WOOL AND THE TARIFF.

Continued from Second Page.

then 56 cents on the dollar of their cost, and those not at work at a much less figure."

So much in evidence of the opinions and experience of at least two of the representative woolen manufacturers of the country. On the other hand an application for information to two of the leading houses in the country dealing in domestic woolens—jobbing or commission—elicited the following responses, under dates of Feb. 20 and 22 respectively.

No. 1 writes:

"It is stated on good authority that the Directors of the Washington Mills of Lawrence, in which the original all-wool "Bay State" shawl was first made, and which has been struggling to maintain an all-wool manufacture, having become dissatisfied with their results lately, and particularly last year (1872), are considering the giving up of the woolen business and turning their machinery over to cotton. This establishment has heretofore been regarded as one of the most successful in the country."

"For the same reason, the Salisbury Mills of Amesbury, Mass., have determined to stop at once 50 per cent of their machinery. The celebrated Harris Mills, 50 sets, formerly owned by Edward Harris, deceased, situated at Woonsocket, R. I., are to be closed as soon as they can make arrangements."

"The Boston fire caused the failure of one woolen commission house in that city, and the very moderate loss suffered by them revealed bankruptcy on their part, and on the part of eight or nine large woolen factories for which they had been making advances. It is reported that 80 sets of machinery will be permanently retired by this failure."

"An 8-set mill at Millville, Mass., failed some months since, and has not resumed business." "A large satinet manufactory in Easton, Mass., failed within a few days, owing over $200,000." "A 12-set mill in Worcester, Mass., the 'Adriatic,' contemplates a suspension of manufacturing." "—— & Co. of Boston, who have been doing quite a large business as agents of woolen mills, have concluded to give up that branch of their business, considering that it involves too much risk."

"We have to-day conversed with a very trustworthy gentleman who has traveled five or six times every year for several weeks, during each of the past 15 or 18 years, in the woolen manufacturing districts of New-England. He has just returned to-day from an extensive trip among these manufacturers. He states that he has never found them so discouraged with their efforts and with their prospects for the future as they are now. They are most of them ready to turn their machinery to anything which they could work—cotton, flax, or anything by which they could make any money. He thinks that at least three-quarters of these manufacturers would be willing to-day to sell out their goods, machinery, &c., at a very large reduction on their January inventory."

"He has talked with the largest, most intelligent, and most wealthy woolen manufacturers in this part of the country, and they all agree that a large reduction in the present high tariff on raw wool is the only thing that will give them relief and resuscitate this most important, expiring interest of the country."

No. 2 writes:

"We know particularly of one of the sharpest and most careful small manufacturers of the country who made during 1871, he states, $18,000 on his year's business, who in the year past lost all of that amount and $3,000 besides, in all $21,000. He manufactures fancy cassimeres, and is a close, sharp manager."

"An 18-set mill near —, N. Y., making fancy cassimeres, fine, handsome goods, has not made any money during the past year; so the Treasurer stated to us a day or two ago. Since the failure of a well-known commission house, doing a large business in the sales of woolen goods, we have heard of the failure of three of the manufacturers who consigned their goods to this firm. Of these, one offers his creditors 20 per cent of his indebtedness, another 16 per cent, and the third has no assets at all, and it is said can pay nothing. Manufacturers have been generally complaining of hard times since the early Autumn of 1872. Raw wool in the country, in Ohio, for example, which, when the clipping took place in June last, was sold at 70 to 75 cents, gradually settled down to 50 to 52½, and has fluctuated since between these figures and 62½. This declining and unsettled market on the raw material had the usual effect on prices obtainable for the manufactured woolen goods. Prices were inclined downward, too, and it was generally conceded were not remunerative. Besides this, our importations of woolen cloths and cassimeres for the first eight months of 1872 were 30 per cent in excess of the same period of 1871.

To all of this *The Economist and Dry Goods Reporter* of January, adds:

"The woolen manufacturers, during the past year, passed through one of the most trying periods the interest has ever experienced. High cost material and low prices for goods ruled without exception, the latter being greatly increased by the large competition offering in a dull market.

"From the beginning of the year to its close, our constant efforts were to induce a curtailment of production by any method possible. Manufacturers by their actions chose a different path, and endeavored to cheapen the cost of production by an increased production rather than enhance the price of goods by reducing the supply. With the close of the production of Autumn goods, many mills, however, shut down, as to continue to run at the prevailing prices for goods would be suicidal in the extreme. By this action, though taken late in the day, we find about 300 sets of machinery idle, yet notwithstanding this curtailment of production, and the large destruction at the Boston fire, heavy goods can be purchased to-day at a less price than for many years.

"The present Tariff has failed to give that protection to the interest that it was intended."

The monthly wool circular of Walter Brown & Sons of New-York, issued March 1st, 1873, in reviewing the record of the preceding month (February), has also this significant sentence:

"Further failures among manufacturers have occurred during the month, which tend to heighten the distrust felt by commission houses in accepting risks."

