

has been authorized by the Congress, as I understand, to dredge to only 35 feet. The Navy requirement is 42 feet.

In fiscal 1961, the Navy funded dredging in San Diego Harbor to the tune of \$2,851,000, which by itself automatically and completely took care of commercial needs in itself.

Mr. HARSHA. But you would have done that had there been no commercial traffic in there; would you not?

Mr. BELLE. We would have had to do it if the Corps of Engineers were not authorized to go beyond the 35 feet as the question at hand.

Mr. HARSHA. Do you mean that under the Corps of Engineers restrictions that only ships, commercial ships that could travel in 35-foot depths would be entitled to be in there, but because you dug it to 42 feet, then larger vessels can come in there and use that?

Mr. BELLE. That is not necessarily the Navy's permission, Mr. Harsha. The Navy's permission is in the establishment of project depths in Federal waterways, the U.S. Government vessels, in the depths required for them, be given equivalent consideration as to the requirement for depths for commercial and private vessels, since it has been designated a "Federal waterway" under the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers, under the civil works appropriations.

Mr. HARSHA. Do commercial vessels have the right to use these—

Mr. BELLE. Yes, sir; because they are Federal waterways which the Navy has to use.

Mr. HARSHA. Are they restricted to the type of vessel that can only use a 35-foot-depth channel?

Mr. BELLE. Is the Navy vessel?

Mr. HARSHA. No; commercial.

Mr. BELLE. No, sir; certainly not to my knowledge.

Mr. BLATNIK. Repeat again, Mr. Belle, just what would this bill do.

Mr. BELLE. This bill inasmuch as the waterways in question require it to be used by naval vessels are Federal waterways, that the depths authorized by the Congress be those depths required by the U.S. Government vessels when they require a depth greater than commercial vessels.

Mr. BLATNIK. What does that mean in terms of cost, project costs?

Mr. BELLE. In discussions with the Corps of Engineers we feel it might not be more than two to three projects a year, and not more than several million dollars, \$2 to \$3 million a year.

Mr. HARSHA. Does that mean the cost of constructing the additional depth would come out of the Corps of Engineers' funds, rather than out of the Department of Navy's funds?

Mr. BELLE. That is right, sir.

Mr. HARSHA. In other words, it is going to cost the Government just as much in the long run, but it comes out of Paul's pocket instead of Peter's pocket?

Mr. BELLE. Yes. The only savings we can perceive is savings in administration, because there is split responsibility right now.

Mr. HARSHA. What is the Corps of Engineers' position on that?

Mr. GURNEE. My name is Mark S. Gurnee, Chief of Operations for Civil Works in the Corps of Engineers. We have subscribed to this statement, and also the statement submitted on behalf of the Department of Defense by the Navy on April 1, 1968, which takes the same position which Mr. Belle has taken here.