

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Your first reversal was based upon what you said and have explained were political considerations?

Dr. CAIN. Together with my personal judgment of the advice.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. And then your reversal of that reversal was because it was to your tactical advantage?

Dr. CAIN. The staff, as I have just said, thought that I was in an untenable position, being in opposition to the position which the two bureaus not only took in 1964, but maintained. And this is perfectly sound advice to your superior. I followed it.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. They still have that opinion today, do they not?

Dr. CAIN. I do not know. We have not had another such meeting since.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. But they had it then, did they not?

Dr. CAIN. They had it then, yes.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. As far as you know, they never deviated from their opinion that it would adversely affect the conservational and recreational values?

Dr. CAIN. In this case, "they" means the Bureau?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Yes; the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the National Park Service.

Dr. CAIN. That is right. I think both of them have testified before you the last few days. They are still in the same position that they were.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Now, the first reversal you said was based on political considerations, and we heard some definitions of what "political" means. And it does mean many things.

Dr. CAIN. I merely meant that I did not mean political parties.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I wonder if you would tell us, one, two, three, as far as it goes, what were those political considerations on which you based your reversal that obliterated the recreational and conservation considerations.

Dr. CAIN. I would like to object to the word "obliteration."

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Well, "overcame."

Dr. CAIN. Because what I have described as "political" is one aspect of what was in my decision.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Let me rephrase my question to make it simpler. What were the political considerations on which you based your reversal?

Dr. CAIN. There is only one which I can testify to. And that is the position taken by Congressman Dingell, in which he first historically opposed the permit, and then in a letter to the Corps of Engineers removed his objections. And I said that I have known John Dingell for many years, and I admired him highly, and I think he is a great conservationist, and particularly in the field of wildlife. So I depended very largely on John Dingell's action.

I also, as I said, had a general knowledge—without any specific knowledge whatsoever, because I do not think that anybody else's position at that time was in writing as far as I know—I had general information that the congressional interest was divided in this case. This was all I meant by that.

I knew also—and this comes in the sphere of political impact—that there were citizen conservation groups which were very much interested in the preservation of this. And I have got a pretty good record of supporting and going with and belonging to these groups.