

Remarks of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D. Minn.)
National Forest Products Association
L'Enfant Plaza Hotel
May 6, 1974

President Moser, Mr. Hodges and all the Officers and Directors of the National Forest Products Association and Guests and Friends:

You know while I was listening to Mr. Baxter introduce me I started getting tired. I didn't realize I was involved in all that sort of stuff. I've got good PR too, apparently. Really, I'm not doing quite that much.

I think I should start out by telling you that I'm no expert. I'm a general practitioner. We don't have time in the Senate, at least I've never found the time, nor do I have the ability to become what we call a specialist -- you know, an eye, ear, nose and throat man -- even though I could use one today because I have a first class cold for which we still have no cure. Neither the Republicans nor the Democrats have promised that so far. I think I should tell you one other thing, I do not have an answer to inflation right now. That is, one that you could afford to buy at this moment. We were talking about it up here and I'm serving on the Joint Economic Committee, I'm Chairman of the Consumer Economic Subcommittee, I'm an expert on problems. I know what's wrong, and I guess that's the first step. I was told that and I have a young son who's now a state senator and I've told him that he should become an expert on answers. His father's explored the early part of it, namely, the problems.

I notice, also, that there was some reference made to election reform and that's true. The reform that I wanted was winning. I missed out on that a couple of times, so I'm in a position to talk to you both from the joy of victory and the suffering of defeat. It's this kind of balance that you need in a speaker, so he's not too euphoric.

I just jotted things down quickly here, as I was listening. I asked Mr. Hodges, I said, "Ralph, how many vice presidents do you have here?" I think it's five. Is that correct? Well, whatever the number is I used to do it all. One man. I also feel that I fit into this audience fairly well because you've heard a great deal about ecology and recycling. Well, I went back to pasture, as some of you may recall, back in 1968 due to the will of the electorate and the terms of the Constitution. I went back to where I started -- teaching school. Then I recycled and here I am back. This has been one of the great setbacks for environmental protection. Many people are not sure, well, in fact, they've come to the conclusion that the recycled product is not quite as good as the original.

I want to compliment you on many of the people that you have working for you in Washington, and I'm not doing this to get them a pay raise, I'm sure that they're doing alright. But, I was talking with Mr. Baxter and Mr. Hodges about the people that work for you here in the nation's Capitol -- and I know a little bit about people that work in the nation's capitol. I've been around here now for about twenty-three years. I've been in public service for over twenty-five years. So, I've watched what organizations do in terms of equipping themselves with people to state their case, to help them in their contacts with the Federal Government. You have some remarkable people working for you, not only in your own people here -- Mr. Hodges and others who are helping you -- but in his staff. Warren Rogers. I saw Warren outside and you couldn't get a better PR man I don't care where you go. He's just absolutely terrific and I've known him, know his family, know his wonderful Dad. We happen to be good friends. I had forgotten that Warren was working for you, but I do know what a good man he is. And Phyllis Rock, who used to be the legislative assistant to Senator Wayne Morse and worked with me. I got her early -- I want you to know that I trained her first and she's just a remarkable person in the field of legislation. And Joe McGrath -- just one of the most talented and knowledgeable people that we have in this capitol city. Now, there are undoubtedly others, but I know these three and I want to compliment you. You ought to know that the money you're spending is well spent. That isn't always true in Washington. So when you get a little good news, enjoy it.

Now, I'm going to visit with you today, and let's get it straight before we start. I do not know how to run your business. You may know how to be a Senator, everybody does, you know. There are a few Minnesotans out here or people that do business in our state and, by the way, we want you to know that we welcome you. I want to put in a plug for my home state. If you have any idea about where you'd like to invest you can't find a nicer place than in Minnesota, and you ought to get out there and just pour it in. Isn't that right, Mr. Moser? You just keep things going up there at International Falls and a few other places. We welcome you. We have tremendous forest resources in Minnesota and we're going to take good care of them, and we're going to try to make it a good economic climate for you.

But, I am a Senator of the United States, not just a Senator from Minnesota. But I'm proud of my state and I would be derelict if I didn't say that we're very proud of the association that we have with many of you here and your companies.

I said I had a couple of observations I want to make. The first one is -- I am not an expert. I believe that experts should be on tap, not on top. You hire experts. I'm a general policy man and I'm very general. I do not claim to know all the answers and I am a sort of a short-course wonder now in forest management. You can imagine how much I really know. But I know a little bit about legislation, and I know one of the things you have to do is to tap a number of sources of information, and that's what we did in the perfecting of certain legislative proposals, which we have been talking about here today and which I shall allude to in my remarks.

There's another observation that I should like to make that during our 200 years of national history, and we're coming up to our 200th birthday, now, we have utilized our resources and, indeed our land and our so-called renewable resources recklessly. And indeed our non-renewable resources. Now at a time of scarcity we must make up for our past negligence. We need also to develop plans for the future, and I shall emphasize planning. The Chinese long ago almost destroyed themselves before learning that man must work with, rather than against, nature. Our history in terms of utilizing our vast resources has been an on-going attempt to fly in the face of this rule. While there were warning voices, we have used up our resources at an alarming rate, and I believe it's my duty as a public official when I see these things, when I learn about them -- as we do in these committee sessions and through our study -- to call these matters to your attention. Since the birth of our nation we've had bountiful supplies of land, of timber, of water, of minerals and, indeed, of capable people.

So it was natural for our early people, our pioneers, to say why worry, it's here. I mean, you know, after all when my grandparents went into the Midwest, my grandfather on my father's side, my great-grandfather I should say, going into Minnesota in 1848 from Connecticut. There was unlimited land. Why worry? Three-fifths of the whole surface of my state was covered by virgin timber. Why worry? And I'm not being critical of those early pioneers, because as the scriptures say they knew not what they were doing, so to speak. They knew not what they did. There was no reason to be alarmed. So our early settlers used the soil, then they moved on once the soil was exhausted. Our early loggers cut the timber and they got out. They certainly had no idea of what the future resource needs would be. They'd never heard of such a thing as population pressure; they didn't know of anything called affluence, and the term inventory was almost totally unknown. But in the past few

years, and it's coming on like gangbusters, so to speak, things are changing so rapidly. The danger of this waste has become increasingly evident. A society is governed by the laws of nature, as much as by the laws of man and possibly more. And we've just now begun to realize this.

