

cussion. You said you wouldn't want to bind your successors for the next 20 years. This was with respect to the establishment of sanitary facilities.

This raises a question in my mind with respect to wilderness systems. If the time comes when this has to be put to a different kind of use which is different from a wilderness use, isn't it the logical thing then to change the classification of it rather than to dilute the concept of the wilderness system which Congress worked out after some 6 or 7 or 8 years of hard effort?

Wouldn't the logical answer be to then change the classification of this to some other classification so that we are not having within the wilderness system those things which comply with the original act and also areas of land which do not comply, but are still named wilderness?

Mr. GOTTSCHALK. I think that is correct, sir. If the future demands some changed usage of a particular area. I believe it would be mandatory that the agency come back to the Congress with a recommendation for a change in status.

Senator ALLOTT. In other words, if you had to established outdoor latrines and things like that and perhaps even broader facilities through this area, then to keep maintaining it as a wilderness system and in that classification only dilutes and diminishes the concept of the wilderness system as established by Congress. You do agree generally with this?

Mr. GOTTSCHALK. Yes, I do generally, but I am hopeful that we can establish the minimum kind of facilities needed to accommodate public use that would be acceptable on wilderness areas.

This is a very good and important point that we are discussing because if we are unable on these small areas which are going to be subject to a high degree of intensive public use, if we are unable to put the modest development needed to control public use, then I believe we would be put into the position of having to look at many of the other areas that would fully qualify for wilderness status under the act and which, in our opinion, fully justify inclusion in the wilderness system and need the protection of the wilderness system. But I am hopeful that we can recognize the difference between these high-use areas that we are going to be looking at in the refuge system in the East from some of the very extensive areas of the West where the ratio of people to unit area, acres, square miles, or whatever it is, is much lower and where these problems are not going to be so acute.

Senator ALLOTT. I think we are generally of the same mind. I think my own statements on the wilderness system have been often misquoted and misunderstood, but it was because I had some different ideas I was anxious to incorporate into the original system. But I agree that, having established it—and I think there is too much proliferation now in the Department of the Interior with various kinds and classifications of national land areas—I am reluctant to see the wilderness system diluted by development so that it results in a system which really isn't a wilderness system and doesn't comply with the original act.

I would like to ask this one solid question. On page 2 of this bill there is a section 3 which says that, "Except as necessary to meet minimum requirements in connection with the purposes for which the area is administered, including measures required in emergencies in-