

logging, and hauling to pond, there would be a falloff of only 1,400,000 man-hours out of the total of 12,200,000 man-hours, so that the bulk of the man-hours would still be involved, if we were to roll back to 1966 export total; am I correct in this?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. Correct.

Representative DELLENBACK. And if I would ask you how many employees that would mean would actually be displaced, you would work it out by a proportion I assume between this and you would find out what 1.4 million percentage was out of 12.2 million and it would be a part of production?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. 700.

Representative DELLENBACK. So that again emphasizing the point that both Senator Hatfield and Congressman Wyatt just made—and I am sure it has been made by other members of the committee earlier—that if we are not talking in this context about eliminating log exports, but either staying with the 1967 figure, in which case there would be no loss of employment whatsoever, or going back to the 1966 figure, in which there would be only perhaps 700 as opposed to whatever else might happen in the loss to the lumber industry, we are not talking about 7,500 jobs, we are not talking about 3,000 jobs, we are not talking about 1,500 jobs, we are talking about approximately 700 jobs, am I correct in that?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. If you were to roll it back to 1966, yes; plus the fact that there are port employees that would be involved.

Representative DELLENBACK. We ought to have those in the record at some time, too. Rather than going on at this time, I will look over the other testimony and see whether those figures are already in the record.

Thank you, Senator Morse.

Senator MORSE. Congressman Pollock?

Representative POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman. Mr. Van Brunt, I did not hear your earlier direct testimony, but it is not clear to me whether you are distinguishing at all between the export of round logs and the timber upon which there has been any primary manufacturing process. Have you pooled these figures here or are you talking about just one?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. Just talking about logs.

Representative POLLOCK. Just round logs. Do you have any comparable figures for processed logs, processed timber?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. For lumber or plywood figures?

Representative POLLOCK. Yes, or sided lumber.

Mr. VAN BRUNT. Department of Commerce records are very detailed, the exact footage shipped on each.

Representative POLLOCK. I was just trying to get it for comparison with the figures you were talking about, because, again, you are concerned with the shipment of product, whether it is processed or unprocessed here, are you not?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. Correct, and this is something that we must make clear, that we cannot stress too hard: that we are desirous of joining the lumber and plywood industry and the Government, not only the union but the stevedores and the port people concerned, in an effort to increase the market so that it will increase the tonnage shipped. We could not care less in what form it is shipped. We only encourage