

5. Wildernesses in the proposed North Cascades National Park region would be administered in accord with essentially the same principles, with one notable exception: Hunting. Hunting is permitted within national forest wilderness but would be prohibited in national park wilderness. This difference is one major reason why thousands of sportsmen in the State of Washington oppose creation of a national park in the area; and,

6. We do not believe that one Federal program should be created at the expense of another without reasons more compelling than those proposed in S. 1321.

Mr. Chairman, we hope the committee sees fit to preserve the incomparable beauty of the North Cascades by determining the size and conditions under which the area shall be preserved and then permit the Federal agency currently administering the area to implement congressional directives.

Regardless of whatever decision ultimately is made in this controversy, we would hope that the committee can give more time to consideration of all of the aspects to this complex situation.

Most of the land involved already is in governmental ownership and the urgency for acquisition that exists with respect to many other park, recreation areas, or seashore and lakeshore areas is not present in this situation.

The more controversial aspects of the proposed North Cascades legislation revolve around the protection of the scenic beauty of the area from the resource exploiter, namely the timber and wildlife harvester and mineral extractor. While it goes unquestioned that representative examples of unique forest specimens should be preserved in a pristine condition, Congress itself should make the decision on how much timber should be excluded from a sustained yield of forest products after a detailed inventory of the timber within the area is completed. Congress itself should determine how much of the area should be excluded from scientific wildlife management where recreational hunting is eliminated as a management tool, and this should be done only after careful consideration of the recommendations of the Washington Game Commission. Most certainly the extraction of minerals could have the greatest possible deleterious effect upon scenic grandeur but the \$600,000 mineral survey of the area by the U.S. Geological Survey will not be completed until the end of the year. Should not Congress know the variety, quantity, and economic value of all of the minerals located in the area before irrevocable decisions are made?

The urgency of a decision of this magnitude would be apparent if the land needing protection was in private ownership but the great bulk of the area is already in Federal ownership ably administered by the U.S. Forest Service with no significant changes in its wild character or incomparable scenic beauty for the last 30 years.

A congressional directive prohibiting timber cutting and mineral prospecting within the area until after all data currently being collected is made available and fully analyzed would afford all necessary protection until Congress renders a final decision.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, if the committee decides there is a compelling need for a North Cascades National Park at this time, with the accompanying wilderness areas and recreation areas, we believe it should be limited to the alpine reaches of the Picket Range to offer