

channel of the Potomac used for navigation is very narrow, a few hundred feet right down the center. Therefore, if you are going to say that anything in the Potomac not actually used for navigation is going to be filled, what you have said is: "Let the land developers come along, let them fill the Potomac, all except a little 100-foot-wide open sewer in the middle, and we will give them land at the taxpayers' expense." Well, I don't really think that that is a very good way to preserve the Potomac.

I would hope that the Corps of Engineers would find its conscience one of these days and decide that its job is not just to look at navigation, with a little permission to conservationists to bring up wildlife values, but that its job is also to consider the public interest generally.

Step 2, the Fish and Wildlife Service, immediately after it found out about this, made firm and forthright objection to the fill for just the reasons I have given—that this is the great resting place for the diving ducks in the Washington area, and to ruin any part of it is to go counter to our national policy of trying to save rather than destroy wildlife areas.

Incidentally, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service have splendid records throughout this entire matter at all times, including right up to now. The same cannot be said of some of the political officers in the Department of the Interior, or the Corps of Engineers. But the record shows a real dedication to the public interest and the conservation interest, by the Fish and Wildlife Service throughout the course of this Hunting Creek matter.

On pages 3 and 4 of our statement are set forth the reports of the Fish and Wildlife Service 3 years ago as well as the report of their expert biologist, Dr. Uhler, all of which come down to this, and I will give you the conclusion:

"We conclude that the ecological factors of shallow productive waters, adjacent marshes, and abundant food supply combine to make Hunting Creek an attractive area for waterfowl and other water-oriented wildlife. The combination of available wildlife and public access provides an opportunity for the observation, study, and enjoyment of aquatic life in the immediate vicinity of our Nation's Capital. Therefore, the Bureau feels that every effort should be made to protect these esthetically valuable resources."

At the same time, the National Park Service heard about this and vigorously objected, saying "We intend to build a park at Jones Point, and hence we oppose the fill."

Congressman Saylor, Congressman Moss, and myself also heard of this in the spring or summer of 1964 and we, too, vigorously protested it, both to the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior, and due to the protest of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, and perhaps some of the rest of us, the Corps of Engineers, on December 9, 1964, wrote us a very welcome letter saying "We are giving up, we are going to take no further action on these requested permits because of the obvious damage to the public interest if the fill permit were granted."

We then dismissed the matter from our minds for 3 years.

Then in the fall, August and September of 1967, the applicants suddenly became very aggressive again, and out of the blue—though we didn't know it at the time—on October 10, 1967, the Assistant Sec-