

MANTHERY & MILLER, Publishers. GEO. W. MANTHERY, Editor. CLEVELAND, OHIO.

THURSDAY EVENING, FEB. 7, 1861. The Public Workman Mr. Commissioner Martin.

On the 31st of January we published an article in the Statesman, referring to the Public Works, their revenues and expenditures, which were moved to do, from the fact, that being in the House on the day before, when Dr. Scott, of Warren, was on the floor, submitting some remarks, which we then thought and still think, were not made in sincerity and good faith, and with a view to elicit information to enlighten the judgment of the legislature. In that article the following paragraph appears:

In the report referred to, Mr. Martin and Mr. Gregory ask appropriations, which are claimed to exist for the support of their two divisions, amounting to the sum of \$409,391.90.

At the end of nearly one week, from the publication of our article, Mr. Jones, a member of the Board of Public Works, thought it incumbent on him to reply to it, and for that purpose furnished us with the article which we published on Tuesday last.

It is not material in the facts to be elicited, and therefore, not necessary, to reply specially to his strictures on what he deems our unfairness, or to his insinuation that we desire to depreciate the value of the Public Works. We are willing to trust our conduct and motives in all that we published on the 31st ultimo, as well as all that we have ever said on the subject, in the Statesman, to the judgment of such of our fellow citizens, as have read the several articles which we, from time to time, have written and printed.

Mr. Martin takes issue with us, and declares that our statement is untrue to the amount of \$164,941.90 that he has only asked, as he now says, for appropriations on the Miami & Erie Canal to the amount of \$129,000 (which our types on Tuesday erroneously made \$129,000) for the three quarters of the current fiscal year, and the first quarter of 1862; and that Mr. Gaxson only asked for the same period, for his division of the Public Works, the sum of \$117,150, making the whole amount asked for by both gentlemen, only \$246,150, and being therefore, less than the sum stated by us (\$409,391.90) by the amount of \$163,241.90.

Following this statement, Mr. Martin concludes that appropriations were recommended for the purchase of land at the Leeward and the Mercer county Reservoirs, amounting to the sum of \$35,000, made necessary as he alleges, by mal democratic legislation, but still declares that the sum is not properly chargeable to expenditures for the maintenance of the canals; but granting that it be charged, and still our statement, he says, is incorrect, to the amount of \$195,741.90. Mr. Martin then says:

Again, and to include every item of appropriation recommended, not only for the two divisions of which you are a member, but also the contingent expenses of the office of the Board of Public Works, salaries of members, resident engineers, land damages, attorneys' fees, etc., amounting to the sum of \$17,800, and still your estimate contradicts the old ledger, which shows you can't lie, to the moderate extent of over \$109,000.

In that portion of our article, of the 31st of January, to which Mr. Martin takes exception, and wherein he states the truth of our figures, it is proper to declare, that we had no intention to parade the estimates of Mr. Martin and Mr. Gaxson before the world, for unkind criticism; but our object was to show how much the Report of the Board asked for, to be appropriated and expended, in the three quarters of the present and the first quarter of the next fiscal year, in connection with the management of our Public Works.

Mr. Backus had made no estimate for the amount required for the division in his charge, and hence in speaking of the appropriations asked, and the moneys stated to be necessary for the superintendence, construction and repair of the Public Works, for the three quarters of the year, and the first quarter of the next fiscal year, we spoke of the estimates and required appropriations, as asked for and recommended by Mr. Martin and Mr. Gaxson, but we did not intend to confine ourselves to the simple estimates made under the head of general superintendence, construction and repairs, on their divisions, but all else recommended by them, or by the Board, and therefore by them, thus leaving nothing to estimate, or "guess at," but the supposed amount that would be required to keep Mr. Backus' division, through the period referred to, and for which this report sum of \$60,000, and in connection with it, said:

Mr. Backus has made no estimate for his division, but we will assume it will not be less than \$20,000 when made—and it will most likely exceed that sum considerably—and this legislature will be called upon to appropriate the sum of \$409,391.90, for the support of the Canal for the next twelve months.

