

Mr. HARTUNG. I am going to try my best.

Senator MORSE. That is your burden of proof, and we will be glad to hear you on that basis.

Mr. HARTUNG. Mr. Chairman, I am going to try very hard to do just that.

There are times when a labor organization is tempted to formulate its position on an issue such as log exports primarily by the probable immediate impact upon employment for its dues-paying membership. By the same token, there are junctures in an industry's economic balance when one group of employers or another alines itself with a particular side of the proposition for no more altruistic reason than the fact that for the time being they stand to profit from such a policy.

Finally, the caretakers of the Federal Treasury from time to time find themselves leaning in a given direction due to the overall economic situation—not because it is good for an industry or its workers—but because it promises to have a favorable impact upon the immediate balance-of-payments situation and/or budgetary deficits.

To us, the exigencies of the moment from any of these standpoints do not suffice for the purpose of establishing long-term governmental policy. Historically we have adhered to a position that sanctified the general principle of free trade. At the same time, we have assured all-comers that we were the champions of the principles involved in solid conservation practices leading not only to the survival of timber as the prime base for the Pacific Northwest's economy but also to the safeguarding of the irreplaceable forestry resource for public multiple-use purposes including recreation, flood control, and the like.

But in fact we were probably guilty on more than one occasion of giving too little thought to the problem or taking the easy way out by endorsing the position that seemed for the moment to most closely approximate the immediate short-term interests of our membership.

We are, quite frankly, in a dilemma at this point involving pressure stemming, on the one hand, from Northwest millworkers who have recently lost their jobs due to plant closures. What with all the ballyhoo, it is understandably easy for these workers to conclude that this catastrophe in their lives—since many of them are too old to find other employment—was due exclusively to the export of logs to Japan.

On the other hand, we are besieged by various considerations that cause us to question the particular answers that come from the opponents of log exports. We know for a fact, for example, that the essential scruple motivating this particular group of employers, as well as those currently on the other side of the argument, are considerations reducing themselves to nothing more or less than what would be most profitable to their operations for the moment.

Our own bedrock position is, to be perfectly frank about it, not so easily arrived at. By the nature of things, we cannot help but be acutely aware of the tragedy and discomfort that hundreds of our members and their families have experienced during the past year alone due to plant closures in the Northwest. At the same time, we do recall that only a year and a half ago, when the housing industry was at its lowest ebb, the internal pressure from our membership came from the direction of IWA loggers who were faced with layoffs or short workweeks simply because domestic markets for their production did not exist.