argument, it takes time to get at those things, and this quota would be in effect until we really got at those problems. Is that correct?

Mr. PATTON. That is one of the purposes of the bill. There are so many complications involved in world trade, including some of the things you have just mentioned, that it is going to take time to get this whole new posture of world trade properly set up as far as the United States is concerned, and in the interim we ought to have this protection.

Mr. CURTIS. This makes a big difference as to whether we encourage these foreign nations to eliminate those practices, rather than for us, in turn, to emulate them. I wanted to be sure that we were in agreement on the thrust of what we should be doing in the ensuing years.

Should we be trying to encourage these other nations to stop subsidizing——

Mr. PATTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. Or try to drop what we might consider our own unfair trade practices.

Mr. PATTON. I would hope ultimately we would have a situation evolve in world trade where we could say that we were all playing in the same ball park.

In the interim, however, we don't want the American steel industry to go down the drain. We want protection now.

Mr. CURTIS. I won't prolong this further. I thought that was your position, and I might state here that I certainly will listen to such a proposition, because as long as I see in which direction our thrust is, then I am a little bit wiser.

You give us the picture as far as actual steel production, but not that which concerns all aspects of steel.

For instance, we export a great deal of structural steel as well as heavy machinery and automobiles that are made from steel, and I do think it is important to have a complete picture before this committee.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Abel has that picture. He presented it in his statement.

Mr. CURTIS. Is that item in here, Mr. Abel?

Mr. ABEL. Yes, sir. It shows roughly an adverse balance of about $500 million a year on steel products, equipment made of steel. That is contrary to the general belief.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, it is contrary to what I had thought was the picture as far as steel products are concerned.

Mr. ABEL. As a matter of fact, what I say in the statement is simply this, that we have been a deficit nation in the value of direct steel trade since 1962. The current deficit amounts to about $900 million, but more than that, we are still a deficit Nation when we take into consideration indirect steel trade, that is, trade in which steel is used in manufactured products.

In 1966, our total steel trade balance was in a deficit position by almost $500 million.

Mr. CURTIS. What I need to do, then, is to supply to you the figures I have seen on this in order to have them reconciled with your figures, and I will do that through correspondence, and we can look at that.

Mr. PATTON. Thank you, sir. We will be glad to get them.

(The following material was received by the committee:)