

Senator HANSEN. That is my general idea.

Mr. BONNEY. I am told that it is up through the reservation from Horse Ridge. At the end of Horse Ridge, as has just been pointed out to me, is probably one of the most scenic spots in the entire United States. But I feel it would be ruined by a tourist road up to that point. I would much rather see it stay as it is. The moment you put in a road, you have the pressure on it, just like you do at Old Faithful in Yellowstone. They can get in here by pack train or hiking. I have been there, and carried a pack all the way into that area of Horse Ridge, and really enjoyed myself because I was back there where it was all natural.

There are very often mountain sheep in that area that can be seen in the summertime. There are many things there that would be completely destroyed by the effects of civilization, which a road always brings.

Senator HANSEN. You are saying, then, that you would not favor the intrusion of a road into that primitive area. Is that right?

Mr. BONNEY. That would be my feeling on it and that, in the boundaries of the primitive area there, there should be no road beyond those boundaries. There may be some justification for some adjustment of those boundaries. They can't be adjusted very much, because the ridge defines them on the west, and the Indian reservation defines them on the east and south. On the glacier area, there cannot be much change in boundaries, but I would not be in favor of seeing a road go in there.

We may have to take another look at the northern boundaries, and talk to the people in the county and see where they feel they should be, but I don't believe a road should go in there.

Senator HANSEN. Just one further and final question, Mr. Bonney.

In your judgment, are the values that you see endangered, and those which you seek so earnestly to preserve, jeopardized almost exclusively by the timbering? Is this your main concern for asking that extra areas be included in the wilderness system, or are there other factors, as well?

Mr. BONNEY. There would be two main factors there that would disturb it.

One would be the timbering, which will certainly destroy it forever, and it is not worth it. There is just not enough involved in the timber and, of course, if it is put in the wilderness classification it can never be timbered. That is a protection against change of attitude in the Forest Service, or anywhere else. It is a full and final protection, and just one man can't say, "We have changed our minds. We are going to timber it off." That protects it, the act of putting it in the wilderness classification. The fact that there are no roads in there protects it from being overrun by people.

I believe in having the people see this proposed wilderness, and believe in building these recreational areas. There are numerous recreational areas, and we have not included any of those within the boundaries that we feel should be established as wilderness.

At Double Cabin you can go right in there, and are on the boundary of the wilderness area, but there is an area there that should be developed so that people can come there and hike into the wilderness. There are numerous other areas suitable for development, also.