

the administration for major changes in present Forest Service policies for administering the Federal forests that fall under its jurisdiction?

Mr. CLIFF. Senator Morse, we have construed this report as being a staff paper which was prepared as a prelude to discussions with the Department of Agriculture. The paper was sent over to the Department with the request from the Under Secretary of the Treasury that he would like to discuss this paper with us, and I think that was the intent—as a basis for discussion. At least I choose to construe it that way. But it was released in some way to the newspapers before it was released to us, and this gave us some consternation.

Senator MORSE. Do you have knowledge also that it was released to some Members of the Congress before it was released to you?

Mr. CLIFF. That is my understanding, but I do not know the details of that, sir.

Senator MORSE. I believe it was. Mr. Cliff, even as a staff report of the Treasury, in light of the use to which the report has been put publicly, in your long experience in Washington is it a common administrative practice among departments to be working on a report that involves the jurisdiction of another department in respect to some of the topics that are being investigated to prepare such a report with no consultation with the department involved during the preparation of the report?

Mr. CLIFF. That is not standard operating procedure as we practice it in the Department of Agriculture.

Senator MORSE. Has the Secretary of the Treasury or the Under Secretary of the Treasury or anyone else in the Treasury made any public statement that you can cite to this committee expressing any modifications of the report following what I assume are consultations that they must have had by now with your department?

Mr. CLIFF. Mr. Greely informs me that there was a statement made by one of the Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury describing this as a staff discussion paper.

Senator MORSE. I am familiar with that. But that does not change the fact that the staff report for the Treasury, has not yet been modified to the slightest degree to my knowledge by the Secretary of the Treasury. It does not change the fact that that report in my judgment has represented the points of view of the critics of your department who have sought to modify some of the policies of your department, which you again this morning defend in the very able statement. That is, in such areas as allowable cut; and policies of management that you have followed over the years administering Federal forests; and a proposal to export logs from Alaska in flagrant opposition to a policy that you have followed for years. If I understood you correctly, this policy goes back to 1928, and was established with considerable vision. But, when any department of Government, be it Treasury or any other, comes out with a report of that nature that has so many sections in it which are so completely contrary to the policy of the agency of the Government that has the legal duty to administer the forests, can we expect anything else but damage to your department as the result?

I do not care what semantics they use to describe their report. It is a report that adds up to criticism of forest management of the Forest Service, and I happen to be a stickler for procedure, as I think