

change the report. It was not upgraded in that sense. It was upgraded in the sense that it was placed in a higher category of importance than the regional office had originally thought that it might be.

The second point I would like to speak about very briefly is that which relates to the testimony of Dr. Francis Uhler. I would like to preface my remarks on this point by saying that Dr. Uhler is one of our most valued and knowledgeable wildlife biologists. He has been an employee of the Bureau and its predecessor agency for more than 30 years, if my memory serves me correctly.

In that time he has established a reputation that is international, because of his knowledge primarily of the habitat requirements of waterfowl. When it came time to develop this report, it was only natural that we turn to Dr. Uhler, because he is our acknowledged expert in this field.

The substance of our report is based on the knowledge which Dr. Uhler himself contributed to the preparation of that report. After the Assistant Secretary wrote to the Corps of Engineers, advising that the Department was withdrawing its objection to the application, and hearings were rescheduled by the colonel of the Corps of Engineers for Alexandria, the question came up as to whether or not Dr. Uhler should present testimony at that hearing.

This matter was discussed with Assistant Secretary Cain by me and other members of my staff, and we concluded that it would not be appropriate, in view of Dr. Uhler's strong feelings about this project, for him to go there as a representative of the Department, since the Department had changed its position to one of no opposition to the project.

We made it quite clear—and Dr. Cain really acceded to this point—that should Dr. Uhler's testimony, as a technical expert, be desired, he should be free to give it. Consequently, he was instructed not to attend the hearing as a representative of the Department of the Interior, but he could attend on his own behalf and was free to answer questions with respect to the status of the resource or anything else that might be asked of him that related to his professional capacity.

Dr. Uhler did attend the hearing. He was present there. He was not called upon to answer questions, but he did prepare a statement for the record which was submitted to the Corps of Engineers at that time.

I personally called his superior at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Dr. Eugene Dustman, and told Dr. Dustman of the conversation with Dr. Cain and asked Dr. Dustman to reassure Dr. Uhler that he was to contribute any knowledge that he had available on this project that related to its significance as a waterfowl area. This he did.

Those are the two points I wanted to dwell on, in a preliminary way, because I think there may have been some question about their arising from the previous testimony. If there are further questions, I would be glad to answer them.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Moss.

Mr. MOSS. Yes, I have some questions, Dr. Gottschalk. I am pleased to have the clarification of the process of upgrading in Washington. You state it does not go to a change in values or conclusions.

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. Yes.