it is shameful and, on a domestic slaughtering line.

It is just common sense to know that an inspection in the Queensland office, for example, a single shoulder of beef or mutton than to reject tons and tons of meat because he found a defect or too many. Even in instances where domestic inspectors check lots of 20-100,000 pounds of meat—16 tons—were to be rejected and ordered out of the country for a few too many minor defects.

Piece by piece inspection is inevitably better than inspection of units with values running into five and six figures. Three faults in the system appear to be self-evident:

1. Foreign review officers are spread too far apart. They are not in a position to keep our market will go if what we produce is not satisfactory. By doing so we jeopardize the belief that the United States—any store, any restaurant or hot dog stand or any dinner table in the United States—any store, any restaurant or hot dog stand or any dinner table in the United States—any store, any restaurant or hot dog stand or any dinner table is cooking wholesome, wholesome, wholesome quality meat that we want and can be confident we had. There is absolutely nothing more important to the livestock industry than complete confidence and absolute assurance that the meat she buys at the retail store is healthful, sanitary and wholesome.

If the housewife loses confidence in what is in the freezer, or on the butcher's block, our market will decline precipitously. Our American product must be kept up to the highest standards.

Mr. Mansfield. Mr. President, Representative MOLCHEN is the original author of this proposed legislation. He is one of the best known veterinarians in the northwestern part of our Nation. He is a
good, sound Congressman, and he knows the livestock industry as very few other Members of Congress do. What we are endeavoring to do, I repeat, is to apply the same standards for wholesome meat to imports that we apply to our domestic production.

My testimony before the committee appeared in a previous memoir, and it pointed out that we have only 14 or 15 men who travel the globe to make sure that more than 1,100 foreign pack-plants are designed and operated to meet our sanitation requirements, and that the day-to-day inspection of meat as it moves down the packinghouse line is equal to the inspection standards and requirements we maintain. The annual report of the inspection branch at USDA shows that one of these men frequently inspects three plants a day, which certainly is not much of an inspection of the plant, the premortem or postmortem procedures, the boning, cooking or freezing, packing, and handling of meat destined to the United States. In a month or two visit, he cannot, of course, assure himself that there is premortem examination of all animals butchered around the clock, that there is thorough premortem inspection of every carcass on the packing line 365 days a year—that has to be taken on faith that the government or the Inspector or the Meat Inspection force is doing its job. And so I repeat that the proposal that has been pending for the past year, which would interfere in the same requirements applicable to our own imports should apply to these foreign imports.

It is interesting to note that in this column by the Drummonds, the heading is "Hruska Beef Bill for Health or Protectionism?" To the best of my knowledge, while I know the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Hruska) is very sympathetic to this proposed legislation, I do not know that his name was not on the measure when it was considered before the committee. I must admit I do not know what Hruska Beef Bill it is, one of which the distinguished Senator from Nebraska introduced some time ago, which has passed both bodies, which has been signed by the President, and which is now the law of the land. But I defer at this time to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, who can explain his position far better than I can.

Mr. Hruska. If the Senator will yield, the Senator from Nebraska would say that he also carefully inspected the bill that was introduced by the Senator from Montana, and his name does not appear as a cosponsor of that bill.

Mr. President, I want to minimize the offenses more accurately, or otherwise, of the authors of the article in question. I ask unanimous consent at this time, with the permission of the Senator from Montana, to join him as a cosponsor of his bill, so that we will correct that part of the column, even though it is on a news pro tunc basis.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. With unanimous consent it is so ordered.

Mr. Mansfield. I am delighted to have the distinguished Senator from Nebraska as a cosponsor, because, in my opinion, he is the leader of the Senators in this Chamber, both Democratic and Republican, in trying to bring home a better understanding of what the beef industry stands for in this country, and also in pointing out the humane aspects of the inspection of foreign meats in the marketplace and beef on the hoof.

