We believe you gentlemen will agree that it should be the responsibility of the Congress to encourage a strengthening of our domestic industrial economy and that, while recognizing the need for essential protection of the health and welfare of all citizens, caution must be used to avoid unjustified injury to America's industrial might.

For a number of years, there has been general recognition that America must maintain its self-sufficiency of a number of essential raw materials as a simple fact of national security. Political or military crises could—and have—shut off our supplies of oil, tin, natural rubber, sugar, and many other essential commodities in the past, and this Nation cannot afford to be in a position where another such event could deprive us of things necessary both to our life and strength.

I could talk for hours on this point—in fact, if all I have said to various committees of the Congress since 1959 on the national security dangers of excessive imports of residual fuel oil were made a part of this record the Government Printing Office probably could not have it ready for publication before the Congress adjourns.

I will only cite the most recent warning I have seen, from a responsible, concerned, high Government official.

Speaking of crude oil, but in a context that is equally applicable to any other essential fuels, metals or raw materials, Assistant Secretary of the Interior J. Cordell Moore told the Rocky Mountain Oil and Gas Association on March 27 that it is essential "that the United States have an assured, plentiful supply at the lowest practical cost.

"—Plentiful, because we will need to find at least 4¼ billion barrels of new oil each year just to replace what we take out of the ground.

"—Assured, because we cannot afford to be dependent upon sources which might be denied us through war or political instability."

Now, to this compelling national security factor has been added a new—and, to us, unprecedented—reason for self-sufficiency of essential supplies. We no longer can afford to purchase more and more of them abroad, which we, nevertheless, are doing each year.

That is, perhaps, a drastic way of saying that we have to curtail our spending for overseas purchases of things we can produce, or substitute for, at home. But it is basically true. Anyone who has watched the dwindling of our gold reserves, the continuing deficit of our foreign payments balance sheets, and the steady inroads into our domestic market of critical minerals and fuels by foreign supplies cannot help but be alarmed.

I don't want to go too far afield here, and I certainly recognize that the foreign trade and balance-of-payments situation involves much more than purchases of fuels and other raw materials. Nevertheless, I think they are legitimate and crucial factors when we are considering the wisdom of adopting new restrictions which may further weaken the competitive position of domestic supplies vis-a-vis those in other countries.

I likewise fully recognize the desirability of maintaining substantial trade with other nations, with the legitimate interests of each trading nation properly accepted and protected. Because of our technical and industrial development, our trade balance, as contrasted to our payment balance, remains favorable, and this was written 10 days ago and they tell me since the first quarter of this year there is a deficit, too, some two and three-tenths billion.