

I am going to hold the hearings in session tonight until I have finished with the witnesses scheduled for today. The only other witness remaining is Mr. Hodges.

Congressman Dellenback.

Representative DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask one follow-up question as a followup to the questions that the chairman has just asked.

Do I understand you, Dean, as saying that you feel our supplies of timber in the United States, with particular emphasis on Douglas-fir, even if fully utilized would yield no surplus when measured against the needs projected for such supplies of timber in the United States?

Dr. GRAVES. I think this could be answered in the affirmative with this qualification: That we will be able to produce more wood needs 40 or 50 years from now for the generation after next if we can get our timber resources into a properly managed, a more fully managed condition now, because it takes 40 or 50 years to grow the trees. At our present growth rates, in large areas of our timber resource, are only about a half to two-thirds of what they could and should be under prudent management.

Representative DELLENBACK. Let me be sure that I do understand, because this was at the crux of what the chairman was driving for. Under present management practices, there are no surpluses available from the forest as measured against needs; is this correct?

Dr. GRAVES. No. There are surpluses over present needs, with revised public management policies, and these surpluses will not be the kind that are available 40 or 50 years from now, because after all, trees do not last that long.

Representative DELLENBACK. Let me then rephrase my question, because again our essential question is; Do we have a surplus here? Now, you say that you feel that the forest management practices being followed are not all that you would like to see them be. But you also state, as I hear you, that even if the practices were what you think they ought to be, then measured against projected needs for the product of the forest, there are going to be no surpluses in supplies of timber. Am I correct? Now, I recognize the proviso that you added to the thing, but it does not seem to me that your proviso speaks to this point. You say that you want to put pressure on us to increase the efficiency in the forest practices. But let us assume that we do that against what you see as the needs of the forest, as to the need for this raw material in the years that lie ahead, even with improved practices, do I understand you correctly that you think we will have no surplus of this raw material?

Dr. GRAVES. There will be no surplus of raw material 50 years from now.

Representative DELLENBACK. So that in the long run, even with approved practices, with what you anticipate to be future needs, there will be no surplus 50 years from now as you have just said. Now, at the present time under present practices that are being followed in our public lands, not what you would like to see done but what is being done at the present time, is there any surplus of this raw material against present needs?

Dr. GRAVES. Yes, there is a surplus in both quantity and quality.

Representative DELLENBACK. At the present time that the production from the American forests would yield a surplus?