

policy being placed upon the purchasing practices of Japan in buying logs for export at the prices they have been paying in the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. GREENWALD. You want a "Yes" or "No" answer?

Senator MORSE. I want to know whether or not you have reached that conclusion.

Mr. GREENWALD. We have reached the conclusion, along with the rest of the administration, there is a problem in the Pacific Northwest that requires some kind of an action. We feel, as Mr. Cliff and others said, we should follow the course, at least through the February 20 meeting, of seeing whether we can find a solution through discussions with the Japanese before we make a final determination.

Senator MORSE. Some kind of action? What do you mean by some kind of action?

Mr. GREENWALD. Some kind of action that will alleviate the problem.

Senator MORSE. If you let them continue to buy logs as they have been buying logs, more mills will be going down. I want to know whether the State Department has reached a conclusion that the Japanese policy of purchasing logs must be restricted? That is why I asked for a "Yes" or "No." And if your answer isn't "Yes," I speak more specifically, this proposal for negotiations with Japan is a facade. They will be a waste of the industry's time and the committee's time. Neither you nor anybody else would be qualified to negotiate for our country in such a situation. Are you going over there without your mind made up as to whether or not the log purchase ceiling based upon the levels of 1966 or 1967 is to be established or whether unrestricted log exports are to continue and be increased, as the evidence in this record shows, up to 2 or even 3 billion board feet of logs in the next few years? We are entitled to know that now before you go into negotiation. If the position of the State Department is that it has no position, I will do what I can to stop your appropriation for such negotiations, because it would be a waste of our money.

I don't see how you can possibly justify going into negotiation, if you aren't going to go in with a plan agreed upon that sets up a floor in which you say to the Japanese: "We come here to tell you that you are not going to be allowed to buy the amount of logs that you bought in 1967."

You know what our witnesses testified on the case for restrictions and what this record shows. We think there should not be more than 350 million feet, which was the 1966 figure, and the difficulty with you people in the State Department, from the beginning of this case, is just the evasiveness you are now trying to get by with me.

I would like to have a definite answer to my question, or let the record show you didn't answer. And if you don't want to answer, then we have to have a determination, may I say, with the State Department, as to whether or not we should be drawn into this kind of a negotiating facade. And I repeat my question now to you, Is the State Department going to make clear to Japan that we cannot permit a continuation of the purchase of Japanese logs, in any such amount as they purchased logs in 1967, which automatically answers what we are not going to agree to in 1968, 1969, 1970, and 1971? From the testimony and the evidence in the record, they expect to go up to several billion board feet in the next few years. If you are further not going