

The Great Swamp is also important for its general environmental value, and the fact that there are so many people nearby to enjoy it. One simple measure is that residents of New Jersey and the New York City area have contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars, and countless hours of volunteer work to save the swamp.

A wilderness preserved in the heart of the swamp can provide scenic beauty in the midst of a giant suburban-industrial complex—a stretch of open greenery, quiet, and relief from exhaust fumes and industrial chimneys—a buffer against noise and pollution. In addition the proposed wilderness area can enhance the surrounding park and mass recreation facilities, planned or already in use around the Great Swamp, by providing an inner sanctuary as a breeding ground and haven for wildlife.

The proposed Great Swamp area is not big enough to qualify as a wilderness under the general yardstick used by the Wilderness Act, but we believe it clearly qualifies under the provision that makes exceptions for islands, and includes “ecological” islands as well as those surrounded by water. The mere fact that the Great Swamp is still there to be saved—that its natural features have resisted the inroads of civilization for so long—proves that these features do, indeed, make it an island. We believe that with the protection of this proposed law it can continue to exist as an island of wilderness, consistent with the letter and spirit of the Wilderness Act.

We urge a favorable report on this and the other three bills, and we thank you for letting the National Audubon Society present its views.

I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, that also this area now, we believe, does qualify as two separate units of wilderness, it would certainly be preferable, we believe, to remove the road entirely and make it into a single wilderness area and since it has been testified here that local authorities are willing to do so, if this is necessary we recommend that the committee make it necessary to close off the road.

Senator METCALF. As Dr. Gottschalk stated, the Migratory Bird Association has told us that by withholding some of the duck stamp money we will be able to move all of those people out of the area who are served by the road, so there would really be no use for the road or justification for it except as an access road, which several have already said is outside of the concept of the wilderness system. All of us can justify roads in these areas for a time in order to take care of some of these inholdings we can't acquire but if we can, through the duck stamp money or in other ways, acquire these inholdings, I would concur with you that there doesn't seem to be any use for an access road to such a small area as this.

Mr. BOARDMAN. I believe it is a shortcut for half a dozen people going to Chatham and I don't think that should stand in our way.

Senator METCALF. For a long time I have been having a running feud with the Bureau of Public Roads about putting roads through public wildlife refuges and I would like to take one out for a change.

Mr. BOARDMAN. We certainly concur.

Senator METCALF. Thank you.

The next witness is Mr. Stewart M. Brandborg, executive director of the Wilderness Society. Mr. Brandborg is a Montanan and certainly equipped to testify about wilderness in the West as well as the whole concept of wilderness on behalf of the Wilderness Society.