

those who are "politically friendly" to the President, *as to the offices that can be used for party purposes*, if those who fill them be disposed to turn them to such an account; and within the last year there has been no lack of effort in that way on the part of almost every single individual officer "politically friendly" to the President.

When vacancies have occurred since last October and November in offices that cannot be turned to party account, *upon the line of canal*, with the existing appointments as to its leading officers, a few "political opponents" have received appointments. In one of which cases the committee will have perceived that the vacancy arose from the resignation of a "political friend" of the President, who prior to last October had taken the place of a "political opponent" removed. I refer to the case of the commissioner.

This state of things as to the *whole patronage* of the company, as dependent on the officers *upon the line of canal*, having been placed, since the change of direction in June 1839, with the single exception of the subordinate officer residing in Virginia, who is no *politician*, entirely in the hands of persons "politically friendly" to the President,—the greater part of whom are notoriously politicians, and who since their appointments have actively and openly exercised their influence in the late elections,—has been effected, upon the line of finished canal, entirely by removals with a view to appointments, as witness the removals of the superintendants of the 2nd, 3rd and 4th divisions; and upon the line of unfinished canal, (where a considerable reduction was required in consequence of the lessening of the amount of work under contract,) it has been effected,—1st, by retaining and promoting those "politically friendly" to the President, dismissing those who were not; 2nd by removals with a view to appointments; and 3rd by *appointments with a view to removals*; that is, by increasing the number of officers when, in the opinion of the board, there were already too many in service, and then at a meeting immediately subsequent dismissing the older officers. I here refer more particularly to the case of Schnebly, thus appointed on the 12th of August, 1840, and that, too, if I have not been misinformed, when there was but half a quorum present, viz: the President and the Georgetown Director.

Upon the change in the direction in June 1840, of the six directors who with the President compose the board, two were