But I think it would accomplish very little for us to moan about the past. Really, you can't do anything about it. What's important is now. Learning some lessons from the past and understanding -- as in that childlike statement -- that today is the first day of the rest of our lives. Here's where we start. We can't turn the pages back. I've never believed that it did much good to wring your hands and go around in ashes and sackcloth and moan and groan. I believe in standing up and getting at it. The uncomfortable fact is that we are a highly consumption-oriented nation. Growing, too. 212 million people. When I came here as a Senator in 1948, we had a population of slightly over 150 million. Now, I don't want to take credit for all that's happened since then, but we've added 62 million people since the mid-forties. We are consuming and wasting resources at an alarming rate. For example, in this energy crisis, you've heard all kinds of figures. Six percent of the world's population -- we're actually less than that to be factual about it, about five percent -- and we consume 35 percent of the world's energy resources right here in the United States of America.

We've also had a great aversion, as you know, to planning in any form. The motto "Don't tread on me" of our early history has been a strongly held attitude for many rugged individuals. We did not want to be told what to do and, particularly, we didn't want anybody in government to tell us what to do. The future would somehow take care of itself. We just have to face up to it, dear friends, that anybody that had the unmitigated gall, as they would call it, to stand up and suggest that we look ahead and plan was looked upon as a dangerous, militant radical. Except if you were in private enterprise. AT&T tries to plan a little bit -- not as well as they should have -- they didn't quite foresee what was coming. But I want to tell you if they hadn't done any more planning than the Federal Government, we'd still be communicating with smoke signals. But they had to plan, and you wouldn't invest a dime in them if they didn't. But you invest huge sums of money in your government, and you haven't asked us for any kind of a plan. You've got a Federal budget -- annual budget -- and, let me tell you it makes anything that you're doing fade into insignificance like you're operating a junior grade peanut stand.

I've got to vote on a budget over over \$300 billion! And those are investments. That budget affects the money market; it affects the rate of interest; it affects everything that goes on in this country much more than any industry, no matter how big it is. And yet, we have a one year plan called the annual Federal budget, and what's more you don't have anything to say about it. It's the most

closely guarded secret in the entire government. You heard about the Pentagon Papers. There wasn't anything new in the Pentagon Papers, anyway. That was all in the New York Times before they rewrote it. They just got you all jazzed up so that you'd continue to buy, and I say that as a man who was in the government at the time that the Pentagon Papers were being written. There wasn't one single thing new in there that people didn't already know. But we have a budget that comes down to the Congress of the United States every year like it's a rediscovered Dead Sea Scroll. Holy Writ. Written by people who are supposed to have a passion for anonymity. I never knew how you could be anonymous and passionate at the same time, but maybe you can. And then it comes down to Congress -- really it's wrapped up in paper that you can't break with steel clippers and a sealing wax Presidential Seal, and it's very impressive. And then all at once it's unveiled. Now, don't misunderstand me. People that work on that budget work hard and they do the level best they can, and they are extremely capable people that work on it -- all the way from the President, the Cabinet, the Office of Management and Budget, down on through the Departments. But, ladies and gentlemen, a budget of that size should have some input from you, from the business community, from the labor community, from governors and from mayors, from students, from doctors and from people around this country. We ought not to have it all a little in-house thing as if somehow or another we're dealing with a budget like Calvin Coolidge had.

We're dealing with one-fourth to one-fifth of the total gross national product of this country, and I want to open it up. I think we ought to have open budget hearings. We ought to be having budget hearings out in the countryside right now listening to the American people about the next fiscal year, and what they think we ought to be doing way down line. Well, that's another speech. If I get in that one this is going to be the longest speech that you've heard for years, so I better back off. That's my problem. I get all involved here, but I wanted to toss it out to you anyway because I have strong views on these things. Now, I'm a happy man, I'm not running for anything. I've got a lot of strong views and I'm going to announce them. It is wonderful to feel liberated.

Well, planning also has strongly ideological overtones. You know, you're sort of a socialist or a communist if you plan anything. Other countries have had five-year plans for national economic growth and some of them were socialist countries and some of them were not. The German Federal Republic is no socialist country, but it does a lot of planning. But, not our country. We were the first to come into the Twentieth Century as a modern industrialized nation, and we're the last to do anything about planning the use of our resources. In the late 1930's, we established what was called the National Resources Planning Board to carry out some long-term "look see," you know, kind of forecasting where are we going, how

will we get there, or how should we get there, etc? But, we abolished that in 1940. It became politically unpopular. And then the war -- that, of course, took all of our resources. And after the war we returned to the old ways with a vengeance. The future would have to take care of itself. We thought there was no limit to growth and no end to consumptive levels, and within the last two years we have seen the results. All at once, we were lined up at filling stations. All at once, we have an energy shortage and don't let anybody fool you one bit, dear friends, I've been working on this since 1956 and it's going to get worse before it gets better.

Of course, you can ration it through price. Just like you can do anything else. You can get a lot of people out of the use of energy. You can answer the population problem if people just die off. We're going to have a food crisis. Two or three months ago we had 28 days world's food supply. Today, we have 21 days. A year ago, or two years ago, we had 165 days of world food supply. We're down to 21 days. We're praying for a crop like we've never had before, and we're even praying for it in communist countries where they're not supposed to be praying. But they are. And we're hoping and praying that the weather's going to be perfect, and after we get the good crop somebody's going to wake up to find out that we don't have any railroad boxcars.

Now you and I have got to level with each other. I read all these government statistics and I'm not exactly a mean critic because I don't believe in meanness. It takes too much energy. But I like to be occasionally, once in a while, a bit of a sharp critic. Hopefully, with a little smile and a willingness to realize that you can be wrong. But I saw the Secretary of Agriculture here a month and a half ago ask for 4,000 boxcars to help move last year's crop. He got 1,000. Now, we've got a crop this year -- we've opened up 22 million acres of land -- and we hope to get a crop that's about 20 percent larger than last year and we have fewer boxcars and fewer hopper cars than we had a year ago. Now, how are you going to move it? We don't have anymore ships to move it with, either, from the ports. The railroads have got a system in this country of how to save the railroads. Quit railroading. That's right. Go into hotels and land development and what have you. Everytime they come up with a solution to their financial problems, it's to abandon trackage.

Now, you've got a stake in all of this. Because everybody can't live alongside the main line or the interstate highway system. I've just had a look see recently at the rural transportation problems in this country and they are phenomenal. They're unbelievable. We've been so busy building interstate systems and federal state highways that we forgot about county roads. Oh, they are there, but the trouble is that the trucks are bigger than the roadbed will take. We kept building bigger trucks, but we forgot about the roadbed. Out my way in Minnesota, where we think we're progressive and forward-

looking we've got four and six ton roadbeds and we've got eight and ten and twelve ton trucks. So, we've got real problems, particularly in certain periods of the year.

