

gatory, contained in the said order, he would, in addition to the answer given to the same by Mr. Ingle, refer the committee to Joseph J. Merrick's letter to the President of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, of the 17th May, 1835, numbered 1. His letter to the same of the 30th Dec. 1835, No. 2. To the answer from the President of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, to Joseph J. Merrick's letter of the 30th Dec. 1835, No. 3. To a letter from Col. J. J. Abert, enclosing one from Joseph J. Merrick, dated June 29th, 1836, No. 4. To the report of the committee on the claim of Joseph J. Merrick, No. 5. And to Joseph J. Merrick's letter of the 9th April, 1838, to the President of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, No. 6, and to the answer to the same. [See appendix to this Journal, No. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12.]

The committee then adjourned.

FEBRUARY 11th.

The committee met. Present Messrs. Wootton, Causin, Pitts, and Blocher.

George C. Washington, Esq. appeared before the committee and presented in writing his answers to the interrogatories propounded to him at the last meeting.

The 1st and 2d interrogatory, he answers. Upon the suggestion of Mr. McCulloch, (one of the commissioners representing the State in the Internal Improvement companies, in which she is a stockholder) that it would be important to have the aid of efficient counsel in our application to the Legislature, he was authorized to employ such counsel as in his judgment would best promote the interests of the company.

To the 3d interrogatory, he answers, it was.

To the 4th interrogatory, he answers. Mr. McCulloch never claimed or received any thing in the form of compensation from the company for his services in the application to the Legislature for aid, either for the two million loan or the three million subscription.

Answer to the 5th interrogatory. No bill was reported in 1836, by the committee on internal improvement. The report and bill came from the committee of Ways and Means.

To the 6th interrogatory, answered. There was considerable hesitation and delay on the part of the stockholders in accepting the act of 1836—the grounds of objection are presented in the report of the committee of the stockholders, to which the subject was referred—that report is offered in connexion with my answer to this interrogatory. [See appendix No. 10.]

7th interrogatory, answer. The board was aware that under the authority it had given to Mr. McCulloch to employ such counsel as he might deem essential for the promotion of the interest of the company, that he had engaged the services of Mr. Merrick, but the character of the engagement was not known to the board, until the claim of Mr. Merrick was presented last spring,