

so on. I heard that before I left home, but it has not been serious in that respect.

Mr. JOHNS. Up to this time, so far as transportation is concerned, you have not needed any canal?

Mr. SHARY. Yes; we have needed a canal.

Mr. JOHNS. You said your transportation facilities were sufficient?

Mr. SHARY. But the rates are not equalized properly for us. They are detrimental to our returns.

Mr. JOHNS. The reason you want the canal is so you can get lower rates, is it?

Mr. SHARY. Yes, sir. And to take up a market to which we are entitled, the eastern-seaboard market, which is almost prohibitive to go to by railroads.

Mr. JOHNS. On account of freight rates?

Mr. SHARY. We are entitled to it just as well as any other part of the United States. And the railroads have got so high in rates we can not meet the competition. There is too great a difference.

Mr. JOHNS. That is the reason you want the canal, to cut down the rates?

Mr. SHARY. Yes, indeed. To agument our canning industry also, which I believe we are canning this year something like 6,000,000,000 of box canned goods alone; and we are pretty much up against it, since our transportation along the deep water has been abandoned, you know.

Mr. JOHNS. If the war should end next week or next month and the freight rates are adjusted, you would not need a canal, would you?

Mr. SHARY. I still say we need the canal. There is no hope of adjusting rates in comparison with a barge canal. I cannot foresee any solution of that sort coming to the American people in our district.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not seen it come to any other people, have you?

Mr. SHARY. No, sir.

Mr. MILLER. I think it ought to be stated for the information of the committee that the committee has already approved the report of the engineers and the item is in the bill authorizing the extension of the canal to the valley on the basis of 9 feet.

The CHAIRMAN. But, Mr. Miller, that is sort of like the joke you told us this morning. That was a year ago.

Mr. CULKIN. Is that in the pending bill?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; it is in the pending rivers and harbors bill.

Mr. CULKIN. I remember that generally, but from this new portion of the canal the untouched portion of it down to the valley line, what were the the figures on that?

Mr. MILLER. The estimated cost was only \$2,500,000.

Mr. CULKIN. That will give them what?

Mr. MILLER. A 9-foot depth. It is self-evident that if the entire project is standardized at 12 feet—

Mr. PITTENGER. It was 12 feet in the pending bill.

Mr. MILLER. No; 9 feet.

Mr. PITTENGER. In the present bill?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

I have three other witnesses from the Rio Grande Valley who, I am quite sure, will present some valuable information.