We opened up 22 million more acres of land and we forgot to tell the fertilizer industry. And on the land we opened up the farmers are pretty smart -- you have to be smart to survive as a farmer, particularly over recent years -- so the good land had been kept in production, the less valuable land had been taken out and we opened that up two years ago. Last year, we opened up the tag end. The last 22 million acres that we have. The last that we have of our reserves. A lot of that is sandy and rocky and scrub land, and we forgot to call up the fertilizer industry, or the railroad industry, and tell them that we were going to start farming that land. So, we've got farmers planting; we've got railroads curtailing, and we've got an overall 12 percent fertilizer shortage and we're predicting huge bumper crops on land that absolutely must have fertilizer. I'm only using this as an example that we didn't plan anything. God must love America, believe me, because he performs miracles for us all the time. But, maybe he'll have to take care of somebody else once in a while, because there seems to be trouble someplace else.

Well, I got off on a line there, but I thought we ought to toss that in, too.

You remember those ads that we had? Electricity -- cheap, cheap, cheap, cheap. You know, they were on Con Edison and others. Now, they've got an ad that says turn down the thermostat, turn off the air conditioner -- after you bought the air conditioner and the furnace, however. Then, do you remember, we had the throwaway concept? Built everything that you can throw away. Well, we've had to learn that the pressure on resources is too much, and now we have to take a major step and I want to concentrate my attention not on how we're going to save the world, but what are we going to do now about our forestry and our rangeland.

It was indicated here that we had passed some legislation in the Senate, S. 2296, which 27 Senators joined with me in introducing and that legislation attempts to chart new directions in valuable resources of our forests and range, and it's good legislation. Your people have worked with us, and, as was said, we drew in everybody from the Sierra Club, the conservation groups to the forest products groups, to the lumbermen's associations. They were all involved, and we found out that you can bring people together. That's what this country's got to have. We've got to quit fighting each other, or we won't have to worry about who is going to whip us. We'll whip ourselves. There's got to be some meeting of the minds. We've got to be willing to make some adjustments and some compromises amongst ourselves. That's the law of life. That's the way it has to work in a family; that's the way it has to work in local hometowns and in your business, and I know that there are lots of people in Washington who like fights. That makes headlines.

We've got more fight promoters per square acre in this town than anyplace in America. That's what they want, and, generally, to get some publicity you've got to find a burglar or somebody that's attached to it, rather than just looking at the fact that somebody may not have known what he was doing or didn't have the facts. Now, the House has got this legislation before it, and I must tell you that you can praise the Senate bill all you like -- and it's good legislation -- but it won't be worth a hoot in a few months, because it will go down the drain. It takes two Houses to pass it, and I want you, while you're here, to go over to the House side and ask them for some action on that legislation. Otherwise, all we've done in the Senate, with your cooperation, is just an exercise in futility. We need your help. You need it. We need you and you need this legislation.

The General Accounting Office has just published a report on the use and the management of our natural resources, and if you want to read something that will make these other transcripts look like good reading, you ought to read that report. It is unbelievable what we have not done. And, by the way friends, you're not looking at a pessimist. I have been the town's number one congenital optimist for over twenty years, but I'm slipping. I must say that things have scared me a bit.

Now, this bill, in designing it, we had to keep in mind that a forest is a resource with multiple values and uses. We had to think in terms of fish and wildlife, water, air and soil, and we decided to look at the totality of the forest and the rangeland. It seemed to me that what we needed was an integrated assessment of these lands and their resources. With such an assessment, or inventory, we would be in a position then to develop a rational national program. To know what we had before we started talking about what we ought to get. I also felt that time was of the essence in getting a first crack at an assessment and program. Refinements in the program can come later. We always have people around here who say we have to wait a little while. We have to get more information. Well, I want to tell you something. I know it's better if you can have all the information you need at one time, but a lot of you are not going to be here long enough to get that. Sometimes you have to act on the basis of what information you have, and you learn as you do. I happen to believe that way. I think the best learning is through experience.

We needed to retain in this legislation some flexibility to deal with inevitable changes. You can't project everything.

Finally, the Federal role, we believe, should be to provide leadership as a land manager without usurping private initiative. In fact, it could and should, assist the private effort, and from the assessment we can develop a program which outlines our goals and priorities. The program will need to balance the multiple uses of

our forests. It just also includes a schedule which phases, or puts in stages, the program's implementation. You can't do it all at once. We have to learn that. By the way, in all of this planning, we have to know what our goal is, what our priorities are, what the time frame is that we're talking about and how much we are willing to commit to its achievement. Now, we know how to do things, dear friends. Let me tell you we can plan.

When we planned the space program, and I was Chairman of the Space Council, and I know what we were able to do in that plan. When John Kennedy said that within the decade of the Sixties, even though we were better than five years behind the Russians in space technology, that we would put a man on the moon and bring him back safely to earth people laughed. A lot of people have said that was a tragic waste of money. No, it wasn't, because it was a demonstration project that if you make up your mind what you want to do, if you set the goal, if you put on the priority, if you make the commitment of resources, physical and human, you can accomplish it. It was a management exercise, and besides that there were tremendous spinoffs. The space program is possibly the best investment this country has made for years. If we didn't get any other spinoff from it except the earth resource satellite or the communication satellite or the computer, or Project Nimbus for weather projection, or the pacer for your heart or whatever else you may think about -- everyone of those came from that program. But, more importantly, what it was was an effort to show that we can plan. I want to give you a quick aside. I was in Moscow, sitting at a table in the Kremlin with Mr. Kosygin, on the day that Neil Armstrong put his foot on the moon. And, I was there when the launch took place. And, I was in Isvetsia and Pravda telling them where's the news. Why don't you talk about this? Meeting with their editorial staff, I saw what happened when what they call the Consul of Ministers -- I was meeting with them -- when this great American enterprise succeeded. That thing did more for world peace than anything we've done, because the Russians, right at that moment, realized that these crazy, mixed-up Americans -- if they made up their mind that they wanted to do something -- could do it. And they understand that. They understand that a lot better than a lot of handshakes and goodwill messages. They were looking at our technology; they were looking at our science; they were looking at our management; they were looking at our plans and they were looking to see whether we knew we could carry out the fulfillment of a goal and assign priorities and they saw that we could do it, and we passed them going away. I want to tell you, dear friends, we've got to do a little more of it, because if we don't they're going to pass us. I sat in the Kremlin in 1958 with Mr. Krushchev when he told me that in the 1970's the Soviets would produce more steel than we did. Can you imagine that? In 1958, they were country bumpkins in steel production, but in the 1970's they produced more steel than we did. They made up their minds they were going to do it.

