

quantity of logs. But with your experience in the industry, are you prepared to answer the question I now put to you?

If it were possible to work out an understanding with Japan, whereby they would agree to take increased quantities of finished lumber from the United States, and especially an increased quantity of finished lumber from Oregon and Washington, as they now purchase finished lumber from Canada and Alaska, would not there be more employment on the docks and on the ships that would compensate at least to a substantial degree for any loss of employment on the docks and on the ships that might result from a restriction on the quantity of logs below the figure of logs now being exported?

I am not prepared to say whether it would be more jobs or fewer jobs, but it at least would be more employment than would exist if you didn't have the agreement to increase the shipment of lumber, but followed only a restrictive policy of decreasing the amount of the logs. Are you prepared to say from your experience in the lumber business that the shipment of increased quantities of lumber to Japan would compensate at least in some degree for the loss of jobs that would flow from restricting the shipment of logs?

Mr. JOHNSON. I would certainly believe that the effect would be a compensating one. I am not in a position to give any figures as to the amounts.

Senator MORSE. I am not, either.

Mr. JOHNSON. The man-hours and employment that might be involved. I am not certain as to specifics in terms of hours for handling of lumber commodities.

Senator MORSE. I am not, either. This is a very important fact we have got to get into the record. But I raise the question with you because I think the industry is entitled to have this record show that it is not seeking to depress the ports, and it is not seeking to throw maritime workers out of jobs, but it is seeking to balance the interests between the ports and the maritime workers and the mills and the lumber workers in those mills. Is that not the position as far as policy is concerned on the part of the lumber industry representatives participating in this hearing?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; it is.

Senator MORSE. One final question. You spoke in your testimony about the dimensions of the problem from the standpoint of the State of Washington as compared to Oregon. You pointed out that up until now, at least, a substantially larger quantity of logs has been shipped out of the State of Washington than out of the State of Oregon, but is it not true that in both States the quantity is sufficiently high so that it is damaging the economic welfare of mills in both States? And, therefore do not the representatives of both States have a common obligation to do what we can to work out this balanced figure that the representatives from Washington and the representatives from Oregon have heretofore gone on record in support of?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The impact has accelerated and moved into Oregon so rapidly within the past 2 years from the original concentration in the Washington area, we certainly feel that any reduction—and as stated earlier our position is a reduction, in effect, to surpluses—but I might add a wider geographic distribution would even be very helpful to the industry in our State.