Mr. Hruska. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana this question: He well knows that Public Law 90-301, which is the Meat Inspection Act of 1967, contains provisions, under section 20 thereof, requiring that foreign meat products imported for human consumption be prohibited entry unless the exporting country complies with all inspection and building standards and other requirements applicable to such articles produced and inspected within the United States.

My question is this: Is it not a fact that the bill introduced by the Senator from Montana, and now cosponsored by the Senator from Nebraska, in addition to several other Senators, simply seeks to extend the provisions which have been law for 3 years now, and to make it more accurate and to make it more effective, to see that only wholesome meats are imported into this country.

Mr. Mansfield. The Senator is correct. I might add that the purpose is to equalize the situation between imported meats and domestically produced meats.

Mr. Hruska. I am confident that the authors of the article would not take any other position but that any meats which are imported should comply with the law of this land, because the objective of the law of this land is to protect the consumer; and that is exactly the purpose of the Mansfield bill.

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

Mr. Hruska. I am happy to yield.

Mr. Mansfield. May I say that that is the view of the Department of Agriculture, which is against this proposal for reasons which I cannot understand, even though I have in my hand the letter written by Mr. Hruska to the Under Secretary, addressed to the Honorable Allen J. Ellender, under date of July 16, 1970. With it is a USDA statement on standards and activities for preventing introduction of animal diseases.

It is most interesting that our own Department of Agriculture is in opposition to a bill which seeks only to achieve for imported meats what we now demand of domestically produced meats. This is such a simple, straightforward bill, having nothing to do with imports, that it was a shock to me to find that the U.S. Department of Agriculture was in opposition to giving this kind of a fair deal, a square deal, to the American meat producers.

Mr. Hruska. Mr. President, normally we talk of Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond as among the most careful and articulate of the newspaper columnists in their utterances.

Mr. Mansfield. And they usually are.

Mr. Hruska. It is surprising and disappointing, therefore, to find them engaging in careless and reckless misstatements when one of their personal causes or pet articles of faith comes under attack.

I refer to a column which appeared in some of the Nation's newspapers yesterday relating to proposals to tighten up on the sanitary inspection of foreign meat imported into this country for American consumption. To Mr. Drummond and his son, evidently the cause of foreign trade is so sacred that no consideration—not even the need to protect the health of the American public—must be permitted to stand in its way. Sanitary inspection procedures accepted by most meat inspectors for human consumption are treated as deliberate harassments and "protectionist" obstacles when applied to food products brought here from foreign sources.

Regrettably, the column by the Drummonds contains a number of specific mis-statements of fact which need correction.
It imputes motives to the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) and to the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CHAMBERS), which are unworthy. It says that legislation presented as a "health" bill is really a "keep out imported meat" bill. By insinuation and artifice it suggests all sorts of devious actions on the part of these two Senators. These various implications and suggestions are untrue. The record shows it, and shows it over a series of years, and the record in connection with the article ought to be set straight.

In the Drummond column it is stated that "Senators MANSFIELD and HRUSKA know that health-endangering meat is not being imported into the United States."

The fact is, Mr. President, that health-endangering meat has been imported into the United States and we know that to a fact because the Department of Agriculture has told us so. To give an example, several months ago, the Department of Agriculture found it necessary to close off all Australian mutton because the Australian inspection system on mutton is not adequate. It is not close to the standards we impose on our own industry. Until the deficiencies in the Australian system are corrected, we must insist on no more Australian mutton coming into this country. That ban was imposed more than 2 months ago, and the Australians have not yet raised their requirements to meet our standards.

Mr. HRUSKA. The press release is dated May 11, and it was received in my office a few days later. The opening sentences read as follows:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture announced today that Australian mutton shipped this year may not be imported into the United States. The action was taken by USDA's Consumer and Marketing Services which administers the Federal Meat Inspection Act.