I'm a competitor. I don't believe in coming in second. I did that once and I didn't like it one damn bit. I believe that when you make up your mind your going to do something, you put the energy and muscle to it. You put the zip into it and get it done. And, at the least you ought to outline a program and mobilize people behind it.

Well, now, in forestry we know a lot of things that we can do in this program, and we're going to do it. We know that by thinning and improved management forest output can be increased substantially. Our estimated timber requirements will increase by at least 50 percent in the next three decades, and I think that may be conservative. But, it surely will double. If we can find reasonable ways to increase supplies on a sustained-yield basis, forest products, your business, will be able to meet this demand. Washington State has already incorporated practices and funding techniques to increase the yield of State forests. State and Federal forests can, if properly managed, yield more uses on a sustained basis, and they ought to be brought around to do it.

The President's Advisory Council on Timber and the Environment recently concluded that intensive management would greatly increase timber yields. A study by the General Accounting Office noted that much more solid reforestation and stand improvement would pay dollar and conservation dividends. There's a new awareness that these positive steps are needed now. We also have time to deal with this problem, and can lay out a strategy that can succeed.

Developing this legislation involved a lot of work over a period of about eight months. We brought groups together with sharply differing and competing views, and many of you made useful contributions to the effort. The legislation makes provision for continuing citizen participation. I am hoping that developing the program will enable and encourage groups with differing views to continue this useful interchange. This approach should go far towards developing the best possible program. What I am saying is that we have to get a start, and then we keep tapping into the citizen groups across the country and the professional groups, for its improvement. It could well be argued that if this bill had already been enacted into law, recent court cases over forest issues might have been avoided. The process of developing a program would air conflicting views, which, hopefully, could be resolved without litigation.

While I'm optimistic about the bill, and what it will accomplish, we should not expect instant miracles. It will take time to make the assessment and to develop the program, and any time that we waste is lost. In the meantime, we can make improvements in the present forest system operations. I'd like to suggest five steps which would serve this end. First, increase the Fiscal Year 1975 funding for the Forest Service. I pointed out to the

Committee on Appropriations that the Fiscal Year 1975 funding proposed by the Administration is just not adequate. In my view, an additional \$190 - \$195 million or more dollars is needed. The National Forest system now contains more than half of the nation's total softwood timber inventory. The rate at which this sustained yield wood supply can be utilized depends largely on the intensity and the effectiveness of forest management. The U.S. Forest Service needs beefing up if it is to increase the intensity of its timber management. And you have a stake in this, and I want you to speak up. Yes, in the spirit of love and demand, both, 'cause it won't happen otherwise. I do believe in the power of love -- outside of Washington. You really have to go to work on them here.

There is also a backlog of three million acres requiring reforestation in this country, and another 13 million acres needing timber stand improvement. There is no excuse for this. Additional funds could help catch up on this work and lead to an increased timber take off. Now, let me tell you something. Some people say well that's just spending government money. Not at all. That's investing your money. There are some things that are investments. We have got to invest in these renewable resources.

Secondly, we have to provide incentives for small, private holdings. Small, private timber holdings account for about 60 percent, I estimate, of the total commercial timberlands. However, they carry only 20 percent of the softwood timber inventory. Timber management levels on most of these lands, other than for fire protection, are low. Improvement of tree stocks and forestry care cultural practices would be essential steps towards increasing the nation's timber supply. In other words, we need to enlist more small owners in good forest management practices.

Thirdly, we need good land use. And it is good business for every land owner, public and private. It is of paramount importance that private forest owners practice good forest management. Now, many of you in this room, I hope all of you that are involved in ownership of forest lands, do that. In fact, I think it is fair to say that the private sector has done a much better job than the public sector. There is a sound reason for this. Private enterprise is the keystone of our system and most of the productive commercial forest land is in private ownership. And, on these privately held commercial lands great strides have been made in these last two decades. The cut is still above growth, however. We need -- nationwide -- to get all lands on a high level of management, and wherever feasible, on a sustained yield management.

On public forests, there is a serious disagreement over how this land is to be used. Boy, you ought to be in Congress and find out. Congress has enacted a multiple-use, sustained-yield policy. I voted for that when I was in the Senate years ago. Some groups would like to see more land allocated to just one use. Some would opt for more wilderness, and I am one of the original

authors of the Wilderness Preservation Act. In fact, I introduced it when they wanted to shoot you, because of its terms. You know, that's literally a true story. I remember going up into northern Minnesota and there was a sign outside of Ely, Minnesota, telling me not to come in. I used to get letters from people up there saying if you come in we're going to shoot you. I run for office up there, too. And I didn't want them to shoot me, I wanted them to vote for me. There's a lot of difference. But, we passed the Wilderness Preservation Act. Some would give priority just to timber production. Others say wildlife values are dominant. Still others see water values as the most important, and, finally, the great rank and file of people think of the forest as a public park. There is no easy answer to how we resolve this dilemma. In my view, the great bulk of the commercial forest lands in our National Forests are, and ought to be, in multiple-use management.

Fourthly, National Forest timber management should be directed towards making its proper contribution to the nation's forest products requirements. This means prompt reforestation and securing the fullest and best possible output of all of our resources. And, it also means adequate funding on a continuing basis. The trouble around the government is that we give it a big shot one time, and then we decide we can't afford it. I'm a taxpayer, too, and I'm here to tell you that the greatest waste of tax money is the on again, off again, yo-yo kind of policy that we have. We get started on a housing program -- we start -- and we quit. We get started on some kind of other scientific research program. We get everything all geared up and then we stop. We collect the scientists and the technicians together and all at once they can't get funded. We do the same thing with aid to education.

We would be much better off if our funding levels were lower, but continuous and consistent. This business of coming in and just seeing whether or not you can pack it all in in one year, and then find out later on that you had to cut back the next year is poor management and poor business. You can't run Humphrey's Drugstore that way. By the way, I want to get in a plug. If you're out in Huron, South Dakota, stop by, we need the business.

Intensive management requires, as I said, a long-term commitment, and that's what I'm talking about. And I need your help and you need it, too. If you're going to plant genetically superior tree stocks, there must be the commitment to secure the full benefit of its superior growth decade after decade.

