RICHMOND ENQUIRER.

TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 15, 1853.

FREE NEGROES.

A bill was reported in the Senate, last week, "*To provide more effectually for the removal of Free Negroes and Mulattoes from the State of Virginia*," which has since been printed, (containing 16 sections,) and appears to embody a complete system founded upon the principle of voluntary colonization. The bill appears to have been prepared with great care, and if passed, will doubtless be productive of much good. Several schemes have been before the House of Delegates; but the friends of removal mixed up in each measure so many controverted propositions, that after all had been referred to the Committee for Courts of Justice for the purpose of reconsideration, that committee reported a simple proposition to increase the appropriation now authorized to be paid out of the treasury, from twenty-five dollars to fifty for each adult free negro transported by the American Colonization Society, and a proportional increase for minors. And this measure, it is supposed, cannot pass. It is deemed by many a waste of money to persist in making expenditures which it is thought, cannot transport from the commonwealth a number of free negroes anything like equal to the current increase. The time has been when this argument was not really sound, although it may be so at present.

While the colony was weak and incapable of receiving a large accession to its numbers, it might have been inconvenient and probably dangerous to the colonists to push them too rapidly into the country. But such can hardly be the case at this time. It would seem wise in Virginia, if she means to do anything upon the subject, to do what would be effectual, in ultimately extinguishing the mischief proposed to be remedied; and as enough has already been seen in the movements of the House of Delegates, to establish the fact, that no act of direct expulsion, or for the immediate hiring out of the free negroes to raise the means for their transportation, can pass; nor can any bill pass to levy a tax upon the State for the purpose, equal to the object desired to be effected: yet the appropriation of thirty thousand dollars a year, from the treasury for five years from 1850, may continue. But under the condition of that appropriation, it is necessary that a sum equal to the amount allowed out of the treasury for the transportation of each negro, shall be raised by private contribution. These private contributions are inadequate, and consequently, but a small portion of the appropriation has, as yet, been expended. While the measure reported by the committee of the House would probably enable the colonization society to expend the appropriation, very nearly within the term of its limitation, yet it would be entirely inadequate to the transportation of a number of free negroes, equal to the current increase. It is not at all material, therefore, whether it pass or not. For it might effect as much good a few years hence as at present, if an effective measure shall be adopted. Those philanthropic citizens, who will not abate their exertions in the cause, will most willingly accept the $30,000, whensoever it shall be the pleasure of the Legislature to award it to them, upon terms sufficiently liberal to enable them to use it. But while there is a hope of adopting a really effective and patriotic system, it may be just as well to preserve the fund to aid in its execution.

The bill before the Senate promises more, at least, than can be expected from that in the House. The act of 1850, appropriating $30,000 out of the treasury for the removal of free negroes, also provides that a tax of one dollar shall be annually levied and collected from every male free negro over 21 and under 55 years of age, and which shall be added to the said appropriation; and that the tax charge for the seals of Court used in the attestation of the papers of free negroes shall, in like manner, be applied to the same purpose. These taxes amount to about $10,000 a year, making the available appropriation about $40,000.

Now the Senate bill provides for the establishment of a legal Board, of from five to seven persons, denominated "*The Virginia Colonization Board.*" This Board shall have power "to provide for the removal from Virginia, of such free negroes and mulattoes, as are now free and residents therein, and their children, to the western coast of Africa, the West India Islands, or to any other suitable place' and to apply the funds which may be appropriated by the Legislature, or contributed by individuals or associations for the purpose, in the best and most advantageous manner to effect the final removal of all such free persons of color from this Commonwealth. The Board may employ the agency of the Virginia Colonization Society, or any responsible person or persons, for the transportation and suitable care of such free persons of color, or provide their own agents and means of transportation."

It provides that an annual tax shall be "levied upon all free negroes between the ages of twenty-one and fifty-five, that is to say on every male *five dollars*, and on every female *one dollar*." The same tax, as now prescribed under the law of 1850, is charged on the seals of Court attached to free papers. These taxes, with the unexpended balances of the appropriations made by the act of 1850, are appropriated to the purposes of the bill, and put under the control of the new Board therein established. No limit is placed upon the sum to be applied for the transportation of any negro, and consequently the Board can effect the object of their institution under all circumstances which may arise. The sum which these taxes will produce will be ample to remove a number of free negroes more than equal to the annual increase.—The measure may therefore be deemed an efficient one, which every person, desirous of carrying out the object, might with propriety advocate.

Very minute details are provided for enforcing the payment of the assessed tax. After the first year, land-lords and lessons of free negroes, are made liable for the taxes of such free negroes as they keep upon their premises, as well as the free negroes themselves. It is made the duty of the Commissioners of the Revenue diligently to hunt up all free negroes so taxed, and also the duty of the negroes to cause themselves to be assessed; and if any such free negro shall be delinquent for the tax for three years, either by failing to pay, or by evading the Commissioner and failing to be assessed, he or she shall forfeit all right, he or she otherwise had, to remain in the Commonwealth; and shall be proceeded against. But there is a very humane provision, in this; that after a free negro has forfeited his right to remain in the State, and has been proceeded against and adjudged to be sold, at any time before the Sheriff has actually made a sale, if any white person will enter into a bond with approved security before the Clerk of the Court, or Sheriff, conditioned that he will take the defendant in custody, and remove him out of the State, within ninety days, the sale will be stopped; and the delinquent may retain his freedom. A more humane system could hardly be devised to possess any of the energy necessary to effect the object desired.

