

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD W. BROOKE, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Chairman, no one can deny that certain national areas of our environment, if not preserved now, will be lost to us forever. S. 3425 which is presently before this committee, seeks primarily to retain Monomoy Island as a quiet, unspoiled preserve, enjoyed solely by sportsmen, nature lovers, hikers and campers. It is apparent that this can best be accomplished by its being designated a wildlife area.

The accelerated increase in the population of Cape Cod puts great pressure on the Cape's last unprotected and truly virgin tract of beach. The everpresent need for human solitude of wilderness in the midst of dense population serves to emphasize the necessity to preserve for future generations this unique, barrier beach-type wilderness.

Making Monomoy into a wilderness area would not infringe upon the rights of any of those who presently enjoy its resources, nor would it necessitate any changes in the management of the Interior (as a result of the Island being designated a wildlife refuge in 1941). There are no improved roads on the Island so there are none that would need to be kept under repair. Further, in the event that the Corps of Engineers connects Monomoy Island to the Mainland by a sandspit, the Department of the Interior has indicated their willingness to cooperate with the Corps.

It is apparent from the public hearings held in Chatham, Massachusetts on the subject of designating Monomoy Island a wilderness area that an overwhelming majority of the population favors passage of this legislation. Those who would use the island the most have pointed out that not only is the legislation needed to protect this island's beauty, but also its value as a wildlife refuge for feeding and nesting birds. I might also point out that it is the only area with wilderness potential within a reasonable one day drive from Boston. Also, it would, I believe, be a beneficial adjunct to the Cape Cod National Seashore.

I am hopeful, therefore, that this committee will take swift and positive action on S. 3425 in order that this beautiful scenic resource may be preserved.

Senator METCALF. Before we get into the broad discussion of these four measures by the conservation groups who have come to testify, I think it would be well to include the statements of Senators Holland and Smathers and Congressman Rogers, all of Florida, on S. 3343, the Pelican Island National Wilderness legislation.

(The statements referred to follow:)

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1968.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is our understanding that your Committee will shortly consider S. 3343, which both of us joined in introducing, to designate certain lands in the Pelican National Wildlife Refuge, Indian River County, Florida, as wilderness.

The Pelican Island National Wildlife Refuge comprises about 403 acres and is located some 75 miles north of West Palm Beach, Florida. It includes Roseate, Pelican, Roosevelt, Horseshoe, North Horseshoe, Long, David, Plug, North and South Oyster, Preachers, Middle, Nelson, Pauls, and the four small islands designated as Egret Island. A portion of the refuge is located on the mainland but has been cut up by a mosquito control project and contains numerous roads and therefore is not included in this proposal.

In April 1967, public hearings on the proposed Pelican Island Wilderness were held in Vero Beach, Florida, at which time testimony from citizens and public officials fully endorsed the proposal. During the course of hearings, the primary reasons for supporting the inclusion of Pelican Island in the National Wilderness Preservation were given: protection of colonial birds and their nesting and feeding habitat; protection of estuarine and fisheries resources; long-range preservation of natural areas for scenic, aesthetic and ecological values; preservation