We now proceed to show that in our hands the old saw that "figures can't lie," is good yet, however much Mr. Martin may try to the contrary, and however ingeniously they may labor to impale the public conscience, in this old and popular adage.

We ask the reader to go with us to the report of the Board of Public Works, and there we will call the various items out, page by page, and place them conspicuously in this article.—We will first take Mr. Martin's division—the Miami & Erie Canal.

The estimates are as follows: Page 36. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. \$20,000 Same page, for the Mercer County Reservoir. 5,000 Page 37. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. 2,000 Page 38. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. 2,000 Page 39. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. 2,000 Page 40. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. 2,000 Page 41. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. 2,000 Page 42. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. 2,000 Page 43. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. 2,000 Page 44. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. 2,000 Page 45. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. 2,000 Page 46. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. 2,000 Page 47. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. 2,000 Page 48. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. 2,000 Page 49. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. 2,000 Page 50. Report of the Board for the Last Fiscal Year. 2,000

Table with financial data: RECEIPTS, EXPENDITURES, BALANCE. Includes items like 'Special estimate for the Board of Public Works' and 'Estimate for the Board of Public Works'.

We might add several thousand dollars to this exhibit, but as it is already \$3,043.00 greater than the sum stated by us in the article from which Mr. Martin so confidently and ostentatiously dissent, we will resist further gleanings of matter still to be found in the ponderous report of the Board; having proved, we think, that however much the Board may distort the facts and confuse the figures, yet when appropriately and fairly used, they "speak not lie."

We said on the 31st of January, that we would not give a pinch of snuff for all the reports which the Board could make from that time until the legislature adjourned, because they would not be reliable. After the exhibit we have made in this article, what candid man will say that we were not justified in what we said at that time?

Mr. Martin intimates that we have sought to depreciate the canals for the benefit of individual speculators. In reply to this charge we have said, that the assertion is not only unwarranted and without foundation, but the file of the Statesman will show that we have repeatedly declared that they were a valuable property, and our efforts have been to impress the General Assembly with the necessity of doing something to rescue them from the utter decay and destruction, to which they were rapidly tending, under Mr. Martin & Co.'s "State management."

Neither Mr. Martin nor the Board propose any change in the policy of the management of these Works. They profess and promise, that at some future time, "the next year," and for a series of the "next years," they will make "a net revenue to the State." But without reform, that day will never come, and Mr. Martin will be an exceedingly sanguine man to believe, under the present system of management, that it ever will.

We do not mean to assent to the particular members of the Board now in office. The same thing which is now occurring, will continue to occur, no matter who may manage the Canals. Ten years ago there was a Board of Public Works in office, who in one year turned over to the treasury some \$460,000, net revenue, after keeping the canals in good repair. The same men could not now, if in the Board, do the same thing; and it is shameful and wicked in Mr. Martin and all other guilty of such conduct, to seek to embarrass the judgment of the members of the legislature, and to confuse and confound them, on the subject of these canals; a subject on which, unfortunately for the State, there is but little practical knowledge among the great mass of the members.

Mr. Martin was elected to the office he now fills in October 1858, and took his seat in the Board two years ago. We took charge of the Statesman some six weeks before he assumed the duties of his office. He was, however, most of the time from the beginning of the session until he assumed the duties of a member of the Board. This canal question was then up. A bill to sell the canal had passed the House, the previous winter, and was then pending in the Senate. Gov. Chase in his message to the Legislature had thrown his influence in favor of a sale. We took the subject up, opposed the sale, and suggested what we deemed the best policy to be adopted at the time, to extricate the State from her complications with the canal contractors, and effectually take care of the canals for two years to come, during which time, we suggested that the question could be fully considered, and a definite policy adopted.

Mr. Martin opposed our views. He was impressed with the importance of his new position, and inflated with the idea that he was to be the dispenser of official patronage, and could not brook the idea of having taken from him the power to let jobs and contracts, and appoint men to office. "State management" and "proper economy," were to work wonders, and the canals were not only to sustain themselves, but to pay into the treasury a handsome revenue. The two years have expired, and the treasury can testify to the result. Mr. Martin and his colleagues have had during this whole time, their "State management," and it would be unkind to say that they had not used all "proper economy;" but the maintenance of the canals has cost the State some \$350,000 more than would have cost, had the policy we then recommended been adopted, instead of that urged by Mr. Martin, and which has been pursued during the time referred to.

Last year the question was again up, but referred from the compilation with the old contractors. We then urged the policy of leasing the Public Works, which the Journal had urged at the year before (under a just and proper law) to be enacted for that purpose. A responsible company offered to pay the State a specific sum (\$300,000) per year, for the canals, and to bind themselves to keep them in good repair, and in navigable order, to the satisfaction of the Board of Public Works. Mr. Martin, and others opposed the leasing policy, and insisted that by "State management" and "proper economy," the canals would sustain themselves, and pay some revenue into the treasury. The result is again triumphant, and the result is ascertained. The Board reports the gross revenue from the Public Works for the year (page 46 of their report) at \$308,935. The Treasurer of State reports the payments out of the Treasury for their support for the same time, (page 6 of his report) at \$601,125.54—making the expenditures exceed the revenues, to the amount of \$292,189.54, to which add the \$30,000 rent offered for the Canal, by Messrs. Miller and Robinson, and we have the sum of \$122,189.54, which would have been paid to the State, in the year just closed, had the policy we advocated been adopted, instead of Mr. Martin's "State management," and "proper economy," which did prevail.

In addition to the amount paid out of the treasury, during the year, the Auditor states on page 17 of his report, that there was unrecouped of the checks drawn by the members of the Board, at the end of the year, the sum of \$211,438.37.

The truth is, in Mr. Martin and those who act with him, who are depreciating the value of this property, whether for the ultimate benefit of "individual speculators" or not, we will not say; but that their policy is blighting the rapid development of these canals, no man who carefully examines this report, can for one moment doubt. With all that has been expended, the reports of the Board show that the canals are rapidly going to decay, whereas, by our policy, they would have been placed within the power of the Board to have made the most thorough and complete repairs, and to have renewed structures and rebuilt dams and locks to any extent they deemed necessary, and yet have kept the expenditures within a specific sum, and saved a large amount of money to the Treasury.

rapidly going to decay, whereas, by our policy, they would have been placed within the power of the Board to have made the most thorough and complete repairs, and to have renewed structures and rebuilt dams and locks to any extent they deemed necessary, and yet have kept the expenditures within a specific sum, and saved a large amount of money to the Treasury.

In stating the amount asked for the support of Mr. Gaxson's division, (and which we have shown in this article to be a much greater sum than Mr. Martin places it at), the latter gentleman says:

"Of the above sum \$30,000 is estimated as necessary for new structures and their completion until the year following."

This paragraph is a sample of the reckless and unwarranted statements which emanate from the office of the Board of Public Works, in the discussion of this question, and because of which, we have said, and now repeat, that no reliance can be placed on the special reports or newspaper articles which come from that quarter, whenever this canal question is discussed. Turning to page 13 of the last annual report of the Board, we extract the following paragraph from that document, in relation to the Division under Mr. Gaxson's charge. It shows that there is a necessity for the speedy expenditure of the moneys estimated for that division, by the condition of the canals and structures connected with the same. The Board say:

"During the past year this division of the Public Works, owing to a great extent to the exposed condition by the limited amount of work done for several previous years, suffered great damage that in any time require the construction of the works, by the extraordinary, and perhaps unprecedented flood on the 10th of April; consequently large expenditures have been made to repair these breaches, and it is estimated that it will be necessary to erect various structures that should have received attention."

And yet in the face of this statement in the annual report, Mr. Martin has no hesitation to declare in his letter to us, that \$30,000 of the sum estimated for Mr. Gaxson's division, is for work not necessary to be completed during the year, but may be deferred until 1862.

