

any man-made changes in the nature or character of the area under consideration in H.R. 16771.

We are cognizant of the very high standards that an area must meet to obtain wilderness status. We are aware, further, of the limitations placed on an area as a result of achieving this status.

Without affirmative action by Congress, the Great Swamp will remain vulnerable to man's encroachment. This is a unique area, and is particularly valuable located as it is in the densely-populated New York-New Jersey metropolitan area. We feel it is deserving of the highest possible protection by Congress.

With warm personal regards,

John E. Hunt; Charles S. Joelson; Charles W. Sandman; Henry Helstoski; James J. Howard; Peter W. Rodino, Jr.; Frank Thompson, Jr.; Joseph G. Minish; Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen; Florence P. Dwyer; William T. Cahill; Cornelius E. Gallagher; William B. Widnall, Dominick V. Daniels; Edward J. Patten.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I cannot emphasize too strongly our desire to keep this area of the Great Swamp in its pristine and unspoiled state. We are most definitely opposed to any manmade improvements or changes in the nature or character of the area under consideration. In short, Mr. Chairman, we feel that the swamp is most deserving of the highest possible protection by Congress.

I might just add one thing more and that is at an appropriate time I would like to introduce others who have come down to testify before this committee from my home county and the adjoining county of Somerset, which is also deeply interested in this project.

Senator CHURCH. Yes, if you would just remain at the table, we will hear now from Senator Nelson of our committee. I want to thank him for obliging us the way he has.

STATEMENT OF HON. GAYLORD NELSON, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Senator NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am appearing in behalf of S. 3502, which is sponsored by myself, the senior Senator from Wisconsin and the Senators from Michigan. Senator Muskie was not available at the time we were endorsing the proposal. This bill would designate six wilderness areas in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Maine. I am gratified, Mr. Chairman, that hearings on the bill have been scheduled so promptly. I hope we can anticipate that these and the other proposals you are considering today will be acted upon and become a part of the conservation record of the 90th Congress.

I am especially happy to take part in these considerations, not only because an area in my State is involved, but because this marks a great step in the further implementation of the 1964 Wilderness Act.

As a sponsor of the wilderness bill, I am happy to see this landmark law being extended to protect additional wild areas. Since passage of the act in 1964, 30 proposals have been made to the Congress. Already two Forest Service areas have been fully considered by the Congress. Acts of Congress have made the San Rafael and San Gabriel Wilderness Areas in California the first two additions to the national wilderness preservation system since the Wilderness Act was enacted.

Today the committee is beginning the consideration of areas in our national wildlife refuge system for wilderness protection. This is a great step for the program, for in many ways the refuges bring new