All things considered, I recommend the desirability of the Department restudying its recent decision at Hunting Creek.

Then on April 8, Dr. Cain, in a very significant memorandum to the National Park Service, replying to that April 4 memorandum, clarified his role. Again, reading the relevant portions of this memorandum from Dr. Cain to Director Hartzog:

I have read and surnamed your April 4 memorandum to the Secretary, through me. I would like to clarify my role, which has not been an enviable one. I was told by BSFW that the original field report on the area under discussion was in weak opposition to the permit and that the fish and wildlife values claimed for the area were "upgraded" here in Washington. It was further stated that this was at least partly in response to certain congressional opinions. This was before I was Assistant Secretary.

He also said:

I was informed that some of the congressional objections had been withdrawn.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 this 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.

Ordinarily, one doesn't put these self-revelations in memorandums, but there it is.

His memorandum continues:

Congressmen Moss and Reuss have let me know their displeasure.

Mr. Saylor had also made known his displeasure but his apparently was not included.

Dr. Cain's memorandum goes on:

More recently, I have asked BSFW to make a field examination of the area, since it had not been looked at for several years. I have not had a report on this yet.

His final paragraph says:

I will be happy to reverse myself if BSFW makes a strong case and if NPS can give me evidence of the important values.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has been making a strong case publicly and privately for the last 4 years, and the National Park Service likewise. One wonders where the Assistant Secretary for Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Park Service has been.

This April 8 memorandum, incidentally, has more than its share of inaccuracies. It says that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife report was weak. As the record shows, it could hardly have been more vigorous. It says that other Congressmen were no longer opposed. Well, Congressman Moss, Congressman Saylor, and myself are not amused at that.

Then there is the admission that the main reason for the October 10, 1967, reversal was "political considerations." I would like to know what those considerations were. Who was pressing Dr. Cain so hard to make the fill? Why, 6 months after Mr. Moss and I requested it of him, did Dr. Cain fail to give us a list of people who were exercising this political muscle of theirs? And what was so strong about this political muscle that it outweighed the professionals in the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service?

He also asked in this memorandum that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife make a field examination of the area "since it had not been looked at for several years." This is simply erroneous. The