

Now, Congress knew what it was doing. It did not say consult with the Secretary of the Interior, the Under Secretary of the Interior, or the Assistant Secretary of the Interior. It wanted the career men to be consulted. Here, what the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks does by using the editorial "we," is to imply that the career men have changed their minds, when in truth and in fact, far from changing their minds—

Mr. JONES. You don't contend that the Secretary of the Interior could not overrule the two bureaus?

Mr. REUSS. I do not. The Secretary of the Interior who, incidentally, has apparently delegated this to the Assistant Secretary and the Under Secretary, could overrule the bureaus, but what Congress wanted in the Coordination Act was the benefit of consultation by the Corps of Engineers with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. That is why we said "United States Fish and Wildlife Service" instead of the Secretary of the Interior or any of the other overhead in the Department.

It is worth noting that even though the Interior Department well knew the objections of Congressman Moss, Congressman Saylor and myself to the bill 3 years before, Assistant Secretary Cain did nothing to inform us of the fact that he had changed his mind. Incidentally, Secretary Cain, I understand, was asked to testify at these hearings. He is out of the country at the moment. I do hope, for reasons that will become apparent, that he will be given an opportunity to testify before the subcommittee.

When the three Congressmen heard of Secretary Cain's action, some weeks later, several of us wrote to the Department. Congressman Moss wrote Assistant Secretary Cain, asking the reason for his change of position. On November 24, 1967, Assistant Secretary Cain replied, and the key words are:

While it is true that this Department interposed objections to both the original applications and the revised applications, the conservation values which would have been affected were relatively minimal. I understand that objections on conservation grounds were filed, nevertheless, in support of opposition to the proposed development from other governmental sources. However, much of the opposition has been withdrawn and it seems to us to be the sensible course of action to withdraw our objection to the revised applications * * *.

This letter so bothered Congressman Moss that he wrote back to Secretary Cain on January 3, 1968, saying:

In all candor, sir, I must confess that I find your letter totally unresponsive to the questions contained in my communication to you.

Those questions were, "What was back of this?" Congressman Moss said:

I assume the original action of opposition was based on careful studies of the effect upon wildlife * * *. If my initial premise is correct, then certainly there must be some sort of study upon which you based your subsequent action. Or is it your intention to tell me that you made "a judgment" without any additional studies by the experts of the Fish and Wildlife Service?

To this Secretary Cain had a reply on January 11:

In reply to your letter of January 3, I can tell you that I did make a judgment without any additional studies on the fish and wildlife values at the site.

I, too, heard of this change of position in early December 1967, and I wrote a letter outlining my position—which is identical with