Now, let's talk about the increased use of cut trees in mill-waste. I couldn't believe what I found out when I got into this business a little bit. I've been increasingly concerned over the wood waste which is presently not used. There is much dead and diseased wood which can be carefully removed from the forest. The Forest Service normally does not secure the removal of all wood

waste left by primary loggers. I've urged that funds be appropriated so that this wood can be utilized. In this era of wood shortages I see no reason whatsoever why we should be so slow in utilizing this supply. I don't know, I'm not Mr. Thoreau or some nature boy, I just happen to think if that stuff is lying on the ground it ought to be used. I made a comment up here about Rock Creek Park one time when they were having the big energy problem here in the middle of the winter, and I said why doesn't somebody go on up there, if you've got fireplaces, and get that wood that's lying around on the ground. My gosh, the government almost came collapsing down. They thought there was going to be a mass raid on Rock Creek Park with people going in there like little George Washingtons with hatchets and chopping down all the trees. But the Park Service finally got hold of it and they did make available some of the dead timber.

Well, I believe that we ought to do that. We should also clean out trees that spread disease to healthy forests. Beyond outlining a long-range planning mechanism and recommending more immediate improvements, we need to give greater attention to the immediate economic problems confronting the forest products industry.

Some of these are a part of the broader problems facing the whole economy, and believe me we've got problems in the economy. Nobody quite knows what to do. I know one thing -- we can't afford a 16, 17 and 18 percent rate of inflation, and we're hell bent for it, dear friends. We're at 14 1/2 percent, right now and I see no indication of anything going back. Prices are going up. New labor contracts are being negotiated. Transportation costs are going up. Money rates are going up, and I've never been able to understand how these high interest rates help cut back inflation. I always found out that interest was just as much a part of the price of a product as anything else. But, they've got some kind of new magical economic philosophy that somehow that's the way you cut back inflation. That's a lot of bunk. I wish everybody was as successful as bankers in selling their product, because as an old populist economist born in South Dakota, educated in two or three universities, and studying seven years of economics -- most of which I could throw in the ashcan -- I learned more economics in South Dakota dust storms than I learned in all those seven years at the university. When you ain't got it, you ain't got it. And when they haven't got, you haven't got it -- that's what it all boils down to.

These costs are fantastic. That's why I said that we've got some very serious immediate economic problems. Others are more aggravated as in the case of your industry. The Administration has not let you twist slowly in the wind. That was some phrase I want to tell you. Lexicon of American modern democracy. It has given you a spin whenever it looked like you were merely hanging there. The way in which it has handled housing has compounded the problems of supplying forest products. The Administration has done little

to dampen the fires of inflation, if it knew how. It has produced policies of reaction rather than action. The budget policies over the past years on timber sales, reforestation and roads can only be characterized as not only short-sighted, but asinine. You know, I sure did like Truman. He really laid it on the line. The more we see that fellow from a distance, the better I like him. I think we need a little "Trumanese" around this man's town. Say it like it is. We get so guarded in our statements that you can't even find out whether or not you're married or unmarried or whether you're going home or staying uptown, or whether its morning or night. If someone asks how's the weather and you're in public office you say well, I don't know, what's your view about that.

We've had impounded funds and frozen programs, and the government has sought to maximize income from timber resources now, rather than invest in the development of a full level of multiple-uses on a sustained-yield basis.

That's what's gotten us into a lot of trouble. We're on this "now" kick all the time. We sold all of our wheat -- now -- in order to get that money into the budget in order to get rid of that surplus, now. We've been paying at the rate of \$6 billion a year in increased food costs. We gave those Russians the best deal that anybody's given them since time began. They never had a good deal before from anybody, but we took care of it for all of history. There wasn't any hanky-panky. I'm not accusing anybody of being crooked. As a matter of fact they're just stupid, and that's worse! You can deal with a crook, but if you're just plain dumb and ill informed it's difficult. And the real problem was that our government just did not have the information it ought to have, and we were so anxious to make the budget look good in Washington that we didn't care about your budget. And I want to say to every person who goes to the supermarket here, the beginning of food price inflation was that deal, right there. And it has cost a minimum of \$6 billion per year to the consumers of this country in order to get a sale for a little wheat that we thought was no good. That was good collateral. Better than greenbacks, as a matter of fact.

In spite of inflation, high interest rates and price controls, I want to say that your industry has every reason to be proud of its performance. The recently completed study by the Rinfret-Boston Associates describes the keen competition in the softwood and plywood industry. The study provides a useful, comprehensive overview of a most complex industry. This report should acquaint citizens with the problems of the timber industry, and its important contribution to our nation. As a legislator long associated with resource issues, I applaud the contributions and the statesmanship of your organization and thank you for being here in Washington. But you get out of this hotel and you get up on Capitol Hill and you talk to your Senators and your Congressmen. You can talk to them about everything and insist that they be there to talk to you. There

is nothing better than your going to that Congressman or that Senator and talking personally to that person about your interests and your concerns in your industry. Don't you be ashamed of it. I've never been opposed to a lobbyist. Lobbyists have a role to play in this city. You don't have to buy it. I met with my staff this morning and told them of certain things that people at home wanted me to do which I didn't think were right, and I just didn't do it. I've had to vote against some of the people who have supported me with everything they had, because my judgment is what I have to use. But you have the right as a citizen to go there and plead your case and to send your lobbyist up there, but I want to tell you something -- nobody's better than you. Your lobbyist can inform you what you ought to be thinking about, and what the emphasis ought to be, but you go there. You've got a Congressman and he's important and he's fair. He's more interested in you than any document he'll read, and your Senator is fair. He'll be interested in what you have to say if you know what you're talking about.

And what happens with organizations like this when they come to Washington? They get so busy in their meetings and so busy in their social functions that they forget that only a few blocks away from here are the power cells that count. I urge you, after having been here all these years, to get up there and plant the seed of your good ideas.

Well, I've given you more than you can take. I told them it's just like that kid that wanted to write a term paper -- a little paper on Finland -- and he wrote to the Library of Congress and they sent him out a whole box, about that high, and he wrote back and said "I didn't want to know that much."

Thank you very much.

###

MANAGING OUR FORESTS FOR THE FUTURE
NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION
WASHINGTON, D.C.

MAY 6, 1974

Inflation

No Expert -
Gene Brockman

Ext. Refrm

^{Steve}
Mr. Mosher
Baie Cascade

^{al}
Mr. Boxter
^{Ralph}
Mr. A. Hodges

5
VPS

Warren Rogers
Phyllis Rock
Jo & McHath

a couple of observations to start the meeting:

↳ DURING THE 200 YEARS OF OUR NATIONAL HISTORY, WE HAVE

UTILIZED OUR RESOURCES AND LAND RECKLESSLY. ↳ NOW AT A TIME

OF SCARCITY, WE MUST MAKE UP FOR OUR PAST NEGLIGENCE. ↳ WE

NEED ALSO TO DEVELOP A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE.

