

19, 1830, has been so much misunderstood by you, as to be deemed and brought forward to support the charge you have made.

The entire paragraph, *from which you have quoted only an extract*, is in the following words:

"Whilst, however, the directors of this company are prompted by an earnest desire, to avoid any interference with the progress of the works contemplated by the canal company, they cannot permit the present occasion to pass, without again calling your attention to a proposition made by the President of this Company to the President of the Canal Company, in the presence of the counsel of both parties, at the time of their first meeting to confer on the subject of the dispute which had arisen in relation to the right of way, referred to in the proposition now received from you. That proposition as reported to us by our President has received our unqualified approbation, and was to this effect, to wit: 'That the two companies should each prosecute its respective work to the point of junction, and thus far put them both into actual operation; by this means an opportunity would be afforded of practically testing the relative advantages of the two systems, and the one which the country should decide upon to be the best, could, and ought then to be exclusively prosecuted.' This suggestion was originally offered, and is now renewed, under the persuasion, that it can hardly be for the public interest that two works of such magnitude, intended for the same precise object, and involving so large an expenditure, should be constructed for so great a distance immediately along side of each other, when one would answer all the requisite purposes, provided that were the one, best calculated to secure the objects desired."

Thus it appears, as this Board conceive, you will be satisfied, on a reconsideration of the *whole paragraph*, that the proposal made in that letter was, "that the two companies should each prosecute its respective work to the point of junction," and, after they had both been put in operation *to that point*, and their relative value ascertained, that then, from the place of interference, "the work, which the country should decide upon to be the best, could, and ought to be exclusively prosecuted." It is sufficiently clear that "*the point of junction*," referred to in this letter, is not at Harper's Ferry, but at "the Point of Rocks," 12 miles below Harper's Ferry, and that, up to "the Point of Rocks," the Rail Road does not pass over any part of the contested grounds. So far from having changed the course of policy, which induced the making and approval of that proposition on the part of this Board, they still are ready, as they always have been, to carry it fully into effect.