they ought not to remove him although the President may have desired it.

I have shewn that the contemplated removal of Mr. O'Reilly was no secret. I will now state that it was no unusual thing for an opinion to be formed as to what the board would in due time do, from the common rumours of the day. The dismissal of Mr. Stone and even the name of his successor Mr. Hollman was matter of common conversation before it was mentioned by the President in my hearing. So also was the removal of Mr. Rodgers and the name of his successor Mr. Grove.

I am aware that "the Collector General" in his letter communicated with the President's report, exhibits a great show of errors in the way-bills and returns of Mr. O'Reilly, for the past year, which bills and returns it was not in the power of the late Treasurer to audit before his dismissal. It is quite probable that many of these errors will prove to be like those discovered by some other of the new officers of the company which they have been constrained to acknowledge as their own. I am also aware that Mr. O'Reilly is not such an accountant as it might be desirable to have, if the trade upon the canal would justify a corresponding salary, but he has always been esteemed as an honest man, and the Treasurer was always willing to revise and correct any errors, and as he is under bonds with security to the company, no loss can be sustained even if the supposed errors should prove real. Mr. O'Reilly was collector and lock-keeper for the Potomac Company before the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company had a being, and with a view to economy the board has chosen to continue the two offices in him. It is not an easy matter to find a person who is "highly qualified" for the office of collector, who is willing to arise at any hour of the night and pass boats through the locks.

None of the errors referred to in the letter of the collector general were known to exist in July 1840. If errors in accounts was the subject of "suspicion," ought not an opportunity to be allowed the excused for explanation.

The question proposed to me asks whether the board was not in private session? I do not know that this session was in the slightest degree more private than any of its sessions had been, or that there was a desire on the part of any one present to make it so.

I am asked whether I did not leave the room soon after the