

In the opinion of this chairman, you should know at the outset of your testimony, a *prima facie* case has been made in this record against the continuation of the export of logs to Japan in unrestricted quantity. There remains to be resolved whether or not there is a basis for working out a formula that can provide for the shipment of some logs under some conditions, provided that shipment is balanced off with a shipment of finished products. But even a proposal of such a formula raises the question that the committee has to deal with. Can we justify exporting these natural resources in any form outside of our country, if the facts show that there is a need for the retention of those resources within our country?

If the answer to that question is that there is a need for the retention of our forest resources to meet the present and future needs of people of this country, then as far as the Senator from Oregon is concerned, the exportation should stop. And, in that event, if the administration does not see fit to impose appropriate restrictions, then as far as this Senator is concerned, it becomes the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to seek legislation that will stop it.

I have said many times, Mr. Cliff, and I want to say again as I present you for testimony this morning, that is a controversy I think we ought to avoid if possible. It is a controversy that I think will bring up a great many overtones of conflict between the Congress and the administration that will spread far beyond the administration of Federal forests. So many of these economic interests and issues are intermingled and intermixed, and I think that we ought to do everything that we can to limit ourselves, to try to work out a balanced solution to this log-export problem.

One more word and then I will call upon my colleagues to ask if they have anything to say by way of a statement before you start.

I have said from the beginning, Mr. Cliff and Mr. Greeley, that I think the task is to work out a balance between the exportation of logs in those amounts that can be justified, and the export of lumber products going through at least the primary processing, although the nearer to the final processing the better. It seems to me that a balance of that kind will give fair and equitable protection to the economic interests of our ports, which includes the economic interests of the maritime workers in our ports, the longshoremen, the seamen, the seaman, the stevedoring companies, the business community of existing ports that are dependent upon foreign trade for the level of their prosperity, the interests of the mill towns, the workers in the mills and in the woods, the cash registers of the businessmen that the testimony in this case shows are not ringing as frequently as they did prior to the exportation of Japanese logs, and all the others.

The question I think this committee has to answer is:

"What is that balance?" How much can you justify exporting in board feet. As a temporary restriction it has been strongly urged by a remarkably united front within the industry (and that doesn't mean there hasn't been some dissension, but overall there is substantial unity within the industry) that temporarily now there ought to be a restrictive limit of not more than 350 million board feet of round logs exported from the Pacific Northwest to Japan, which is the figure that was exported in 1966. Then, with that as the floor, serving notice on Japan that there will be no more exports for now until we