

I think it is fair to say that the record will show the point of view is shared by many that the very purpose of our Federal laws establishing our national forests in the first place, providing for their maintenance and administration in the second place, and setting up the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management within the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, respectively, was for the purpose of carrying out a governmental trusteeship obligation to the American people, who from coast to coast own these forests.

These forests are not owned by the States of Oregon, Washington, Alaska, California, Idaho, Montana, and any other State in which a national forest is located. They are owned by all the people of this country, and the argument is, the point of view is, that the purpose of our whole legislative program for the administration of these forests is to carry out a congressional and governmental responsibility to administer them in the interests of the owners of forests, all the American people, and that that trusteeship obligation carries with it a legislative intent which it is argued is clearly expressed over and over again in the various pieces of legislation that have been passed over the years by the Congress relative to the national forests. The overriding policy is that those forests are to be maintained in a manner that will provide the American people in perpetuity with an adequate timber supply to meet their lumber product needs.

Arguing from that major premise, it is contended that these forests do not exist for the purpose of having foreign countries obtain the trees from those forests in various ways to meet the needs of their people, if by so doing a sound conservation program for the benefit of the American people is interfered with.

Therefore, it is argued further, that there is a question of fact that the Congress must always face up to when it is concerned with a problem that affects the administration of the national forests; namely, do the facts in a given operative case show that a policy of exportation of logs, as in this case, contravenes a protection of the interests of the American people in their forest rights? Is the exportation of logs in excess of the quantity of logs that should be allowed to be exported if the lumber rights and interests of the American people are to be protected?

Now, I have condensed in that very brief statement, let me assure you, a very detailed statement of American national forest policy. Along with that the witnesses have testified that the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture have not been carrying out their responsibilities under existing legislation in respect to protecting the American people in connection with this matter of export of logs to Japan.

They argue further that Japan is not entitled as a matter of right to a single log, and no American exporting company is entitled as a matter of right to the exportation of a single log, if that exportation contravenes this overall national forest policy of the Federal Government in relation to Federal forest lands.

So it is argued by these witnesses that the responsibility of the Congress, if the administration continues, as they allege, not to carry out their responsibilities, under existing law, to do what we can as legislators to see to it that that responsibility is carried out. If we fail by persuasion and suggestion and recommendation to get the adminis-