RELICS OF ROBESON'S NAVY.

THE HISTORY OF FOUR DOUBLE-TURRETED IRONCLAD MONITORS.

Worthless Vessels upon which Robeson Squandered Millions—Contractors Allowed to do their Work at their Own Price and in Accordance with their Own Plans—Facts from the Official Records—A Shocking Exposition

WASHINGTON, March 29.—Senator McPherson's resolution directing the Secretary of the Navy to organize a board to inquire into the condition of the four double-turreted monitors Amphitrite, Terror, Puritan, and Monadnock, and to report whether they shall be completed or broken up, was considered in the Senate today. Mr. McPherson spoke on the resolution as follows:

Mr. President, certain memorials were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate asking for an appropriation of money by Congress for the completion (now partially completed) of the four double-turreted monitors, to wit: the Amphitrite, Terror, Puritan, and Monadnock; and the Committee on Naval Affairs, without further explanation, report back to the Senate a resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to organize a board of survey, to consist of competent naval officers, whose duty it shall be to examine said vessels and determine and report to Congress whether they shall be completed or broken up. The good judgment of the committee, as expressed in the terms of the resolution, has no doubt been already rendered apparent to the Senate by reason of facts disclosed in the investigation of this subject by the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, and found in Report No. 787, Forty-fifth Congress, second session.

It seems unnecessary for me to say that the people who pay the taxes, even if they cannot regulate the disbursements, have at least the right to know how and to what extent they are squandered.

The records of the Navy Department show that the expenditures for and on account of the navy, commencing June 30, 1865, down to the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, was $416,785,272.01. This vast amount represents only the money expenditure, to which must be added millions (cost to Government) of accumulated materials sold or traded away, and never found its way into the public Treasury.

The naval administration seems to have been a prodigy of wastefulness, ignorance, and indolence; no plan or estimate could be trusted, no law was obeyed, no check was enforced. The vessels which the liberality of Congress had enabled the Government to build, and which had never been out of the harbors, were wantonly destroyed and others built (by favorite contractors), which were not only unfit for sea, but would go down at their moorings. For all this vast expenditure of money the Hon. B. W. Harris (a distinguished Republican and therefore a competent witness), member of the Naval Committee of the House of Representatives, tells us we have only this to show. I quote from his report:

The vessels constituting the navy of the United States in February, 1869, as appears by the last Navy Register, were 1,441; of this number 1,321 were steam vessels of war of all classes; 22 were sea-going sailing vessels of war of all classes; 24 were ironclads for coast and harbor defense; 2 were torpedo vessels, and the remaining 27 were hulks, receiving ships, etc.

To know the actual strength of our navy we must ascertain the present condition and capacity for war purposes of each class of these vessels. It would, these gentlemen in the committee, and in Congress to allow themselves to be misled as to our naval strength by the number of ships whose names appear in the Register. Small as the number of our actual naval vessels is, compared with other navies of the world, in real fighting power the navy is infinitely smaller, and it is time Congress and the country should know it and act upon the fact.

The steam vessels of the navy are divided into four classes, as first rates, second rates, third rates, and fourth rates.

The first rates are five in number. These were originally fine vessels, and the equals of any of their class in the world; but they must now be classed as obsolete and as practically out of use as vessels of war. We class them as non-combatants. Longer to retain the Niagara (one of the five) on our Naval Register is worse than useless; it is the means of holding out to the world a false estimate of our strength, and the same may be said of many of the other vessels classed as naval vessels on the Register.

The report further states,

We have, then, of the twenty-seven second-rate steam vessels

Fit for sea	9
Under repair	2
Awaiting repair	3
Disabled on account of yellow fever	1
Were never built	1
Worthless and to be sold	7
In the stocks unfinished, worthy of completion	1
Sunk on the stocks and worthless	3
Total	27

THIRD-RATE STEAM VESSELS.

The Register gives the list of twenty-nine third-rate steam vessels.

Of these six are laid up in ordinary, worthless for naval purposes, and should be sold or broken up to save the expense of their care.

Six are deemed worthy of repair, and are undergoing repair or laid up awaiting repair.

Two are antiquated paddle-wheel steamers of obsolete type and extremely slow. They have little, if any, value for strictly naval purposes.

The remaining fifteen vessels are all comparatively small cruising vessels, the largest being less than 1,900 tons burden. They are of no value in time of peace, but would not do us great credit in time of war with any really naval power.

FOURTH-RATE STEAM VESSELS.

The six vessels of this class borne upon the Register are really of no account as vessels of war.

Such are substantially the facts in relation to our seagoing steam vessels of war—our navy proper—for offensive naval warfare.

SAILING VESSELS.

The Register contains the names of twenty-two sailing vessels of all classes.

