

Senator HATFIELD. I could not agree with you more, and that is just what this committee is trying to do. One question as it relates to your chart that you have attached to your testimony: You talk here in your summary about total employees based on 2,000 hours per year, and then that figure has been corrected on my copy, I believe, to read 7,543.

Mr. VAN BRUNT. Correct.

Senator HATFIELD. This table is headed "1967 Log Exports." Am I to interpret that to mean that there were such number of employees through the longshoremen's union who were directly related to log export business?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. No, sir.

Senator HATFIELD. How am I to interpret that?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. Longshore logging and hauling to the barn, sorting and racking, hauling to the ship, administrative and cargo personnel all combine as it relates to log export. The longshoremen, in order to determine the number of men, you would take the total man-hours which were 2,765,126 and divide it by 2,000, and it would tell you how many were longshoremen. The same thing under logging and hauling will tell you how many were involved in that. The same thing in sorting, rafting, administration.

Senator HATFIELD. How many of that total figure would possibly have been involved in the same handling, if the purchaser had been an American firm operating within that area or that region?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. How many? If we put it into a sawmill instead of on a ship?

Senator HATFIELD. Yes.

Mr. VAN BRUNT. 4.5 thousand approximately.

Senator HATFIELD. 4.5 thousand?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. We still have to cut it and haul it.

Senator HATFIELD. Yes. Then what would happen say to the remainder of that group, 3,000 others? Would you care to give us a guess-timate as to what they might have been doing or might not be doing?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. No. We would have continued our program which we began in 1960 of moving the longshoremen, in the case of Willapa Harbor, our intention was to close the longshoremen there out and in Grays Harbor we would have moved Port Angeles and Bellingham, Everett we would have moved the men either into the Seattle-Tacoma-Longview area, which we could not have, we were already full, but to California which we would have done. In the case of Astoria and Newport, Oreg., we would have continued to move men out of there as we did, and try to place them in other ports. We were out of ports in the Northwest, so we would have gone to California.

As to the ports of Rainier, Oreg., and St. Helena, as you know, we did close them, and there are no longshoremen there. They now travel there from other places. We would continue that program.

Senator HATFIELD. So from the employment approach or from the employment aspect of this, it would have been necessary to replace in employment or to shift to other places for employment a total of about 3,000 men?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. Well, I point out that we have added men. We would have had about half that number to move but we have added about half the number since, we have had another 1,500 to have done away with, that we would not have employed in the first place.