

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

---

1958

### Discussion of S. 4036

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, "Discussion of S. 4036" (1958). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 261.

[https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches/261](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/261)

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).

Statement of Senator Mike Mansfield (D., Montana)

Mr. President:

S. 4036, now before the Senate for consideration, is both necessary and in the public interest. I know there are people who will say that subsidies are not justifiable, but I believe that in view of the circumstances confronting the mining industry, that, in this case, they most certainly are. As a matter of fact, the one-year, one-shot program, under which 150,000 tons of copper will be bought and placed in the strategic stockpile, is the only way in which that domestic industry can be helped at the present time, more mines kept from being closed down, and more people retained on the job.

The stocks of copper on hand ~~in the United States~~ as of April 30, 1958, comprise 241,624 tons in the United States and 227,330 tons outside the United States. This comprises a grand total of 468,954 tons. If the legislation now before us passes, it will mean roughly that within a year's period the copper surplus <sup>in the U.S.</sup> would be reduced to around 100,000 tons. This is a normal carry-over and would help greatly to alleviate the strain on the copper market, bring about a degree of price stabilization upward, and restore stability in the economy and employment outlook in this field.

I would point out that many copper camps are wholly dependent upon the production of just this one vital commodity. When copper goes

down, the camp goes down with it. In Butte, Montana, where a depression has been in effect since January, 1957, employment is down 63% among the miners and over 75% among the craftsmen working in and around the mines. You can well imagine what this means to this city and what its effect on the rest of the State is bound to be.

I would point out to my colleagues that the mining industry has been hit the hardest and the longest of any segment of our economy. I would point out also that the purchase of 150,000 tons of copper to go into a government stockpile would not only be good business in keeping this amount out of the price field, but would also be good business on the part of the government in having a ready reserve - an inventory, so to speak - of this strategic metal. Copper does not deteriorate or lose its value. Copper, at a price up to 27-1/2¢ is, in my opinion, a bargain for the government of the United States, especially in view of the fact that under previous contracts some copper is still being bought at a price above that level.

To me it seems to be a well-thought-out and considered choice as offered in S. 4036 or the imposition of tariffs to protect mining. It appears to me that the proposal before us offers us all the necessary safeguards in that it calls for quarterly production quotas, its operation outside of copper is limited to five years, and while the cost will be roughly \$161 million in the first year, this cost will decline substantially in the following four years if for no other reason than that the copper program will be completed.

I have been noticing some interesting stories which have been appearing in the press of late. One has to do with Mine la Motte, a lead mine in southeastern Missouri which will be closed on July 12th after 240 years of operation. The reason - high cost of production - low prices. I have also noted in a recent issue of the New York Times where one tungsten mine is in operation in the United States today, whereas just three years ago something on the order of 700 tungsten mines were operating. According to my information at the present time there are about 375 lead mines, 650 zinc mines and 475 copper mines. If relief is not forthcoming, more and more of these mines are going to go down, and many of them will stay down because it is too expensive a proposition putting them into operation again.

I can speak of mining with some degree of knowledge because, as one who worked in the <sup>copper</sup> mines in Butte, Montana, <sup>and</sup> Bisbee, Arizona, as well as in the Couer d'Alene mining district in Idaho, I have lived in some of these camps during good times and bad times. I knew at first-hand how a shut-down in Butte, Montana affects not only the miners, but their families, the businessmen in the community, and other operations depending upon the mine payroll for a livelihood. I know also that when a mine goes down, it begins to fill with water, the timbers break, and the breast and walls fall in. You can readily comprehend how expensive and how difficult it would be to restore mines in this condition back to a normal operating base.

I plead with my colleagues to give this most important matter not only their most serious consideration - which I know you are doing, but to approve of this legislation. It may seem to effect only a small segment of our economy, but I want to assure you that while this may be true, it effects one of the most important segments of our economy and its effects will be felt far beyond the raw production mining areas. You cannot pick up a mine and transfer it to another part of the country, nor can you bring in a substitute industry to take the place of mines once they start production. As a former hardrock miner who, I repeat, has lived through the ups and downs of the mining industry at firsthand, I would, as strongly as I know how, urge my colleagues to approve this measure because it is not only in the interests of a sound mining economy, but it is in the interests of the United States as well. It is one way of meeting a difficult problem without doing damage to our trade relationships abroad, and it is one way to avoid the dangerous trend in unemployment and insecurity which is rapidly becoming the norm in the mining industry. May I repeat, that in buying approximately 150,000 tons of copper over a one-year period at not to exceed 27-1/2¢ a pound, the government can not lose.

In behalf of the people of Montana and the other mining States of this Nation, I urge that the Senate give favorable consideration to this legislation.