

You say that the basic work on the various reports prepared by the Fish and Wildlife Service on the Hunting Creek estuary were the work of Dr. Uhler?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. Primarily.

Mr. REUSS. In your judgment have those surveys and reports by Dr. Uhler been workmanlike and professionally competent?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. Absolutely.

Mr. REUSS. You would not accuse him of flights of fancy, of imagining there were ducks there when there weren't?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. Not at all.

Mr. REUSS. You would not accuse him of subjective judgments?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. Not as to the questions of the numbers of water fowl, quality of the habitat, food animals and organisms available, and that sort of thing.

Mr. REUSS. You would not accuse him of having acted without any factual evidence?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. No.

Mr. REUSS. In the light of that, let me call your attention to the letter written by Under Secretary of Interior David Black to General Woodbury of the Corps of Engineers on April 26, 1968.

That was the letter in which the Department of Interior reversed itself, I think for the fourth time, at the high level, and told the corps to go ahead with its fill. In that letter Under Secretary Black says this:

While there is no doubt of the opinions reached by those concerned with the conservation impact, their position is founded on subjective judgment considerations rather than any factual evidence which would support valid objection by this Department.

That statement is not true, is it?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. It is a matter of opinion. That statement, however, refers not to Dr. Uhler or his testimony, but to my own opinions. I am the one who developed the concept of the "nibbling phenomenon." I am the one who said I feared if this permit were granted it would lead to additional permits to be granted.

I think that Mr. Black's comment at that particular point refers to my apprehensions rather than to the substantive information developed by Dr. Uhler which became the basis for our report.

Mr. REUSS. You are being very kind to Under Secretary Black but I think we will have to pursue this a bit.

Dr. Uhler is a man concerned with the conservation impact of the fill, is he not?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. Yes.

Mr. REUSS. Isn't Secretary Black, in the letter I have read, if the English language has any meaning, stating that those concerned with the conservation impact reached their position by subjective judgment considerations rather than any factual evidence? The mere fact that he may accuse you—whether rightly or falsely I do not know—of having used subjective judgments and not used factual evidence, doesn't mean that Dr. Uhler used subjective judgment considerations, rather than factual evidence, does it?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. I have my opinion about this particular point because of the fact that I did discuss these things with Under Secretary Black out on the ground. I do not think that he has any misconceptions or any erroneous ideas about the facts of the case as they relate to waterfowl use.