

whatever amount that that can be done consistent with sound forest practices.

We are not experts. It is up to the foresters to tell us what sound forest practices are, with the private foresters, the foresters in universities such as you are serving as checks upon the judgments of our Federal foresters.

It is my understanding, and I wonder if it is yours, that the Forest Service in their response to the Duerr report did not seem to share the conclusions of that report from the standpoint as to whether or not its recommendations could be carried out within the framework of a sound sustained yield conservation, forest conservation multiple-use program. Is that your interpretation of the reaction of the Forest Service to the Duerr report?

Dr. GRAVES. So far as I know, that is their reaction. However, I do not feel that there are any serious professional problems that are involved in the attainment of these goals. They are primarily questions of policy and a management decision.

Senator MORSE. In these hearings, including Mr. McCracken's statement today, we have been dealing with questions such as these: Is there a surplus of available logs in Oregon and Washington, that is, can we continue to export round logs to Japan without doing injury to our own lumber economy and to the obligations that we owe the American people who are owners of those forests?

I interpret part of the thrust of Mr. McCracken's testimony today to support the proposition that we do not have any surplus, but that there is some need for increasing the supply that we already have as far as the availability to the mills is concerned. That is why there has been so much interest in this allowable cut issue, which is involved also in your testimony.

I would assume that part of this reasoning is his association and other witnesses have taken the position before this committee that if we set a ceiling of 350 million for the export of round logs, which was the amount of exportation in 1966, and if on top of that we sought to obtain a negotiated agreement with Japan that she would change her policy of not buying in any large quantities primary processed or lumber processed beyond the point of primary process, we might be able to agree to export round logs to the extent of 350 million board feet, at least as a temporary ceiling to see how it works. I interpret further Mr. McCracken's testimony that there are grave doubts as to whether or not we can justify maintaining a log export program to Japan, but rather the emphasis should be on the exportation of lumber products to the extent that they can be exported beyond the need of our own country, which were outlined earlier this afternoon by Dr. Sumichrast.

Now, I have made these statements because my next question is: What is your position, as an expert in this field, on the issue as to whether or not we ought to restrict the exportation of logs from public lands to Japan? In stating your position to the committee, I would like to have you comment on whether you go along with the recommendations made to us that we ought to certainly put a top ceiling of not more than 350 million board feet, at least for the time being, until we see what negotiations can be worked out with Japan. For as Congressman Clausen has clearly indicated, concerned as we are about all phases