

ness is a question that must be determined in the light of future populations, rather than present-day economics alone.

I am not trying to say that we can ignore economic arguments. I am simply saying that it is impossible to have too much vision. I would speak to the idea that we have to make our decisions now if we are going to preserve anything as wilderness. Any decision made at this time to exclude areas that are proposed for wilderness is an irrevocable decision, because those lands will be placed under the multiple-use, sustained-yield logging, and very quickly, once a road——

Senator METCALF. Well, now, we discussed this a moment ago, and we had an area J which was recommended to be incorporated in a wilderness that had been logged over, and has a network of roads.

Mr. TEPFER. Yes; but not with present-day logging methods, with all the machinery, and all the blasting, and all the roads.

Senator METCALF. It doesn't always result in the fact that a logging or logging operation destroys an area for future incorporation into the wilderness.

Mr. TEPFER. That is right; but it is never quite the same as if you get it before it has been logged.

Senator METCALF. Then we should take area J out.

Mr. TEPFER. Area J in the Washakie?

Senator METCALF. Yes.

Mr. TEPFER. All I know about area J is what I heard this morning, sir. From what I heard of area J, I think that the intrusions have not been sufficient to exclude it, but if you look over the logged-over country in western Oregon, I think you would say that it would be a long time before you could even think about it in the same fashion.

I will get back to that point, though, on another matter, in a minute.

I am saying that if we draw the line for preservation at a time of any future national emergency, the Congress makes the line, the Congress can move the line. You are saving the trees, and they will be there. You are saving the land, and you can change the decision, if necessary, although, I hope it would never be necessary.

Most of the discussion in the Jefferson has to do with the west side areas that are designated by No. 14 in pale blue on the map.

I would like to speak first in connection with the statement made this morning that one of the functions of a wilderness area is to preserve an example of the forest heritage.

Well, the Mount Jefferson Wilderness indeed will preserve a segment of the forest heritage of Oregon, according to the present boundaries, but most of the commercial forests of Oregon are Douglas-fir forests, and very, very little of the forest that is set up for preservation is indeed Douglas fir forest.

Somewhere between 2,000 and 3,000 acres of it are; but the rest of it is Alpine and sub-Alpine types, other species. There are mountains, glaciers, meadows, beautiful, magnificent country; but the forests are not, in fact, representatives of what the forests were in western Oregon, because that is high country. Most of the effort in setting lines on area 14 was to include some of the somewhat lower elevation Douglas-fir forest. Not the best of it. The best of it is already open to logging, and that is fine.

The next point is the question of jobs. The statement was made by the Forest Service that, if area 14 were excluded, we would lose 600-