

Mr. RANKIN. May I ask, Mr. Bowie, if I might ask Mr. Culkin, the gentleman from New York, a question? I know that his views and mine coincide on this question of inland waterways: Is it your contention that this provision should be added as an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill?

Mr. CULKIN. Yes; I think so. I think the whole country should take pot-luck on this thing; and that we should approach it from a broad front rather than in specified fronts. That is my belief.

Mr. PITTINGER. You do not think we should attack just the one problem?

Mr. CULKIN. I do not think so. I think the issue should be taken to the country and let the people know what is being done, and what Congress is doing with regard to the situation. I have the highest respect for the wisdom of Congress, but I must say that in my judgment we have a struggle here and I think at least during these hearings we have learned something about this situation, but Congress followed other leaders apparently. I think we ought to take potluck with this general bill.

Mr. RANKIN. If the bill were passed with the project added, they could proceed at once to build the pipe line and construct this canal.

Mr. CULKIN. There is already authority for building the pipe line; I understand there is authority for the pipe line now.

May I say to the gentleman right at this point that there is a definite conspiracy to bottle up and make the Great Lakes a great operation for the benefit of the Steel Trust.

Mr. BOWIE. I did not know that.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman think there is anything this committee can do to expedite the building of the pipe lines to carry petroleum products?

Mr. CULKIN. I think it could be done—

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman think we could do anything to expedite the building of the pipe lines?

Mr. MILLER. May I make this statement—

Mr. HALL (interposing). I would like to have the gentleman answer because I know he is an able lawyer and I would like to have his opinion.

Mr. CULKIN. I waive that last part of your statement. I think there is authority enough now to build this pipe line. That should be our initial step. The morning paper carries a story on that from Mr. Ickes, and I am in sympathy with his general position with regard to pipe lines.

But in order to make the relief complete as long as we are not in control of our own shores, we have to build, provide for building the barge lines as well.

Mr. HALL. If it is shown that this barge canal is necessary to get the oil across Florida I am going to vote for the barge canal. The only thing I am worried about is this: We had the question of the barge canal, as I remember, discussed informally in this committee sometime ago. I remember that at that time there was not much sympathy for a barge canal; they wanted a ship canal—

Mr. CULKIN (interposing). I never was in sympathy with that feeling.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman recall that discussion?