

retary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Dr. Stanley A. Cain, wrote a letter to the District Engineer of the Corps of Engineers, Colonel Rhea, at Baltimore, saying the following, in effect: "The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the National Park Service in 1964 advised the Corps of Engineers of their opposition to the granting of the requested permits." They had opposed the fill, they continued to oppose it in July 1964, when the fill applications were slightly revised to reduce their area. But then, "However, since that time we have reconsidered our interests in this matter, in the light of existing conditions in the area. We have concluded that the granting of the applications would not significantly affect recreation or conservation values in the Hunting Creek area. Accordingly, we withdraw the objections interposed to the granting of the permits in accordance with the revised applications."

Incidentally, I notice a misprint in our statement on page 5. It says October 10, 1964. That should be October 10, 1967.

That October 10, 1967, letter is, to say the least, disingenuous. It talks about "we," having just referred to the National Park Service and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, as if they had changed their tune. The fact is just to the contrary. Both the Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service, to their great credit, have continued to stick to their guns and the only person who changed his tune was the Assistant Secretary for, ironically enough, Fish and Wildlife and Parks, who proceeded to sell both his constituent agencies down the Potomac by misinforming the Corps of Engineers that there had been this change of position.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, might I ask a question?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. GUDE. I was wondering—did they give any reasons for their change?

Mr. REUSS. The entire letter, Mr. Gude, is a part of the staff file, which has been introduced in evidence.

Mr. JONES. It is item No. 3.

Mr. REUSS. The letter that I quoted is substantially verbatim and gives no reasons. It simply says "We have changed our views," although, as I pointed out, the "we," while it seemed to include the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service, in fact did not. They did not change their views at all.

I make something of this point because Congress has expressed itself pretty clearly as to what kind of coordination it wants. Back in 1958—was that the date, Mr. Indritz? Is that the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act?

Mr. INDRITZ. 1958 was the last amendment.

Mr. SAYLOR. 1956 was the act itself, and it was amended in 1958.

Mr. REUSS. Right. In 1958 Congress passed the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act which provides that "* * * whenever the waters of any stream"—that is, the Potomac—"are proposed or authorized to be * * * modified for any purpose whatever"—that is, filled—"by any public or private agency"—in this case the applicant—"under Federal permit or license"—that is, the Corps of Engineers—"such department or agency"—that is, the Corps of Engineers—"first shall consult with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior * * * with a view to the conservation of wildlife resources by preventing loss of and damage to such resources * * *."