↳ THE CHINESE LONG AGO ALMOST DESTROYED THEMSELVES BEFORE

LEARNING THAT MAN MUST WORK WITH RATHER THAN FIGHT AGAINST

NATURE.¹

↳ OUR HISTORY - IN TERMS OF UTILIZING OUR RESOURCES - HAS

BEEN AN ONGOING ATTEMPT TO FLY IN THE FACE OF THIS RULE.

WHILE THERE WERE WARNING VOICES, WE ^{have} USED UP OUR RESOURCES

AT AN ALARMING RATE.

SINCE THE BIRTH OF OUR NATION, WE HAVE HAD BOUNTIFUL
SUPPLIES OF LAND, TIMBER, ^{waters} MINERALS AND CAPABLE PEOPLE.

So why
worry,

↳ OUR EARLY SETTLERS COULD USE THE SOIL AND THEN MOVE
ON AFTER IT WAS EXHAUSTED. ↳ ^{early} OUR LOGGERS CUT THE TIMBER

AND GOT OUT. THEY CERTAINLY HAD NO IDEA OF WHAT THE FUTURE

RESOURCE NEEDS WOULD BE. THE TERM "INVENTORY" WAS ALMOST
TOTALLY UNKNOWN.

↳ IN THE PAST FEW YEARS, THE DANGER OF THIS ^{waste +} PROFLIGACY HAS
BECOME INCREASINGLY EVIDENT. ↳ A SOCIETY IS GOVERNED BY THE

LAWS OF NATURE AS MUCH AS BY THE LAWS OF MAN. WE HAVE ^{just}
BEGUN TO REALIZE THIS. ~~AT A SERIOUS COST.~~

But

IT WOULD ACCOMPLISH LITTLE TO POINT OUT WHAT WE SHOULD
HAVE DONE. — *winging hands*

THE UNCOMFORTABLE FACT IS THAT WE ARE A HIGHLY

CONSUMPTION-ORIENTED NATION OF 212 MILLION PEOPLE. WE ARE *consuming*

† WASTING RESOURCES AT AN ALARMING RATE. — *60% Pop. need 357. fuel*

WE HAVE ALSO HAD A GREAT AVERSION TO PLANNING IN ANY FORM.

THE MOTTO, "DON'T TREAD ON ME", OF OUR EARLY HISTORY

HAS BEEN A STRONGLY HELD ATTITUDE FOR MANY RUGGED INDIVIDUALS.

WE DID NOT WANT TO BE TOLD WHAT TO DO. THE FUTURE WOULD
SOMEHOW TAKE CARE OF ITSELF.!

PLANNING HAS ALSO HAD STRONGLY IDEOLOGICAL OVERTONES

IN MORE RECENT YEARS, OTHER COUNTRIES HAD FIVE YEAR PLANS

FOR NATIONAL ECONOMIC GROWTH, BUT NOT OUR COUNTRY.

the late 1930's
IN ~~1940~~ ¹ WE ESTABLISHED THE NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING

ended 1940 - then the war

BOARD TO CARRY OUT LONG TERM PLANNING. / HOWEVER, AFTER THE

WAR, WE RETURNED TO OUR OLD HAPHAZARD WAYS. / THE FUTURE WOULD

HAVE TO TAKE CARE OF ITSELF. WE THOUGHT THERE WAS NO LIMIT

TO GROWTH - NO END TO CONSUMPTIVE LEVELS.

*Energy - Food -
Transportation -
Land use*

~~BUT WE HAVE RECENTLY ADVANCED IN OUR THINKING. THE ENERGY~~

~~CRISIS AND THE PRESSURE ON ALL OUR RESOURCES HAVE BEEN GROWING.~~

IN FACT, IN THE 1950'S AND 60'S WE INVENTED THE "THROW

AWAY" CONCEPT.

*Electricity - cheap-cheap-cheap
The Pressures on all our resources
has been growing.*

/ WE MUST NOW TAKE A MAJOR FORWARD STEP. THE SENATE-

PASSED BILL, S. 2296, WHICH 27 SENATORS JOINED WITH ME IN

INTRODUCING, ATTEMPTS TO CHART NEW DIRECTIONS IN THE

VALUABLE RESOURCES OF OUR FORESTS AND RANGE. HOPEFULLY,

*Energy
Food*

*House
Bill
needs
action.*

900 Ripston Resource Shows
no planning - and little information

-5-

IT WILL SERVE AS MODEL LEGISLATION FOR OTHER RESOURCE AREAS. (X)

↳ IN DESIGNING THE BILL, WE HAD TO KEEP IN MIND THAT

A FOREST IS A RESOURCE WITH MULTIPLE VALUES AND USES.

↳ WE ~~WAS~~ HAD TO THINK IN TERMS OF FISH AND WILDLIFE,

WATER, AIR AND SOIL. ↳ WE DECIDED TO LOOK AT THE TOTALITY

↳ OF THE FORESTS AND RANGE.

↳ IT SEEMED TO ME THAT WHAT WE NEEDED WAS AN INTEGRATED

ASSESSMENT OF THESE LANDS AND THEIR RESOURCES ↳ WITH

SUCH AN ASSESSMENT WE WOULD BE IN A POSITION TO DEVELOP

A RATIONAL NATIONAL PROGRAM.

↳ I ALSO FELT THAT TIME WAS OF THE ESSENCE IN GETTING
22

A FIRST CRACK AT AN ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM. ↳ REFINEMENTS

IN THE PROGRAM COULD COME LATER.

FURTHER, WE NEEDED TO RETAIN SOME FLEXIBILITY TO DEAL
WITH THE INEVITABLE CHANGES.

FINALLY, ~~WE BELIEVE~~, THE FEDERAL ROLE SHOULD BE TO
PROVIDE LEADERSHIP AS A LAND MANAGER WITHOUT USURPING THE
PRIVATE INITIATIVE. ^{& Should} IN FACT, IT COULD ASSIST THE PRIVATE
EFFORT.

FROM THE ASSESSMENT, WE CAN DEVELOP A PROGRAM, WHICH
OUTLINES OUR GOALS AND PRIORITIES. THE PROGRAM WILL NEED
TO BALANCE THE MULTIPLE USES OF OUR FORESTS. IT MUST ALSO
INCLUDE A SCHEDULE WHICH PHASES THE PROGRAM'S IMPLEMENTATION.

