

E-Gob Dips In Reservoir As Cops Fume

Arrest Follows 'Water Show' by Jobless Baker

Sportive as a young sea lion, a 22-year-old ex-sailor swam for 40 minutes yesterday in the cold waters of East Park Reservoir, 83d and Diamond sts., while a squad of policemen tried to lure him out.

Only because he finally grew tired did the swimmer return to shore and permit himself to be arrested. The charge against him is disorderly conduct by attempting suicide.

He Saw the Sign
He is Edward Stoddard Barber, 2123 N. Stanley st.

He couldn't have failed to see the "No Swimming" sign, police said. Swimming in the reservoir is forbidden because the water there is part of the city's supply.

Barber and a friend, Alex Imovitz, 16, of the Stanley st. address, were first seen at 1.30 P.M. by Water Bureau Guard Frank Pierce when they climbed over the picket fence that surrounds the reservoir.

Barber, an unemployed baker, stripped down to his swimming trunks, dived into 26 feet of water and swam away, heedless of warnings from Pierce. Pierce jumped into a rowboat and rowed after him. But he couldn't row fast enough and so returned to shore and called police.

The Fun Begins
Seven Park Guards and two city patrolmen responded. And then the fun began.

Barber, one of the best swimmers, continued on Page 2, Column 5

Wayway He Had a Good Time



Park Guards help Edward Stoddard Barber, in swimming trunks, through a barbed-wire fence atop a valve house at East Park Reservoir, in which he took an illegal swim. Inset: Barber's bride, Lorna.

EX-SAILOR SWIM IN CITY RESERVOIR

Arrest Follows One-Man Aquacade by Jobless Baker

(Continued From First Page)

mers the officers ever saw, employed back stroke, side stroke, breast stroke and Australian crawl. He dived. He floated. He swam under water for half a minute at a time. He scared the cops silly by pretending he was in distress and drowning.

They had reason for their fears. For on the shore, Barber's friend, Imovitz, was explaining how Barber, out of a job and unable to support his recently acquired wife, Lorna, was despondent and had been talking about suicide.

Barber swam across the reservoir. The police figured he was about to climb out, ran around to the other side to nab him. The reservoir is mile and five-eighths in circumference, and it was quite a run. But when the officers reached the other side, puffing and peevish, Barber merely swam away to another point.

Pierce had gone on his way, and the officers didn't know he had a boat nearby. So two guards piled into a truck, drove to Girard ave. on the Schuylkill, pulled a 300-pound boat out of the river, put it in the truck, and hauled it back to the reservoir. As they arrived, sweating and red-faced, Barber swam easily to the shore and climbed out.

"Tim tried," he told Park Guard Sgt. William Jett. Later, he told Park Guard Detective Sgt. Richard Donahue that one reason he'd leaped into the water was that he'd lost his job and had quarreled with his wife.

He will have a hearing at the Sedgley Park Guard House this morning.



NEW FIGHT IS MADE ON DAM PROJECT

BULLETIN * 6-11-46 Warrington Officials say Water Plan will Wipe out Third of Taxables

Location of a reservoir and dam in Warrington Township, Bucks County, in connection with a proposed new upland water supply for Philadelphia, will wipe out one-third of that community's taxable properties, township officials contended today.

They were among those heard when City Council's Committee on Public Works, headed by Councilman Phineas T. Green, chairman, resumed public hearings on various plans under consideration for providing Philadelphia with a larger and more modern water supply system.

Summoned by Robert T. McCracken, solicitor in law for Bucks County Board of Commissioners, the township officials protesting the location of the Warrington reservoir and dam were George T. Tettemer, real estate assessor; Charles L. Murray, tax collector; and Edward J. Hancock, a member of the County Board of Commissioners.

Judge Ladner Assails Plan

Earlier in today's session, Orphans' Court Judge Trevor C. Ladner, president of the Schuylkill River Valley Restoration Association, condemned the Walpack Bend plan, which involves construction of the reservoir objected to in Warrington Township and suggested, instead, that a wholly state-controlled unit present source of supply cannot be improved.

Tettemer, under the questioning of McCracken, told the committee that Warrington Township's total assessments are \$1,510,962 and that the 2,900-acre site selected for the reservoir is assessed at \$52,353.

Within that site, Tettemer said, are 270 homes and farms housing more than 1,000 persons, all of whom will have to find new homes. Location of the reservoir in the township, he also said, will wipe out two public schools, a parochial school, three churches and the entire village of Neshaminy.

Says Creek Will Dry Up

Tettemer also contended that 35 to 40 miles of Neshaminy Creek will be dried up as location of the reservoir in the township, he said, will eliminate Little Neshaminy and Park Creeks, two of its principal tributaries.

Murray told the committee that the township would lose approximately \$13,000 in present taxes if the reservoir is located in his township and that surviving sections would have to have taxes increased to make up for the losses.

