

Colonel HALL. No, sir. We are involved with land, easement, rights-of-way for the whole pool. This is part of the assurance required by the authorizing legislation, which is a 1960 act.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, their argument apparently is, because fish and wildlife is involved, that they should not have to pay for the land, is that what it amounts to?

Colonel HALL. No, sir. It goes beyond that. They object to buying the land.

Mr. CRAMER. Period.

Colonel HALL. For the navigation pool also.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, that is a new precedent, then, if they were permitted to do this.

Colonel HALL. Let me correct that statement. I said object—they say they are unable.

General NOBLE. They are not objecting, as far as I can determine.

Colonel HALL. All the people think it is a good project and would like to see it proceed, but they have run up against this obstacle.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question as to how long the chairman expects to go, and what the general plan is with regard to completing this matter, possibly marking up the bill?

Mr. BLATNIK. It will only take a few minutes to complete these. We will skip the controversial and noncomplicated ones.

If there are no further questions on this, we will take the Mississippi River, Gulf Outlet, and Michoud Canal, La.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GULF OUTLET, MICHOD CANAL, LA.

It has a high benefit-cost ratio of 7 to 1. It is not too large a project, Federal cost \$1½ million. This was explained. It is a modification of existing Mississippi River Gulf Outlet project by deepening and widening the effective portions of the waterway.

There is the chart. Is there anything special or particular that you can emphasize, call to our attention on this, Colonel?

Colonel HALL. No, sir. It is a good project. It has a high benefit-cost ratio. We have just recently received all the comments from the States and Federal agencies.

It is now enroute to the Bureau of the Budget via the Secretary of the Army's Office, actually transmitted to the Secretary this morning.

Mr. BLATNIK. The Bureau of the Budget report, is that in yet?

Colonel HALL. No, sir. It just left the Chief of Engineers Office, enroute to Bureau of the Budget this morning. It was hand-carried to the Secretary's office.

Mr. HARSHA. I notice you do not have HEW's report.

Colonel HALL. HEW's comments, they signed off on their portion yesterday, and we understand there is nothing of substance which would be objectionable within their comments.

Mr. HARSHA. Nothing what?

Colonel HALL. Nothing within their comments that would be objectionable to this project, as I understand it.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT VENICE, LA.

Mr. BLATNIK. Next is the Mississippi River at Venice, La.