This bill, while it proposes no rash or inhuman measure, nevertheless contains principles of active energy, always operating on the minds of the unfortunate creatures for whose real benefit it is designed, calculated to wake up within them, as much of intelligence and manly enterprize in seeking new homes and a more exalted condition of life, as can well be expected from them. They must be brought to know and feel the necessity of their removal by firm, but humane and gradual action.

It is amusing to witness the spasmodic efforts of the Whig press to arouse their party in Virginia, to carry the State for the Whigs. After the utter falsification of all their predictions in the late canvass—after the electric effect of President Pierce's noble Inaugural, which rings like true metal throughout the Union, extorting the praises of Whigs every where—all the efforts of the Whig organs to reanimate their party upon the old exploded issues, have a fabulous aspect. There is great force in what is said by the editor of the Chambers (Alabama) Tribune, a Whig paper, which by request publishes the following article, advocating the reorganization of the Whig party of Alabama, but at the same time takes occasion thus to discourse with regard to the proposed rally:

"We have no hesitation in saying that there never was an undertaking which promised less success. There are a dozen reasons why the Whig party cannot now, if indeed it ever can, present a respectable front in Alabama. The most prominent of these is, that the unfortunate attempt to bolster up the late Presidential nomination, and force a candidate notoriously unsound upon the party, has resulted in loss of confidence among those who believe that the conservatism of Southern Whiggery should extend to and embrace the institution of Slavery. There were in the Presidential contest concessions of principle made by Southern Whig leaders, (by the adoption and endorsement of the Whig nominee,) which we think must be fatal to the party in the Southern States. *An advocacy of Seward for President would not have injured us more*—and, in our opinion, if distrust of Whig principles on this most vital question had engendered, it is useless to attempt to sustain a party organization. The people will say, 'The Whigs may be the party of progress—they may, more than the Democrats, incline to such a course of policy as will develop our resources and stimulate our industry—they may be against fillibustering—but if they are willing to take Scotts and Sewards for presidents, we cannot and will not assist them to power. If they wish to organize here, it is to make part of a national organization—and what is the Northern (and most powerful section) of the Whig party, but one wide-spread nest of abolition and freesoilism? Who besides Mr. Filmore, of eminent Northern Whigs, is there but uncertain in views which aim more or less directly at the stability of the Union; and for one we are done with and sick of such Northern Whiggery. Since the name of Webster and its word became more potent than those of Fillmore and Webster—since all that was conservative in the Northern wing has been beaten under foot to make room for 'higher law' abolition and freesoilism."

The condition of the Whigs, however, should not induce the Democracy of Virginia to relax their efforts in securing the fruits of the victory, and in sustaining our admirable standard-bearer, Frank Pierce, by a decisive majority in our State Legislature, as well as in Congress. Let good men be selected every where, and let the good old maxim, "Measures not men," which has so often given us success in Virginia, and produced harmony and solid strength, be still the noble watchword and guide of action.

Great doubt hangs over the fate of the political prisoners in Cuba—the government appearing to be either undecided or anxious to keep its intentions a profound secret to the last. The worst, however, is feared by the Cubans.

DR. BAIRD'S LECTURES.

The lectures of the Rev. Dr. Baird at the Athenæum have not been so well attended as they deserve to be; perhaps, because lectures of various sorts have been so numerous this winter, that the public appetite for such entertainments has been satisfied; and yet other places, where little or nothing that is new, can be learned, still attracts their crowds.

No lectures have ever been delivered in this city, containing a greater amount of useful and interesting information than Dr. Baird's; and they are delivered in that easy, conversational way, that fatigues less than more laboured compositions. No one who hears him will regret it; but those who fail to attend these lectures, will never meet such an opportunity again.

The principal subject of the lecture, to-night, will be *France*, and many interesting events in the city of *Paris* will be illustrated by reference to the map of that great metropolis.

Mr. O. Sackett, "Yankee Card Writer," writes us that he will in a few days make a professional visit to Richmond.—We do not know Mr. S.—but the wood cut on the back of his letter represents him to be a good-looking fellow, and the most accomplished pensman in the world, having executed in three years, upwards of 800,000 visiting cards.

Mr. John A. Johnson proposes to publish in this city, in a few days, a weekly paper entitled "The Mechanic's Friend and Literary Emporium," at $1 per annum. It will contain original stories, essays on Mechanism, Literature, the Arts and Sciences, notices of new inventions, experiments, &c. If properly carried out, the work will be interesting and valuable, and we wish it success.

