

our military, our shipyards, our Polaris base, and many of the towns and cities and our REA projects in that area.

I believe that this is a valuable and desirable feature, also, provided it is not used to delay or buck the construction of the St. Stephens project, but only to get the benefits as soon as possible and without awaiting the completion or even the start of the St. Stephens project. We want it all to go along at once.

I am not going to waste my time and I am just about through and I know you are glad. I am not going to waste my time, Mr. Chairman, to tell you about the Bureau of the Budget's recommendation. I only have a few more paragraphs here to refer to on that.

You know that the Bureau of the Budget's authorization is only for early implementation between now and the date of the expiration of the license of the Federal Power Commission to this agency. The Bureau of the Budget wants to let them go ahead, but do not do anything regarding their powermaking capacity until the license expires in 1976.

Who am I to conject or predict and who are you to conject or predict who will be sitting on the Power Commission in 1976?

Who are we to know who will make up the personnel of the Federal Power Commission? This thing is so ridiculous it is silly. I want you to let us go ahead and build this power plant and implement what the Army Engineers have done. If you follow the suggestion of the Bureau of the Budget all you will do will be to gut the project.

Let me go off the record here.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. RIVERS. The Engineers understand and this is elementary with the Engineers. You have to build a canal and at the end of the canal you have to build a powerplant. You cannot do it any other way. If you do it any other way you kill the project. They have the license. They have a noncapture clause in it. This is an agency of the State of South Carolina. That is their business and they agree to try to save the Harbor of Charleston by diverting the water and sending it down to the ocean in some other stream, but they have to have the power with it and this is what the Army Engineers are recommending and I will ask and implore this committee to give us what the Army Engineers have recommended because it is absolutely foolproof, arrived at after many, many hearings, endless hearings and after many negotiations and it is understood.

The manager of the project is here at the table with me. He has already submitted his statement and he does not want to take up your time. He knows how busy you gentlemen are and he is perfectly willing, as I am, to leave it to the good gentlemen of this committee, the least of whom is not Mr. Harsha.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You have explained the proposition very clearly. The project is, from an engineering point of view, feasible and favorably approved by the Corps of Engineers, by several Federal departments, the Department of the Interior, HEW, Agriculture, Department of Commerce, Department of Transportation, the Federal Power Commission and certainly your own State of South Carolina.

The benefit-cost ratio is very favorable, 2.2. You do have this complicated situation to which the Bureau of the Budget objects.