

ers, and that National Park Service has objected to issuance of permit because it infringes on their riparian rights to their Jones Point holdings. On the basis of our knowledge, we have not commented, and propose to take no further action on permit.

Now, that is April 6.

Mr. REUSS. From whom?

Dr. CAIN. Signed by a Mr. Towns, whom I do not know, from the regional office in Atlanta, Ga. Towns, I believe, was not the director, but one of the staff.

I believe that the first record that the committee has used is a communication from the regional office in Atlanta to the district engineers dated June 17.

Mr. REUSS. What year?

Dr. CAIN. 1964.

Mr. REUSS. And that was a strong opposition to the fill, was it not?

Dr. CAIN. This is a three-page letter signed by the regional director, Mr. Gresh.

Mr. REUSS. And it was strong opposition to the fill?

Dr. CAIN. Yes, indeed. And it ended up recommending against the granting of the permit.

Mr. MOSS. Will you yield?

Mr. REUSS. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. MOSS. I think in order to have the statement of Director Gottschalk in context with this discussion it would be well to refer to his statement of yesterday. He says:

When this particular application was brought to the attention of our field personnel situated at our regional office at Atlanta, the Atlanta office looked over their whole program and decided that they would not be in a position, because of the other requirements being made of their staff, to make a study of this project.

When our Washington office learned of this decision at the regional office level, the region was directed to make a study of this project.

The reason that this was done was because at this time, back in 1963 and 1964, there was an awakening of interest in trying to do something to improve the character and condition of the Potomac River. We were not certain that our Atlanta staff was fully appreciative of this increased interest, and therefore we felt that we should make certain that they did understand what was happening, and that we did have an obligation to make a report, and should go ahead and make a study and report.

Mr. REUSS. May I now call your attention to some subsequent language in your April 8, 1968, memorandum to the National Park Service:

When the matter—

And by this you meant the Hunting Creek matter—

was brought to my attention some months ago by the B[ureau of] S[port] F[isheries and] W[ildlife], I was informed that some of the Congressional objections had been withdrawn. John Dingell had done so in writing to the District Engineer of the Corps. It was implied that others were no longer opposed. It was at that point that 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.

Now, you just testified a moment ago that this matter was brought to your attention by Mr. Pozen in Secretary Udall's office through the intermediation of a Mr. Bernie Meyer of the Solicitor's Office, who had a letter all prepared for you to sign, which you ultimately did sign, that being the October 10, 1967, letter. How do you square that