

ume, area and growth estimates. The first working circle management plan based on modern inventory and growth figures was approved in 1958. Since 1958, new management plans for the remaining working circles have been approved and new allowable cuts for each have been established. The newest plan and allowable cut is for the Chugach National Forest. It raised the allowable cut of accessible timber on the Chugach Working Circle from 40 million board feet to 67 million board feet.

As each working circle management plan and allowable cut has been placed in use, the total allowable cut for the Forest and Region has changed. In some cases, these changes have raised the then current allowable cut and in some cases it has reduced it.

In addition to major changes in allowable cuts resulting from modern inventories and growth data, volume utilization studies have been undertaken periodically to determine the effectiveness of inventory procedures. These studies resulted in some changes in allowable cuts during the period since 1958.

The following changes in National Forest allowable cuts have taken place in Alaska during the past ten years.

(In millions of board feet)

Year	Allowable cuts		
	Tongass	Chugach	Total
1959.....	851.5	79.0	930.5
1960.....	958.5	79.0	1,037.5
1961.....	958.5	79.0	1,037.5
1962.....	800.4	79.0	879.4
1963.....	824.3	79.0	903.3
1964.....	823.9	79.0	902.9
1965.....	823.9	79.0	902.9
1966.....	823.9	40.0	863.9
1967.....	823.9	40.0	863.9
1968.....	823.9	67.5	891.4

Senator MORSE. Senator Hatfield has some more questions which he wishes to ask.

Senator HATFIELD. Mr. Cliff, this morning when I was questioning you, I asked the question as to what you would do with this power that you now feel that you have to apply regulations for primary manufacturing policy to Oregon and Washington, and you indicated to me in your answer that if contemplated talks with Japan fail, then you would feel compelled to at least recommend this plan of action to the Secretary.

Now, this afternoon in answering Congressman Dellenback along this same line, I understood you to say that if there were no, I believe you used the phrase if no meaningful results were obtained from this conference there may be a followup conference or additional or a further conference, but you indicated that you would have to wait before you made such recommendations until the possibility of a further conference. Now, the question I have is this. I am sure you realize the Japanese will be reading this record, and if they felt that you meant that further meetings would allow delay, then each meeting actually could become another chance to delay, and thereby maintain the status quo or continue the further erosion of our whole timber economy by inaction. So the question I have is what in your opinion would constitute meaningful results coming out of these negotiations before you would either take action or not have to take action to recommend primary cutting policy restrictions.

Mr. CLIFF. I think an example of meaningful results would be informal agreement by the Japanese or a formal agreement that they