9. The proposed projects would adversely affect navigation and recreational uses of the polls behind lock and dam No. 9 and the Ozark lock and dam on the Arkansas River. The Corps of Engineers' report itself expresses concern that the turbulence caused by the discharge of tremendous quantities of water into the lower pool of lock and dam No. 9 and the Ozark lock and dam on the Arkansas River. The Corps of Engineers' report itself expresses concern that the turbulence caused by the discharge of tremendous quantities of water into the lower pool of lock and dam No. 9, when the pumped storage units were generating each day, would create a safety hazard to navigation. The Arkansas Game and Fish Commission has also expressed concern that the violent fluctuations resulting from these discharges could have only an adverse effect on fish and wildlife and would constitute a serious hazard to sportsmen in small craft.

In summary, these Federal power projects are not economically or technically feasible and should not be authorized. They are pure public power projects which would tend to inject the Federal Government further into the power business in competition with the taxpaying private segment of the industry. We maintain that no constitutional or statutory authority exists under which the Federal Government is authorized to construct these pure power facilities. There is virtually no local public demand in the area for these projects because very few people in the region would be affected or benefited by them.

In September 1966, former Governor Orval E. Faubus, refused to recommend the projects on the grounds that the cost was out of proportion to any benefits which the people of Arkansas would receive. In recent weeks, our present Governor, Winthrop Rockefeller, and his technical advisers have had the opportunity to restudy this matter. Governor Rockefeller submitted a statement which was included in the Senate Public Works Committee's hearing record, which says, in part:

> It is imperative that economic feasibility for the aforementioned project be thoroughly understood and realistic before authorization.

In this time when the Nation's economy is in serious difficulty and when the need for restraint in government spending has never been greater, it is doubly important that no authorization be made for projects with so little to recommend them as these. I believe it is appropriate that I should conclude by quoting a statement made recently in a speech by my own Congressman, Wilbur D. Mills, of Arkansas, when he said:

> It is not enough to simply postpone expenditures in a given year. I think we have to further up the spending stream, or the "pipeline" as it is called, to the obligation-authority stage and provide more effective restrictions if we are ever to regain control over the rate of Federal expenditures. I believe we must mount our principal attack on the problem at the authorization level rather than after Federal outlays have already been authorized and are flowing down the pipeline.

In view of the many compelling reasons supporting our contention that these projects are uneconomic, unnecessary, and not in the public interests, we urge that they not be authorized by this committee.

I would like to make a point that our position in this matter is also concurred in by other investor owned electric utilities serving this general geographic area. Namely, the Southwestern Electric Power Co., the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., and the Union Electric Co., all of which companies have already submitted their statements prior to our appearance here.