When the Australian inspection system is deficient in that carcass identification is not adequate for proper inspection, disposition of questionable carcasses is not in accordance with requirements, and dressing and handling procedures are inadequate

CAMS said that the Australian inspection system is deficient in that carcass identification is not adequate for proper inspection, disposition of questionable carcasses is not in accordance with requirements, and dressing and handling procedures are inadequate.

The facts prove the contrary. It is true that there is a law on the books designed to a put a limit on the amount of meat that can be imported into this country. That act was passed in 1964. It is known as the Hruska amendment, adopted for that purpose. However, it is a perfectly straightforward law—there is nothing gimmicky about it. The quota on imports permitted is a very substantial quota, under the law and the procedures we have followed for an increase in the quota each year to be adjusted according to the increase of consumption of meat in the domestic market.

By recent action of the President, the quantity of fresh, chilled, and frozen beef, veal, mutton, and goat permitted to enter in 1971 will be 1,140 million pounds. The quantity of meat is greater than the quantity admitted in any previous year since foreign meat producers were permitted to share in the growth of the U.S. market with the domestic industry under the law.

As to the allegation that sanitary restrictions are simply a gimmick to close off imports of meat, the same question was raised with respect to an amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska during consideration of the legislation which became the Wholemeat Import Act of 1967.

It was at that point that the amendment to section 20, already referred to, of Public Law 90-510, was adopted which forbids and prohibits entry into the United States foreign meat products imported for human consumption, unless the export country is accredited by the inspection and building standards and all regulations applicable to such articles and produce and inspections within the United States.

Mr. CHAMBERS said that the Australian inspection system is deficient in that carcass identification is not adequate for proper inspection, disposition of questionable carcasses is not in accordance with requirements, and dressing and handling procedures are inadequate.

Mr. HRUSKA. The press release is dated May 11, and it was received in my office a few days later. The opening sentences read as follows:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture announced today that Australian mutton shipped this year may not be imported into the United States. The action was taken by USDA's Consumer and Marketing Services which administers the Federal Meat Inspection Act.

CAMS said that the Australian inspection system is deficient in that carcass identification is not adequate for proper inspection, disposition of questionable carcasses is not in accordance with requirements, and dressing and handling procedures are inadequate.

It seems to me that any one who would seek to quarry the Department of Agriculture on the basis of statements that they use for official action of this kind involving another government has a big task to convince, if we want to put a "gimmick" to throttle the channels of trade, as charged by the Drummonds.

Next, the Drummond column states that "Senators MANSFIELD and HRUSKA know that health-endangering meat is not being imported into the United States."

The fact is, Mr. President, that health-endangering meat has been imported into the United States and we know that to a fact because the Department of Agriculture has told us so. To give an example, several months ago, the Department of Agriculture found it necessary to close off all Australian mutton because the Australian inspection system on mutton is not adequate. It is not close to the standards we impose on our own industry. Until the deficiencies in the Australian system are corrected, we must insist on no more Australian mutton coming into this country. That ban was imposed more than 2 months ago, and the Australians have not yet raised their requirements to meet our standards.

Mr. HRUSKA. The press release is dated May 11, and it was received in my office a few days later. The opening sentences read as follows:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture announced today that Australian mutton shipped this year may not be imported into the United States. The action was taken by USDA's Consumer and Marketing Services which administers the Federal Meat Inspection Act.

CAMS said that the Australian inspection system is deficient in that carcass identification is not adequate for proper inspection, disposition of questionable carcasses is not in accordance with requirements, and dressing and handling procedures are inadequate.

It seems to me that any one who would seek to quarry the Department of Agriculture on the basis of statements that they use for official action of this kind involving another government has a big task to convince, if we want to put a "gimmick" to throttle the channels of trade, as charged by the Drummonds.

Next, the Drummond column states that "Senators MANSFIELD and HRUSKA know that health-endangering meat is not being imported into the United States."