THEATRE.

Last night a full house was delighted with the successful performances of the Rousset Sisters, and Mr. John Sefton, a great wag, was warmly received. They all appear again tonight.

Last evening James A. Scott, Esq., showed us a letter from ex-President Fillmore, in which he states that, in consequence of the illness of Mrs. Filmore, he will not probably be able to leave Washington for Richmond before the last of the present week or the beginning of the next. He will give to the Committees of the Council and Citizens timely notice of the day when he may be expected in Richmond.

SPEECH OF MR. BOTTOM OF AMELIA AND NOTTOWAY,

In support of the Bill prescribing the duties and fixing the compensation of the Public Printer, delivered in the House of Delegates, February the 9th, 1853, in reply to Mr. Staples of Patrick.

Mr. Speaker:—The majority of the select committee on Public Printing, of which I was a member, have devolved on me the duty of presenting to the House the views and considerations that influenced them to report the bill now under consideration; and it is with much reluctance that I bespeak the indulgence of the House, whose patience, I fear, has been already exhausted, by the discussion which this bill has elicited.

It is recorded in holy writ, that "he who is first in his own cause seems just; his neighbor cometh and searcheth him." Such, I apprehend, is the case with the gentleman from Patrick (Mr. Staples.) The warmth of his declamation, and the zeal and ardor with which he enforced his specious arguments, were well calculated to deceive members who have not investigated the subject of public printing, and to impress them with the belief that his *cause is just*. But, Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to *search his cause*, to examine his facts, to dissect his arguments, and to expose his errors; and, if I mistake not, the result will be a complete vindication of the action of the majority of the committee upon the subject under consideration.

Before proceeding further, however, it is proper that I should explain the main provisions of the bill, in order that members may correctly understand the real grounds of controversy. It will be recollected by the House that, in the early part of this session, a select committee was appointed, at the instance of the gentleman from Patrick, "to enquire into the expediency of reducing as well the prices paid the public printer of this Commonwealth, as his annual salary fixed by the 10th section of chapter 14th of the Code of Virginia." The public printer now receives, under the Code, an annual salary of $4,500. But this section was enacted before the adoption of our present Constitution, when there were annual sessions of the Legislature, and the duties the public printer was required to perform for his salary were printing for the most part done during the sessions of the Legislature, or immediately afterwards. But the sessions of the Legislature being now only once in two years, should the public printer be allowed to retain his present salary, he would receive $9,500 chiefly for the printing devolved on him by only one session of the Legislature. The committee, therefore, at first thought the salary should be reduced, but, upon examination of witnesses, they found great difficulty in ascertaining the exact extent to which such reduction should be made. In order to avoid all difficulty upon this point, the committee agreed unanimously to abolish the annual salary of the public printer, and to allow him a reasonable compensation for all printing that might be executed by him. The majority of the committee, after a full investigation of the subjects referred to them, and after a long and searching examination of many witnesses, most of whom are practical printers in the city of Richmond, reported the bill now under consideration, which fixes the prices to be received by the public printer at 62½ cents per 1000 ems for the composition of plain work, 62½ cents per token for press work, and $1,25 for rule and figure work. It was proven before the committee by a majority of the witnesses, that these prices are not only fair and just, but that they have been charged by the public printer for the last twenty years. The gentleman from Patrick has moved to amend the bill by striking out 62½ cents and $1,25, and inserting in lieu thereof 50 cents and $1.00; so that, if his amendment should prevail, the compensation allowed the public printer will be 50 cents per 1000 ems for the composition of plain work, 50 cents per token for press work, and $1,00 for rule and figure work. The House is now called upon to decide between the prices provided by the bill of the committee and those proposed by the amendment.

The gentleman from Patrick and myself agree that the public printer should receive a higher compensation for printing executed for the State than is usually charged for regular work for individuals. It was proven before the committee, by Messrs. Page and Redford, that the press of copy sent from the House is frequently so great that the public printer is compelled to pay his hands very high extra wages for working extra hours, in order to get the work done in a reasonable time after he receives it"—that, at other times, "the hands who work on the public printing are frequently idle for want of copy, during which time the public printer is compelled to pay them full wages"—that "the public printer is compelled to do this in order to keep his hands together, to meet any press of work that may be sent from the House of Delegates"—that for these reasons the public printing pays no better at 62½ cents "than regular work would at 45 or 50 cents." According to this evidence, the public printer ought to receive from 12 to 17 cents more per 1000 ems than is generally charged for regular work; and the gentleman from Patrick admits that he is entitled to 10 cents more per 1000 ems than the average price of printing in the city of Richmond. Now the important question presents itself—What is the avarage price of printing in the city of Richmond, as established by the testimony? Here is the evidence of all the witnesses upon this point:

Mr. John Nowlan, a practical printer said—"I believe 50 cents to be the average price of printing in the city. Some print at 40 cents, some as low as 38 cents, and others as high as 62 cents." Mr. Wm. Culley, a practical printer, said that "the average price of book printing in the city, is from 45 to 50 cents." Mr. A. M. Bailey, also a practical printer, and the foreman in the office of the Religious Herald, and the President of the Typographical Society of Richmond, testified, that he usually charged 60 cents for printing, and that he had undertaken work at 55 or 50 cents, but could never realize anything at such prices.

