

or recrimination is taken against the career men who have demonstrated their adherence to principle and their courage in continuing to support a position founded on fact and professional expertise.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Roush?

Mr. ROUSH. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Vander Jagt?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to compliment the gentleman for presenting a very well-documented study and a great deal of information. Just a couple of points I want clarified for my own mind.

Is it your contention, Mr. Reuss, that the filling of the red area on the map will create a stagnant backwater in the area that is the dark color there?

Mr. REUSS. That, Mr. Vander Jagt, is part, though a smaller part, of my contention. It stands to reason if you build a projection out into the river, as that red projection is, that it will create greater stagnation, that the silt which washes down the Potomac to the regret of all of us will have a catchment area there. However, I say that is relatively a minor part of my total objection.

My major objection is that if you fill in 9 acres of the last valuable diving waterfowl resting area in the Metropolitan Washington area, you have ruined 9 acres of a priceless resource. Sure there are a number of other acres that would not at the moment be filled in, but it is like somebody coming along and wanting to knock off the top 80 feet of the Washington Monument, and when you protest he tells you there are still quite a few feet of it left.

Obviously, our resources are not such that we can forever nibble at them.

Mr. MOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Glad to.

Mr. MOSS. I think it important to recognize that the black area is covered by an additional application which has not been acted upon, but in light of the very recent experience, could suddenly become fired up and move with great rapidity to final approval.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Again, for the clarification of my own understanding, would an objection by the Department of the Interior have the effect of blocking the permit, or is the exclusive authority for the granting or denial of the permit in the domain of the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. REUSS. It is the latter.

Under the law, the Corps of Engineers, with regard for the total public interest—not just navigation but the total public interest—has to make the decision, and the statute, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, requires that it consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service on wildlife matters. Having consulted, if it did consult, which in this case it did not—having consulted, the Corps may legally come to another conclusion. That, of course, does not preclude the interest of this subcommittee because with a record as squalid as this, the Corps of Engineers, I believe, has some explaining to do.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Did I understand your statement to indicate that the primary material consideration of the Corps of Engineers is in navigational matters?