

the definition of a wilderness is, among other things, described as, "One, generally appears to have been affected by the force of nature with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; two, has an outstanding solitude and primitive type of environment; three, has 5,000 acres of land or is of sufficient size to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition."

I don't think necessarily that this is the proper time to go into this. It seems to me these are matters for the further consideration by the committee with the advice and very competent help from the Department and from you, sir.

I, too, share Senator Allott's concern as to what we might be doing to a wilderness system, despite the strong motivation we all feel for setting aside and making available to the public an area which can make such a contribution as I believe this can. I must say I would be less than honest if I didn't admit that I have some misgivings as to the ability of this area here to qualify as part of the wilderness system. I don't propose to go further. I just wanted to be honest with you, sir, and say that.

Senator METCALF. Do you have a response to that?

Mr. GOTTSCHALK. Only to say that we felt it important to bring up this concept for the consideration of the Congress, both in the other body and before this committee because there are important guidelines that have to be developed. To use Great Swamp as an example, whatever the judgment of the Congress is, the guidelines with respect to refuges in the Wilderness Act are not as explicit as they are with some other lands, but we will adjust our program to fit.

If, for example, it is finally the judgment of the committees that the wilderness concept should be not diminished by any kind of development at all, we will adopt that policy and apply that concept to both of the units that are shown on this map.

We will do the same thing to other areas in the refuge system that have been studied to determine their suitability for wilderness up to the point where we feel there is a serious interference between wilderness status and the objectives for which the refuge was established. There may be some cases like this, I am not prepared to go into it in detail, but responding to the Senator's suggestion I think we would be very happy to discuss it in more detail with the committee, should you so desire.

Senator HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is certainly indicated that we ought to give serious consideration to the purpose for which the wildlife refuge was established. At the same time we ought not to be oblivious to the great concern we hold for the people who will use these areas as well as to the contribution the area can make toward improvement of migratory waterfowl habitats.

I think we ought to be concerned primarily with the establishment of an area to accommodate, as much as possible, the people and the wildlife, which are of prime concern, without having to dilute what I think is really a very important wilderness concept as reflected in the Wilderness Act itself.

I simply suggest that we can serve the purposes which are foremost in our minds now without necessarily—I emphasize the word "necessarily"—saying it has to become part of the wilderness system. These are some very serious considerations that I am sure you and I share, John.