

some deterioration of the high standards set for that concept in other important areas of the country.

Mr. GUTERMUTH. No, I very definitely would want this to be administered for all time as a very true part of the National Wilderness System and if there is going to be any question about encroachment about the wilderness problem, then I would like whatever it takes to maintain and preserve that wilderness concept. I would want it to apply in this area.

In effect, we are just asking that this be done so we will give this added protection to this area. I will say this in front of Mr. Gottschalk and my other good friends here in the Bureau, I don't want them building a lot of latrines and that sort of thing in this area. If they are not going to do it in wilderness, then why do it here.

Senator HANSEN. I certainly must agree with you; it is going to be a case of either/or. Either we are going to recognize the same restrictions, the same standards in this area that we apply in other sections of the country or we will do damage to the wilderness concept. If it is to be used here, then I agree with you that we have to be tough and firm and unyielding and say the same guidelines we recognize as having value in other places apply here. This is not for me to resolve. I will have a small voice in this resolution, but I think basically the people most directly affected ought to ask themselves, Is this the response that they think Congress should give to the great interest in this problem here? Is this the designation, are these the restrictions which will be most responsive to the wishes of the people? If they are, the law must be applied toughly. The law is going to have to be administered carefully because there will be people saying my little boy doesn't want to walk a mile from this area to the latrine. I say it ought not to be done. But if that is what the people here want, then I will go along with it.

Mr. GUTERMUTH. I don't think we need to worry too much about that. For example, in the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area a short time ago when Congress enacted the San Rafael and San Gabriel bills, I heard no such discussion. I see no purpose of it here. I would like it set aside as wilderness and preserved in that way.

Senator HANSEN. I think the purpose here, if I may be so bold as to suggest it, is that somewhere down the road somebody will be reading the legislative history on this particular bill and they will try to say the precedent was set and the will of Congress was set back in 1968 as to what was intended.

The administration of the law has a vital impact upon the way we proceed under the law and not only do the courts determine these things, but administratively the practice is to assume a certain intention was declared by the Congress and we proceed on that basis.

There are a series of Executive acts where I think it can be construed by the courts the precedent was well set. I think there is a useful purpose in discussing it.

Mr. GUTERMUTH. I can understand the great concern of Dr. Gottschalk and the others here, but if our concept in setting aside and designating these wilderness areas is correct, then the refuge system and the national park systems in those areas set aside and designated as wilderness are only going to be a portion of the refuges and a portion of the national parks and that sort of thing.

Let the public use and the development and the providing of facilities for hordes of people and that sort of thing be provided in the