

For example, this means the science of politics, and that in turn means such things as exercising or seeking power in political affairs. It pertains to the state of government, or matters which affect or involve government, or actions engaged in connected with civil administration, or having a policy or system, or pertaining to citizen rights.

So that what I would like the committee to understand is that when I used the word "political" in this memorandum—and as I remember, I made two points in the October 10 statement, which I explained later in the memorandum in response to Director Hartzog of the Park Service—I did say, my first consideration was political, and then I said that the second was my judgment with respect to the values that were involved, meaning fish and wildlife, esthetic and other values.

So in this sense I did not mean partisan politics as was interpreted in this connection. I agree thoroughly with the statement that Mr. Saylor made later—that conservation is generally not a political matter in the party sense—but it is a very political matter in the sense of citizens' judgment with respect to aspects of decisionmaking processes as to whether one does or does not do something in a particular case. And this is often very complicated.

So that with respect to my meaning, I am pleased to clarify this intention on my part in using such an expression.

Another term that I used in connection with one or another memorandum—and this was specifically the April 10 memorandum which I sent to General Woodbury, who was at that time the Chief of Civil Works of the Corps of Engineers—I used in one paragraph the expression "we"—"we" had decided. Now, I see quite clearly that "we" is ambiguous. It is, however, something more than an editorial "we." I certainly did not have in mind, in "we," the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the National Park Service, because they had not changed their position. In fact, I meant "I." But in the preparation of this memorandum, or rather in my citing of this memorandum, I had had consultation, and this was the "we" that I intended. So let me admit candidly that this is a little bit sloppy writing at the time I said "we," because it is ambiguous.

So perhaps the next step for me to take is to explain the circumstances of this memorandum, which represents in effect a new position taken by the Department of the Interior as a result of an action which I took.

On the 10th of October there was brought to me a letter for my signature which is in fact the letter which I did sign. But when it was brought to me I said, I will not sign it until I have looked into the matter; that is, specifically until I have taken the matter up with the Office of the Secretary. I meant the Office of the Secretary in the usual sense, I meant Secretary Udall's office.

I looked up the record yesterday, and the record of his office shows that I did seek and obtain an appointment on the 10th of October, late in that day, something like 6:30 in the evening. And after that time Secretary Udall said to me with respect to the Hunting Creek problem: "This lies in your program area. You handle it." Which I proceeded to do.

In this connection also I talked to staff people in Secretary Udall's office who had received communications with respect to the problem from Congress both by people who were for this permit and by people who were against it.