Mr. JONES. In other words, the same as the project was authorized?

Colonel HALL. This is the view of the Secretary of the Army and the Bureau of the Budget: that is correct.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Colonel Hall, I think we find ourselves in this particular project somewhat in the same position as the other project; is that correct?

Colonel HALL. That is correct.

Mr. CLAUSEN. So there is a differing opinion as to what the local sponsors can and should do.

Colonel HALL. That is correct, sir.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Could you give me your best evaluation as to why the so-called local sponsorship requirements have now resulted in a lesser amount than what was considered average on the national scale?

Colonel HALL. Well, the requirements of the local cooperation requirements are administered or required by the authorizing acts. In this case the Flood Control Act of 1946 established the requirement of local cooperation for the St. Francis Basin project. As pointed out in the Secretary's comments, the local interests have contributed over the 30 years beginning in 1936 about 48 percent of the total spent on flood protection against the nationwide average of 25 percent. However, if you only compute the last 10 years, the local-interest share amounts to approximately 17 percent.

Mr. CLAUSEN. You say it is now about 17 percent. In the last 10 years, it has gone down to 17 percent?

Colonel HALL. Yes, sir; the percentage of the local cooperation in the St. Francis local interest dollar cost against the Federal dollar costs spent on flood protection amounts to 17 percent. This is in accord with the authorizations for the St. Francis Basin and other basins with respect to the local cooperation requirements.

General NOBLE. May I add something to that, sir? The 17 percent is a reflection of the 1946 authorization for the St. Francis Basin which differs from the nationwide policy in that consideration is given to the preponderance, local participation in the past and therefore, if you consider just the result of the current policy in the St. Francis you are bound to get a great reduction because that was the purpose of the policy, to reduce the level of participation of the local people in St. Francis considerably below the national average, in consideration of the greater percentage over the national average in the past.

If you consider just the present you see you are bound to get something that has been below the national average.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Let me ask this question another way. Is this particular project in the basic ratio between the local cooperation and the Federal participation, is it different in another area? I am trying to pin this down as to whether or not the local interest factors are on the decline.

General NOBLE. For so long as the current policy remains in effect in St. Francis, the percentage of local participation for a particular project will be less than it would be for that same project somewhere else.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Why?