

Senator HATFIELD. I would like to have, with the approval of the chairman, the insertion in the record of text four points, merely to again indicate the interest of this committee in resolving the problem with all interests involved and consideration for all interests, because in these four suggestions, it was indicated that there might be considered a temporary restriction placed upon the shipment of logs, not to cut off shipment but rather to temporarily hold it to the 1966 level.

In my concept, it seemed to me that we should deal with both public and private lands. There are those who disagree with me on this point, but in my own view I think that we must find some practical way, though it may appear difficult at this moment, if we are to place restrictions we must, I feel, consider and incorporate in any such program both private and public.

This figure would be at 1.1 billion feet, which is the highest level for the 1966 level.

Secondly, it seemed to me we must be flexible on whatever we do on this, and again to indicate flexibility was the second point or the second recommendation, that we could ship more logs than the 1.1 billion foot restriction, but it would be tied to a Japanese purchase of manufactured products, some formula. There is no set idea here, but some formula for each additional 1,000 board feet of logs, for instance, there would be required an equivalent amount of manufactured lumber.

This would be used to encourage, as Mr. Van Brunt indicated a moment ago, the expansion of markets for the American manufactured lumber product.

Thirdly, again recognizing what points you have already indicated, all three of you, and other witnesses, that we try to rate the amount of the resource available for market. I have indicated here in this third point the idea of open sale, including the export to Japan of those portions of the same yield annual allowable cuts which were not offered or were unsold in the preceding year.

During the witnesses' testimony before this committee, it has been indicated, and again today, that there is professional base upon which we could move for increasing allowable cuts, maintain our commitment to the sustained annual yield program and good conservation practices, and this indicates one such thought.

Fourthly and lastly was the idea expressed here that we work through the Department of State, with certain time limits involved, with the Japanese toward a voluntary agreement on log exports, not only to get an agreement in terms of specifics, but to sense a spirit with which we are working in attempting to solve this problem. In other words, that we act in the national interest, yes, but we also act with the consideration for the needs of the Japanese people in meeting their own requirements for lumber products, their general economic needs.

Well, I only indicate at this point in our testimony, Mr. Chairman, these points because I had the privilege of visiting, after that November session with some of the members of this panel here and other people as well, and at that time I sensed in their thinking and their expressions as well as today a desire to help resolve this conflict or this problem outside of conflict as between interest groups, and today I merely would like to follow through by asking Mr. Van Brunt specifically as relates to his last line of his last page of his statement when he says, "We can see no reason to restrict any portion of the log exports