

For the taxpayers to fork out \$21 million for electric power's share of this dam project in an area amply supplied with power for the foreseeable future is totally unnecessary and a waste of the taxpayers' money. It should be borne in mind in addition to the above-mentioned Vepco atomic energy plant that the Virginia Electric Power Co. has just started building another new atomic energy plant of 4 million kilowatt capacity only 20 miles away on the North Anna River. This plant alone will have a capacity 50 times that of the Salem Church hydroelectric plant.

In other words, the area is more than amply taken care of for electric power now and in the future with private enterprise. There is no point in having the taxpayers of the U.S.A. saddled with the cost and operation of an unnecessary hydroelectric plant in an area already so bountifully and cheaply supplied with electric power.

9. We value our farmlands, and our homes, we value our beautiful rivers and the recreation they give us as they are in their natural state. We value these things dearly. Then again, we cannot understand the Engineers and the people further downstream giving justification for flooding us out by stating that the oyster farmers and commercial interests in the bay justify the expenditure of \$22 million spent on them for salinity and water quality control as their share of the Salem Church Dam costs. The oyster farmers have no right to have \$22 million spent on them to help flood out the dirt farmers upstream. We cannot understand why the Rappahannock must be flooded out for the benefit of the oyster farmers 100 miles downstream when they are already overproducing on oysters, and the Fisheries Commission moved last fall to the days for oyster harvesting down 50 percent to forestall an oversupply and the consequent price drop in the oyster market.

If we omit what we believe to be the unnecessary and doubtful values of this project; namely, recreation, \$23 million, water quality and salinity control below the dam, \$25 million; and electric power, \$21 million, there will be very little left to justify the expense of such a high dam for water supply and flood control for the Fredericksburg area.

We would be spending \$79 million for benefits of \$10 million and even half of that \$10 million is not necessary because the town of Fredericksburg is now going ahead with its own water supply system on nearby Motts Run which it estimates will take care of its water needs for the next 20 years.

This leaves us taxpayers with a \$79 million bill for \$5 million worth of flood control for the town of Fredericksburg. If this program goes through it will be America's greatest pork barrel.

Mr. Chairman, I have a petition signed by landowners in the Remington area, Virginia, which I would like to submit for the record.

That completes my statement.

Mr. JONES. The petition may be submitted for the record at this point.

(The petition follows:)

We, the undersigned property owners and residents in the Rappahannock Watershed Area, are opposed to the unnecessarily high dam on the Rappahannock River at Fredericksburg for the following reasons, among others:

1. It will flood out 7,000 acres in Fauquier County and 14,000 acres in Culpeper County, mostly farm land.