

of Government rights and the rights of private ownership. These rights are relative and must be exercised consonant with and in conformity to a greater public interest. I think that is particularly true when you are dealing with natural resources in the timber field.

I would fight to the last ditch to see to it that there was no confiscation on the part of the Federal Government of private timber rights. That would be highly unconstitutional. But I think someone ought to say in this hearing, and I do now to the industry, we are all partners together.

There are three partners, the owners of the private lands, the Forest Service and the BLM representing their agencies, and the general public. The purpose of this partnership or trusteeship is to carry out what we have always said is the purpose of maintaining this natural resource intact for future generations.

I do not want to ask for any agreement with my philosophy. A lot of people might not agree with it. But, I have fought for here in the Congress for this philosophy for 20 years. And, that is why I want to work out an arrangement with private industry, so we can help them to the maximum, and at the same time let them know that they must not follow a course of action that hurts the economy of the country. When the ratio is what you have just testified, the question arises as to whether excessive log exports from private lands is just as bad in its economic effects, such as loss of jobs, diminishing our position in balance of payment, and all the rest, as exports of logs from public lands.

With men such as you and Mr. Greeley and Mr. Rasmussen and the others, I am satisfied you can work out domestically within the industry an understanding whereby there will not be an excessive export of logs off of private timber. But if there is, and the situation develops along the lines of my hypothetical, here at least is one Member of the Congress that thinks we have got to consider some legislative checks, if administrative checks will not work in that practice.

I appreciate very, very much your testimony. It has been very, very helpful. It is going to be very helpful to the negotiators, I am sure. It will be very helpful to the industry. While you are here let me say I have conducted this type of a hearing, which is not a typical legislative hearing, related only to a proposed bill. I have conducted this type of a hearing because I wanted to make a factual record.

I venture to say that the record that has been made in this hearing by the time we close, when it is printed up, accessible and available to all interested parties, is going to be referred to for the next several years at least as outlining some of the major objectives that we all should work toward in protecting the lumber economy of our country.

Thank you very much indeed, Mr. Cliff and Mr. Greeley.

Mr. CLIFF. Thank you.

(The subcommittee subsequently received a letter and attachment from Mr. Cliff, as follows:)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1968.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Marketing Practices,
Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We were asked about two subjects at the Committee Hearing on January 23, 1968, for which we were unable to respond as desired. These two subjects were: