

Mr. Hartzog, those four paragraphs end with your recommending the desirability of the Department's restudying its recent decision at Hunting Creek. Was that restudy made before Mr. Black wrote his letter of April 26 to the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. HARTZOG. I do not know, sir, but I did not make it.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. If it had been made, would it not have been made by people partially under your direction and control?

Mr. HARTZOG. Well, not necessarily, sir. The Secretariat has a staff and they use it occasionally to formulate their own recommendations and to get additional study data.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. In your discussions with Mr. Black, and particularly in your conference before testifying here today, was the question discussed as to whether or not such a restudy had been made by the Department?

Mr. HARTZOG. The question was discussed by Mr. Black and me as to whether or not my conclusions here were valid, in his judgment. We did not talk in terms of any additional studies; no, sir.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. No discussion on whether or not the restudy you recommended had been made or not?

Mr. HARTZOG. That is right.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. To your knowledge, has such a restudy been made?

Mr. HARTZOG. I don't know the sequence of this, whether it was after my memorandum was written or before, but you may ask the Under Secretary. He personally went out on the ground, himself, to look at it. What interpretation he puts on this, I assume, would be part of a study; yes.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. This would be a personal study by the Under Secretary?

Mr. HARTZOG. Yes.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Aside from the personal observation of this area by the Under Secretary, to your knowledge has any restudy been made such as you recommended in this memorandum of April 4?

Mr. HARTZOG. None in which the National Park Service participated; no, sir.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Hartzog, are you familiar with the comment made earlier today that representatives of the Department of Interior were instructed not to testify at this February 21 hearing?

Mr. HARTZOG. I certainly am, sir, and I would appreciate very much an opportunity of clarifying that.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. You have it.

Mr. HARTZOG. This is standard operating procedure within the National Park Service growing out of a long series of very difficult, and I think very productive, negotiations with the Corps of Engineers involving the central and southern Florida flood control project. They came about when I took over as Director of the Park Service in which we had local Corps of Engineers people and local National Park Service people appearing in public, testifying at the field level in opposition to each other's views—many times out of context—without a full knowledge of the facts. The agreements were worked out at that time and, as I understand, they have subsequently been incorporated in a departmental agreement between the two departments—I had worked them out with the Director of Civil Works—that thereafter I would not have my field people appear in public to testify on Corps of Engineers projects, but instead the Corps of Engineers would refer its proj-