

1. It could leave timber standing in the woods which would not be needed for domestic use.
2. It would tend to lower stumpage prices. Price pressure, as such, would disappear, particularly on the lower grades of timber. Cartels from export markets would tend to control the prices on our timber through pre-agreements.
3. It would tend to encourage exporters to buy only prime timber.
4. There would be no incentive for thinning because the conventional cuts could fill whatever limitation was established on exports, and domestic prices cannot support this type of program.
5. It would tend to have a very heavy impact on areas close to ports, unless a complex reassignment of cutting priorities was established, because the exporters would want to buy timber close to their shipping outlets.

"It must be remembered that this is not only an import/export free trade question, but is a question of proper utilization of one of America's publicly-owned resources...a resource that has been nurtured and made available through tax dollars at the local, state and federal levels."

This plan also is favorable in that:

1. It applies to sales of timber from public lands only.
2. It is not tied to lumber and plywood exports.
3. It is free of arbitrary volume restrictions on log exports.
4. It does not require the negotiation of new trade agreements with Japan.
5. It does not require new legislation.
6. It can be implemented under existing laws by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

ACTIVE SUPPORT NEEDED FROM A UNIFIED INDUSTRY

The problems arising from log exporting to Japan can best be solved by the plan presented above. An industry unified in support of this plan can gain its adoption and implementation.

There is no refuting the short term economic facts. In log export