

Mrs. MAY. Well, I think here we have preservation for perpetuity, which is the overall goal of all of us. We think this is land that must be administered very carefully for future generations. We believe we owe that to those people who come after us. That is the main thing that we are all in agreement on, though we may have different approaches to it. Secondly, of course, we feel that this answers more fully the question placed. At the same time, it makes available not just for specific groups of people in certain areas for a certain type of activity but truly for outdoor recreational interests of all of the people throughout the United States with a variety of recreational pressures which we have on all of our lands today.

Mr. TAYLOR. I judge that except for the 312,000 acres in the national park that the present multiple use would continue but perhaps more emphasis would be put on recreation.

Mrs. MAY. Far more emphasis. I assume this is what all the committee had in mind because that is the way they started on this. There should be more priority given to recreational use, to a far greater extent than it has been in all of these areas.

Mr. TAYLOR. You recommend, and the Governor recommended, establishing an advisory board to aid the Secretaries in planning and developing this area. We have established a great many national parks and recreation areas. Do you know of any specific reason why an advisory board is needed here more than would be in the redwoods, for example?

Mrs. MAY. I think the variety of a recreational plan like this, with a national park in it, with a wilderness area in it, and then high priority recreational areas, that you would need some very wise planning and management here, some good heads on it representing all the interests that might be affected, from the Forest Service to the park people, to the people of the State representing the Governor of that State.

Mr. TAYLOR. Of course, nationwide, we have a National Parks Advisory Board with Mr. Grosvenor of the National Geographic as the head of it. This would be sort of an advisory board working under an advisory board.

Mrs. MAY. Well, I suppose it could be. That depends on how the already established Board would feel here. I think they are very familiar and very interested in the development here, but they know it is an unusually large acreage. The large variety is even more unique as far as the usage. I think they might welcome some help on some of the major decisions, however this was set aside, as to what uses were decided for the recreation and other areas.

Mr. TAYLOR. You recommend establishing several smaller recreation areas inside the big recreation area. I just wonder if the terminology wouldn't be confusing.

Mrs. MAY. Perhaps the committee in its wisdom should have come up with something different because this is why I pointed out in my statement that we are not using the definition as a Federal definition. But, of course, defining it here so that—if I can refer back to my statement—to describe, and it seemed the only term that they could find that would describe, an entire area that should be set aside for that primary recreational use. Within the outside boundaries would be the high-intensity recreational use areas plus the national park and the wilderness.