

Mr. CURTIS. Is your organization going to testify on the administration bill?

Mr. PATTON. I cannot answer that at this moment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Abel, would you comment on that?

Mr. ABEL. Frankly, Mr. Congressman, we support the position of the AFL-CIO on that measure, and Andy Biemiller has testified on certain provisions of it and objecting to certain other provisions.

Mr. CURTIS. I see. Your testimony here has been confined to this position you have talked about.

Mr. ABEL. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. To get all this in context, what position does your industry take, Mr. Patton, in respect to the Kennedy round? Has that in any way aggravated the problem of the steel industry, or do you feel you are largely unaffected?

I don't think too much went on there in steel products, but I would like to get whatever position the steel industry has with respect to the impact of the Kennedy round.

Mr. PATTON. My our position with respect to the Kennedy round is that it had not too much impact on our problems. Our problems were far and beyond the Kennedy round.

The slight reduction in steel imports which were involved in the Kennedy round didn't change the problems of the steel industry in any material respect.

They were there before and they are more there, in an emphatic way, than they were before.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, your problem with the Kennedy round was not what it did, but what it didn't do that might have helped?

Mr. PATTON. I think that would be a fair observation.

Mr. CURTIS. The same question to you, Mr. Abel: Has your union taken a position on evaluating the Kennedy round?

Mr. ABEL. We supported the Kennedy round action, but our position has been and still is pretty much as Mr. Patton has said, on the basis that our industry is primarily a domestic industry and not too much concerned with the export market, and so the Kennedy round and the tariff arrangement doesn't have too much impact.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Patton, I am anxious to pursue, not necessarily here, but perhaps by memorandum, the line of questioning earlier on the use of the national security machinery, OEP. I don't know anyone who disagrees with your point that a viable and vital steel industry is essential to the security of this nation, or any nation.

But I would appreciate a memorandum—perhaps that would be the best way—as to what the industry has done through the OEP, including whether or not you feel that the machinery there is inadequate to meet the national security aspect of the steel problem.

Mr. PATTON. We will be glad to file such a memorandum with you, Mr. Curtis. We are convinced, however, that any relief through administrative agencies is not realistic.

(The following information was received by the committee:)

DISCUSSIONS OF STEEL IMPORTS WITH OEP—RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS
BY CONGRESSMAN CURTIS

As Mr. Patton indicated in his testimony on June 18, 1968, representatives of the steel industry have discussed the national security aspect of steel imports with members of the staff of the Office of Emergency Planning.