the United States of America. On our west coast our border goes out three leagues, or $10\frac{1}{2}$ miles. This is a Federal benefit. And it is the shoreline of the United States of America that we are dealing with there, which is being very dangerously and badly eroded away by the tides.

So this is a project which means a great deal to our area. It is the chief support of our great tourist industry in that area, which means many millions of dollars in taxes to the Federal Government, as well as to the State and to local governments, as well as a very good tourist industry for our State.

So we are particularly interested in the authorization of this project. The figures are given. There is a very favorable ratio to the cost that would be incurred by the Federal Government.

The only other thing—this is just incidental to this subject, but we all have some problems in our matching of the Federal funds, even though the Federal share is smaller than the local share. But I introduced a bill a little bit ago—I don't have the number of it at my fingertips—but it provided for a reconsideration of the percentage of total cost in respect to beach erosion projects to be borne by the Federal Government, and my bill would provide that the Federal Government would bear 90 percent of the cost, particularly when you are dealing with the shoreline of the United States. It is protecting, as it were, Federal property and Federal interest directly. I realize that is only incidental to this discussion, but I thought it was relevant to it, and I wanted to mention it. I understand you are not going into navigation projects particularly—that is coming up next week. So I will confine my remarks to that.

Mr. CRAMER. May I ask one question. We had a beach erosion project over my way—Treasure Island. We had to get all the property owners to agree in order to get additional Federal participation, 50 percent instead of 30, to make that beach area open to the public. I understand there has been some discussions took place. Has there been any success at all relating to that in Miami?

Mr. PEPPER. As my able colleague, Mr. Fascell knows—that has been very much the subject of discussion in the area. As I recall it, all but about 3 miles of this area is relatively private beach. The other is public beach. Now, there has been some discussion, and there will be further discussions, when this project is authorized, as we hope it will be, as to whether there should be any change in the status of what is now referred to as private beach, so there would be a difference in the ratio of local and Federal contribution. And when they come to raising this money, I do not know what arrangements will be worked out by the local people, but I am sure they will try to work out a plan that will be most acceptable to the committee. It may be that they will make changes so as to admit the public to some of the beaches that are now adjacent to privately owned hotels. I do not know what will be worked out. But it is a subject of discussion. But we can only assure this distinguished committee that local interests, however the funds may be derived, will put up its share of the cost.

Mr. CRAMER. I am not advocating necessarily—I want that understood—except where those people involved are willing to do it. They just happen to be willing to do it in this instance. But that is one way to get 50 percent.