

or completely illuminating, at least to the Forest Service; is this right?

Mr. GREELEY. Senator, we have not wanted to poke into things that people did not want to tell us. We have gone for many years in the belief that the area that is shown in white there did not contain points that are of particular religious significance. On the basis of the testimony given in the hearings 2 years ago, that belief may not be correct. We may have been wrong in that assumption and this is what I am trying basically to get at.

We don't want to know precisely but we would like to know in general. I should also comment that there is a community to the east of this area and there is a timber sawmill operator who is not even getting timber to operate his mill and maintain the community. If all other things were equal, if there were an area of national forest lands being managed under multiple-use principles, we would be conducting a carefully done timber harvest operation in there. I think this is not an area which would be treated under conventional forest service multiple-use plans and standards for the very reasons that we are here talking about.

The point I would like to make here on this record is that we do not think we should impose our fixed, rigid ideas about how we would manage timber in this area over what I am assuming would probably be some quite valid objections on the part of the Indians. If there are some parts where there would not be objections then we think over the long period of time we should have some timber harvest operations there.

Senator HANSEN. You spoke about the possibility of developing an increasing visitor-day use, or did you mean daytime use?

Mr. GREELEY. Yes, in and out in a day.

Senator HANSEN. Would this sort of development, which I assume is being contemplated by the Forest Service, be a valid reason for fear among the Indians that the privacy of the area, insofar as their religious activities are concerned, might be damaged or invaded?

Mr. GREELEY. When we were first dealing under the permit, we were given to understand and we had the impression that there was a period during August which was a time, which was a critical time, when the whole area should be left vacant and there was not the same degree of criticalness as far as the need for privacy is so concerned at other times of the year.

Again, in recent years, we have been told mostly through criticisms of things people did not like that maybe we did not have the right interpretation of this. Again we have been going kind of blind because we have purposely not been trying to find out what their religious ceremonials are and we don't want to find out about them.

If there could be agreement, in our thinking in the amended legislation we propose is that the area that is outlined in the dashed line there should be for the exclusive use of the Indians and nobody else go in there at any time of year. As we have been given to understand over a period of time, this does include the principal areas that we have been told about as having religious significance.

Now if there are other areas that could be treated the same way, I think the same arrangement could be worked out. That is the way we would prefer to do it.