

Woodbury, the fact that he knew about the unsettled condition within the Department's Bureaus on this issue, and the fact that he wanted to invoke, if that is not too strong a word, the machinery of our memorandum of understanding. I meant it is not material in the sense that it is outside of that.

The original October 10 reversal was, I think, before there was such machinery, and was in a different context.

So I don't mean, on the merits, one position was any less material than the other. I mean, on the track that it had gotten, it was not, I think, significant. It was a one-page memorandum in which Secretary Cain said, "I have asked for your judgment. You have given it to me and I am compelled to accept it." In a word, I don't think that is material.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. All right. I think you can also appreciate my concern as a Member of Congress because we have established that the Army Engineers concerns itself pretty much with navigation and they depend upon you to protect the conservation and recreational values.

We have also established that it was this letter that presents the position to the Department of the Army, and that they are depending on you for the protection of these values.

We have established that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the National Park Service were not themselves permitted to testify at the public hearings, or they did not testify. They were not there, which is exceptional. Usually they are. So, we have established that this letter was the way in which the Department of the Army was informed of conservational and recreational values.

As I read your letter to General Woodbury of April 26, it tells them that the Department of Interior, in October 1963, objected because there would be an adverse effect on conservation and recreational values; but that on October 10, 1967, the Department of Interior, through Secretary Cain, withdrew its objections. Is there anything in this letter, then, that would indicate to the Department of the Army that that position had been reversed, which in fact it had?

Mr. BLACK. I think that there is, at least given all the history of this there is, and I think over on page 2, the last full paragraph, I said to General Woodbury:

As to the damage to conservation values, I have received and considered the views of people in and out of this Department who entertain concern on this point \* \* \*. 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.

This Department would, of course, prefer that there be no additional intrusions upon the existing Potomac environment. Our deferral in this instance is dictated solely by the circumstances that the proposed fill project \* \* \*.

And so on.

So, to answer your question, this certainly does not present to General Woodbury, was not intended to, the impression that there was monolithic support for my view.

I think it indicates very well there wasn't, and I think it is reflected in this.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. As a matter of fact, there was within the Bureau monolithic opposition to your view, wasn't there?