

tional forests in the Western United States, and have been typical of the western tradition in wilderness reserves. The proposals before you involve land which are administered now—and would continue, with their wilderness designations, to be administered—as wildlife refuges by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. All are relatively small, wild, and in a natural condition. They are located in the Eastern or Midwestern United States. Importantly, they are similar to those already protected as wilderness. These are lands—where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man—lands retaining their primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation—lands generally appearing to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable. These areas provide outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation. They contain ecological, geological, and other features of scientific, educational, scenic, and historical value. Each of these areas is federally owned, and has at least 5,000 acres of land or is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition as wilderness.

I think it is important to note that the Congress in working out the Wilderness Act has made clear allowance for the inclusion in the wilderness system of areas which are indeed smaller than 5,000 acres. The 5,000 acre criterion is used as a general guide to the wilderness agencies for the purpose of some of their reviews but certainly it is not to be used in any context as a means of eliminating from consideration important units of the type that the committee has before it here today in the measures it is considering.

Senator METCALF. The Wilderness Act requires, in fact, a review of all areas of 5,000 acres or more; isn't that correct?

Mr. BRANDBORG. That is correct.

Senator METCALF. But for the reason Dr. Gottschalk cited for the Great Swamp area, it doesn't mean it has to be 5,000 acres.

Mr. BRANDBORG. That is correct. There is nothing in the act that prevents the review of smaller areas within the context of your concept.

These areas meet all of the criteria of suitability established by the parent Wilderness Act. They bring to our wilderness system a new diversity of land types, a new variety of ecological communities, and a broader geographical distribution and representation. They bring different but not lesser forms of wild land into a wilderness system which will be broadened and diversified by their addition, and will thus more fully serve its mandate to protect "an enduring resource of wilderness" for the American people of present and future generations.

Furthermore, there is a vital need for legal protection of the wilderness character of these lands. The excellent record of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in administering these and the other refuges and game ranges as wildlife sanctuaries is gratefully acknowledged. The intent of the Bureau to preserve natural conditions is recognized and commended.

It is increasingly apparent, however, that new and mounting pressures for development have become so intense that present laws and regulations governing the protection of de facto wilderness are inade-