

ness affairs—in approximately what amount board footagewise are these contracts?

Mr. BROOKS. Our was for $8\frac{1}{4}$ billion feet. I believe the Alaska Lumber & Pulp was $5\frac{1}{4}$ billion feet, and the present contract that Mr. Davidson holds is for approximately 1 billion feet.

Representative DELLENBACK. Are there other major operations in Alaska which do not have this type of long-term contract?

Mr. BROOKS. None of the sawmill industry has long-term contracts, with the exception of Mr. Davidson's mill at Wrangell.

Representative DELLENBACK. So that as far as the mill operation is concerned, and I believe there was testimony yesterday that there were six sawmills in the State of Alaska, none of these has a long-term contract. They all have Federal contracts that are of short or limited term, is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. They all have short-term sales except Mr. Davidson's.

Representative DELLENBACK. He indicated to us yesterday in his testimony, I believe, that he no longer has an interest in this mill, so that he kept referring to his mill and then he would catch himself and say "the one in which I was formerly interested."

Mr. BROOKS. I think that is correct.

Representative DELLENBACK. You are talking about the same mill?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Representative DELLENBACK. So you are worried not only about the immediate present but you are worried about the future when you talk about the export of round logs. You are worrying about the door having once been opened to the export of logs, it would cause immediate difficulty for some operations now, particularly the sawmill operations, for example, and even for those pulpmills which have the long-term major contracts to which you allude there would be long-term difficulty.

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. The potential loss of our chip supply comes from the sawmill residues we see as a very serious threat. That is a reason why I am here representing Ketchikan Pulp Co.

Representative DELLENBACK. And you see the same problem existing at the present time in the States of Washington and Oregon, is that not correct?

Mr. BROOKS. That is right.

Representative DELLENBACK. And it would be your feeling that rather than to open the doors in Alaska, what we should do would be to take some steps in the States of Oregon and Washington to set up a situation that is comparable to that which now exists in the State of Alaska.

Mr. BROOKS. I, like Mr. Kramer, hesitate to advise the States of Washington and Oregon, but I certainly would think that they should adopt some protection.

Representative DELLENBACK. But you see, you aren't advising the States of Oregon and Washington. You are advising the Federal Government, which is in effect responsible for the policy in Alaska now. What you are saying to us as I read your testimony is that the Federal Government should take the necessary steps to institute in the States of Oregon and Washington procedures and policies that are somewhat similar to those that you find existing in the State of Alaska now, which you feel are imperative in the State of Alaska if you are to continue the operation of this industry in Alaska.