

Roughly only 3,000,000 tons of that enormous commerce was handled by the so-called subsidized method of transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I think that so far as the proponents are concerned, we have concluded, except that we would like to reserve the privilege of making a concluding statement when Major B. R. Parten, Director of Transportation of the Petroleum Coordinator's Office, appears.

#### STATEMENT OF J. HARDIN PETERSON, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in connection with your hearings on the Intracoastal Waterway, I would also like to call attention to the Intracoastal Waterway from the Anclote to the Caloosahatchee which has already been approved by the Board of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers and is included in the rivers and harbors bill already reported out of this committee. Also, the waterway from the Caloosahatchee to Stuart, or sometimes referred to as Punta Rassa to Stuart. This waterway is already existing and the deepening to 8 feet has been favorably reported. It would only take a small amount to deepen this to 8 feet. The utilization of the existing waterway would carry considerable barge traffic. It is carrying some traffic now and the feasibility of the use of this waterway has been pointed out in the special study which is being made of the oil-transportation situation. This existing waterway is such that barges could move through same and, in turn, up the east coast of Florida in the inland waterway as far as Norfolk.

I would like to also call the attention of the committee to the feasibility of a pipe line from Tampa to Sanford. It is only around 85 or 86 miles cross country here and it is over a terrain in which it would be very easy to lay a pipe line with the minimum of expense. In calling the attention to this pipe line, I do not want to seem critical of the other proposed pipe line, because undoubtedly both can be served and become an important part in serving the eastern seaboard in the present emergency. At both Tampa and Sanford will be found storage and pumping facilities, and so forth.

With reference to the proposed canal across Florida, the committee has heard so often my position with reference to a cross-State canal, that I will not go into details with reference to same, but would refer to the data in the previous hearings. Every effort should be made to adequately protect the water supply. Emergency measures should not be used as an opening wedge to construct the cross-State ship canal. Adequate locks should be constructed to safeguard the water supply and a sea-level canal is dangerous to the water supply.

The construction of the cross-State canal, of course, will take time, explosives, and steel, which are needed in the war economy. The problem now is to meet the immediate situation, both in such a way as to utilize facilities and at the same time not create a disordered condition after the war period is over and also not to create or allow a monopoly of transportation facilities in the hands of any one group. Rather large movements of petroleum products can be made by using barge and tanker service to the northern part of the State where the pipe line is contemplated and through Tampa in the use of these temporary proposed pipe lines. A great amount can be moved in shallow traffic, light barges through the existing waterway and up the east