

But in this case I opposed them, for reasons that I have already mentioned. And in my personal judgment I did not think this was a very important case in terms of the values for wildlife that were related to these acres.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I know, Dr. Cain, of your lifelong interest in conservation. I know that of my personal knowledge, and it is an outstanding one. And I do not mean to try to quarrel with you here. I just want the record absolutely clear. That is what I am interested in. You are telling this committee that you reversed the position of the Department because John Dingell changed his mind, and you made that reversal without reviewing any of the studies or the documents or records that your bureaus had made. Is that what you are telling us?

Dr. CAIN. That is not quite it.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Is it almost?

Dr. CAIN. I had merely emphasized the importance in my mind of John Dingell's change of position. And I also said—which I have no documentation or proof for—that I had heard that there was a divided opinion in Congress on this matter.

Mr. MOSS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Yes; I would.

Mr. MOSS. There should have been documentation, I believe, from Congressman Saylor. Congressman Reuss and myself vigorously expressed ourselves in 1964 as opposed to this. And I believe it is quite possible that there may have been other Members of Congress also—I would have to check my record—who voiced their strong opposition to this permit application.

Dr. CAIN. Mr. Moss, I have already stated that my action on October 10 was made without any reference to the history of the case in terms of who stood where or who had communicated what. I have already admitted that I did not even at that time know that my own Secretary had taken a position against this.

Mr. MOSS. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. You are welcome.

Dr. CAIN. But the other aspect of this is my judgment about the natural history and other values of these few acres. So you cannot really separate the two. They are the two major aspects of the decision.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. But the political considerations, just so that the record is clear were: one, that John Dingell had changed his mind; and two, that Congress was divided on this matter.

Dr. CAIN. Right.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Now, you said when this letter was brought in to you for this reversal on October 10 that it was written for you and brought in to you to sign; is that correct?

Dr. CAIN. It was not written for me. It was written upon request, and I was sought out to sign it.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. And you were sought out to sign it. And you said that at that time there was a sense of urgency about the signing of it?

Dr. CAIN. I got the impression that there was a sense of urgency.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. What conveyed that impression to you?

Dr. CAIN. Well, Mr. Bernard Meyer of the Solicitor's Office, who had composed the letter on request—which is, incidentally, a common