Many of our members have the same feeling—the league continues to believe that projects should be authorized instead on the basis of clear need. We suspect that some aspects of the Salem Church proposal require further appraisal before the stated needs are fully proven to exist.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for considering our views.

With your permission, I shall read the following resolution of the Virginia Division of the Izaak Walton League of America regarding the Salem Church Dam:

Whereas the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has recommended construction, at the Salem Church site, of a dam which would inundate major portions of the Rappahannock and Rapidan Rivers; and

Whereas both the Rappahannock and Rapidan Rivers posses enormous scenic and esthetic values, and offer immense opportunities for public enjoyment if they and their immediate environments might be retained in existing natural condition; and

Whereas justification of the present Salem Church proposal is mainly for recreation, salinity control, and hydroelectric purposes—while the people of the region are primarily concerned about water supply and flood control, which purposes provide less than 7 percent of total project benefits as currently conceived by the Corps of Engineers; and

Whereas no agency at any level of government has undertaken comprehensive evaluation of possible alternative programs for future use of the Rappahannock-Rapidan River system to retain existing natural values while meeting water supply and flood control needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Virginia Division, Izaak Walton League of America, in convention assembled this 15th day of October 1967, at Winchester, Virginia, That is opposes authorization of Salem Church Dam until the public has had opportunity to evaluate full information as to alternative means of meeting water resource needs—such information to include detailed answers to the following:

(a) What steps could be taken, at what costs and how allocated, to meet water supply needs of the Rappahannock Basin without construction of Salem Church Dam as presently proposed?

(b) Without construction of Salem Church Dam, what steps could be taken, at what cost, to alleviate Rappahannock flood problems through alternative flood control works, restrictions on use of flood plains, flood plain purchase for open space and park purposes, and similar methods?

(c) What alternative use might be made of the money allocated to outdoor recreation in the Salem Church Dam proposal? And it be further.

Resolved, That the Commonwealth of Virginia should develop and present for public consideration an alternative program for use of the Rappahannock-Rapidan River system, designed to investigate the possibility and practicality of meeting long-term regional water supply needs while retaining existing natural values for public enjoyment.

Adopted: October 15, 1967, at Winchester, Virginia.

Thank you for allowing me to appear today.

Mr. JONES. Thank you very much, Mr. Harris.

Next we have Mrs. Richard Hogue, a landowner from Remington, Va.

STATEMENT OF VIRGINIA REMINGTON, REMINGTON, VA.

Mrs. REMINGTON. I am Virginia Remington. I am privileged to speak for Mrs. Richard Hogue. We are trying to preserve the little wilderness left on the east coast.

This Rappahannock River on trial is only 45 minutes from the great metropolitan area of Washington. The miracle is that it still survives as unpolluted, and one of the most wondrous rivers with all manner of wildlife. Please don't pass a death sentence on this river.

Here is Mrs. Hogue's statement which she asked me to read to you.

Mrs. REMINGTON (reading):