✓ WE KNOW THAT BY THINNING AND IMPROVED MANAGEMENT, FOREST
OUTPUT CAN BE INCREASED SUBSTANTIALLY. ✓ OUR ESTIMATED TIMBER
REQUIREMENTS WILL INCREASE BY AT LEAST FIFTY PERCENT IN
THE NEXT THREE DECADES. ✓ IF WE CAN FIND REASONABLE WAYS TO
INCREASE SUPPLIES ON A SUSTAINED YIELD BASIS, FOREST PRODUCTS
WILL MEET DEMAND.

✓ WASHINGTON STATE HAS ALREADY INCORPORATED PRACTICES AND
FUNDING TECHNIQUES TO INCREASE THE YIELD OF STATE FORESTS.

✓ STATE AND FEDERAL FORESTS CAN, IF PROPERLY MANAGED,
YIELD MORE USES ON A SUSTAINED BASIS.

✓ THE PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON TIMBER AND THE ENVIRONMENT
RECENTLY CONCLUDED THAT INTENSIVE MANAGEMENT WOULD GREATLY
INCREASE TIMBER YIELDS. ✓ A STUDY BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING

OFFICE NOTED THAT MUCH MORE SOLID REFORESTATION AND STAND
IMPROVEMENT WORK WOULD PAY DOLLAR AND CONSERVATION DIVIDENDS.

↳ THERE IS A NEW AWARENESS THAT THESE POSITIVE STEPS ARE
NEEDED NOW. ↳ WE ALSO HAVE TIME TO DEAL WITH THIS PROBLEM

AND LAY OUT A STRATEGY THAT CAN SUCCEED.

↳ DEVELOPING THIS LEGISLATION INVOLVED A LOT OF WORK
OVER EIGHT MONTHS. ↳ ^{we}~~it~~ BROUGHT GROUPS TOGETHER OF SHARPLY
DIFFERING AND COMPETING VIEWS. MANY OF YOU MADE USEFUL
CONTRIBUTIONS TO THIS EFFORT.

↳ THE LEGISLATION MAKES PROVISION FOR CONTINUING CITIZEN
PARTICIPATION.

✓ I AM HOPING THAT DEVELOPING THE PROGRAM WILL ENABLE
AND ENCOURAGE GROUPS WITH DIFFERING VIEWS TO CONTINUE THIS
USEFUL INTERCHANGE. ✓ THIS APPROACH SHOULD GO FAR TOWARD
DEVELOPING THE BEST POSSIBLE PROGRAM.

✓ IT COULD WELL BE ARGUED THAT IF THIS BILL HAD ALREADY
BEEN ENACTED INTO LAW, RECENT COURT CASES OVER FOREST
ISSUES MIGHT HAVE BEEN AVOIDED. ✓ THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPING
A PROGRAM WOULD AIR CONFLICTING VIEWS WHICH HOPEFULLY COULD
BE RESOLVED WITHOUT LITIGATION.

✓ WHILE I AM OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE BILL AND WHAT IT WILL
ACCOMPLISH, WE SHOULD NOT EXPECT INSTANT MIRACLES. ✓ IT WILL
TAKE TIME TO MAKE THE ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOP THE PROGRAM.

IN THE MEANTIME, WE CAN MAKE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE PRESENT
FOREST SYSTEM OPERATIONS.

I WOULD SUGGEST FIVE STEPS WHICH WOULD SERVE THIS END:

1. INCREASE FISCAL YEAR 1975 FUNDING FOR THE FOREST SERVICE.

I HAVE POINTED OUT TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS THAT

THE FY 1975 FUNDING PROPOSED BY THE ADMINISTRATION IS

JUST NOT ADEQUATE IN MY VIEW, AN ADDITIONAL \$193 MILLION

IS NEEDED.

THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM NOW CONTAINS MORE THAN
HALF OF THE NATION'S TOTAL SOFTWOOD TIMBER INVENTORY.

THE RATE AT WHICH THIS SUSTAINED YIELD WOOD SUPPLY CAN

BE UTILIZED DEPENDS LARGELY ON THE INTENSITY AND EFFECTIVENESS
OF FOREST MANAGEMENT.

{ THE NATIONAL FOREST SERVICE NEEDS BEEFING UP IF IT
IS TO INCREASE THE INTENSITY OF ITS TIMBER MANAGEMENT.

{ THERE IS ALSO A BACKLOG OF 3 MILLION ACRES REQUIRING
REFORESTATION, AND ANOTHER 13 MILLION ACRES NEEDING TIMBER
STAND IMPROVEMENT.

{ ADDITIONAL FUNDS WOULD HELP CATCH UP ON THIS WORK AND
LEAD TO AN INCREASED TIMBER OFF-TAKE.

#2/ 2. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR SMALL PRIVATE HOLDING.

SMALL PRIVATE TIMBER HOLDINGS ACCOUNT FOR 60 PER CENT
OF TOTAL COMMERCIAL TIMBERLANDS. HOWEVER, THEY CARRY ONLY
20 PER CENT OF THE SOFTWOOD TIMBER INVENTORY.

h TIMBER MANAGEMENT LEVELS ON MOST OF THESE LANDS, OTHER
THAN FOR FIRE PROTECTION, ARE LOW. |

h IMPROVEMENT OF STOCK^{tree} AND ^{Industry Care} ~~CULTURAL~~ PRACTICES WOULD ~~BE~~
BE ESSENTIAL STEPS TOWARD INCREASING THE NATION'S TIMBER

SUPPLY.

In other words —

h WE NEED TO ENLIST MORE SMALL OWNERS IN A GOOD FOREST
PRACTICES PROGRAM.

3. 3. ASSURE GOOD LAND USE.

GOOD LAND USE IS THE BUSINESS OF EVERY LAND OWNER,
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE. | IT IS ^{of} ~~of~~ PARAMOUNT IMPORTANCE THAT
PRIVATE FORESTS OWNERS PRACTICE GOOD FOREST MANAGEMENT.

THERE IS A SOUND REASON FOR THIS: PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IS THE
KEYSTONE OF OUR SYSTEM AND MOST OF THE PRODUCTIVE COMMERCIAL
FOREST LAND IS IN PRIVATE OWNERSHIP.

Privately held Commercial lands
R L ON ~~INDUSTRIAL LANDS~~, GREAT STRIDES HAVE BEEN MADE IN *E*

THESE LAST TWO DECADES, THE CUT IS STILL ABOVE GROWTH.

WE NEED, NATIONWIDE, TO GET ALL LANDS ~~VOLUNTARILY~~ ON A
HIGH LEVEL OF MANAGEMENT AND, WHEREVER FEASIBLE ON A
SUSTAINED YIELD MANAGEMENT.

