

The basic fact is that the United States is not now, and does not expect to be in the foreseeable future, self-sufficient in lead and zinc mine production.

Quotas will not put ore in the ground where it does not already exist.

Furthermore, as findings of the Tariff Commission have already determined, lead and zinc imports are not a matter of cheap labor or low manufacturing costs abroad. The governing factor in the economics of mining is the grade of ore in the ground and the nature of the ore body.

I will stop there, if I may, sir. I would just like to add one comment, which is not part of my printed testimony.

There have been certain suggestions, and I believe something like the Herlong bill is one, which I would call blanket type suggestions, which might cover all commodities under certain circumstances.

I would very much wish to go on record as expressing our opposition to this type of blanket protection for any industry.

We believe that the problems confronting each industry, and we have heard quite a lot, or I have, today, of the nature of steel and other products, are so very different that I think it is most important that each industry be dealt with on its own merits, and not lumped together under any blanket bill.

I think that would be a catastrophe.

Thank you very much, gentlemen. I appreciate you having stayed in late in the day to hear me.

(Mr. Fletcher's prepared statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF AUBREY FLETCHER, C. TENNANT, SONS & Co., OF NEW YORK

My name is Aubrey Fletcher. I am Executive Vice President of C. Tennant, Sons & Co., of New York, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before you to present my Company's general views on the matter of lead and zinc import quotas and our specific views on H.R. 51. C. Tennant, Sons & Co., of New York is an American corporation with headquarters in New York City. As merchants engaged in foreign commerce for over 100 years, and in the trade of non-ferrous metals and ores for nearly 50 years, we wish to submit this statement registering our opposition to lead and zinc import quotas.

1. *Record of Tariff Commission's Opposition to Lead and Zinc Quotas*

Over the past 15 years or so a great number of hearings have been held, some before the Tariff Commission and others before Committees of Congress, in order to study various proposals designed to provide added protection for the domestic lead/zinc industry. As a result, in 1958 a system of import quotas were imposed by the Administration in the hope that they would provide the domestic industry with the protection they were seeking, but after 7 years they were removed having failed in their objective.

The Tariff Commission, which has studied the lead-zinc situation exhaustively, and on many occasions over the past 15 years, has expressed itself fully on the unsuitability of import quotas as a means of protecting the domestic lead/zinc industry.

The Commission first expressed an adverse opinion on lead and zinc quotas 14 years ago in its report to the President of May 1954 (Page 30). Subsequently, Commissioners Sutton, Jones and Dowling devoted 31 pages in the Commission's report of April 1958 to a thorough and explicit statement of their findings, which constitute an excellent summation of the reasons why quotas would be undesirable and harmful to the U.S. lead-zinc industry.

At that time the Commissioners stated (Page 85 of their Report) "we reject quotas as a feasible remedy in this instance" and in the next paragraph they go on to state that in their opinion "the imposition of quotas would be definitely harmful to the best interests of domestic lead and zinc producers."