

technical details. I will leave that to the Army Engineers. My purpose is to express my support of the St. Stephens project as recommended by the corps and not by the Bureau of the Budget and to try to explain its importance both to the district I represent and to the Nation.

Mr. Dorn knows a little something about this, I am quite sure.

The St. Stephens project is unique in that it is of clear benefit. All of the projects considered by this committee have a favorable benefit ratio, but for the most part the benefits are measured by estimates of the good they will do and these estimates are subject to wide margins of uncertainty.

In the case of this project on which I testify it would eliminate a major part of a very large dredging expense which the Corps of Engineers is now saddled with.

When I came to Congress before anybody on this committee ever got here, this Harbor of Charleston which this project is designed to relieve was less than \$250,000 maintenance. Now it is long past the \$1.3 million. The dredging expense mounts and it continues to mount year after year.

Now, the Army Engineers are trying to prevent the continuing siltation of the Charleston Harbor to the point where it would be unusable either for commercial or navigable defense projects, the Charleston Harbor is vital to the defense of this country. It has gone past as I say \$1 million and even up to the \$2 million plus a year maintenance cost of this harbor which we think is a result of the Santee-Cooper project.

There is some project from year to year in the cost but over a period the increase for the maintenance has been very rapid.

For illustration, the average cost of maintenance of Charleston Harbor in 5 years from 1951 to 1955 inclusive was \$550,000. In the next 5 years the cost will average almost \$1 million.

In the years 1961 to 1965 inclusive, the average cost was almost \$1.6 million and the last year of the period, the cost was \$2,237,949.

These figures are from the Corps of Engineers' report, page 9, which accompanies my testimony. Now, no prudent businessman would accept these mounting costs for dredging when there is a practical way to avoid this cost by reducing the silting and this is a proposal before you.

These savings will increase from year to year because inflation will drive up the maintenance cost every year whereas this project we are talking about, the St. Stephens project when it is built, the annual charges will be fixed permanently.

There is another important aspect of the comparison. The maintenance cost consists of the removal of thousands and thousands of cubic yards of silt each year from the Charleston Harbor. The Corps of Engineers is running out of spoil areas to put this silt on. As a matter of fact, it is quite a controversy in my town of Charleston where to put this silt.

Even the legislature who is responsible for finding out, they always bring these problems up and you know whose lap they dump it on. So, I am in the middle of that as well as everything else in this area which I represent.

Mr. Chairman, this is a vexing problem that will grow and grow with time. The Corps of Engineers says that the solution to the siltation problem is to end the condition which is leading up to the deposit of