

To connect the navigation of Lake Erie with that of the Hudson river by means of a free canal, they desired to obtain for New York from the United States four millions of acres of land, worth eight millions of dollars, to construct a work that has since cost nine millions of dollars: whereas, *to meliorate the navigation of the Potomac river*, now being improved by a canal, at a cost exceeding ten millions of dollars, two-thirds of which the State of Maryland supplies, they desired that to Virginia and Maryland 200,000 acres of land, worth only \$400,000 might be allotted. Well might they apprehend, that their application would be viewed with jealousy by other States, and that fatal opposition would be made by these, to propositions as extraordinary as they were bold. Well might they apprehend and intimate as they did, see 'New York Canals,' vol. 1, p. 92, that Pennsylvania, and even *Maryland*, would look with jealousy on such a plan!! The illustrious men who framed it must have felt strong indeed from the intrinsic power of the empire State, when they challenged for that plan the approbation of the representatives of other States—and especially of Virginia and Maryland: a plan too, devised by the commissioners of a State, 'that delights to accelerate rather than retard her neighbor's prosperity.'

The Erie and Hudson Canal cost, as has been stated, about nine millions of dollars, see vol. 2, 'New York Canals,' p. 629. The quantity of land proposed by the foregoing bill to be allotted to New York for its construction, being 4,000,000 acres, worth \$2 per acre; the appropriation was quite equal to \$8,000,000; whilst it was estimated in 1836 that said canal could be constructed for \$6,000,000—see vol. 1, 'New York Canals,' p. 143. The commissioners who framed that bill, as if to vindicate the excess of land, which it proposed should be allotted to New York for the construction of that work, made the extraordinary claim to be considered liberal towards other States; when they proposed to receive for New York the full value or cost of said work in land: and in favor of trade to make it a free highway; whilst they proposed to allot to other States land in value, wholly insufficient to construct their several canals, and consented, as if in aid of these, but against their trade, that tolls should be charged on such highways!!

I shall now speak of the election of a president of the Chesapeake and Ohio canal, to succeed Mr. Eaton. This happened on the 27th day of June, in the year 1834, when George C. Washington, of Montgomery county, Maryland, was unanimously chosen. In the selection of a person to fill this office, it seemed to be peculiarly proper and expedient in the depressed condition of the affairs of the company at that time, that a citizen of Maryland should be elected: and that the individual to be chosen, should hold harmonious intercourse with the dominant party in this State. The friends of Mr. Washington in Maryland and the District of Columbia, soon presented his pretensions for the approbation of the stockholders. He was then a member of the Exe-