

to go in on that basis, stop kidding us into believing this is a good-faith negotiation. It is not.

You don't go into negotiations without a minimum proposition below which you are not going to go. So when you give the committee, and let the record speak for itself on this, the kind of general language that you have given us, I ask you: What makes you think this industry should cooperate with you? If they are going over there with a head of the negotiating team that isn't representing a State Department that is committed to a ceiling for the purchase of logs, why should they go at all?

I will be glad to have your comments on it, because as far as I am concerned, this is the issue between the Senator from Oregon and the State Department. I know a great deal, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, about some of your negotiations. I would not lead my constituents into this kind of negotiation, if you are not ready to commit yourself here tonight that you are not going to come out of that negotiation without making perfectly clear to Japan that the State Department will not support a level of log purchases such as Japan purchased in 1967. In the absence of such a commitment, the State Department will be closing more mills in my State and putting more people out of employment. If that is the kind of an issue you wish to draw with this congressional delegation, go right ahead and draw it and we will take you on. If you are going to go over there as head of our delegation without being able to give us assurance you are going to stand for a commitment not in excess of the 1966 log purchases, then you ought to stay home and you shouldn't have the negotiations at all.

I can't be more clear than that. I speak respectfully but out of deep conviction that the kind of negotiation that doesn't carry with it that commitment on the part of the State Department in advance is just a waste of the time of the members of the forest industries from any State that you are going to take along.

So I will await your comment.

Mr. GREENWALD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With all due respect, I would like to make two comments. One, it is not the State Department that is in charge of the determination of the U.S. Government policy with respect to forest policy in the United States.

It is an administration determination. We happen to be the agency that is charged with the conduct of foreign relations and, therefore, someone from my Department will be the chairman of the U.S. delegation to the next meeting in Tokyo. The delegation's position will be an agreed administration position. It is not a State Department position. And I have no authority to say right now what that position is or should be. It isn't the State Department, it is the whole Executive Branch that includes the Department of Agriculture and all the other agencies that have a crucial interest in this matter.

Senator MORSE. Let the record show you are not answering my question. We are entitled to know as a committee what the position of the State Department is going to be.

As a practical matter, what that State Department recommends to the administration in all probability will be the position of the administration. The other agencies, Forest, BLM, Commerce, and Treasury, may I say are your associates; but in the final analysis, they will fall