The fact is, Mr. President, that health-endangering meat has been imported into the United States and we know that to a fact because the Department of Agriculture has told us so. To give an example, several months ago, the Department of Agriculture found it necessary to close off all Australian mutton because the Australian inspection system on mutton is not adequate. It is not close to the standards we impose on our own industry. Until the deficiencies in the Australian system are corrected, we must insist on no more Australian mutton coming into this country. That ban was imposed more than 2 months ago, and the Australians have not yet raised their requirements to meet our standards.

Mr. HRUSKA. The press release is dated May 11, and it was received in my office a few days later. The opening sentences read as follows:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture announced today that Australian mutton shipped this year may not be imported into the United States. The action was taken by USDA's Consumer and Marketing Services which administers the Federal Meat Inspection Act.

CAMS said that the Australian inspection system is deficient in that carcass identification is not adequate for proper inspection, disposition of questionable carcasses is not in accordance with requirements, and dressing and handling procedures are inadequate.

It seems to me that any one who would seek to quarry the Department of Agriculture on the basis of statements that they use for official action of this kind involving another government has a big task to convince, if we want to put a "gimmick" to throttle the channels of trade, as charged by the Drummonds.
livestock producers are endeavoring to build a fence around this country to keep foreign producers out, and we say that fences stop trade in both directions.

If those quotations do indeed, in full context, represent the views of the American Meat Institute, they seem to me to militate against a key tenet of a tabulation recently published by the Department of Agriculture, imports of foreign livestock, meat and meat products in 1969 were $1,105 million, compared with similar exports to foreign markets of only $427 million. Exports exceeded imports in a ratio of nearly 3 to 1 in 1969 and no doubt the experience of 1969 was similar.

Now, then, as to whether that 1964 amendment was protectionist, we had that out a number of years ago. It was discussed thoroughly during the negotiations that Secretary Orville Freeman of the Department of Agriculture had with the industry in the international arena, and he was referring to the amendment of 1964 when he said the following words:

Ordering a trade war is not a call for reasonable protection of our industry—nor protectionism. There's a big difference. Reasonable protection allows trade to flow. It permits comparative advantage to function with relative freedom for the good of all. Protectionism, by completely shielding inefficient producers from competition, stifles trade.

Secretary Freeman then went on to say:

The U.S. beef quota law illustrates what I mean by reasonable protection.

Mr. President, I quote now from one of his 1968 statements endorsing what he called the orderly trading in the international arena, and he was referring to the amendment of 1964 when he said the following words:

Ordering a trade war is not a call to designate this as being a protectionist measure and a protectionist step.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the statement from the Honorable Fred Taft that appears on pages 9-21, 10-9, 1-1, and 11-2 of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which summarizes U.S. imports and exports of live stock, meat, and meat products in 1968.

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

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, July 27, 1968]

Is USCA Security for Health or Protective Nuisance?

(By Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond)

WASHINGTON—Special-interest congressmen are grappling with the task of taking advantage of the high-protectionist madness now gripping both the House and the Senate. Industries are lining up in clusters to grab a share of the protectionist favors—domestic market walling out competition from imports. This lets prices go where they will, which is up. Politicians are lining up to hand out the goodies, and they see votes at home when they do.

Just when you think that the worst is over, it isn't. Nothing more comes out of the legislative factory now running at high speed for no good purpose and oiling for the coming elections.

And who is fashioning the latest bit of high-protectionism gone berserk? None other than thoughtful and careful men in the Senate—the distinguished liberal majority leader, Mike Mansfield of Montana, and the Republican conservative, Roman Hruska of Nebraska.

They are proposing a restrictive trade measure which shows what can happen when two usually reasonable and responsible men get caught up in the home-industry, protectionist mania on the eve of a congressional election.

It's a regulatory use if there is a good bill, then the liberal two-way trading policy which has brought so much prosperity to the United States is bad. The bill is presented as a “health” bill—which isn't—as a keep-out-imported-meat bill, which it is.

