

have not included anything in your report relating to the Humboldt County, Calif., area. Did you do this on purpose?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. I kept to the report only to answer the questions as they were received by me from Senator Morse, the question as I understood him referred to Oregon and Washington, and I therefore confined our answers to Oregon and Washington.

Representative CLAUSEN. I am assuming that your comments relating to Oregon and Washington would affect California in a similar fashion, right?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. Yes, similarly.

Representative DELLENBACK. And you thus were left with the man-the timber-producing areas of northern California.

Mr. VAN BRUNT. Right.

Senator MORSE. Congressman, I want to thank you very much. Congressman Dellenback.

Representative DELLENBACK. Thank you.

Thank you, Senator. May I clarify a number of points in my mind. I did not hear Mr. Van Brunt's direct testimony but I had a chance to read the statement. As against this may I ask when you answered Senator Hatfield's question, Mr. Van Brunt, as to your computation as to what portion of the 7,500 would or would not be covered, I gather you did this on the basis of looking to your chart and taking that column on logging and hauling to yard?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. Right.

Representative DELLENBACK. And taking that out?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. Right.

Representative DELLENBACK. And you thus were left with the man-hours of direct longshore and sorting, rafting and hauling, and all administrative and clerical, so that if there were to be replacement in administrative and clerical work—let me rephrase the question.

Would there be any other portions of those tasks that would have had to be performed anyway, of either the administrative or clerical, or the direct longshoring, that had there not been this export would still have had to have been done so that some of those jobs would have remained in existence? Or do you feel that all, the entire amount in those three columns would have come out?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. We were very careful to include nothing in those columns except what was directly related to the existing log exports.

Representative DELLENBACK. So that there are not any man-hours in any of those as you have computed them that dealt with longshoring or anything else on other products than log exports?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. No. This we were very careful to see that nobody included them, because we wanted and assumed that the Senator in his questions wanted just that which related only to log exports.

Representative DELLENBACK. The other point that I just wanted to explore a little bit further, and as Congressman Wyatt has pointed out, we are all aware that we are not talking about a banning of exports, but we are talking about whether or not there should be any meaningful restrictions put on these, and if the restrictions, if there should ultimately be any, if they were placed on a basis of 1967 figures, you would find that there would be no loss in any of this, is that correct?

Mr. VAN BRUNT. If there was a ban placed or a restriction placed at the 1967 level?

Representative DELLENBACK. Right.