So it appears that the average price of printing, in the city of Richmond, is somewhere between 45 and 55 cents per 1000 ems. Now, if the public printing be worth 12 cts. more than ordinary printing for individuals, for the reasons which I have just alluded to, and if the average price of printing in the city be 50 cents per 1000 ems, then it will follow that 62 cts. is a fair compensation for the public printing; or if the average average price of printing in the city be worth 52 cents, then 10 cents in addition, which the gentleman from Patrick admits that the public printer should receive, will give 62 cents, the compensation fixed by the bill.

Mr. Staples. The gentleman misapprehends my position, if he supposes, that I am willing to allow the public printer 10 cents more than the average price of printing in the city of Richmond. I contended, that the average price of printing, according to the testimony taken before the committee was about 40 cents, and 10 cents in addition, to which I thought the public printer was entitled, for reasons assigned by Messrs. Redford and Page, before the committee, would make 50 cents the compensation proposed by my amendment. According to the testimony, 40 cents would be about a correct average of the prices charged for public printing in the States of Virginia, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts; and it is the price paid the printer for the Court of Appeals.

Mr. Bottom. The gentleman from Patrick sees very clearly, that he admits that the public printing is worth 10 cents more than the usual price for regular work done for individuals. In this city, he will be driven inevitably to the conclusion, that the compensation of 62½ cents, provided by the bill, is fair and reasonable; hence he seeks to avoid this conclusion by adding the 10 cents, not to the average price of printing in this State, but to the average price of printing in the three States to which he has referred, which he says is about 40 cents. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to permit him thus to avoid the legitimate conclusion of his own admission. He makes allowance, he says, for reasons assigned by Messrs. Redford and Page, and adds 10 cents per 1000 ems, for such allowance. Now what were the reasons assigned by Messrs. Redford and Page, which entitles the public printer, *even in the opinion of the gentleman from Patrick*, to the additional compensation of ten cents per 1000 ems? The evidence of those witnesses, upon this point, I have already stated. Their evidence proves that there are certain disadvantages which are only applicable to the public printing and which do not attach to private printing, in the city of Richmond. Now it does appear to me that it is a proposition too plain and palpable, to need elucidation by argument, *that if the public printer, in the city of Richmond, is subject to disadvantages which the private printer in the city is not subject to, and if in consequence of such disadvantages the public printer is entitled to additional compensation, such compensation should be in addition to the usual prices charged for private printing*. This seems to me to be strictly in accordance with the plain, simple and natural justice—yes, with the common sense and common justice, of the case. Yet where the gentleman from Patrick polemes, by his amendment, to allow the public printer 10 cents per 1000 ems, as an additional compensation, yet "strange, passing strange, and pity 'tis 'tis strange," he hardly allows the public printer the usual prices charged for private printing in this city! This is certainly *keeping the words of promise to the ear, but breaking them to the hope*. But we are told that this amendment allows the public printer ten cents more per 1000 ems; than the average price of printing in the States of Virginia, Pennsylvania or Massachusetts, which is about forty cents per 1000 ems. But what propriety is there in going to Pennsylvania and Massachusetts to ascertain what compensation should be paid the public printer in Virginia? The causes that depress the price of printing in those States do not exist to the same extent in Virginia. The wages of labor is always in proportion to the density of population. The sparser the population of a country, the higher the wages of labor; the denser the population, the lower the wages of labor. Massachusetts has a population of 120 to the square mile—Virginia has only 21 to the square mile. Hence, in Massachusetts, journeymen printers can be employed for much less than they can in Virginia. But to expose fully the absurdity of considering the price of printing in Pennsylvania or Massachusetts as a criterion by which to fix the price of public printing in Virginia, suppose that in those States the average price of public printing were 30 cts. instead of 40 cts., the gentleman from Patrick, I suppose, would add 10 cents to 30 cents, and give our public printer 40 cents per 1000 ems, and would contend, no doubt, that he had allowed him an additional compensation of 10 cents, "for reasons assigned by Messrs. Redford and Page." Thus he would contend that he had made ample allowance for all disadvantages connected with the public printing, while he would actually give the public printer ten cents less than the price usually charged for private printing in the city. And what does he, in fact, propose to do by his amendment? Why, he says he makes ample and liberal allowance, "for reasons assigned by Messrs. Redford and Page," and yet he does not allow the public printer as high a compensation as is frequently charged in Richmond for private printing.