Its purpose is described as providing for “thorough health and sanitation inspection of all livestock imported into the United States.” And it is specifically added that every can, every pound of fresh, frozen or chilled meat or sausage shall be inspected piece-by-piece at its entry.

Senator Mansfield and Hruska know that health-endorsement is not being imported into the United States. They know that Americans are not dying or being made sick by poisoned meat.

They know their proposed additional inspection is a trick, a gimmick designed to close up loopholes. They know that their bill would mainly hurt the poor, because the imports they are trying to keep out are mainly ingredients for hamburger and sausage.

Maybe some few livestock men somewhere—in Montana or Nebraska or elsewhere—will find themselves benefited, but certainly not the consumer, certainly not agriculture as a whole and certainly not the nation's total economy.

This is special-interest protectionism at its worst.

The health issue is phony. Says Dr. H. M. Steinenof the Consumer and Marketing Service of the Agriculture Department: “The President's Meat Inspection Bill is equivalent to that produced under federal inspection in our country.”

It is American agriculture a limping industry which can't compete in the world market? Not at all. U.S. farmers exported a near record of $66 billion in farm commodities in the last 12 months and this is a billion dollars more in commercial sales than the year before.

We sell abroad far more farm commodities than we buy abroad—over a third of our wheat, over 40 percent of our soybeans, over 60 percent of our rice. And if we apply unnecessary, discriminatory "sanitary" restrictions against our goods, the United States would inevitably be retaliated.

I am one of the reasons why Alred P. Davies, vice president of the American Meat Institute, opposes the Mann-Harris bill.

"The meat industry," he says, "now finds a market in foreign countries of half a billion dollars a year for livestock products. While the advocates of protection for U.S. livestock producers are endeavoring to build a fence around this country to keep foreign products out, they will discover that fences stop trade in both directions."

I fear some President will throw a veto if such madness as this gets through Congress.

[From the U.S. Department of Agriculture]

USDA Announces Temporary Ban on Imports of Australian Mutton

The U.S. Department of Agriculture announced today that Australian mutton slaughtered after May 15 may not be imported into the United States under the trade agreement recently taken by USDA's Consumer and Marketing Service which administers the Federal Meat Inspection.

C&MS said that the Australian inspection system for mutton is deficient that carcasses are not examined when they enter the country. It is not in accordance with requirements of the United States.

C&MS said that these deficiencies in the Australian inspection system applied only to sheep slaughtering plants.

C&MS said that imports of Australian mutton this date will be resumed when the deficiencies are corrected.

Federal law requires that, before a country may export meat to the United States, it must have and enforce inspection laws and regulations equal to those which apply to meat products in the United States.

[From the U.S. Department of Agriculture]

New Meat Import Provisions Announced

The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture have been instructed by the President to set new voluntary restraint levels on meat imports under Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Accordingly, Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin announced today that 1970 imports of meat subject to the Meat Import Act are now estimated at 1,140 million pounds. The new estimate is based upon revised restraint levels for principal foreign suppliers for calendar 1970.

The President has issued a proclamation pursuant to Section 2(c) (1) of Public Law 86-661 limiting imports on certain meats—primarily beef and mutton—subject to the Act. At the same time he suspended that limitation.

The President suspended the limitation after determining that this action is required by overriding economic interests of the United States giving special weight on the importance to the nation of the economic well-being of the domestic livestock industry. The President also indicated that imports would not be permitted to enter without limitation during the balance of this year.

The Secretary of State has also announced the voluntary restraint program which has been negotiated with the Governments of the principal foreign suppliers that those imports of these meats will not exceed 1,140 million pounds during calendar 1970.

In his proclamation the President said this action applies only to the balance of the cur-
rent year and does not establish a precedent for action which may be taken in 1971.

Secretary Hardin also stated that he is today taking steps which would stop further transhipments through a third country of meat originating in Australia, New Zealand and Ireland. The transshipments of meat from Australia to New Zealand and Ireland have been a significant contribut or to the need for increasing the third country estimate.

