

Mr. McCracken. Yes.

Senator Hatfield. To forestry practices?

Mr. McCracken. Yes.

Senator Hatfield. So that this is not taxing our capabilities as it relates to production or any other technological thing?

Mr. McCracken. No.

Senator Hatfield. But it is only on the amount of natural or raw material that we have available, and that we can anticipate being available under present practices in forestry management programs.

Starting under the foreign policy context, you have been sitting through most of these hearings thus far and you have heard me ask previous witnesses relating to whether or not they have knowledge as to what Japan is shipping to North Vietnam in terms of products which represents 20 times greater flow of goods and services into North Vietnam than they are trading with South Vietnam as between 1964 and 1966. Now, let me pose the same question to you.

Is it conceivable that logs shipped from Oregon and Washington could find their way into manufactured products in Japan which in turn would be products shipped into North Vietnam? Is this conceivable or possible?

Mr. McCracken. It is conceivable.

Senator Hatfield. Do you have any information as to what kind of products Japan is now shipping into North Vietnam?

Mr. McCracken. No, I do not. I have heard stories with respect to the shipment of lumber to North Vietnam, but I do not have personal knowledge of this.

Senator Hatfield. But just from a general matter of international trade.

Mr. McCracken. It is certainly feasible.

Senator Hatfield. With raw materials going into a manufactured item and then being traded out of that country to other countries it is conceivable?

Mr. McCracken. I would think so.

Senator Hatfield. On page 12 and I think later on in another reference you indicated that the Secretary of Agriculture recognized the possibility for increasing allowable cut, but then the sentence says: "The matter never got into the budget." And then later on I think you referred to another action or another recommendation or thought expressed by the Secretary when you say "It did not get into the President's budget."

Now, the question I have is this: The other reference is on page 21, you say "The item was omitted from the President's budget."

Now, did the Secretary put it in his budget before it was reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget on page 12 as say differing from the situation when you referred to the President's budget on page 21?

Mr. McCracken. I am not privileged, Senator Hatfield, to know the details of the budgetary discussions between the Secretary and the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget. I would have to say that I believe that the Department of Agriculture did place it in their budget, but as I say, I am not privileged to those discussions.

Senator Hatfield. The point I wanted to make clear in my own mind is whether you were just getting some polite talk or whether