But, again: If the gentleman from Patrick will insist upon going to Massachusetts to ascertain what prices should be paid the public printer, I suppose, with equal propriety, he should go there to ascertain what prices should be paid other public officers of the State. Now, if I mistake not, the members of the General Court, or Legislature of Massachusetts, receive a salary of only $2 per day; whereas, the gentleman from Patrick, receives $4 per day and mileage. Now, as that gentleman seems to be the peculiar advocate of retrenchment, reform and economy, in the admininistration of the government, if he thinks the prices paid the public printer in Massachusetts, should regulate the prices that should be allowed the public printer in Virginia, by parity of reasoning, no more *per diem* than is allowed her members of the Legislature, should be allowed our members. Why does not the gentleman, then, who seems to be so warm and vigilant a guardian of the public interest, introduce a bill to reduce the *per diem* of members to two dollars? To adopt the elegant language of the gentleman, "What is sauce for the goose, is sauce for the gander!" By doing this, he would reduce the taxation of the State to the amount of nearly fifty thousand dollars for every session of the Legislature that is held. Why, then, does he not apply the knife of retrenchment to this branch of the public service? Is he afraid of disturbing a certain nerve, which, when touched, is said to vibrate through one's whole system? 'Oh, consistency, what a jewel thou art!"—a jewel, however, which the gentleman seems not to appreciate.

Mr. Speaker, when the deep-toned denunciation of the gentleman from Patrick, of wasteful appropriations, and reckless expenditure of public money reverbirated through this hall—when I listen to his lugubrious notes, relative to "the people's money, wrung from them by heavy and grinding taxation;" "the very earnings of the sweat of their brows;" "the people's money flowing like water," and many other similar expressions of patriotic sympathy for the masses, I could but contrast the gentleman's votes upon questions involving the expenditure of millions of dollars with his loud professions of strict economy in the appropriation of "the people's money." He has voted, with few exceptions, for every internal improvement bill that has asked aid of the treasury, whether it was for a railroad of national importance involving the appropriation of millions, or whether it was for a mud-pike, six miles in length, from Cleek's Mill to Peter Lightner's, in the county of Bath. Well, then, might the gentleman exclaim, as he did in his speech, conscious of dereliction of duty in this respect, alike to his constituents, and to the State, "our Legislature while they have been squandering millions upon millions of the public treasury, have never conceived of the necessity of any economy in their appropriation, or of shielding the State from reckless extravagance." Yes, the gentlemen has aided in "squandering millions upon millions of the people's money," and, now, to redeem the promise that he made to his constituents of economising the administration of the government, he relies on the evidence of certain *envious* and rival printers in the city of Richmond, to strike down Wm. F. Ritchie, the public printer, and a most faithful officer, for charging the very same prices that have been allowed every public printer, for the last twenty years; the same prices that were charged by Samuel Shepherd; his *whig* predecessor as public printer without objection from any quarter whatever. Sir, the gentleman is estopped by the record from raising this *hue and cry* against wasteful and reckless expenditure of "the people's money"—his lips should be forever sealed of "the people's money"—his lips should be forever sealed upon this subject, or at least, until overcome with remorse, he shall have kneeled upon the stool of bitter repentance, and obtained unmerited forgiveness from a wronged and outraged constituency.

But, Mr. Speaker, I propose to examine and to analyze the evidence taken before the committee on printing, and if I mistake not, upon a deliberate review of the testimony, every impartial and unprejudiced mind will be satisfied that the compensation provided by the bill is just, fair and reasonable, and should not be reduced.

The evidence of 13 witnesses was taken before the committee. The gentleman from Patrick says, "summing up the opinion of all the witnesses, eight thought 62½ cts. too much, and five thought not." The eight witnesses he claims are the following: Messrs. Warrock, Culley, Bailey, Colin, Nye, Nowlan, Guest and Ellyson.

Mr. Warrock states, in his testimony, that he has been the printer to the Senate of Virginia for 35 years; and that the prices received by him during the whole of that time have been 63 cts. per 1000 ems, and that such prices do not yield more than a reasonable profit. He is then cross examined and testifies as follows: (See p. 8 of evidence taken before the select committee on printing.)

"By Mr. Staples. If you had double the amount of printing to do that you have, could you afford to do it at less rates per 1000 and per token?

I suppose I could.

Do you think you could do it as well as it is done for a less price?

I think that (63 cts.) a tolerably fair price.

Do I understand you to say you could do it for less.

For a *very* large job."

Here, Mr. Warrock states, that *a very* large job of printing is worth more than a small job, which every one knows; but he does not state that the printing for the House of Delegates is worth less than 62½ cts.; for he expressly says that he thinks 63 cts. a tolerably fair price. It takes several thousand copies of the same document to constitute *a very large job;* and there are, not generally more, than 250 or 500 copies of a document printed for the House of Delegates.—So the gentleman cannot eke out his case by pressing Mr. Warrock into his service; but, on the contrary, his evidence sustains the committee in the compensation provided by the bill.

Wm. Culley is next relied on by the opposite side. This gentleman contracted to do the printing for the late Reform Convention at 35 cts. per 1000 *ems*; but finding that he would be ruined by such prices, petitioned the convention to allow him 62½ cts., the compensation received by the public printer, and his prayer was granted. It would, therefore, have been extremely inconsistent and illiberal in him to have denied to Wm. F. Ritchie the compensation he himself received from the convention. Here is his evidence upon this point: (p. 26 of evidence.)