The following additional notices of changes in the woolen manufacture are taken from journals of recent date:

The Namaske Mills, at Nashua, N. H., have taken out their woolen and substituted cotton machinery, because raw wool worth 42 cents last June now sells for 75, and there has been no equivalent enhancement in the average price of woolen fabrics. [N. Y. Tribune.

WAREHOUSE POINT, Conn.—J. H. Simons, who bought the woolen mill, has sold the machinery, and will refit for other manufacturing. [Springfield Republican.

Two large manufacturing establishments in or near Providence, R. I., are about to be offered for sale—the Arkwright Mills, with 36 tenements and 140 acres of land, and the woolen mills of Messrs. Babcock & Moss, at Westerly. [N. Y. Dry Goods Reporter.

It is thought the woolen business at Amesbury and Salisbury, Mass., has not been at so low an ebb for 15 years as at the present time. [Ibid.

The Marland Manufacturing Company, Andover, Mass., ceased to operate their woolen factory about Jan. 1. The company have voted to settle their affairs and sell the entire property. The company was incorporated in 1831, and has been very successful in past years. It has eleven sets of machinery, a valuable water-power and buildings, with about 40 acres of land. [Ibid.

To this list of displacements and suspensions should also be added the "King Woolen Company" mill of Occum, Conn., (reported in the list of the Woolen Manufacturers' Association in March, 1872) sold for less than 50 per cent of its cost, and converted into a cotton mill.

The representatives of the American wool and woolen associations, in memorializing Congress in 1866-7 for the enactment of the increased duties on wool and woolens, put themselves, it will be remembered, on record as promising that in case their requests were granted, two things would certainly follow: *First:* "That sheep husbandry will increase" in the United States. *Second:* That "woolen manufactures will expand and diversify, securing the people from dependence on foreign lands for their clothing, which they will be able to procure permanently at home at less cost than abroad in exchange for the only products they can export." I next propose to inquire how far these promises have been verified.

And first as respects the increase of sheep husbandry. In April, 1872, the Senate of the United States requested the Commissioner of Agriculture to furnish that body "all facts recorded in the Department showing the causes of fluctuations in the numbers of sheep and prices of wool," and in the response of the Commissioner was included the following table, showing the number of sheep in the United States, and the quality of domestic wool marketed from 1867 to 1871 inclusive:

Years.	No. of Sheep.	Wool marketed.
1867	42,000,000	147,000,000
1868	41,000,000	155,000,000
1869	37,000,000	143,000,000
1870	34,000,000	135,000,000
1871	32,000,000	128,000,000

It may be here remarked, in passing, that the faith which men who make their living by dealing in cotton and wool as raw materials put in the official statistics of the Agricultural Bureau is of the kind that admits of measurement by a grain of mustard seed; the aggregates of the domestic wool clip, as accepted by the New-York trade for the years above referred to, being thus reported by *The New-York Commercial Bulletin*:

	Pounds.		Pounds.		Pounds.
1867	160,000,000	1869	162,250,000	1871	146,000,000
1868	177,000,000	1870	160,000,000	1872	160,000,000

But notwithstanding the marked discrepancy between these reports, the general inference deducible is the same in both instances, namely, that notwithstanding the great increase of the tariff in 1867, and the confident predictions of its friends, the production of domestic wool has remained absolutely stationary for the last six years; or as compared with population, has very considerably decreased. It needs but one other touch to complete the picture of the effect of the tariff of 1867 on American wool-growing, and this can be effectually given by asking attention to the comparative imports of foreign wool during the period under comparison. They have been as follows:

TOTAL IMPORTS IN UNITED STATES.

	Pounds.		Pounds.		Pounds.
1867	30,875,509	1869	42,710,812	1871	78,249,069
1868	32,106,752	1870	26,559,798	1872	98,206,561

But it will be remembered that in addition to engaging that "American sheep husbandry" should increase under the new tariff, the representatives of the wool and woolen associations also promised to rescue the American people "from dependence on foreign lands for their clothing." To show to what extent this second great object has been compassed, attention is asked to the following exhibit of the gold value of the imports of foreign wool fabrics, from 1870 to 1872, inclusive:

	1870.	1871.	1872.	Excess in 1872 over 1871.
Cloths and cassimeres	$7,671,013	$10,902,761	$14,159,774	$3,257,013
Woolen rugs	55,649	87,687	292,231	144,544
Shawls	1,867,874	2,160,037	3,424,349	1,264,312
Blankets	21,952	28,050	38,785	10,735
Carpets	3,940,707	4,691,061	5,797,183	1,098,122
Dress goods	15,447,960	18,596,874	20,499,481	1,892,607
Hosiery	441,598	538,770	658,193	119,423
Other manuf's	5,043,919	6,844,420	7,728,945	884,525
Total manuf's	$34,490,632	$43,839,640	$52,408,921	$8,569,281
Wool unmanufactured	6,743,350	9,780,443	26,214,105	16,433,752
Total gold value imports wool and manufactures of wool	$41,233,982	$53,620,083	$78,623,116	$25,003,033

The above figures, which I hold to be among the most remarkable ever furnished by the commercial experience of any nation, tell their own story, and require from me no word of comment to point their application. But to sum up in brief, it may be stated that the evidence above cited conclusively shows three results to have followed the enactment of the highly productive wool and woolen tariff of 1867.

