

these lands were to be managed for the purpose of providing the permanent source of timber supply and contributing to the economic stability of local communities and industries.

So there was a deliberate difference in the thrust of the Congress when instead of taking the vested O. & C. lands, instead of putting them into the national forests, they put them in a separate ownership which dealt with the specific areas where those forests lay, so far as the O. & C. lands were concerned, and so far as the national forests were concerned, they dealt with the citizens of the United States in general.

I am sure that this was not anything that you meant to contradict in this very fine statement that you have just made.

Senator MORSE. It supplements, Congressman, what I have said. I include all the various features of our Federal legislative forest policies, which includes the O. & C., on the basis of the premise that all of those separate programs were adopted by the Congress because they were necessary to promote the national interest. When you promote the O. & C. program, you are promoting the national interest. The lands can be used for the specific purposes for which they are earmarked.

I want to get credit for the fact I was as brief as I was, and didn't cover all of the details, because that is quite a speech. But I only wanted to get to my witnesses here this economic philosophy in relationship to our Federal timberlands.

I did not go into the partnership that is created, in a sense, between the owners of private timberlands and the Federal Government, when those owners of private timberlands seek to obtain Federal stumpage to supplement their own land. But that is incorporated, too, by reference.

All I want to hear from you is what your position is in regard to the Federal policy, which as I have pointed out is contended to be the intention of congressional legislation on the books, and whether or not you quarrel with the right of the Government in administering the forests to impose such restrictions as other witnesses in this hearing are advocating that this committee recommend.

Senator HATFIELD. Mr. Chairman.

Senator MORSE. Senator Hatfield.

Senator HATFIELD. May I suggest that the witness be restricted to a yes or no answer. [Laughter.]

Senator MORSE. No, I am a great one to protect the witnesses. I have already suggested to them very tactfully that I want them to be as brief as the chairman and to supplement their views with a written memorandum.

Mr. Van Brunt.

Mr. VAN BRUNT. No yes or no answer. I am afraid that would be a loaded question if you did ask for a yes or no answer.

If the facts indicate that we are depleting our national forests, then you and all concerned should of course make any and all restrictions necessary. I do not feel that the record shows that we are depleting and thus depriving the people of what they should be guaranteed and were by that trusteeship, and therefore I would say that the solution is still in obtaining a market.