"Do you consider 62½ cts. too much for the public printing?

I do not know if it is. It is necessary to have good practical printers, and persons familiar with the proceedings of the Legislature to read the proof sheets. *It requires attainments other than mechanical.*"

It seems, then, that Culley, like Warrock, has been pressed into the service of the gentleman from Patrick, contrary to his will.

The next witness relied on is A. M. Bailey. He says in his evidence, "that if the public printer has an open field, and can take in other work on which to employ his hands, he can afford to do it for less than 62½ cents; but not, if restricted to the public work." He states that he would not undertake the public printing for less than 60 cents. So Bailey thinks that the public printer is entitled to 10 cents more than the amendment proposes to give him. How, then, can the gentleman from Patrick, claim him as his witness?

The evidence of Nye is not entitled to much weight, for, while he states 50 cents per 1000 ems to be a reasonable compensation for the public printer, he yet says that Culley was entitled to 62½ cents for the printing done for the Convention; which he admits, as Culley does himself, that the printing for the Convention, was inferior to the printing done for the Legislature, by the present public printer.—Now, "what is sauce for the goose, is sauce for the gander;" and if Culley's printing for the Convention was worth, in the opinion of Nye, 62½ cents, with what sort of consistency could he contend that the printing of W. F. Ritchie, for the Legislature, is worth only 50 cents, when it is admitted that the printing of the latter is vastly superior to the former?

The next witness is John Nowlan. Here is an extract from his testimony, (p. 24 of evidence:)

"You say you have examined the work done by Mr. Culley for the Convention. Was it as well done as the public printing, and should the same prices be paid for it?

Ans. I should say not, either as regards the quality of the work or price that should be paid for it."

Now, if Nye be right in his opinion, that Culley's printing was worth 62½ cents, then, in Nowlan's opinion, the printing of W. F. Ritchie is worth more than 62½ cents. But, if Nye be wrong in his opinion, and Nowlan be right—who says that Culley's printing is worth only 50 cents—then it follows, conclusively, that in Nowlan's opinion, the printing of W. F. Ritchie is worth more than 50 cents; and, in either event, John Nowlan is no witness for the gentleman from Patrick.

The next witness relied on is John B. Colin, who was for many years the partner of Samuel Shepherd, late public printer. He believes the public printing can be done for 50 cents, though Shepherd received 62½ cents, which he considered *fair*. He, moreover, stated that the "public printing is worth more (than printing for individuals,) because it has to take precedence of every thing else. It requires a larger amount of material, and a larger office." [See p. 5 of Evidence.] But it was proved by the testimony of other witnesses, that the average price of printing for individuals in the city of Richmond is about 50 cents; now, the additional compensation of 10 cents to which the gentleman from Patrick thinks the public printer is entitled, makes 60 cents. So Colin's testimony, when thoroughly sifted, does not sustain the minority in their report or the amendment.

The evidence of James Guest, who had been discharged from the employment of the office by Wm. W. Dunnavant, the partner of the public printer, says that 50 cents is enough for the public printer to receive.

These are all the witnesses upon whom the gentleman from Patrick relies, with the exception of H. K. Ellyson, whose quibbling testimony I shall notice presently. It is thus seen that of the eight witnesses claimed by the gentleman, in my opinion, *three testify positively against him*, and that at least three, when their evidence is properly weighed, *do not testify for him*. So of the 14 witnesses, (including the evidence of R. H. Gallaher, whose letter was read before the committee and received as evidence,) whose testimony was before the committee, at least eight sustain me in the fairness and reasonableness of the compensation reported by the bill; and at least four of the remaining six believe that the compensation proposed by the amendment is inadequate. The result is that two witnesses testify against twelve. But however this may be, every one must and will conclude that, if any regard is to be paid to weight of testimony, the amendment to the bill should be rejected.

