

and Wildlife Service, this permit—taking 9 acres of valuable waterfowl resting ground—should not have been granted. That is correct, is it not?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. That is correct.

Mr. REUSS. You then went on to say that the Assistant Secretary and Under Secretary of the Department of Interior have broader interests and thus that you had no choice but to go along with their recommendation—despite your views—that the permit be granted. That has been your testimony; is that correct?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. That is correct.

Mr. REUSS. Are you familiar with the April 8, 1968, memorandum of Assistant Secretary Cain in which he says, and I am quoting:

I withdrew Interior's opposition, a decision based first on political considerations and second on the feeling that the values were not great in the area to be filled.

Is the broader interest that you refer to the "political considerations" that were evidently in the Assistant Secretary's mind?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. I would not want to say that this is correct. I do not know exactly what was in the Secretary's mind.

Mr. REUSS. If there were political considerations as the primary cause of the overruling of the Fish and Wildlife Service judgment, in your opinion, is that good government?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. If we could put this on a hypothetical basis, I would be much more comfortable.

Mr. REUSS. I want you to be comfortable. Let us put it on a hypothetical basis.

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. I think there are undoubtedly situations which arise which require the Secretary to trade one kind of an achievement, shall we say, for another.

In the normal course of events in this country, and the way we run our country, there have to be sacrifices made in order to achieve larger gains. I don't know that kind of a situation prevailed in this case. To my personal knowledge it did not. But I do not have any specific knowledge on this point from Dr. Cain. I do know that one of the considerations here which actually is on the side of the preservation of the river is that which relates to the natural beauty of the area. There was quite a bit of discussion over the relationship of additional apartments in that particular spot versus the condition as it exists there now with the Hunting Creek Towers project already in existence. Much of our discussion is related to this aspect. I was not personally involved in these, except as a bystander, but Dr. Cain, I do know, had these concerns to take into consideration also.

I use them as examples of these other concerns beyond just the fish and wildlife.

Mr. REUSS. Still permitting you to be hypothetical, I will have to renew my question: If the decisions on the preservation of our wildlife resources are to be overruled, is it, in your judgment, wise and just that they be overruled for political considerations? Just give me a hypothetical yes or no.

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. I hesitate to equivocate. I think there could be situations where good government would demand that the specifics of a particular project should be overlooked.