

ects to us for written comments. We have been giving the Corps of Engineers those written comments, all of our field personnel have been participating in them. As a matter of fact, our field personnel prepare the basic comments and if the basic comments include a knowledge of all of the facts, then they go from the field level. Otherwise they go from my level to the Corps of Engineers. So the implication that our people were not allowed to comment on this is not the correct implication.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Let me see if I understand this correctly. As a result of this earlier project, it is the policy of your Department that at the Corps of Engineers public hearings you will not have your people testify if their views contravene any Corps of Engineers views?

Mr. HARTZOG. No; no. Simply not to have them, whether they confirm or contravene, simply that I do not think it is good practice for Federal employees to testify out of context—because in our organization our research program is directed by our chief scientist in Washington who is not in the line of control of our superintendents.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Is it fair to say, then, that at a public hearing of the Corps of Engineers the public would not expect to hear the professional judgment of your staff people within the Department?

Mr. HARTZOG. No, sir; that is not it, either. In other words, we will present those, as we have presented them, but they are presented in the total context of all of the knowledge that we have, including the views of our chief scientist. Previously, you see, what was happening is we would have a park biologist or park superintendent appear at a hearing and without a full grounding in the area of this particular hearing he would sound off on his particular views. Now, every individual that we have, in my judgment, is very competent and capable. But as in any large organization, no one scientist has the total picture of what is involved in the resources in that particular area. This came out strikingly in the central and southern Florida water controversy involving the Everglades National Park.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Let me go back and just limit my inquiry to this hearing on February 21 which the Corps of Engineers held. Was there any individual of the National Park Service at that hearing who testified?

Mr. HARTZOG. No; none, because we had already communicated our views to the Corps of Engineers on this application.

Mr. Moss. Would you yield to me on that point?

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Yes.

Mr. Moss. This was a public hearing called for the purpose of acquainting the public—(1) to give them the opportunity to register their views; and (2) to permit them to become acquainted with the views of the Government agencies involved?

Mr. HARTZOG. Yes.

Mr. Moss. Yet the letter of January 30, 1968, from Assistant Secretary Cain to the district engineer, Colonel Rhea, stated: "I have talked with the people in the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife," and I assume because you folks weren't there he must have talked with you, and a decision was made that "we do not need to present testimony at the hearing." How does the public become privy to the nature of the views, not of the field personnel of your Department, but of the Director of the Park Service, of the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, if they do not appear at these public hearings?