First: The production of domestic wool has not increased, but diminished.

Second: The woolen manufacture of the country is depressed to a degree almost beyond precedent, and as a whole, the owners of the property represented by it would undoubtedly be very glad to dispose of the same at a cost very far below what it would cost to replace it. How pitiful, indeed, must be its condition, when the Bulletin of the Association of Wool Manufacturers, in its issue for December, 1872, is forced to admit through one of its editorial writers—R. W. Robinson, (see page 352)—"that any change must be for the better!"

Third: The proportion of the people of the United States who are to-day clad in woolen fabrics of foreign manufacture is larger than ever before; and to this I would add (and in respect to the same would challenge refutation), that the price paid by the consumers in this country for their woolen clothing is nearly 50 per cent in excess of that paid by the people of any other nation, our compeers in wealth, civilization, and population.

In view of these facts, furthermore, what becomes of Mr. Edmands's[5] assertions that "the good feeling between the wool-growers and manufacturers continues unchanged, and both are satisfied with the results of the arrangements made in 1867;" or that the wool and woolen "trade of last year was in general satisfactory?" Will the President of the American Woolen Manufacturers' Association rise to explain?

There is one point more to which I desire to call attention to in this connection, and that is, the striking illustration which the most recent statistics of the woolen industry of the United States afford of this fallacy that the excessive duties imposed in 1867 were enacted in the interests of American labor. The late Edward Harris of Rhode Island, whose thorough practical acquaintance with the woolen manufacture will not be questioned, long ago asserted as the result of his experience, that the cost of labor in this industry was not in excess of 20 per cent of the value of the products which it created. The census of 1870 more than confirmed the conclusions of Mr. Harris, by showing that the proportion which the cost of labor in the woolen industry sustained for that year to the aggregate value of the annual product of woolens was a little in excess of 17 per cent, the exact figures being: $155,405,058 value of the annual woolen product; $26,877,575, cost of the labor entering therein.

Now, in 1867, a careful personal examination and comparison of the woolen mills of the United States and Great Britain showed that the average difference in wages in this department of industry between the two countries (equal efficiency being conceded to the English operative) was about 25 per cent in favor of the United States; but since then wages have so far advanced in Great Britain that the existing difference is probably not in excess of 20 per cent. But for the sake of argument, and to cover all contingencies, I will assume that the American laborer in the woolen mills of the United States receives, on an average, 30 per cent more in wages than his English competitor. This, then, on the basis of the census returns, would give the English woolen manufacturer an advantage of about five per cent (5.1) in the cost of his fabric, or six per cent on the basis of the estimates of Mr. Harris, the calculation being 30 per cent of 17 per cent in the one instance, and 30 per cent of 20 per cent in the other. A tariff of 10 per cent on the import of cloths would, therefore, be more than sufficient to supplement any advantage which the English woolen manufacturer may have on the score of wages, through the employment of his so-called "pauper labor," over the American. But notwithstanding this, the actual tariff on the import of these products ranges from 60 to 150 per cent, the heaviest duty being imposed on the cheapest fabrics, worn by the poor, and the lightest on the most costly, purchased by the rich; and the present condition of the woolen manufacture in the United States conclusively proves that even these excessive rates are anything but protective. The explanation of this singular phenomenon is, that the doctrine of protection has been "run into the ground," and in attempting to protect everything we have so raised the prices of every constituent of manufacturing industry that, except in the case of a few articles—like worsteds and carpets, in respect to which the tariff is a jugale and a fraud—we protect nothing; that we have deprived the American woolen manufacturer of the immeasurable advantage enjoyed by the manufacturer of all other countries, namely, that of a free choice of raw material, without which he can no more make good and cheap cloth than the Israelites could make good bricks without straw; and finally, that by the conjoined agency of the tariff and a base currency, we have made the United States the poorest of all lands to buy in, but the very best to sell to. Is it any wonder that under such circumstances our commerce should vanish from the ocean, our imports continually increase and our exports continually and comparatively diminish, our woolen industry be prostrate, our paper-mills—as is now the case—work only half time, and our great agricultural interests of the West be forced to pay more for all they buy and take less for all they sell than during almost any previous period of our history; the average price of beef, pork, flour, and corn having been in the aggregate nine per cent less the 1st of January, 1873, than it was on the 1st of January, 1860. To borrow an expression of the late Mr. Greeley, may we not well exclaim, "Men and brethren, how long shall this state of things continue?"

