

month of June, 1828. On the 26th of that month, (see page 67 of the printed argument) the stockholders in general meeting passed two resolutions, by one of which, they sanctioned with their approbation, the prior location of the canal throughout its eastern section; and, in conformity with a condition of the act of Pennsylvania, incorporating the Chesapeake and Ohio canal company; fixed its western termination at Pittsburg

The reference to this final proceeding of the stockholders in general meeting, conformably to which, the actual contracts for the various works of the canal have been made, completes the answer to the inquiry of the committee, with regard to the location of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal.

It may not, however, be impertinent to add that long prior to this location, at a time when the public sentiment was directed, exclusively, to a continuous canal navigation along the Potomac; two surveys were made of the valley of the river, one by the principal engineer of Virginia, under the authority of that commonwealth, and another immediately following the former, by commissioners acting under the joint authority of the states of Maryland and Virginia; (see page 76, 77, 78 79, and 190, of the printed argument,) by both of which surveys, as is manifest from the accompanying reports and estimates, the proposed canal was located along the northern shore; and, of necessity, for considerable portion of the way, in the bed of the river. At the chief obstruction to its natural navigation, the Great Falls, the southern shore presented the best site, for conducting a canal around those falls, while, at the narrow pass, below the Little Falls, a canal along the southern shore, was obviously impracticable. To cross and re-cross such a river, by stone aqueducts, was deemed highly inexpedient, on account of the great cost, as well as immeasurable hazard, which would attend it; and the warmer exposure of the northern shore, of itself, furnished a conclusive argument, in favor of conducting a canal along the Maryland in preference to the Virginia bank of the river. (See from page 80 to 86 of the printed argument.)

The next topic of inquiry which the letter of the chairman of the committee addresses to the undersigned, relates to the contracts for the completion of the canal. Its intended import is not precisely understood. Whether the date, substance or time of completion of the several contracts be de-