

tration to carry out its responsibilities, then we should follow the legislative route, which all of us think should be avoided if at all possible.

May I say that in what I have said there is an assumption of a good many facts, and we are arguing about facts in the course of these hearings, but the assumption of certain facts (which various witnesses may not be willing to assume) doesn't change the major premise of the remarks that the chairman has made about Federal national policy and responsibility over Federal timberland.

Therefore, putting yourself for a moment in the seats that the members of this committee occupy, which are not characterized by coolness, what would you do if you came to the conclusion, after weighing all the evidence, that the degree to which we are exporting logs does in fact contravene the rights of all the people of this country that own these forests to have the Government follow a policy that will restrict the exportation of logs, at least to the degree to which they have been exported since 1960?

It is possible that in a given period of time there has been a lessening of domestic needs for our forests' logs because there was a slump in the building of housing under the tight money policy of the administration, or because there was an impounding of funds appropriated by the Congress for homebuilding, or because of some other administrative policy on the part of the Government; but that doesn't justify our exporting a quantity of logs in excess of what may be found as a matter of fact a sound conservation policy in respect to the protecting of the trusteeship obligation that the Government owes to the American taxpayer owners of the forests.

Do you deny, if we assume those facts, that this committee would be following a mistaken course of action if we didn't seek to mediate this dispute by working out what I have called the balance formula? That refers to a formula to balance, interests, and protect to the maximum extent possible the jobs and the developments in the ports and the jobs and the development in the mills and in the woods, until there can be worked out a negotiated trade agreement with Japan that will resolve, or help resolve the problem in connection with other facets that are involved.

That is a somewhat cumbersome statement but I don't think a single one of you have any doubt as to its meaning, and I would be very glad to have your comments.

Representative DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman.

Senator MORSE. Congressman Dellenback.

Representative DELLENBACK. May I just make a brief addition to what I think has been a very well-put statement. As you have referred to the objectives of the National Government in dealing with the national forests, there are those, of course, who sometimes in this context link the national forests which are within the province of the Agriculture Department and the national forests within the province of the Interior Department, so that there may be at this point in the record—may we refer back to the testimony which Mr. Hagenstein gave our very first day, that dealt as you have so eloquently stated—in dealing with the national forests stressing the point that a major objective was to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of the citizens of the United States. So far as the objectives of the Congress were concerned in vesting the O. & C. lands, however, there was the point made that the objectives here were that