Mr. Edmands, in his TRIBUNE statement of Feb. 7, remarks that "the stability of the wool tariff seems now assured;" and congratulates himself that trouble is no longer to be anticipated from that noble American manufacturer, the late Edward Harris, whose complete success as an "all wool" manufacturer under the low tariff of '57 was a constant witness to the incompetence of those who demand complete prohibition from competition as a condition precedent for continuing a business in which the highest standard of success is to combine the smallest proportion of wool with the largest measure of some other and cheaper constituent. But in this Mr. Edmands is mistaken. The stability of the wool tariff and of every other form of interfering, tricky industrial and commercial legislation is more seriously threatened than ever before. "Because judgment is not speedily executed against an evil work, therefore the hearts of the sons of men have it fully set on them to do evil." But the judgment will come. The people are beginning to think on these subjects. Facts like those which I have referred to in this paper, and which are rapidly multiplying, will compel thinking; and when the people of this country have once given this question of the tariff full and unbiased consideration, there will be no more chance of protection among us than there is for the bayonet.

DAVID A. WELLS.

New-York, March 20, 1873.

THE STOKES CASE.

In the Court of Oyer and Terminer, yesterday, before Judge Brady, an application was made by Mr. Dos Passos on an order to show cause why the judgment received in the case of Edward S. Stokes should not be amended by having inserted therein the proceedings on the first trial of the plea in abatement, because the Judge and the prisoner were absent from the court-room during part of the trial, and during the reading of the affidavits used in a motion for a new trial. It was asserted by Mr. Dos Passos that the record should show all the facts, and in support of his plea he cited various authorities. The District-Attorney contended that the judgment record as it stood, was complete, and that what the defense was seeking to introduce was altogether foreign to it. Judge Brady reserved his decision.

THE EXTRA STREET-CLEANING BILL.

John L. Brown recently obtained a writ of alternative mandamus to compel the Board of Apportionment to pay him $86,000 for extra street-cleaning. The Board claimed that the work had not been done, and Judge Fancher ordered the issue to be tried by jury. The case came on before Judge Van Brunt, yesterday, and the plaintiff put in a general proof of the work done. On behalf of the Board, evidence was put in that certain streets were not cleaned as required by the contract. The case was given to the jury, and in an hour they returned asking the Court if, in case they gave a verdict for the defendant, would that debar Mr. Brown from recovering pay for the work which had been done. The Court decided that it would not hinder him from suing the city, and the jury, therefore, gave a verdict for the defendant.

STATE CANAL MANAGEMENT.

THE COMMISSIONERS DEFEND THEMSELVES.

REPLY (IN PART) OF ALEXANDER BARKLEY, COMMISSIONER FOR THE EASTERN DIVISION, TO STATE TREASURER THOMAS RAINES.

On the 24th day of January, 1872, at a meeting of the Canal Board, Mr. Raines offered the following:

Whereas, The object of an act entitled "An act to abolish the Contracting Board and the system of repairing the canals by contract," chapter 55 of the laws of 1870, was to put an end to existing contracts, as soon as a proper regard to the navigation of the canals would permit; and,

Whereas, Contracts are now in existence, alleged to be excessive in amount, and which can only be annulled and canceled upon the recommendation of the Canal Commissioners; therefore,

Resolved, That the Board of Canal Commissioners are requested to report to this Board whether, in their judgment, the interests of the State would not be promoted by the canceling of present existing repair contracts.

It will be observed that the Canal Commissioners were called upon to report whether, in their judgment, the interests of the State would not be promoted by the cancellation of the present existing repair contracts. Not as he represents, viz.: "I introduced a preamble and resolutions which were adopted, calling upon the Board of Canal Commissioners to recommend, as provided by law, the cancellation of certain repair contracts." He says, further, "who doubted that these Commissioners would promptly and favorably respond." Let us note the action of the Canal Commissioners on that resolution. On the 7th day of March following, Commissioners W. W. Wright and John D. Fay presented to the Canal Board a report on said resolution, too long to embody herein, but which closes as follows:

"The contents of this report have not been submitted to Mr. Barkley, on account of his continued absence from the city in consequence of sickness in his family. Inasmuch as there are no repair contracts on the Eastern Division, and the Commissioner in charge having had no experience in managing such contracts as Commissioner, it is not probable that he will deem himself called upon to join in a report on the question submitted to the Commissioners."

On motion of the Attorney-General the report was laid upon the table, and no further action has ever been taken on the same. Thus the Canal Commissioners fully performed the duties imposed upon them by said resolution, and it seems to have been so considered by the Canal Board. What then becomes of the unjust and insinuating charge of Mr. Raines, that the Commissioners failed to comply with his resolution?