The Secretary also stated that authority to issue regulations limiting imports of certain meats under Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1967 has been delegated by the President to the Secretary of Agriculture, under an Executive Order issued simultaneously with the Proclamation and suspension of action on which is to increasing the third country estimate.

Public Law 88-482, enacted in August 1964, provides that if yearly imports of certain meats—primarily beef and mutton—are estimated to equal or exceed 110 percent of an adjusted base quota, the President is required to invoke a quota on imports of these meats. The adjusted base quota for 1970 is 988.8 million pounds. The amount of estimated imports which would trigger its imposition is 110 percent of the adjusted base quota of 1,088.7 million pounds.

Imports of meat by months from January 1967 through May 1970 were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPORTS OF MEAT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC LAW 88-482 BY MONTHS</th>
<th>[in million pounds]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>804.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rejections which occur after entry are made in the aggregate, the figures and amounted to 13,950,000 pounds during 1969.

[Extract from Senate Report No. 91277]

FOREIGN MEAT INSPECTION PROGRAM

Public Law 90-201, the Meat Inspection Act of 1967, contained provisions under section 204 of the Act that foreign meat of products imported for human consumption be prohibited entry unless the exporting country complied with inspection and building standards, and other regulations applicable to such products produced and inspected within the United States.

The Secretary of Agriculture must certify that approved foreign meat processing plants, which slaughter or process meat products for export to the United States, "have complied with requirements at least equal to" all provisions of the Act and regulations. In summary, the Secretary must impose standards and procedures for foreign meat plants equivalent to those imposed by the Department of Agriculture on meat slaughtering and processing plants which ship in interstate commerce.

Based on committee findings and the hearings on this bill, it is evident that the departmental regulations and requirements designed in foreign meat processing plants do not specifically require those governments to establish and maintain an independent regulatory body with periodic inspection of plants and a periodic program of supervision equivalent to the U.S. inspection program.—under which highly trained veterinarians conduct periodic periods of scheduled visits to U.S. federally supervised meatpacking and processing establishments.

The purpose of visits and inspections by specialized veterinarians in the U.S. federal inspec tion program is to certify that the standards of performance maintained in plant facilities, and by the regular inspection personnel assigned to these plants, are at least equal to all provisions of the Act and regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture, and is effective to the Meat Inspection Act.

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to institute prompt changes in current regulations dealing with the foreign meat inspection program under Section 204, which will require foreign governments interested in exporting meat products to the United States to establish standards and procedures as an equivalent of periodic supervision and inspection of the plants that such countries are to maintain for the purpose of U.S. meat inspection and operating requirements. It is expected that such revised regulations will require that these be a minimum of at least one supervisory review inspection each month in addition to the regular inspection reports, and it is expected that the reports of findings will be made available to U.S. veterinary personnel upon request, with a request, with a request, with a request. The new regulations, printed in the Federal Register, are scheduled to be in effect by January 27, 1971.
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Based on committee findings and the hearings on this bill, it is evident that the departmental regulations and requirements designed in foreign meat processing plants do not specifically require those governments to establish and maintain an independent regulatory body with periodic inspection of plants and a periodic program of supervision equivalent to the U.S. inspection program.—under which highly trained veterinarians conduct periodic periods of scheduled visits to U.S. federally supervised meatpacking and processing establishments.
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foreign products out, they will discover that fences stop trade in both directions.”
No wonder President Nixon threatens a veto if such madness as this gets through Congress.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am grateful that the Senator from Montana brought this subject up. I was most happy to join him in this colloquy. It will no doubt set the record straight with men of good faith, and in the exchange of views and the information here perhaps their views will change a bit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If they do, I think it will be because of the clarity with which the distinguished Senator from Nebraska expressed himself and explained the situation which confronts us on the basis of the column which was published throughout the Nation.