

large investment by the company and has tremendous mill capacity. It is only right and fair that the Forest Service should try to provide sufficient timber to maintain the operation of the mill; and it has always been the policy of the Forest Service to recognize investments connected with forest use, from a fence or cow camp built by a stockman to a cabin on a special use permit.

In the case of the U.S. Plywood timber operation, I suspect that the Forest Service has a tiger by the tail through the fault of no one person or organization. Both timber consumption and the capacity to consume have increased far beyond what anyone would have believed 20 or even 10 years ago.

With the extremely slow and difficult growth of timber in the high, cold, and arid Wind River Mountains, it is inevitable that sooner or later the timber will be gone, and U.S. Plywood or any other operator will find it necessary to seek trees somewhere else.

The comparatively small amount of timber which we would like to see included within the wilderness would maintain the Dubois sawmill only a very short time and is relatively unimportant.

The Forest Service estimates there are 30 million board feet in the east and west Dubois area under consideration, and this will last the mill less than a year.

Everyone who has watched the clear cutting going on in the Wind River Mountains is convinced that if these timbered areas are not included in the Washakie Wilderness Area they will be logged in a very short time, with the consequent loss of so much that can never be replaced once it is gone.

I want to repeat that—which can never be replaced, once it is gone.

The Forest Service is all set to start construction of a timber access road just as soon as the wilderness boundaries are legally established, and in spite of local assurances that no roadbuilding or logging would be done until that time, a block has recently been cut on Wolf Creek, which is within the area in question, an act which dramatically removes the decision from the Congress of the United States. Why have hearings, debate, public participation, if the areas in question are logged without waiting for the wilderness boundaries to be established by law?

This certainly effectively removes them from future consideration. The reason the Forest Service needs recreation areas on east and west Dubois, within the area we want included in the wilderness, is that they have devastated the country below that boundary. They have logged all along the creeks. If they want public recreation for people on the park that should be, just go to the ridge on the highway on Long Creek, but that is completely devastated, logged, and turned up. It is no place for public recreation.

This is the situation which has brought us to Washington and makes the Dubois community so unanimous in its desire to have these additions made to the Forest Service proposal for the wilderness area. Other people are here to explain the boundaries and areas in question in detail and tell you what roadbuilding and logging will do to the matchless scenic excellence, the game habitat, the watershed. The elk herd in question is not a migratory herd. I am not even sure that migration routes enter into it too much. They live in the country, and Senator Hansen and Mr. Bonney had a discussion of how the elk go into