Again, Mr. Raines says, "The plain truth is, that the Canal Commissioners and State Engineer have the practical control of the management and disbursements of the canals." Who, I would ask, if not these officers, should have the practical control and management of the canals? It is for this very purpose that they were elected, and if the canals were not the property of the State there would be no necessity for such officers. The Attorney-General, Controller, Secretary of State, and Treasurer are officers who are elected to perform duties entirely unconnected with the management of the canals. They are only members of the Canal Board *ex officio*, and are not supposed to have much practical knowledge of public works. Why, I doubt if some of these men know the difference between the berme bank and towing path, a slope wall and a vertical wall, a miter sill and a balance beam, or what would be the proper materials from which to construct either of the same.

It was truly said by the late Auditor, "that he considered it no reflection upon the honor or integrity of the Canal Board, or any member thereof, to say that, aside from the Canal Commissioners and State Engineer, no State officer holds his office by virtue of his practical knowledge of canal matters." The responsibility of keeping the canals in navigable condition is only on the Canal Board, in so far as they hinder and embarrass the Canal Commissioners in the discharge of their duties and refuse to carry into effect the wishes of the people as expressed through the Legislature. The practical care and management of the canals is upon those officers whom the people have elected especially to perform those duties.

Now let us see about the matter of extraordinary repairs:

The people through the Legislature appropriate specific sums of money for new work and for the improvement of the canals. These appropriations are called "Extraordinary Repairs," and the money is raised by a tax on the people, instead of paying the same from the canal revenues. For instance, in 1870 the Legislature created a law (Chap. 786, Laws of 1870) providing for the enlargement of the Champlain Canal, and appropriated the sum of $425,000 for that purpose.

It strikes me that it is the duty of the Canal Board and the Board of Canal Commissioners to carry into effect the wishes of the people as expressed in said laws, by proceeding, as soon as may be, to enlarge said canal. And so it is with every specific appropriation of money by the Legislature, whether it be to remove the wall bench on the Erie Canal, bottoming out the same to a uniform depth of seven feet, or the construction of bridge superstructures.

It is a matter over which the Canal Commissioners, as a board, have no control or discretion to exercise, and I, as Commissioner of the Eastern Division, am in no way responsible for this expense to the State, except so far as my supervision and control is concerned, to see that the money is economically expended, according to laws directing it. The appropriations are made by the Legislature; the work is ordered to be let by the Canal Board, and the Canal Commissioners advertise and let the same pursuant to law. And yet Mr. Raines charges the responsibility of expending $564,000 for extraordinary repairs, during the calendar year ending Jan. 1, 1873, on the Commissioner of the Eastern Division.

There has been expended from Jan. 1, 1872 (when I came into office), to April 1, 1873, for ordinary repairs (the estimates of the Superintendents having been allowed and approved up to that date) the sum of $619,000. This extended over one and one-quarter years, and is an average of $495,200 per year.

There was expended for ordinary repairs on

the Eastern Division, in 1869	$777,194 34
Expended in 1870	1,222,554 47
Expended in 1871	724,388 46
Expended from Oct. 1, 1871, to Jan. 1, 1872, (three months)	463,325 55
Total	$3,187,462 82

This shows an expenditure by my predecessors in three and one-quarter years of $3,187,462 02, or an average per year of $980,757 76, while my expenditures during the whole time I have been in office average $495,200 per year, or only $89,643 more than one-half per year of that spent by my predecessors. And I give it as my deliberate judgment that the Eastern Division of the State canals will never be kept in such a condition of repair, as the interests of the State demands, for a less sum than I have expended.

Not one dollar's worth of work is in progress, for ordinary repairs on this division, that is not covered by the above figures. And consequently the assertion of Mr. Raines, "That after deducting the $130,000 debts of the late administration, the liability for work in progress will swell instead of reducing the amount, is without the least fact to sustain it." It will be seen that the expenditures on this Division, since I came into office, when truthfully compared with former expenditures and explained, show a great reduction of expenses over former years.

Again Mr. Raines says, referring to the Commissioner of the Eastern Division, "I find that if the tables in the Auditor's office are correct, his appropriation is entirely exhausted," thus inferring that the $400,000 appropriated to the Eastern Division for ordinary repairs for the fiscal year commencing Oct. 1, 1872, was wholly expended during the first three months. This is totally unwarranted by the facts.

On the first day of January, 1872, when I came into office, there was only $72,000 available funds for ordinary repairs on the Eastern Division, and during that month the same was nearly exhausted in paying debts incurred by the late administration. This fact was stated in the Canal Board on the 7th day of February, 1872, whereupon a resolution was adopted at that time transferring $30,000 from the Western Division to the Eastern Division—Mr. Raines voting in the affirmative. On the 10th day of June, 1872, I received a communication from the Auditor's office, which contained the following: "The expenditure for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1872, on your Division was something like $142,000 less than the appropriation. This amount was added to the appropriation for current fiscal year, and actually expended by Mr. Chapman during his term, and, as I understand, by virtue of a decision of Attorney-General Champlain. As the $142,000 actually went into the treasury, in order to make the surplus revenue of $600,000, I cannot see how it can be made available for repairs this fiscal year. If my view is correct, it, of course, will reduce your appropriation of $250,000 just that amount."

