

Senator MORSE. Mr. Johnson, I think that is a very fair, clear statement on your part. It is a very intellectually honest statement. We appreciate it very much. I think I owe it to the committee to point out that the committee has a multiple obligation that it has to carry out from the congressional level.

We have been very fair with the industry and the lumber workers, and we have also been very fair with the port authorities and the maritime workers from the very beginning in making clear, keeping constantly in mind the foreign trade policy of our Government. But we have to strike a balance between the lumber industry and the maritime industry, and when I say maritime industry, I include the port authorities and the maritime workers, the longshoremen, the seamen and the others. We have to find what that figure is, what that level of restriction is that will balance the rights of the two, that will give to the lumber industry the protection that it is entitled to, and more important than the interests of either the ports or the lumber industry, will recognize and protect the interests of the American public. It is our duty to urge the adoption of a timber policy that will carry out the trusteeship obligation that the Government owes to the American people, which is to conserve and develop our forest resources on that sound sustained-yield program necessary to provide future generations of Americans with lumber products in perpetuity. That is the job of this committee. It isn't going to be understood by some before we get through, I am sure, and probably will be very difficult to represent to those that will be special pleaders and seek only their immediate economic interests. We are accustomed to that as legislative representatives; but we have to place our confidence in what this entire record proves, not just one part.

I want to say, Mr. Johnson, I think you have been an exceedingly helpful witness in that you have pointed out the facts from the industry standpoint. Your statement simply reasserts the position that we on the committee have taken: We have got to find a balance. You point out some of the problems of unemployment. You point out also the competitive disadvantage that you are placed under by British Columbia and other Canadian manufacturers of wood products: that as long as you have to pay these high prices for logs, while the Canadian producers pay, as the record in this case already shows, a substantially lower price for Canadian stumpage, you can expect the competition that you are receiving right now and have been for some years from the Canadian mills for the eastern U.S. lumber market. And standing out in the causation of your competitive disadvantage is the difference in governmental timber policies between the Canadian Government and the United States. Most important, perhaps, is the fact that the Canadian Government is not happy with the exportation of logs to Japan, but enthusiastically supports the exportation of finished lumber products.

And as was pointed out in the hearing yesterday, although some logs are exported, the quantity that is exported, when compared with the quantity that is exported from the United States, Russia, the Philippines and others, the amount that is exported from Canada to Japan can be characterized, as we lawyers say, as *de minimis*. I think the record is perfectly clear and will be made clearer before the hearing is over, that Canadian logs are not exported in large quantity because such exports are not received with any enthusiasm on the