

Nevertheless, we did present his report which is most illuminating. (The material referred to appears at p. 81.)

Mr. REUSS. Incidentally, I want to say once again that in the judgment of our witnesses, Dr. Uhler is a public servant of great ability and great courage, and we shall make it our business to be alert to any attempt to take reprisals against him for telling the truth.

There were a great number of witnesses at the hearing, all of whom testified against it. They included the Izaak Walton League of America, the Audubon Society, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Wilderness Society, the Sierra Club, the Northern Virginia Conservation Council, the Washington Urban League, the Alexandria Council on Human Relations, and numerous concerned individuals.

The engineer for Howard P. Hoffman Associates, the applicants, not surprisingly, testified that the permit ought to be granted.

So the matter rested after the hearing, until some events which just came to light as a result of the subcommittee staff's inspection of the Department of the Interior's files in the matter, and they are extremely interesting. This starts on page 12 of our statement.

On March 15 this year Dr. Cain was apparently getting worried. One of the reasons was that Michael Frome, the conservation editor of Field and Stream magazine and columnist for American Forests and other magazines, had heard of the matter and started to call Dr. Cain. In the files of the Department of the Interior is found this memorandum dated March 15, 1968, from Dr. Cain to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

I won't read it all, but in summary it says:

The pot still boils on the Hunting Creek decision, which I made some time ago to remove objections to this permit reversing an earlier decision made before I was Assistant Secretary.

He goes on:

The latest difficulty arises from Mike Frome who has asked that I reverse myself.

Then:

Today I had a chance to speak to Secretary Udall about the problem. He had earlier relegated the decision to me and had raised no objection to what I did. He merely wishes that we get a scientific-technical basis that can be stood on.

Later on:

This being the case, and since I made my earlier decision without asking for a new study of the area, I think that one should be made now.

Then he goes on:

Will you please have two or three of the Bureau staff—types who ordinarily make such judgments in river basins—go over there and take a new look? Whatever the judgment of the Bureau turns out to be, I will go with it, as will the Secretary. Incidentally, I will not be bothered by reversing myself, if it should turn out that way. And if it doesn't, I'll have to take Mike Frome's possible barbs. C'est la guerre!

The National Park Service, to its great credit, stood by its guns for the umpteenth time, and on April 4, 1968, Director Hartzog of the National Park Service sent a memorandum to his superiors on the subject of the proposed landfill, saying once again that preserving the estuary areas was of the greatest importance and that this fill would adversely affect the Jones Point Park, and concluding: