

absolutely no possibility of injuring the underground waters down there through the construction of the canal. He testified that there could be no injury to the water supply.

Mr. JOHNS. I do not know anything about it except what these people have said in these communications.

The CHAIRMAN. There was some testimony several years ago, when General Markham was the Chief of Engineers, which showed that the Ocala limestone deposit, which was the source of the artesian water supply of southern Florida, dipped as you go down in the State. The testimony showed that it was near the surface where the canal was proposed, but that when you got down to about Miami it was 1,600 or 1,700 feet below the surface. The limestone deposit dips greatly. Some eminent geologists were employed to make an investigation, and they made a very thorough study of the whole situation. They reported that there was no ground for those fears. Of course, the people down there generally have entertained that view, and they have urged us here repeatedly to take action, or favorable action on the proposal. Within the last week or two they have also very strongly urged that the channel be cut across farther down in the State. We have received a number of telegrams urging that that be done. They wanted it cut through their region, and they were very much in favor of it.

Mr. JOHNS. I have no objection to it, because it is not in my State; but if anything should happen in the future that would hinder in any way the farming industry in southern Florida, I do not want the record to show that I sat here and let it be done without calling attention to these objections.

Mr. PITTINGER. I was a member of the committee when the Florida ship canal was before it in 1939. I attended the hearings and heard the testimony of the proponents and opponents, and I voted with a clear conscience to report out the bill. It was believed from the testimony of the witnesses, who knew more about it than any layman could, that there was absolutely no reason to fear that the Florida water supply would be injured in any way. That was the conclusion that they reached at that time. The engineer who testified on that matter had the reputation of being one of the greatest in this country and in the whole world.

Mr. JOHNS. Of course, any man can change his mind. There are several reports here.

Mr. PITTINGER. That has to do with the economic question, and I might say that our economics have moved forward 1,000 years since December 7.

Mr. GREEN. In that connection, I can very well appreciate Mr. Johns' position, because when I first heard the story, I looked into it carefully, and explored every possibility that had been developed by the Army engineers through a fund of \$300,000 for ground-water explorations and examinations. They are not the only ones who have ever examined this situation in connection with the water supply. I believe their conclusion was based in part on a study made by Mr. Pirnie, who was paid, probably, \$50 per day or, perhaps, \$100 per day, for the work. Through the Army engineers, they made a thorough study of the situation, and the conclusion was that there could be no danger whatsoever for more than 8 or 10 miles at the outside, and probably not more than 5 miles, on either side of the