

project; you would be getting your oil from Chicago and Cleveland down the St. Lawrence through a 12-foot channel, if you had agreed to that, and if the Senate had ratified the treaty in 1934.

Speaking very plainly, but kindly, it seems to me you cut off your noses to spite your faces. A lot of other folks do these things.

I expect to go along with the program for the development of waterways and harbors, but I would like to have the witness tell me why the President does not have as much authority now to build a pipe line across Florida as he had to build the Alaska Highway. Why all of this subterfuge? Why not put the Intracoastal Waterway plan through here, with the canal across Florida, which is already in the river and harbor bill? Why make fish of one and fowl of another? They are all meritorious.

These newspaper boys will talk about "pork," and other people will talk about "pork." They have made up their minds that everything in the bill is not pork at all; it is lamb, or some other kind of an animal.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not even a congressional pension.

Mr. PITTENGER. No, it is not.

Mr. MILLER. As the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Pittenger, knows, I do not disagree with him. If I had been a Member of Congress instead of a very ordinary layman, I would have been raising Cain for more than a year to try to get a river and harbor bill passed. But you are up against a practical difficulty there.

I do know this, Mr. Pittenger, that this bill is directed toward a very critical situation. In reference to the service which might have been rendered by the St. Lawrence seaway, I repeat what I said before, that there is no one single remedy for this particular grave situation. It is going to take the fullest possible utilization of all the transportation facilities we possess, supplemented by the greatest possible utilization of all of our inland waterways.

Let me say here that I think the railroads are doing a magnificent job.

I think however that testimony will be presented to show that the railroads have probably reached the limit of their capacity in meeting this oil and gasoline situation, and that as the fruits of our great war production program begin to ripen in greater abundance, we will be confronted and we are now, with the only bottleneck to victory, and that is inadequate transportation.

Mr. RANKIN. As long as the Government uses and operates it, a pipe line is all right to the extent of its capacity—

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Rankin, it will serve the purpose until a better means can be provided.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me finish my statement. But the canal is necessary not only for the present situation but for permanent use, for the simple reason that a pipe line is necessarily a monopoly concern. The Government, or the big oil companies, must monopolize the use of the line, as they do also in Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Mississippi, the great oil-producing section of the country. There are large numbers of independent producers that should also use the barge line when it is finished.

Mr. MILLER. That is very true.