

on the part of people to not necessarily just pick the crest of the ridges as boundaries, but to move over to where they would afford greater protection to this narrow strip of land, and I believe that there is a certain wisdom in that. Some of those precipitous slopes there are not adaptable to good mining, or good timbering operations. At least it would be costly. On the other hand, in concluding, maybe I should say that I have the greatest respect and admiration for the Forest Service, and the way in which they have carried on their program, and they have been good custodians of our wilderness areas over these many years. I have a great faith in them.

Senator HANSEN. It was my understanding that some of the points the Forest Service had in mind, in going along the crest of a watershed, or following a stream, was the obvious advantage that it would be to all and sundry in being able to determine where the boundary of a wilderness was; whereas, if they were to select arbitrarily, say, a line that had not been as yet surveyed, along a mountain slope, or through a valley, that this sort of designation would require first a survey in order that it might be established, and then a description, and, following that, a decision.

And personally, I found some merit in following streams and watersheds as natural boundary lines, that I should think most anyone could easily discern and follow.

Now, is it your thought that these criteria could be replaced by some other system?

Mr. GUTERMUTH. No, I don't have a better system, but what disturbs me a little bit is the fact that in one place, they have designated the crest of prominent ridges, and they hold that this positively must be this boundary, in this particular instance. In the next case they will move over into a valley, and in another case they will pick a river, we will say. And they say in each case, "Now, this positively must be the boundary." I am inclined to think that the reasons that impelled them to select a river valley, for example, as a good obvious marker, could in a great many cases be the case, rather than the ridge. In this particular case, Mount Jefferson, as I understand it, they have selected a ridge as being the western boundary of this area, and they say that this positively must be the boundary line.

But in reality, I am not familiar enough with it to point it out, it is conceivable that some of those rivers could just as well be a good boundary line in this particular case and those precipitous slopes along the western side of this ridge be avoided and thus afford greater protection to the Mount Jefferson Area.

Senator HANSEN. I wouldn't argue at all that we should be restricted in our designation of wilderness areas by the place that God happened to put a stream, or build a mountain range.

Mr. GUTERMUTH. No.

Senator HANSEN. But, on the other hand, I should think we can all recognize that when you are describing areas such as wilderness areas, we don't have an area that will be entirely surrounded by watershed, nor do we usually find one that would be circumscribed by streams, so that both systems, I should think, might very well have to be used.

I don't think, and I am simply repeating now, that we ought to look at an area and say, "Well, it has got to be here, because here is