ON PUBLIC FORESTS, THERE IS SERIOUS DISAGREEMENT OVER
HOW THIS LAND IS USED. CONGRESS HAS ENACTED A MULTIPLE -USE,
SUSTAINED-YIELD POLICY. SOME GROUPS WOULD LIKE TO SEE
MORE LAND ALLOCATED TO ONE USE. SOME WOULD OPT FOR MORE
WILDERNESS. SOME WOULD GIVE A PRIORITY TO TIMBER PRODUCTION.

OTHERS SAY WILDLIFE VALUES ARE DOMINANT. STILL OTHERS SEE
WATER VALUES AS MOST IMPORTANT. FINALLY, THE GREAT RANK
AND FILE OF PEOPLE THINK OF THE FOREST AS A PUBLIC PARK.

THERE IS NO EASY ANSWER TO HOW WE RESOLVE THIS DILEMMA.

IN MY VIEW THE GREAT BULK OF THE COMMERCIAL FOREST LANDS IN

OUR NATIONAL FORESTS ARE AND OUGHT TO BE IN MULTIPLE-USE
MANAGEMENT.

4. 4. INCREASE NATIONAL FOREST OUTPUT.

NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER MANAGEMENT SHOULD BE DIRECTED
TOWARDS MAKING ITS PROPER CONTRIBUTION TO THE NATION'S
FOREST PRODUCT REQUIREMENTS. THIS MEANS PROMPT REFORESTATION
AND SECURING THE FULLEST AND BEST OUTPUT OF ALL RESOURCES.

AND IT ALSO MEANS ADEQUATE FUNDING ON A CONTINUING BASIS.

INTENSIVE MANAGEMENT REQUIRES A LONG-TERM COMMITMENT

TO MAINTAIN THE EFFORT. IF YOU ARE GOING TO PLANT GENETICALLY

SUPERIOR TREE STOCK, THERE MUST BE THE COMMITMENT TO SECURE

THE FULL BENEFIT OF ITS SUPERIOR GROWTH -- DECADE AFTER DECADE!

INCREASE THE USE OF CUT TREES AND MILL WASTE.

I HAVE BEEN INCREASINGLY CONCERNED OVER THE WOOD WASTE

WHICH IS PRESENTLY NOT USED. THERE IS MUCH DEAD AND DISEASED

WOOD WHICH CAN BE CAREFULLY REMOVED FROM THE FOREST.

THE FOREST SERVICE NORMALLY DOES NOT SECURE THE REMOVAL

OF ALL WOOD WASTE LEFT BY PRIMARY LOGGERS. I HAVE URGED

THAT FUNDS BE APPROPRIATED SO THAT THIS WOOD CAN BE UTILIZED.

↳ IN THIS ERA OF WOOD SHORTAGES, I SEE NO REASON WHY

WE SHOULD BE SO SLOW IN UTILIZING THIS SUPPLY.

↳ WE WOULD ALSO CLEAN OUT TREES THAT SPREAD DISEASE TO
HEALTHY FORESTS.

↳ BEYOND OUTLINING A LONG RANGE PLANNING MECHANISM AND
RECOMMENDING MORE IMMEDIATE IMPROVEMENTS, WE NEED TO GIVE
GREATER ATTENTION TO IMMEDIATE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS CONFRONTING
THE FOREST PRODUCTS INDUSTRY. ↳ SOME OF THESE ARE A PART
OF THE BROADER PROBLEMS FACING OUR WHOLE ECONOMY. OTHERS,
ARE MORE AGGRAVATED IN THE CASE OF YOUR INDUSTRY.

↳ THE ADMINISTRATION HAS NOT LET YOU "TWIST SLOWLY IN
THE WIND." IT HAS GIVEN YOU A "SPIN" WHENEVER IT LOOKED
LIKE YOU WERE MERELY HANGING. ↳ THE WAY IN WHICH IT HAS

HANDLED HOUSING HAS COMPOUNDED THE PROBLEMS OF SUPPLYING
FOREST PRODUCTS.

↳ THE ADMINISTRATION HAS DONE LITTLE TO DAMPEN THE FIRES
OF INFLATION. ↳ IT HAS PURSUED POLICIES OF REACTION RATHER
THAN ACTION. ↳ THE BUDGET POLICIES OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS

ON TIMBER SALES, REFORESTATION AND ROADS CAN ONLY BE CHARACTERIZED
AS SHORTSIGHTED.

↳ THE ADMINISTRATION HAS IMPOUNDED FUNDS, AND FROZEN PROGRAMS.

↳ IT HAS SOUGHT TO MAXIMIZE INCOME FROM TIMBER RESOURCES "NOW"
RATHER THAN INVEST IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FULL LEVEL
OF MULTIPLE USES ON A SUSTAINED YIELD BASIS.

IN SPITE OF INFLATION, HIGH INTEREST RATES AND PRICE
CONTROLS, THE FOREST INDUSTRY CAN BE PROUD OF ITS PERFORMANCE.

THE RECENTLY COMPLETED STUDY BY THE RINFRET-BOSTON
ASSOCIATES¹ DESCRIBES THE KEEN COMPETITION IN THE SOFTWOOD
AND PLYWOOD INDUSTRY. THE STUDY PROVIDES A USEFUL COMPREHENSIVE
OVERVIEW OF A MOST COMPLEX INDUSTRY. THIS REPORT SHOULD ACQUAINT
CITIZENS WITH THE PROBLEMS OF THE TIMBER INDUSTRY AND ITS IMPORTANT
CONTRIBUTION.

AS A LEGISLATOR LONG ASSOCIATED WITH RESOURCE ISSUES,
I APPLAUD THE CONTRIBUTIONS AND THE STATESMANSHIP OF YOUR
ORGANIZATION. THE GRASS ROOTS CHANGE IN YOUR COUNCILS
AUGURS WELL FOR THE FUTURE.

∠ I CONGRATULATE YOU AND I ENCOURAGE YOU.

∠ WE ALL KNOW THAT THE DAYS AHEAD WILL TEST US ALL. ∠ EACH

GENERATION OF AMERICANS HAS HAD ITS OWN CHALLENGES. ∠ SOME

ARE INHERITED FROM THE PAST, SOME CREATED IN THE PRESENT.

∠ A MAJOR CHALLENGE AND RESPONSIBILITY - IN A WORLD GROWING

EVER CLOSER TOGETHER - WILL BE TO DEVELOP AND MANAGE OUR

RESOURCES MORE EFFECTIVELY. WE ARE STARTING LATE, BUT

WITH THE HELP OF PEOPLE SUCH AS YOU, IT CAN BE DONE.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org