

and 6, which have here been particularly spoken of, caused the Hancock division of the canal, last year, upon the 1st of October, to have had only about two weeks of navigation,—when but for the course pursued there would have been a navigation from the 1st of April,—which was equivalent to the canal's losing nearly the whole year's trade of the $27\frac{1}{2}$ miles between dams No. 5 and 6,—and of the country above.

It is here due to myself to say, that upon learning from the President himself in almost so many words, in the conversation that has been alluded to,—that Mr. Stone's dismissal was upon "political grounds,"—I addressed a respectful letter to the board speaking of the condition of the work at the two points upon the Hancock division,—of what had been done,—and what had not been, as compared with what had been advised by the chief engineer. I deemed it my duty to speak candidly to the board, but respectfully, that they might not be ignorant of the consequences, in my opinion, resulting from the course that had been pursued. I made no allusion to the then recent dismissal.

The committee should be here informed that this is the case of the removal of a superintendent who was not, and the appointment of a person who was a lock-keeper in opposition to the order of the board of three months before which in consideration of the President's views of the incompatibility of the duties of the two officers had then been passed, and which has been brought to bear upon other superintendents who were lock-keepers, and has been assigned in the President's report as the cause of at least one removal and change.

The second case of the removal of a superintendent of Repairs is that of G. W. Rodgers on the 9th of July last, and the appointment of John D. Grove in his stead. This is the case in which a letter from a recently appointed officer of the company, signing himself "Chairman of the Democratic Executive Committee," &c., sending an accusation against Mr. Rodgers was presented to the board on one day, when it was referred to Mr. Rodgers for an explanation,—but before he received the letter, two days afterwards, he was dismissed;—a director from Baltimore understood to be opposed to "political proscription" being present at the first, but not at the second meeting;—and as already stated to the committee, the proceedings in this case are not to be found appended to the President's report,