We must bring this article to a close, although there is a world of facts which suggest themselves to us, as applicable to this question, and which, if produced would have a crushing effect upon the Board, and its "State management" and "proper economy," by which the Public Works are rapidly running their downward course, and if not soon checked, and some reform introduced into their management, and a change for the better inaugurated, this valuable property will in a very few years become utterly worthless.

EDITOR OHIO STATESMAN.—Sir: I enclose in your paper of last evening, that the telegraph says that Gov. CHASE had assured Mr. TYLER, of Virginia, that he was ready to follow in measures of compromise and concession, as a Commissioner to the peace Congress, wherever Virginia led.

There is a mistake in this, for Gov. CHASE, as I am informed, had an interview, before he left this city, with Mr. C. C. R. Co., late newly agent of the C. C. & C. R. Co., at the Columbus depot, and the chief manager of the Republican politics in the first ward in this city. Mr. Co. is opposed to any compromise, and favors coercion, and as informed Gov. CHASE, who after hearing what Mr. Co. thought of the matter, said that he (the Governor) never started on any mission, in which he had a little confidence of accomplishing good, and that he too, was opposed to compromise. After this interview, and the Governor being advised of the opinions of Mr. Co., I do not think he would dare to change front and go with JOHN TYLER, for a compromise to save the Union. He would not act in opposition to the views and opinions of one so influential and judicious as the Republican ranks as Mr. Co., who is not only a zealous exponent of Republicanism in the first ward, but a prominent, and may probably be a successful applicant for a Senator in 1862, if the Chapter must be wrong, for Gov. CHASE will hardly act contrary to what was said in the interview between him and Mr. Co.

Every, in his account of the feats of walking on the tight rope, which he saw performed by a Turk, at Bartholomew Fair, in 1857, states that these were not, even at that time, unprecedented. When Edward VI. passed through London the day before his coronation, (February 19, 1547), a Spaniard determined a rope stretched from the battlements of St. Paul's steeple and fastened to an anchor near the gate of the denary, "lying on the rope with his head forward," as an old chronicler, "casting his arms and legs abroad, raising up his body and feet on the battlements to the ground as if it had been an arrow out of a bow." The same exploit was repeated on the entry of Philip and Mary into London after their marriage, (August 19, 1554), at the same place, or, according to one authority, "from the Chapter house." The performer, on the last occasion met, soon afterwards, with the fate too common to such persons, and paid for his foolish temerity with his life. A man subsequently performed a similar feat, and was reported to be descended "a rope stretched from the top of the lower of All Saint's church, and brought obliquely to the ground, about four score yards from the bottom of the tower."

OHIO LEGISLATURE. SENATE. WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6th.

Mr. MONROE introduced H. B. 292—To amend Sec. 3 of the corporation act of May 1st, 1852, relative to railroad companies.

Mr. KEY moved to take from the table the resolution of Mr. Brewer, relative to the capacity of the public works to sustain themselves during 1861.

Mr. PARISH presented the petition of A. P. Stone, of Columbus, praying for the restoration of woman's rights. Special committee.

Mr. COLLINS presented a similar petition from Mrs. A. Jones and 157 others of Ross county, in reference to the same.

Mr. HUGHES gave notice that he would discuss the resolution of the House, relative to the duties of Corporators, with an amendment, which was agreed to, when the bill was passed—year 73, page 15.

Mr. SCOTT of Warren, moved that the bill and pending amendments be referred to the committee on Finance, to report on or before the 15th inst.

Mr. WELSH said this bill had certainly been long before the House, and he thought it might as well come to a vote upon it now. It was not probable that any thing more will be done in regard to it, and he thought it best to dispose of the matter at once.

Mr. SEARS moved the previous question, which was sustained.

The question then turned on the amendment of Mr. HILLS, on which the yeas and nays were called—yeas 15, nays 7.

The vote was then called on the passage of the bill, which resulted—yeas 59, nays 29.

On motion of Mr. KRUM, H. B. No. 314—Relative to the duties of members of the General Assembly, was taken from the calendar of the House and referred to the committee on Fees and Salaries.