The gentleman from Patrick seems to have been conscious that the weight of testimony was against him; hence, he argued, that even if the evidence of a majority of the witnesses were against him, yet "there are other considerations which make their evidence of little or no weight." This seems to me to be strictly in accordance with the plain, simple and natural justice—yes, with the common sense and common justice, of the case. Yet where the gentleman from Patrick polemes, by his amendment, to allow the public printer 10 cents per 1000 ems, as an additional compensation, yet "strange, passing strange, and pity 'tis 'tis strange," he hardly allows the public printer the usual prices charged for private printing in this city! This is certainly *keeping the words of promise to the ear, but breaking them to the hope*. But we are told that this amendment allows the public printer ten cents more per 1000 ems; than the average price of printing in the States of Virginia, Pennsylvania or Massachusetts, which is about forty cents per 1000 ems. But what propriety is there in going to Pennsylvania and Massachusetts to ascertain what compensation should be paid the public printer in Virginia? The causes that depress the price of printing in those States do not exist to the same extent in Virginia. The wages of labor is always in proportion to the density of population. The sparser the population of a country, the higher the wages of labor; the denser the population, the lower the wages of labor. Massachusetts has a population of 120 to the square mile—Virginia has only 21 to the square mile. Hence, in Massachusetts, journeymen printers can be employed for much less than they can in Virginia. But to expose fully the absurdity of considering the price of printing in Pennsylvania or Massachusetts as a criterion by which to fix the price of public printing in Virginia, suppose that in those States the average price of public printing were 30 cts. instead of 40 cts., the gentleman from Patrick, I suppose, would add 10 cents to 30 cents, and give our public printer 40 cents per 1000 ems, and would contend, no doubt, that he had allowed him an additional compensation of 10 cents, "for reasons assigned by Messrs. Redford and Page." Thus he would contend that he had made ample allowance for all disadvantages connected with the public printing, while he would actually give the public printer ten cents less than the price usually charged for private printing in the city. And what does he, in fact, propose to do by his amendment? Why, he says he makes ample and liberal allowance, "for reasons assigned by Messrs. Redford and Page," and yet he does not allow the public printer as high a compensation as is frequently charged in Richmond for private printing.

But, again: If the gentleman from Patrick will insist upon going to Massachusetts to ascertain what prices should be paid the public printer, I suppose, with equal propriety, he should go there to ascertain what prices should be paid other public officers of the State. Now, if I mistake not, the members of the General Court, or Legislature of Massachusetts, receive a salary of only $2 per day; whereas, the gentleman from Patrick, receives $4 per day and mileage. Now, as that gentleman seems to be the peculiar advocate of retrenchment, reform and economy, in the admininistration of the government, if he thinks the prices paid the public printer in Massachusetts, should regulate the prices that should be allowed the public printer in Virginia, by parity of reasoning, no more *per diem* than is allowed her members of the Legislature, should be allowed our members. Why does not the gentleman, then, who seems to be so warm and vigilant a guardian of the public interest, introduce a bill to reduce the *per diem* of members to two dollars? To adopt the elegant language of the gentleman, "What is sauce for the goose, is sauce for the gander!" By doing this, he would reduce the taxation of the State to the amount of nearly fifty thousand dollars for every session of the Legislature that is held. Why, then, does he not apply the knife of retrenchment to this branch of the public service? Is he afraid of disturbing a certain nerve, which, when touched, is said to vibrate through one's whole system? 'Oh, consistency, what a jewel thou art!"—a jewel, however, which the gentleman seems not to appreciate.

Mr. Speaker, when the deep-toned denunciation of the gentleman from Patrick, of wasteful appropriations, and reckless expenditure of public money reverbirated through this hall—when I listen to his lugubrious notes, relative to "the people's money, wrung from them by heavy and grinding taxation;" "the very earnings of the sweat of their brows;" "the people's money flowing like water," and many other similar expressions of patriotic sympathy for the masses, I could but contrast the gentleman's votes upon questions involving the expenditure of millions of dollars with his loud professions of strict economy in the appropriation of "the people's money." He has voted, with few exceptions, for every internal improvement bill that has asked aid of the treasury, whether it was for a railroad of national importance involving the appropriation of millions, or whether it was for a mud-pike, six miles in length, from Cleek's Mill to Peter Lightner's, in the county of Bath. Well, then, might the gentleman exclaim, as he did in his speech, conscious of dereliction of duty in this respect, alike to his constituents, and to the State, "our Legislature while they have been squandering millions upon millions of the public treasury, have never conceived of the necessity of any economy in their appropriation, or of shielding the State from reckless extravagance." Yes, the gentlemen has aided in "squandering millions upon millions of the people's money," and, now, to redeem the promise that he made to his constituents of economising the administration of the government, he relies on the evidence of certain *envious* and rival printers in the city of Richmond, to strike down Wm. F. Ritchie, the public printer, and a most faithful officer, for charging the very same prices that have been allowed every public printer, for the last twenty years; the same prices that were charged by Samuel Shepherd; his *whig* predecessor as public printer without objection from any quarter whatever. Sir, the gentleman is estopped by the record from raising this *hue and cry* against wasteful and reckless expenditure of "the people's money"—his lips should be forever sealed of "the people's money"—his lips should be forever sealed upon this subject, or at least, until overcome with remorse, he shall have kneeled upon the stool of bitter repentance, and obtained unmerited forgiveness from a wronged and outraged constituency.

But, Mr. Speaker, I propose to examine and to analyze the evidence taken before the committee on printing, and if I mistake not, upon a deliberate review of the testimony, every impartial and unprejudiced mind will be satisfied that the compensation provided by the bill is just, fair and reasonable, and should not be reduced.

The evidence of 13 witnesses was taken before the committee. The gentleman from Patrick says, "summing up the opinion of all the witnesses, eight thought 62½ cts. too much, and five thought not." The eight witnesses he claims are the following: Messrs. Warrock, Culley, Bailey, Colin, Nye, Nowlan, Guest and Ellyson.

