

of port authorities in Washington have been the principal advocate of the point of view that you have expressed here this afternoon.

They have expressed their views ably, as you have. We expect to hear the Administration witnesses, who are coming next Tuesday. We will probably have a few witnesses on Monday that may have opinions in some instances that are similar to yours. That is the way it should be.

I have been insistent that this witness agenda be built up so that no point of view would be excluded. That is my first job as chairman of this committee.

My second job is to see to it that the questions pro and con are asked. I have a responsibility as chairman to see to it that no question, no matter how controversial, or delicate, remains unasked in this hearing. That is what the committee has tried to do, and I shall continue to do it in connection with your testimony.

I think that the premises in this testimony of yours are going to have to be answered by the proponents for the restrictions on log exports. I have never taken the position that this is a white or black issue. We have always tried to point out that we are not seeking a solution that will cost jobs, as you pointed out in the last part of your testimony. Quite the contrary.

We don't propose to throw longshoremen out of work and break the stevedoring companies, and do damage to the economic life of the ports that are dependent upon maritime business. At the same time, we have no intention of standing by and not doing what we can do to keep your men at work, and the AFL carpenters and joiners at work, and the mill operators operating, and the stockholders receiving the protection that they are entitled to receive, in the process of trying to prevent wrongs from creeping into the administration of our forests.

So our task as members of the committee is not an easy one. The chairman of this committee has said from the very beginning of our discussions of this problem that we have got to find out what that balance point is that will produce a fair balance. Our job is to find the solution that will protect, to the maximum extent possible, the economic interests of the groups in the ports, and in the woods, and in the mills. We haven't come to any final conclusion as to what that balance is.

As you already intimated you were aware when you started your testimony, I would be less than honest if I did not say, as I have on the hearing record before, I think a *prima facie* case has been made that some restrictions must be imposed; not total restrictions, but those restrictions that will produce a balance. That formula is variable as far as I am concerned, depending upon what the evaluation of all the facts in the record, including the facts that you have put in the record, will justify the final decision to be.

I will come back to some questions shortly, but I think in fairness to you, the chairman owed it to you to make this statement of the basis on which the hearings have been conducted. I will now call upon my colleague to ask any questions that he may wish to ask.

Mr. HARTUNG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just make one additional statement. I have generally printed once a week in the Oregon Journal about production, shipments, and orders—I see this—and for the last 2 or 3 months, production has always exceeded shipments, it has always exceeded the orders.