

In all respect, I say we do go down on this issue two different highways. I happen to believe that if you are right in the policies of restriction that you have followed in Alaska, and I think you are, that my State deserves the same kind of support. In Alaska one of the reasons for your policy was to help build new mills and create economic development and be a spur to the development of its economy. In my State the justification to prevent the closing of mills, particularly small mills, and the creation of unemployment in the mill towns which have been, and can continue to be, of great service to the economy of our State and Nation. Now, a depression that stalks the streets and the economic life of some of the mill towns in my State.

Without taking the time now to give you the proof that is in the record, I can take anyone in this administration, from the President down, into those towns and show those pockets of depression.

That being a fact, and then, of course, it is my position that we not only should not wait for negotiations with Japan, but the administration should exercise what I consider to be a clear, legal duty to carry out the intent of law as passed by the Congress time after time in respect to the administration of Federal forest land. In Oregon we are forced with economic loss that is occurring now. This injury should be prevented. We, in no way, in my judgment, endanger negotiations with Japan by doing so, unless the idea is to give Japan what she is not entitled to in the negotiations at the expense of our economy.

We should start out with the negotiations by saying: Here is the floor below which we are not going to go, there is no cellar under it, it is a ground-level structure of negotiations, and we are not going below this. That is why we have been pleading for the 350 million board feet floor, as a basis for negotiation with them. If they want more timber from our forest we can offer it to them in the various processed forms of sawn lumber.

Certainly that is not an improper course of action for us to take in our relationship with Japan. I can testify as a witness that on the basis of that principle we have negotiated time and time again in international negotiations with Latin America. We have said what our floor would be. In some of those negotiations, I have been one of the participants, and I have been a spokesman for my government in those negotiations. You will find that, on many occasions, we have gone in with floors established.

Here we have a situation in which the continuation of the exportation of these logs for any given period of time, 1 month, or 1 week, or 1 day, continues to do economic injury to my State. I know enough about negotiations with foreign countries, and particularly with Japanese negotiations, that they don't place the same value on time that we do, particularly if the running of time will be to their advantage.

I know something from the reports that the administration spokesmen have given us, about the negotiations that have already taken place; and I do not feel that they advance very much or very far any understanding with the Japanese.

I wanted to make this point because the last two pages of your testimony I do not accept as a sound basis for negotiation. I know that is what the State Department would like to do. I haven't any doubt it is what Treasury would like to do and Commerce, but I do not think that it is in the interests of our country.