The substance of this communication was stated to the Canal Board at their next meeting, and the Commissioners of the Canal Fund, of which Mr. Raines is a member, were called upon to raise the money to replace the $142,000, which they did; and when the new appropriation of $400,000 became available, on the first day of October last, the sum of $142,000 was charged against it, to pay the amount raised by the Commissioners of the Canal Fund. It is impossible for Mr. Raines not to have been entirely conversant with these facts, and yet he substantially asserts that I expended the whole appropriation of $400,000 before the first six months had expired. The Treasurer has committed an intentional error, or made a very gross mistake; which is it?

The Treasurer asserts that the whole income of the canals has been expended and the entire receipts spent, leaving not a dollar for the Sinking Fund or to pay the interest on the canal debt. There was a surplus of $1,200,000 to apply on the State debt, after paying all ordinary repairs last year, and had it not been for the action of the Canal Board in 1870 in reducing the tolls it would have been $2,400,000. The decrease of receipts from the canals is owing entirely to the reduction of the tolls. And there will be left annually of canal tolls, under the present toll sheet, over all ordinary expenditures, from $1,000,000 to $1,500,000. Appropriations for extraordinary repairs are what swell the expenditures, which I have fully explained to you.

REPLY (IN PART) OF WILLIAM W. WRIGHT, EX-CANAL COMMISSIONER, BEFORE THE CANAL COMMITTEE OF THE ASSEMBLY, MARCH 27.

The Treasurer advertises now that he alone discovered that the Canal Commissioners have squandered, and are still squandering, enormous sums of money; but suppresses the fact that a great portion of this money cannot be expended without the knowledge and sanction of the Canal Board, of which he is a member.

At the legislative session of 1870 most people admitted that the repairs of our canals were not as thoroughly done as the true interests of the State required. The Legislature finally determined that no more repair contracts should be made, that existing contracts might be surrendered at the option of their holders, and that any of them might be canceled by the Canal Board with the assent of the Commissioner in charge. It is admitted that this last proviso practically left the responsibility of canceling or continuing these contracts with the Commissioners, and very properly, as they were mostly (though not wholly) responsible for expenditures for ordinary repairs. Of course the low-priced contracts were generally surrendered, for they had no value either to the State or their owners, and both parties were glad to be rid of them. Some of the higher-priced contracts were neither surrendered by the contractors nor abrogated by the Commissioners—by which "the State was defrauded," says our learned cannal critic. Not at all. I undertake to say there is not a shadow of truth in the statement. If the higher-priced contracts cost the State less money than they were likely to cost under Superintendents, then it was not only the privilege but the duty of the Commissioners to hold on to them, just as long as the contractors maintained as good a navigation as the Superintendents secured elsewhere at greater cost; and neither the State Treasurer nor anybody else can show that the contractors failed in a single instance to do their whole duty after the law of 1870 was enacted. Another significant fact cannot be converted; as compared to the sections "run" by superintendents, large sums of money were saved to the State in each and every case where these contracts were perpetuated. When the Commissioners spoke of "dilapidated" canals, they had more especial reference to those sections which had been let at non-compensating rates, and on which it was difficult to get the necessary work done, and not to those sections paid for at compensating prices.

The Treasurer's tables showing the cost per mile for canal repairs for the last 12 years, will be better understood if attention is given to the following facts:

First: In three out of the first four years the Erie, Oswego, and Cayuga and Seneca Canals were still being "enlarged," and the Champlain was still being "improved," and liberal amounts were expended annually upon all these works. Every canal man understands that while the "enlargement" was carried on, it absorbed large amounts of work which otherwise must have been done as "repairs;" contracts were let at low rates; labor and materials ruled at ante-war prices, which will sufficiently account for the apparently small cost of repairs at that period.

Second: During the next four years prices rose, and the Legislature made equitable allowances on existing contracts—all of which appear in these expenditures.

Third: During the last four years, viz.: from 1868 to 1872, took place the transition from the contract to the more expensive Superintendent system, involving heavy expenditures to restore such sections as had been neglected by the contractors; heavy payment for materials and tools taken from the contractors as directed by law; considerable allowances for "permanent improvements;" several disastrous breaks, and extra allowance by the Legislature.

"The Commissioner approves the Superintendents' estimates, and hence is responsible." Let us see whether he should always be held morally as well as legally responsible: The Commissioner has various and important duties to perform, none of which can be disregarded or neglected. He has to attend meetings of the Canal Board and the Board of Commissioners. He has to answer calls from the Legislature during its sessions, frequently in person. He is charged with the important duty of looking up evidence and preparing the defense of the State against claims on his own division, frequently amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars; and many other important matters which in their turn must be attended to; all of which ought to teach any man of sense that the Commissioner never did, and never can, examine personally the work embraced in the details of his Superintendent's estimates, made simultaneously, and extending over some sixty miles of canal. If he did, he would himself be Superintendent, and these somewhat expensive officials might as well be dispensed with.

