3. It would provide fuller protection for the administrative "natural area" in the Baring Unit.

4. It would greatly enhance the enjoyment of the national wildlife refuge by those who seek back-country exploration, fishing, hunting, and nature study opportunities.

5. Only wilderness protection by Act of Congress will assure the protection of the Baring Unit from eventual development by man.

In view of the public interest in the Baring Unit and its potential wilderness value, the Bureau proposes to study this unit during the next 3-year period. Following the study, the unit will be presented through a public hearing and other media as required under provisions of the Wilderness Act.

2. Communications from citizens

One hundred and ninety-four communications were received from individuals. Of these, 174 were in support of the wilderness proposals for the same reasons outlined in "1" above. Twenty people were opposed to the project for the same reasons presented under "1" above.

3. Communications from organizations

Thirteen organizations submitted written statements for inclusion in the Wilderness Record. Twelve organizations supported the wilderness proposals for one or more of the same reasons listed in "1" above.

The St. Croix Pulpwood Company, Woodland, Maine, a subsidiary of the Georgia-Pacific Corporation, opposed the wilderness proposals because the company contends that wilderness is a "single-purpose" use.

4. Comments of elected officials

The Board of County Commissioners, Washington County, Maine, favored the Birch Islands wilderness proposal, but opposed designating any other part of the national wildlife refuge as wilderness.

An Eastport, Maine, town official objected to loss of pulp-cutting values and estimated that the annual loss would be up to $440,000.

5. State agencies

The Maine State Highway Commission objected to the restriction of wilderness status because of the possible eventual modernization (widening or superhighway construction) of Route 1 on the east boundary of the Edmunds Unit proposal.

The State Fish and Game representatives and University of Maine representatives objected to the effect they claim wilderness designation would have on loss of woodcock management and research opportunities in the Edmunds Unit.

The State of New Hampshire Committee on Natural Beauty supported the wilderness proposals and urged the addition of the Baring Unit.

6. Federal agencies

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation submitted a statement at the hearing in favor of wilderness status for the Edmunds Unit.

The Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines submitted a statement to be read at the hearing, but the statement was received too late. It is appended as statement number 1 in the "Correspondence received in the Washington Office after the hearing" section of the hearing record. The statement points out that sand, gravel, and clay are the only known mineral resources of economic value within the refuge area, but these are also abundant in the area surrounding the refuge. Igneous rock underlying the Edmunds Unit are not likely to contain minerals subject to the United States mineral leasing laws.

CHANGES IN BOUNDARIES OF PROPOSED WILDERNESS AFTER PUBLIC HEARING

As a result of analysis of the public hearing record and citizens communications, the boundaries of the Edmunds Wilderness Study Unit were reduced to include a total of about 2,775 acres in the western portion of the wilderness study unit. The reduction excludes an area in which manipulation of the habitat will be required to maintain woodcock and waterfowl populations. It also eliminates from consideration the area near Route 1. Thus, objections by the State Game and Fish representatives, University of Maine, and the Maine State Highway Commission have apparently been resolved.

Senator CHURCH. First, we are pleased to have with us the Senators from New Jersey, Senator Williams and Senator Case, and Congressman Freylinghuysen. We welcome your statements.