On motion of Mr. HITCHCOCK, the House resolved itself into committee of the whole on the orders of the day, Mr. HILL in the chair.

want of that institution, in the estimation of all who feel an interest in the welfare of the unfortunate inmates, is the rigorousness of the labor to employ a portion of their time, while beneficial to themselves and the community, after the State has discharged the obligations to themselves as has been already shown, the trade is a practical one, for at least a portion of that class, who possess the usual mental and physical faculties, with a single exception, which of itself, is not an essential disqualification.

The foregoing remarks apply only to the under line jurisdiction of the superior of public printing. The department of binding, under doubt, is still better adapted to the capacity of the deaf and dumb, and to the benefit of the pupils of the institution, than what might be expected from the ordinary course of employment for the girls, there better adapted to their capacities and what than the folding, stitching, collating, &c., connected with the public binding. And in considering the wants of the institution, and the interests of the State, they are a class, that should by no means be overlooked.

Mr. SPRAGUE, from the enrolling committee, reported the enrollment of sundry bills, &c.

Mr. PARISH presented the petition of A. P. Stone, of Columbus, praying for the restoration of woman's rights. Special committee.

Mr. COLLINS presented a similar petition from Mrs. A. Jones and 157 others of Ross county, in reference to the same.

Mr. HUGHES gave notice that he would discuss the resolution of the House, relative to the duties of Corporators, with an amendment, which was agreed to, when the bill was passed—year 73, page 15.

Mr. SCOTT of Warren, moved that the bill and pending amendments be referred to the committee on Finance, to report on or before the 15th inst.

Mr. WELSH said this bill had certainly been long before the House, and he thought it might as well come to a vote upon it now. It was not probable that any thing more will be done in regard to it, and he thought it best to dispose of the matter at once.

Mr. SEARS moved the previous question, which was sustained.

The question then turned on the amendment of Mr. HILLS, on which the yeas and nays were called—yeas 15, nays 7.

The vote was then called on the passage of the bill, which resulted—yeas 59, nays 29.

On motion of Mr. KRUM, H. B. No. 314—Relative to the duties of members of the General Assembly, was taken from the calendar of the House and referred to the committee on Fees and Salaries.

On motion of Mr. HITCHCOCK, the House resolved itself into committee of the whole on the orders of the day, Mr. HILL in the chair.

of the act intended "an act to enable the trustees of colleges, academies, universities, and other institutions for the purpose of promoting education, to become bodies corporate, passed April 18, 1853. Passed—yeas 15, nays 0.

Mr. COX from the same committee reported back H. B. No. 315—An act to amend an act passed April 18, 1853, to amend an act to authorize associations of persons for the carrying freight on any of the navigable waters of the State of Ohio, and the lakes and navigable rivers bordering thereon, passed April 18, 1853—yeas 15, nays 0.

Mr. HARRISON from the same committee recommended the passage of H. B. No. 325; By Mr. Blakeley, to amend the act entitled "an act to provide for the carrying of freight on any of the navigable waters of the State of Ohio, and the lakes and navigable rivers bordering thereon," passed April 18, 1853.

Mr. HARRISON from the same committee recommended the passage of H. B. No. 325; By Mr. Blakeley, to amend the act entitled "an act to provide for the carrying of freight on any of the navigable waters of the State of Ohio, and the lakes and navigable rivers bordering thereon," passed April 18, 1853.

Mr. HARRISON from the same committee recommended the passage of H. B. No. 325; By Mr. Blakeley, to amend the act entitled "an act to provide for the carrying of freight on any of the navigable waters of the State of Ohio, and the lakes and navigable rivers bordering thereon," passed April 18, 1853.

Mr. HARRISON from the same committee recommended the passage of H. B. No. 325; By Mr. Blakeley, to amend the act entitled "an act to provide for the carrying of freight on any of the navigable waters of the State of Ohio, and the lakes and navigable rivers bordering thereon," passed April 18, 1853.

Mr. HARRISON from the same committee recommended the passage of H. B. No. 325; By Mr. Blakeley, to amend the act entitled "an act to provide for the carrying of freight on any of the navigable waters of the State of Ohio, and the lakes and navigable rivers bordering thereon," passed April 18, 1853.

