

express to the negotiators that you will give very earnest consideration to the position of industry in this regard, wherein in effect, as you realize, they are united in their feeling that what we ought to be talking about in the way of round log purchases, is the 1966 level, and that they are deeply concerned that if we even go on to the 1967 level, we have done grave injury to the supply of log purchases that will deprive U.S. producers of log supplies needed, and this is part of the apprehension that we feel about the delay in the meetings. I don't mean intentional delay on your part. I recognize the practicalities that State faces in this regard, but by waiting 2 months from December we are afraid that this rising amount of export is going to be part of what the Japanese negotiators are going to expect will be the base of operations when we already feel that as a base for any further mix we should go no further than the 1966 level.

So while I don't ask you to declare your position at the moment on this, I would like to make that statement again on behalf of industry, how strongly industry and a united front feels about that 1966 level, and how we of the congressional delegation of Oregon, or at least this one member of the congressional delegation of Oregon—I leave my colleagues to speak for themselves—how strongly we feel that the position of industry in this regard is a sound one, and we ought to be talking about that and not going on because this point No. 2 stands by itself independent of your other five objectives, and whatever we may do in expanding and broadening and everything else, we still come back to this terribly difficult point two. This, in our opinion, is a material factor in driving mills out of operation in Oregon and stopping employment in the State of Oregon.

My I ask briefly again, as a followup of what Senator Hatfield spoke in terms of mainly about the involvement of industry people in the negotiations. Now, you have indicated your expectation that industry personnel will be involved as conegotiators, not as an advisory committee on the side, and you also, I think, threw in one sentence that left me with a little bit of question as to whether the Japanese have yet agreed to this? May I ask whether or not it is understood this will be the case, or whether this is still hoped for, as far as the Japanese are concerned?

Mr. GREENWALD. I hesitate to use an entire diplomatic phrase like "in principle," but all I can say at this stage, it is agreed in principle. All the details of the meeting haven't been worked out, but my impression, from the most recent information we have from Tokyo, is that the involvement of industry people is agreed in principle. Personally I don't really have much doubt about it. Again, diplomatic courtesy is that I don't want to make it sound as though something is all settled, signed and delivered, when we haven't worked out all the details with the Japanese, and we shouldn't state it publicly.

Representative DELLENBACK. We don't want something to appear in the press tomorrow that the United States, as a fact, this industry will be involved in negotiations; that it is your high expectation this will be the case and it is agreed on in principle this will be the case?

Mr. GREENWALD. Yes.

Representative DELLENBACK. May I ask how industry representatives are to be selected for this negotiation? Will it be done by the delegation from the administration side, or will it be turning to industry