Mr. Warrock states, in his testimony, that he has been the printer to the Senate of Virginia for 35 years; and that the prices received by him during the whole of that time have been 63 cts. per 1000 ems, and that such prices do not yield more than a reasonable profit. He is then cross examined and testifies as follows: (See p. 8 of evidence taken before the select committee on printing.)

"By Mr. Staples. If you had double the amount of printing to do that you have, could you afford to do it at less rates per 1000 and per token?

I suppose I could.

Do you think you could do it as well as it is done for a less price?

I think that (63 cts.) a tolerably fair price.

Do I understand you to say you could do it for less.

For a *very* large job."

Here, Mr. Warrock states, that *a very* large job of printing is worth more than a small job, which every one knows; but he does not state that the printing for the House of Delegates is worth less than 62½ cts.; for he expressly says that he thinks 63 cts. a tolerably fair price. It takes several thousand copies of the same document to constitute *a very large job;* and there are, not generally more, than 250 or 500 copies of a document printed for the House of Delegates.—So the gentleman cannot eke out his case by pressing Mr. Warrock into his service; but, on the contrary, his evidence sustains the committee in the compensation provided by the bill.

Wm. Culley is next relied on by the opposite side. This gentleman contracted to do the printing for the late Reform Convention at 35 cts. per 1000 *ems*; but finding that he would be ruined by such prices, petitioned the convention to allow him 62½ cts., the compensation received by the public printer, and his prayer was granted. It would, therefore, have been extremely inconsistent and illiberal in him to have denied to Wm. F. Ritchie the compensation he himself received from the convention. Here is his evidence upon this point: (p. 26 of evidence.)

"Do you consider 62½ cts. too much for the public printing?

I do not know if it is. It is necessary to have good practical printers, and persons familiar with the proceedings of the Legislature to read the proof sheets. *It requires attainments other than mechanical.*"

It seems, then, that Culley, like Warrock, has been pressed into the service of the gentleman from Patrick, contrary to his will.

The next witness relied on is A. M. Bailey. He says in his evidence, "that if the public printer has an open field, and can take in other work on which to employ his hands, he can afford to do it for less than 62½ cents; but not, if restricted to the public work." He states that he would not undertake the public printing for less than 60 cents. So Bailey thinks that the public printer is entitled to 10 cents more than the amendment proposes to give him. How, then, can the gentleman from Patrick, claim him as his witness?

The evidence of Nye is not entitled to much weight, for, while he states 50 cents per 1000 ems to be a reasonable compensation for the public printer, he yet says that Culley was entitled to 62½ cents for the printing done for the Convention; which he admits, as Culley does himself, that the printing for the Convention, was inferior to the printing done for the Legislature, by the present public printer.—Now, "what is sauce for the goose, is sauce for the gander;" and if Culley's printing for the Convention was worth, in the opinion of Nye, 62½ cents, with what sort of consistency could he contend that the printing of W. F. Ritchie, for the Legislature, is worth only 50 cents, when it is admitted that the printing of the latter is vastly superior to the former?

The next witness is John Nowlan. Here is an extract from his testimony, (p. 24 of evidence:)

"You say you have examined the work done by Mr. Culley for the Convention. Was it as well done as the public printing, and should the same prices be paid for it?

Ans. I should say not, either as regards the quality of the work or price that should be paid for it."

Now, if Nye be right in his opinion, that Culley's printing was worth 62½ cents, then, in Nowlan's opinion, the printing of W. F. Ritchie is worth more than 62½ cents. But, if Nye be wrong in his opinion, and Nowlan be right—who says that Culley's printing is worth only 50 cents—then it follows, conclusively, that in Nowlan's opinion, the printing of W. F. Ritchie is worth more than 50 cents; and, in either event, John Nowlan is no witness for the gentleman from Patrick.

The next witness relied on is John B. Colin, who was for many years the partner of Samuel Shepherd, late public printer. He believes the public printing can be done for 50 cents, though Shepherd received 62½ cents, which he considered *fair*. He, moreover, stated that the "public printing is worth more (than printing for individuals,) because it has to take precedence of every thing else. It requires a larger amount of material, and a larger office." [See p. 5 of Evidence.] But it was proved by the testimony of other witnesses, that the average price of printing for individuals in the city of Richmond is about 50 cents; now, the additional compensation of 10 cents to which the gentleman from Patrick thinks the public printer is entitled, makes 60 cents. So Colin's testimony, when thoroughly sifted, does not sustain the minority in their report or the amendment.

The evidence of James Guest, who had been discharged from the employment of the office by Wm. W. Dunnavant, the partner of the public printer, says that 50 cents is enough for the public printer to receive.

These are all the witnesses upon whom the gentleman from Patrick relies, with the exception of H. K. Ellyson, whose quibbling testimony I shall notice presently. It is thus seen that of the eight witnesses claimed by the gentleman, in my opinion, *three testify positively against him*, and that at least three, when their evidence is properly weighed, *do not testify for him*. So of the 14 witnesses, (including the evidence of R. H