Hancock said some of the buildings that would be demolished under the proposed plan back to pre-Revolution days and have been occupied by generations of the same family. "In addition to the sentimental objection, he said, he also

(Continued on Page Two, Column Two)

COUNTY PROTESTS WATER PROJECT

Montgomery Board says Warrington Dam would Dispossess 1,000

The Montgomery County Commissioners today formally protested the proposed construction of a reservoir in Warrington Township as part of the Walpack Bend water project as a new source of water. While the protests were being expressed, a group of Horsham Township property owners listened attentively at the public hearing on new sources of city water, before City Council's Public Works Committee.

Warren F. Cressman, Montgomery County engineer, declared: "This project would dispossess upward of 1,000 residents and property owners, who would have to find new homes. Although the dam would be built in Warrington Township, the area affected would cover some 4,400 acres, with the reservoir virtually cutting Housham Township in half.

Dam Relocation Needed

"It would involve a relocation of part of Easton road, as well as other State highways, county and township roads. Some of the latter would be destroyed or inundated. Several bridges would be eliminated."

Present also were Foster C. Higgins, president of the Montgomery County Commissioners; Commissioner Fred G. Peters, and Maxwell Strawbird, e. attorney for the commission.

Peters said the commissioners were unanimously supporting the Horsham Township residents in opposition to the reservoir. When Cressman remarked that Philadelphia needs water and needs it badly, he reiterated opposition to the Warrington project. Councilman J. Wallace Egan observed that as he understood it, the commissioners and residents objected solely because it affected their property and their lives.

"Naturally," said Cressman, "that is the reason. William J. Hoffeman, International vice president of the Uphol-

(Continued on Page Three, Column Two)

Water Project

(Continued from the First Page)

sters' International Union of North America, AFL, urged Council to give serious consideration to improved source of water supply with equally serious consideration to the cost of any improvement program.

Costs, Rental, Increase

"The members of the union have little stomach for today's city water," he added, "but equally little stomach for a 25 per cent rise in water rents that would continue to supply the same fish and diseased water with the dubious method of more chlorine of extra processing."

Charles L. Clark, chairman of the water committee of the Philadelphia Boosters Association, said that water supply is a good water supply as quickly and cheaply as possible, and feels that legal difficulties might be involved in the Walpack Bend project.

"The estimated \$284,000,000 cost, he said, is large a sum for the city to be strapped with, and too much of a burden to carry compared with other projects.

Plan for Ozone Process

He urged Councilmen to give serious consideration to a proposal advanced earlier by Councilman Charles Crossin to abandon the Torresdale intake for one at Yardley, and suggested that the existing intake be used for industrial, street cleaning, fire fighting and other purposes, with new pipes being installed for better water for residential use.

Charles A. Emerson, a member of the board of consulting engineers with Messrs. DellPlan, president of Ozone Processes, Inc., a subsidiary of the Weibach Engineering and Management Corporation.

Councilmen were urged to give serious consideration to use of the ozone process in treatment of water by Messrs. DellPlan, president of Ozone Processes, Inc., a subsidiary of the Weibach Engineering and Management Corporation.

Describes Process

Ozonation was described by DellPlan as a logical treatment for Philadelphia water, regardless of what the final decision is as to source of supply.

The Bureau of Municipal Research, through Robert K. Fenwick, a staff engineer, suggested a three-stage construction program which, he said, would require an immediate capital expenditure of less than \$100,000,000 for water which would meet all quality standards except softness in one year, and all quality standards in three years.

Work in 3 Stages

Stage one would include installation of equipment to remove all objectionable tastes and odors from water of both present sources, and to remove manganese from the Schuylkill River.

Stage two would provide for taking of all needed water from the Delaware at Torresdale, with part of the water going to Queen Lane and Belmont stations, and universal metering throughout the city.

The third stage would provide for future quality requirements, and would include negotiation of the required compact and securing necessary Federal permits to the legal path for construction of a dam at Walpack Bend.

New Fight is Made

(Continued from the First Page)

proposed the plan because it would block relocation of many Bucks County roads.

Questions Legality
McCracken told the committee that he seriously questioned Philadelphia's exercise of the right of eminent domain in another county and that he proposed to file a memorandum with the committee later, expressing that objection.

Judge Ladner reiterated his previous objection to the Walpack Bend project on the ground that it is not sufficiently superior to that of taking water from the Delaware at Yardley and that it would involve interstate complications with New Jersey and New York.

On the other hand, he pointed out, adoption of the proposed Upper Lehigh River Basin plan would involve no interstate complications and compared its estimated cost of \$240,000,000 with the estimated \$360,000,000 cost of the Walpack Bend proposal.

"It is my view," Judge Ladner told the committee, "that if we go to the Walpack Bend, it will give us very little better water, at a vastly greater expense, than if we moved the intake to Yardley.

"If the citizens of Philadelphia want a pure upland source of water, the State of Pennsylvania, free of all interstate complications and so far as possible in a protected watershed that is not likely to be either industrialized or urbanly developed and which can be policed and protected by known State laws.

Philadelphia Water Department
Historical Collection
2004.019.0017B