On one question I do not take issue with the Treasurer; that is the infatuation which induces us to throw away millions of dollars on the non-productive lateral canals. I have urged with the greatest earnestness that the Legislature should reform this matter. I call attention to the following extract from my Report of Jan. 1, 1873:

The lateral canals without exception are old and dilapidated, most of them having decayed wooden mechanical structures which have nearly outlived their allotted time, and hence have become exceedingly expensive to keep up. In view of the Constitutional provision that they shall "remain the property of the State and under its management forever," the Commissioner could not take the responsibility of abandoning these canals in the absence of any legislative direction; and yet they have enormously enhanced his expenditures; and it is for such unavoidable outlays that the Treasurer is attempting to destroy all confidence of your Committee, the Legislature and the public in the Canal Commissioners.

Such work as may be deemed immediately necessary for improving or rendering safe navigation, is usually urged upon the Legislature by the Commissioner; and for such work he should be held responsible, and for nothing more. Take, for instance, the enormous sums paid out within the last few years on the Chenango Extension and Oneida Lake Canals. Neither my predecessor nor myself ever recommended the appropriation of a single dollar for these objects, unless it was to pay off debts already contracted or to secure some precarious work partly finished.

When a tax is imposed or directed by the Legislature, the law is uniformly accompanied by a proviso that none of the money shall be expended nor any contract made until the Canal Board shall first have approved and adopted the plans and estimates, and then it becomes the duty of the Commissioners to advertise the work and put it under contract. But they cannot do this until the tax has been paid into the Treasury, or the Commissioners of the Canal Fund (who constitute the Canal Board, excepting the Canal Commissioners and State Engineer) have borrowed the money. When all these preliminaries are complied with, it devolves upon the Commissioner to conduct the work and issue his draft in payment therefor. If Congress makes excessive appropriations for the army, you might as well hold the paymaster responsible for expending them as the Canal Commissioner for the cost of these so-called extraordinary repairs. Nor is the Commissioner always responsible for the entire sums paid by him from the ordinary repair fund. Many of the allowances made by the Legislature must be paid from the latter fund. The Treasurer charges me with being responsible for an expenditure of more than $900,000 on the Middle Division; when, if he ever learns what he is bound to know as a member of the Canal Board, he will discover that I had no control of one-half of that sum; and so it is with the other Commissioners.

Within the last 12 years large sums have been appropriated by successive Legislatures for these so-called "extraordinary repairs." With the exception of the Chenango Extension and Oneida Lake Canals, it is safe to say that more than 90 per cent of the aggregate expenditures under this head was for objects which should have been enforced in the enlargement, and would have been but for the law of 1862, which nominally terminates the enlargement without interrupting expenditures. Whether this policy was wise or otherwise it is not for me to discuss on this occasion, but I do not propose that the Canal Commissioners should be made the scapegoats for the alleged sins of the Legislature, Canal Board, and all other departments of the State Government, nor that the least of the "chapter of accidents" which the Republican party (unintentionally, it is claimed) inflicted upon the people at the election of 1871 shall set himself up in judgment on these men without an exposé. The fact that he was permitted to appear before your Committee has given his "speech," as he called it, an importance which seems to be held as a justification by such an influential paper as THE NEW-YORK TRIBUNE for publishing editorials severely censuring the Commissioners, which I do not believe would ever have appeared after a fair hearing of both sides.

MR. RAINES WILL CONTINUE THE CONTEST.

ALBANY, March 28.—State Treasurer Raines states his intention to review still further the acts of the State Engineer and Canal Commissioners, and says that every vote cast by him in the Canal Board has been based upon the strong representations of the Engineer and Commissioners, and was but a mere formal approval of plans and estimates, without any expression as to the necessity of the work, which was wholly under the control of the Engineer and Commissioners.

THE STATE LEGISLATURE.

SENATE.... ALBANY, Friday, March 28, 1873.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

By Mr. TIEMANN—Directing the Superintendent of Markets in New-York to execute all repairs of public buildings and markets in New-York. Also, providing for the repeal of the laws of 1871, giving preference to actions in which the Commonalty of New-York is concerned.

By Mr. PARRY—To open Putnam-square, Brooklyn.

By Mr. LEWIS—To establish a department of police in Buffalo. Also, for a new charter for Buffalo.

By Mr. ROSENKRANTZ—Empowering Grace Church, New-York, to purchase and hold property for the purpose of establishing a house for trained nurses, a free reading-room, free chapel and other charities.

By Mr. BENEDICT—Providing for the appointment of five examiners to settle all newspaper claims against New-York City.

