

Mr. HARTZOG. Well, sir, I think they can become apprised of them by the record that is made at the hearing, and I assume that since our views had been transmitted—I don't have a copy of that memorandum that you refer to here. I think reference was made to it in Congressman Reuss' statement. But our views on this application had been transmitted to the district engineer well in advance of this particular time. I have not attended personally one of these hearings at the local level. But I assume that the entire Government record is made available at these hearings. I don't know. But if it is not, certainly it would appear that it should be.

Mr. Moss. Well, of course, it becomes of the greatest value, unquestionably, when you are aware of it after you have had the opportunity to testify. I thought the purpose of a public hearing was to have a contemporaneous discussion and exchange of views, not merely to elicit the views of one side.

Mr. HARTZOG. Well, I would have to defer, sir, to the Corps of Engineers on what the purpose of their hearing is and what it is to achieve. What I have shared with the committee is an operating procedure which I worked out with the Chief of Civil Works involving these local Corps of Engineers public hearings. I did that, believing that in this way the public interest was best served because I wanted my people, when they talked for the National Park Service, to be advised on the facts.

Mr. Moss. If the gentleman would yield further, I would merely like to observe that I think it is certainly meritorious that you undertake to make certain that the departmental position or the Bureau position is clear and unequivocal. But I do not think that is achieved by suppressing appearances. As long as an agreement within the Bureau is made as to what the position should be, I cannot for the life of me understand any reluctance to then make those views known quite publicly as part of the hearing record.

Mr. HARTZOG. They are, sir.

Mr. Moss. I refer to the part that the public participates in.

Mr. HARTZOG. They are, sir; they are. In other words, if you got any other impression from my statement, I am sorry. This is not the procedure.

Mr. Moss. The impression I had is that it is. I yield back to my friend from California.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. The only impression I had was that if there were dissenting opinions within the Department, you did not want those dissenting opinions discussed in public at a Corps of Engineers hearing; is that correct?

Mr. HARTZOG. No, no, no. If there is dissenting opinion within the National Park Service, and I have a man who is talking out of context of his professional competence, I don't want that aired in public at a public hearing. I think this is simply good management to assure that the witnesses that you present, either to the Congress or to the public, are fully informed and competent. This is all I am trying to achieve. Insofar as avoiding controversy, I seriously doubt that anybody has been embroiled in any more controversies with the Corps of Engineers than I have, as the Director of the Park Service, in the last 4½ years—