

some-odd jobs in the lumber industry in Oregon. Well, that may very well be true. I have no way of challenging that figure. I would accept it. I think that we need to look, in the first place, at the duration of those jobs, and the answer, of course, immediately is, "This is sustained yield logging, the jobs will go on forever."

Don't you believe it. We don't log with a mule anymore. We have machinery, and further ahead into the future, fewer jobs are involved in the same kind of logging. That must be balanced against the jobs that an increase in the recreation industry would provide in the future, and the recreation industry buildup in the State. Admittedly, lumber is the major industry in Oregon. I have just heard a figure that it represents 47 percent, but it is falling all the time in its relative importance in the State. It is bound to continue to fall. It is the nature of the trends in our population, in our industrial base, and in the increased time for recreation that people have that provides for greater demands on the wilderness, greater demand on the other recreational facilities.

Senator METCALF. You say lumbering is falling as far as the employment of people is concerned, but not as a major industry as far as production of dollars worth of goods.

Mr. TEPPER. That is right. I think that it is falling in terms of its percent of the total, as other industries are building up. The lumber industry is not growing and other kinds of industry are.

I have a figure that Oregon has reserved only seven-tenths of 1 percent of its commercial timber for preservation; that is, reserved from cutting seven-tenths of 1 percent. A comparable figure for the State of Washington is 8 percent. I don't know what it is in other States. All that we are asking is a very small increase in this very small percentage of commercial timber that is in fact reserved. Obviously, all we can do is ask. It is the Congress that has to make the decision.

I would like now to direct my attention to the small areas including lakes, area E, Marion Lake, on the west side, shown in pink, area 15, on the southeast corner, representing a small section with two important recreation lakes, Square Lake and Round Lake. The Forest Service wishes to exclude these from inclusion in the wilderness, so that they can be developed for mass recreation. They are rather heavily used. They are relatively near to roads, although you can't drive into them. I would make this plea: That they be included in the wilderness so that they will have legal protection from despoliation in the future that they would not have if they were not in the wilderness. It would in no way inhibit the present level of use, nor an increase in the level of use. The Forest Service doesn't intend to put a road into Marion Lake. They said so this morning. Why can't we include it in the wilderness?

An argument may be, "Well, there are so many people there, we have to build toilets." Why can't you build pit toilets in the wilderness areas? There are pit toilets in wilderness areas all over the country. I can see no reason for that as an excuse. There is no question of commercial logging in either of these two areas.

Next, one of the major problems in the entire Mount Jefferson Wilderness at this time of reclassification is the shape of it. Not the total size, but the shape. It is long, it is narrow, and it has a vulnerable