letter with your statement that the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and

Wildlife had brought this matter to your attention?

Dr. Cain. Well, certainly following October 10 there were several occasions in which there were discussions about the Hunting Creek matter. This doesn't say that that is the first time the matter was brought to my attention. I have testified-

Mr. Reuss. Just a minute. It does say. Your memorandum of April 8, 1968, says, "When the matter was brought to my attention some months ago by the BSFW"-then it goes on for a sentence or two, and then it says, "It was at that point that I withdrew Interior's opposi-

Now, would you get out of that one?

Dr. Cain. I don't think I can.

Mr. Reuss. Who were the congressional objectors whom you say withdrew their objection, other than Mr. Dingell?

Dr. Cain. I do not know.

Mr. Reuss. You keep using the passive mood in your memorandum.

"I_was informed," you said. Who informed you?

Dr. Cain. Let me try to explain that. And it may sound a little like I am beating around the bush; but when I first came on this job my very excellent secretary asked me if I wanted her to monitor telephone calls and keep records of all meetings I had. And I said no, absolutely not. And so in a circumstance like this, Mr. Reuss, I have no record of a very large number of meetings upon a great variety of subjects, as to who was present, or even exactly when they took place.

Mr. Reuss. Can you tell us the names of any Congressmen other than

Mr. Dingell who withdrew their objections?

Dr. Cain. I have no recollection that when such statements were made any Congressman was named. As I have already said, apparently the only one of which there is any record is Mr. Dingell.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Dingell in withdrawing his objection did not swing to the other extreme and say that the permit should now be granted,

Dr. CAIN. I don't remember the language of his communication with the Corps of Engineers, so I can't answer that. But I would think the implication was that if he withdrew his objection he wouldn't mind the permit being granted.

Mr. Reuss. Did you discuss this with Mr. Dingell?

Dr. Cain. No. sir.

Mr. Reuss. You never have?

Dr. Cain. No, sir.

Mr. Reuss. Now, a general word about your concept of your duties. In determining whether a given fill permit would hurt conservation, wildlife, and park values, do you go by a head count of Congressmen, or do you make a professional judgment, using the professional services of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Park Service? Either way, it would seem to me, incidentally, you should not have written the letter of October 10, since a head count of Congressmen would have shown an overwhelming majority opposed to this, and continuing in their opposition. And the clear voices of the National Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service were opposed to it. But anyway, my question is: What is your philosophical methodology?