By Mr. COCK—To enable the Staten Island Railroad Company to run and own ferry-boats between points of the island, New-Jersey, and New-York City.

By D. P. WOOD—To amend the laws relative to notaries in foreign countries.

By Mr. GRAHAM—To compel Railroad Commissioners to give bonds.

The bill regulating the rate of interest was lost for the want of a two-thirds majority vote—25 in the affirmative to 11 in the negative. On motion of Mr. WOODIN the vote on the bill was reconsidered and the bill laid on the table.

BILLS PASSED.

To alter the system of repairing highways.

Authorizing an addition to the Poughkeepsie Alms-house.

To amend the Charter of the New-York Bridge Company.

Relative to lands heretofore conveyed to assignees or receivers.

Authorizing the Sheriff of Kings County to appoint certain court officers.

Relative to the summoning of jurors in Kings County, and fixing the compensation of Sheriff thereof.

Relative to charter elections in Poughkeepsie.

Incorporating the Kings County Trust Company.

To amend the charter of the New-York and Queens County Bridge Company.

Empowering the Governor to appoint a Commission to examine the prisons of New-York City.

Providing for the payment of the Clerk of the Marine Court in New-York City.

Authorizing the New-York Protestant Episcopal Public School to sell a portion of their real estate.

Providing for the payment of the salary of the Assistant Clerk of the Third Judicial Court in New-York City.

The concurrent resolution for the appointment of a joint committee for reporting a plan for the consideration of the constitutional amendments was adopted.

Mr. ROBERTSON introduced a bill to facilitate the construction of certain railroads in the City of New-York by the Metropolitan Transit Company. Adjourned until Monday evening.

ASSEMBLY.

BILLS PASSED.

To drain certain lands of Thomas Hunt, in the Eighth Ward, Brooklyn.

Repealing the act allowing members of the Legislature to take the oath of office at any time before entering upon the discharge of their duties. Lost.

To authorize the Bleecker-st. and Fulton Ferry Railroad Company to extend their tracks.

Authorizing the Brooklyn Courts of Record to send persons to the Kings County Penitentiary the same as they are now sent to State Prison.

Mr. PIERSON reported a bill providing for the annexation of a portion of Westchester to New-York.

Mr. DEERING introduced a bill construing certain acts of the Legislature relative to parks in New-York City, which prohibits the establishment of zoological gardens in any park except the Central Park; also, authorizing a railroad in the upper part of New-York City, and making incorporators Isaac M. Walton, Rufus H. Hargy, Richard L. Hill, George White, and others. The route begins at Manhattan-st. and North River; runs to St. Nicholas-ave.; thence to One-hundred-and-tenth-st.; thence to the East River. It also runs through Second-ave., Eighty-sixth-st., Fifty-ninth-st., Lexington-ave., and Forty-second-st.

Two communications were received from the Governor, calling attention to the dangers to navigation in the Hudson River, caused by depositing ashes and other refuse matter in the river, near Albany and New-York.

On motion of Mr. PIERSON the communications were referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GERE introduced a bill to enable Syracuse to fund its floating debt.

Mr. FORT reported a bill to promote rifle practice by the National Guard.

Mr. PRINCE, as instructed by the House, reported resolutions to amend the Constitution, so as to allow women with property qualifications of $250 to vote.

Mr. CLEARY introduced a bill to authorize the City of Troy to borrow money for city purposes.

Adjourned until Monday evening.

THE COURTS.

TRAIN REFUSES TO GIVE BAIL.

The court-room of the Oyer and Terminer held a great crowd of eager spectators, yesterday, called together by the announcement that George Francis Train was to come before the Court again on a writ of habeas corpus. The corridor contained as many more who could not get into the court-room. On opening the Court, District-Attorney Phelps said that he had two writs of habeas corpus in Train's case, and Gen. Chatfield and J. O. Mott responded in behalf of each respectively, Gen. Chatfield claiming the discharge of Train, and Mr. Mott asking for his admission to bail. The District-Attorney allowed Gen. Chatfield to speak first, and he argued that the indictment was deficient in not having set forth the matter claimed to be obscene, and that the alleged obscene articles were composed simply of selections from the Scriptures. It was altogether unprecedented that such an indictment should be held legal. As the question of obscenity could not be decided by the Court or jury unless by inspecting the articles claimed to be obscene, Mr. Train could not be held on such an indictment, as it was illegal and must fail.

Mr. Mott followed with his argument in favor of admitting the prisoner to bail, and Judge Brady finally granted his motion, fixing the bail at $1,000. Train at once refused to give bail, and delivered himself of a short, incoherent speech about a design to burn the Tombs and its 400 inmates. The District-Attorney then said that he had applied to Chief-Justice Daly for measures to determine the prisoner's sanity, and understood that a jury was to be called. The prisoner was then taken back to prison.

CIVIL NOTES.

In the