No one wishes to deprecate the role these Titans played in World War II when they logged exhaustively to provide the Government's needs at a time when Government timber holdings were inaccessible by road.

However, there always comes a point in history when the pacemakers, no matter what they have added to, or subtracted from, the national economy, must stop to listen to the greatest voice of the national interest. In this case it is the economic tragedy of a regional-national industry that is cut off from its domestic market by the Jones Act philosophy that makes domestic shipping prohibitive—and outpriced in the foreign markets, by our do-nothing policy which favors the cheap manufacturing labor in Japan.

As far as losing Japan as a customer for our resources is concerned, it seems reasonable to me that Japan would continue to buy lumber from Oregon, Washington, and Alaska rather than take chances in other exotic and less reliable markets—at least at the present time.

The fact that Japan has invested heavily in Alaska indicates that requirements for primary manufacture have not inhibited them from tapping our woodpile.

It is true that Japan is developing its own timber supplies in Japan for the future, as well as flirting with all potential tree donors.

But I don't know of any law that can insure customers for the indefinite future either here or in any other country. Unreasonable adjustments of our economy to secure future trade, unless it is tied down to specific treaty obligations, is like taking a mortgage on the wind.

We know Japan cannot obtain any substantial quantity of timber from British Columbia or Canada.

As for Japan's latest threat—to turn from the United States to Russia—I ask, "Will Japan really play Russian roulette?" For example, the December issue of the Mitsui Trade News says:

> Logs from the Soviet Union, together with those from the United States, play an important role in supplying the domestic supply of building materials. However, the Soviet Government controls exports of timber products and contracts are made on an annual basis so it is hard to influence transactions from the Japanese side.

The Japanese economy, which this country has brought to its present healthy state through our dollars, and through Japanese ingenuity and hard work, is too sound to put its chips on a wheel of uncertain supply in an unpredictable manner, from a nation whose production they cannot control, and whose contracts are uncertainly honored.

Our generosity to a fallen foe is unprecedented in history. Obviously, one cannot buy loyalty or friendship. I do not know what we could do for Japan in the future that we have not done in the past 25 years.

These intelligent and resourceful people are just as interested as we are in maintaining the nearly equal import-export ratio we hold. They will not eliminate their No. 1 customer by crippling any vital segment of U.S. industry.

As our chairman has indicated, this country should affirm its foreign and fiscal policies on the basis of what is good for this country, and this will also be good for our neighbor and friend, Japan. Japan would not want to be confused with the many hippie nations who bite the open hand of Uncle Sugar as if they are "high on pot."

If Uncle Sugar ever gets hungry, the whole world will tighten its belt. It is difficult for many nations to dig the "hangup" of a great