Mr. HARRISON from the same committee recommended the passage of H. B. No. 325; By Mr. Blakeley, to amend the act entitled "an act to provide for the carrying of freight on any of the navigable waters of the State of Ohio, and the lakes and navigable rivers bordering thereon," passed April 18, 1853.

Mr. HARRISON from the same committee recommended the passage of H. B. No. 325; By Mr. Blakeley, to amend the act entitled "an act to provide for the carrying of freight on any of the navigable waters of the State of Ohio, and the lakes and navigable rivers bordering thereon," passed April 18, 1853.

Mr. HARRISON from the same committee recommended the passage of H. B. No. 325; By Mr. Blakeley, to amend the act entitled "an act to provide for the carrying of freight on any of the navigable waters of the State of Ohio, and the lakes and navigable rivers bordering thereon," passed April 18, 1853.

Mr. HARRISON from the same committee recommended the passage of H. B. No. 325; By Mr. Blakeley, to amend the act entitled "an act to provide for the carrying of freight on any of the navigable waters of the State of Ohio, and the lakes and navigable rivers bordering thereon," passed April 18, 1853.

Mr. HARRISON from the same committee recommended the passage of H. B. No. 325; By Mr. Blakeley, to amend the act entitled "an act to provide for the carrying of freight on any of the navigable waters of the State of Ohio, and the lakes and navigable rivers bordering thereon," passed April 18, 1853.

Mr. HARRISON from the same committee recommended the passage of H. B. No. 325; By Mr. Blakeley, to amend the act entitled "an act to provide for the carrying of freight on any of the navigable waters of the State of Ohio, and the lakes and navigable rivers bordering thereon," passed April 18, 1853.

Mr. BALDWIN admitted that there had been a swindling mutual company, but they were those that had extended their business all over the country. But those that confine their business to their own localities, did well, and he would favor a limit, to them, so that they would be confined to their own localities.

Mr. WELCH objected to this motion, as it would destroy the usefulness of the system. He insisted that the mutual system had only failed when extended beyond a legitimate range. There was a manifest encouragement of the mutual system, by the action of the legislature.

Mr. HERRICK moved to further instruct the committee to amend, so as to limit the operations of all future mutual companies to their respective counties. Thus he would cut off the mismanagement completely.

Mr. HERRICK's amendment was adopted, and the bill was passed—yeas 15, nays 0.

Mr. HERRICK's amendment was adopted, and the bill was passed—yeas 15, nays 0.

Mr. HERRICK's amendment was adopted, and the bill was passed—yeas 15, nays 0.

Mr. HERRICK's amendment was adopted, and the bill was passed—yeas 15, nays 0.

Mr. HERRICK's amendment was adopted, and the bill was passed—yeas 15, nays 0.

Mr. HERRICK's amendment was adopted, and the bill was passed—yeas 15, nays 0.

Mr. HERRICK's amendment was adopted, and the bill was passed—yeas 15, nays 0.

Mr. HERRICK's amendment was adopted, and the bill was passed—yeas 15, nays 0.

Mr. HERRICK's amendment was adopted, and the bill was passed—yeas 15, nays 0.

Mr. HERRICK's amendment was adopted, and the bill was passed—yeas 15, nays 0.

GUERNSEY'S BALM. NEW ADVERTISEMENTS. COVER SEED. DRIED PEACHES.

Disolution of Co-partnership. THE FIRM OF J. M. SMITH & CO.

Partner Wanted. IN A VERY PROFITABLE MANUFACTURING AND BUSINESS.

PATENT TRADE. WHICH (RETAIL TRADE) IS SUCCESSFULLY ESTABLISHED AT DIFFERENT PLACES.

The Premium Horse for Sale. THE CELEBRATED BUCKEYE HORSE.

Notice. CITY BANK OF COLUMBUS. THE FOLLOWING CHANGES WERE MADE IN THE OFFICE OF THIS BANK.