

In general, I would have to agree with you that it would not be good government; but I can imagine situations where it could be that it would work out in the best interests of the greatest number of people if a change were made in order to gain a greater good in some other area of concern or interest.

Mr. REUSS. Putting to one side hypothetical considerations, but just concentrating on the 9 acres which is the subject of this Corps of Engineers fill permit of May 29, 1968: Do you of your own knowledge know any reason why the decision of the Fish and Wildlife Service—that this was valuable waterfowl habitat and should not be filled—should have been overruled?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. No; I do not. I can only speculate.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman would yield, to that hypothetical question, I think you can recall one where the decision of the Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, prevailed in the location of an interstate highway in the vicinity of Decatur, Ala. The location of that interstate highway required the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River. You will recall the discussions I had with you, Doctor, back some 5 years ago, which were kept in the mill about 3 years, and where the wildlife people in the Department insisted that the location of the bridge be 3 miles east of the points designated by the State highway department, Bureau of Public Roads. You would never relinquish your position. As a result we got a compromise as to where the bridge is to be constructed.

We had to redesign the bridge at a cost to the Federal Government of \$300,000. It will cost over \$400,000 in excess cost to the motorists to accommodate those ducks. That was a question of policy. That was a question of decision. For the life of me I cannot see that those ducks were discommoded, because the wildlife refuge was still there. I do not see those ducks, just like the ducks out here by the National Airport, with those planes coming in and out, fluttering around. But here the motorist is going to pay an exorbitant amount, year in and year out, because the bridge had to be constructed in an awkward fashion away from the travel route. Consequently, it was a decision made in keeping with the policy of the Department of Interior.

The ducks won.

Mr. Reuss is asking a practical question, and that is one in which the ducks won to the detriment of the people, and the ducks are still there.

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. Mr. Chairman, if I may comment on this, I made a point to go down and look at this project last winter. The alinement of the road was finally never changed. The original alinement that had been proposed by the State highway department was the one that was finally accepted. There was no rerouting it around, as we had urged, as you say correctly, for many years. I must say we are disappointed that it was not rerouted, because the road now goes through some of the prime waterfowl habitat in the whole refuge. However, the bridge was redesigned, as you indicate. The trestle was lowered. There was a compromise finally reached.

Mr. JONES. It was a compromise, all right.

Mr. MOSS. Would you yield a moment?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to Mr. Moss.