

feel not less strongly assured that the Legislature of Virginia, in employing this phraseology, never contemplated so restricted an interpretation as should compel the company to commence its operations at the head of the tide. In point of fact, the water rises with the flood tide, some short distance higher up the potomac than the present bridge at the Little Falls. The impracticability of making that the commencement of the canal, appears to be conceded, and the advocates of the interpretation, upon which we are now commenting, recommend and urge the junction of the canal with the river, at a point at least two miles lower down. This appears to the committee to be a virtual surrender of the whole argument. Upon what grounds it is wished to have the termination of the canal two miles below the bridge? No other has been assigned or can be conjectured, than such as convenience and expediency suggest. If, then, conveniency and expediency may authorise the company to go two miles beyond the point which the law designates, it seems difficult to contend that a much greater degree of both may not warrant an extension of this distance. Nor have the committee been able to perceive the force of the argument which would narrow the expressions which have been cited from the Virginia law, in such a manner as make them equivalent to the phrase, "the point in the river Potomac at which the flood tide ceases to operate a rise in the water," or even "that particular point of the river where its waters can be made available for the use of canal boats," which seems to be the extent to which the objection is carried. Such, it is insisted, is the only interpretation which the law can fairly and reasonably receive, but, had such been the meaning of the Legislature, how easy would it have been to employ language which would clearly express such a design. The committee have arrived at a different conclusion. It appears to them, that the expression tide water, may be applied to any part of the river between its mouth and the head of the tide; and that, if not restricted by the additional qualification, "in the District of Columbia," the company could have been restrained by no other considerations than those of policy, from extending the canal to any part of the river between those points. There is no tide above the line of the District, and that phrase is wholly supererogatory, unless it was introduced to distinguish between it and tide water below. The law, therefore, in the opinion of the committee, authorises the company to