

4 per year, additional tank cars had been purchased, 150 at a time, to a total of 650 (less a few which were destroyed by wrecks and fire).

Now, when World War I closed, and rail traffic began to resume normal movements, these tank cars made round trips faster, and eventually the number required dropped down to the same 150 tank cars as before. And thus, we had 500 more tank cars that were not needed for the same movement which had required 650 during the war. These cars cost \$2,600 each, and the loss was close to \$1,000,000. (It is many of these World War I tank cars that are now in the rail movement you are directing.) Further details on request.

And thus, the rail movement of the present will inevitably slip as our war effort increases and rail traffic becomes heavier, and there is considerable danger of even a greater oil shortage than at present on the east coast.

On the other hand, with a completed, through waterway, Corpus Christi to Trenton, all oil can be taken off of rails and put on to water, and in addition, south-bound cargoes of merchandise, munitions for our troops—especially shells for artillery practice, bombs for aerial use—can all be taken off of rails too, in aid of the war effort.

I am fully aware of the trials and difficulties in your position as Director of Oil Transportation, and you are assured, most vehemently here and now, that it is your writer's sole desire to forward our war effort regardless. I have no other aim; I have no interests of any kind that are affected favorably, but rather, unfavorably, particularly because of antagonisms that are developing now, which I had hoped could be avoided by cooperation. And if anything I have set down in this communication is interpreted by you as to affect you personally, you are assured that my treatment of the subject is just as professional as a surgeon's. Copies are being sent to numerous authorities.

With every kind regard,

Sincerely,

HARRY PENNINGTON, M. E.

Mr. MILLER. I want to make a brief statement, in conclusion, if I may. I think you gentlemen will agree that about all the pertinent and available information concerning the bill, the necessity for it, and what will be accomplished by its passage, has been placed in the record.

Mr. HALL. On that point, Mr. Miller, may I ask this question: The purpose of this bill, of course, is to aid industries and manufacturing plants on the eastern seaboard that are short of oils and petroleum products today?

Mr. MILLER. That is one of the purposes; yes, sir.

Mr. HALL. That is the principal purpose; because this is a defense measure, is it not?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I would say probably the principal purpose. It will be of great value also to producers in the Southwest and along the route of the canal. It will be of general and national benefit, I think.

Mr. HALL. I ask that for this reason: Have not any of those industries or manufacturers shown any interest in this bill?

Mr. MILLER. I can answer that in this way: I have in my files scores of letters from industries in the Southwest. And the organization which I represent, the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, for probably 25 or 30 years has looked after the waterway interests of the industries down there, and, frankly, they expect our association to represent and speak for them. We could place in the record almost countless letters of endorsement of the purposes of the bill.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. Is it not a fact that the northeastern part of the United States will be shy 300,000 barrels of petroleum products daily this winter?