These old warships of a past age can no longer serve in country in war. Their cost for care and preservation, for repairs and for the wages of idle officers and their crews should disappear from the navy, some of them to rot upon its waters, others to be sold for what they will bring, and their money, only five of them are now in condition to navigate the ocean.

IRONCLADS.

The Register gives the names of twenty-four ironclads belonging to the navy, only fourteen of which are reported to be in condition for offensive service. They are all of earth rules, and carry only smooth-bore shell guns of fifteen-inch caliber. There is not a single rifled gun on our ironclad fleet, as we understand it.

The four ironclad double-turreted monitors, whose merits we are now considering, are on this list, and Mr. Harris's report in respect of them says:

They have been for a long time under contract, and large sums of money have been expended in rebuilding them of iron. The sum estimated for their completion is also very large. They are the following, viz.: Amphitrite, at Wilmington, Delaware, by Harlan & Hollingsworth; Miantonomoh, at Chester, Pennsylvania, by John Roach; Monadnock, at Mare Island, California, by Bowers & Co.; Terror, at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, by Cramp & Sons; Puritan, at Chester, Pennsylvania, by John Roach.

Counting 2 torpedo boats, 27 tugs, and small vessels scarcely worthy of mention in a computation of efficient vessels for naval purposes, we find the whole number of vessels in our navy to be 142, of which number only 48 are capable of firing a gun, and of these 5 are old obsolete sailing vessels.

Considering that in thirteen years of profound peace, ending June 30, 1877, there has been expended on account of the navy over four hundred millions of dollars, is it not disagreeable and humiliating to contemplate that to-day the United States Government in respect of efficient naval equipment is practically bankrupt?

It is proper here to say that an outraged and indignant people found no relief from this culmination of vices in the Government until their faithful agents in the House of Representatives ended at once, to use a mild phrase, this era of unparalleled extravagance. In proof of this, we need only say that the Democratic House of Representatives for the four fiscal years commencing June 30, 1876, and ending June 30, 1880, appropriated but little over fourteen millions per year, and by an arbitrary rule of law stopped the session of larceny so long enjoyed, and required the expenditures to be kept within the limit of appropriations.

In order to show how the liberality of the nation has been made fruitless by the evils in administration, it will only be necessary to follow the history of these four double-turreted ironclad monitors. All statements I may make touching the construction of these vessels is obtained from unimpeachable record testimony, from which I make quotations.

AMPHITRITE.

The only evidence, except receipts for payment, that any formal agreement ever existed for the construction of this vessel is found in the letter of I. Hanscom, Chief of Bureau of Construction, and Repair of the Navy Department, dated Sept. 24, 1874, and addressed to the Harlan & Hollingsworth Company, Wilmington, Del. It reads thus:

GENTLEMEN: Your proposition to perform all the labor necessary to put in place an ironclad monitor in accordance with the plans and specifications you have submitted to us, for the sum of $130,000 is received and accepted.

We find nothing in the records of the department previous to this acceptance of an altered proposal explaining how this proposal came to be made, or that any proposal ever was made.

To state it plainly: Your proposition to do certain undescribed work, at your own price, without soliciting competition as the law prescribes, and in accordance with your own plans and specifications, without first determining that your plans and specifications would sink or sink the iron Puritan, I received no notice. This sum represented only the cost of labor—all material to be furnished by the Government.

TERROR.

The original agreements (with Cramp & Son) for putting in frame this ironclad monitor for the sum of $135,000 (exclusive of material to be furnished by the Government) were substantially the same.

PURITAN.

The original agreements for putting in frame the ironclad Puritan for the sum of $155,000 were identical in form with those first mentioned. * * * The contractor was to receive a certain sum, but what the Government was to receive was left almost entirely to his discretion. The proposition, in writing, on the part of the contractor to perform certain undescribed or inadequately described work; and the information, in writing, on the part of the department that said proposal was accepted, in all the records of the Navy Department reveal in the nature of a contract touching the construction originally of the Amphitrite, Terror, and Puritan.

In like manner on April 5, 1875, a second agreement with the same contractor was concluded by the department for additional work on the Amphitrite—all material to be furnished by the Government; and for labor alone the contractor was to receive the sum of $155,000.

In like manner on April 5, 1875, a second agreement with the same contractor was concluded by the department for additional work on the Terror—all material to be furnished by the Government; and for labor alone the contractor was to receive the sum of $155,000.

In like manner on April 7, 1875, a second agreement with the same contractor was concluded by the department for additional work on the Puritan—all material to be furnished by the Government; and for the labor alone the contractor was to receive the sum of $207,000.

MONADNOCK.

The initial proceedings (all the records show) for the construction of the Monadnock will be found in the following letter of I. Hanscom, Chief of Bureau of Construction and Repair, Navy Department, dated Oct. 19, 1874:

Henshaw—Thomas F. Rowland, contractor.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR, Oct. 19, 1874.

SIR: Your proposition of the 24th ultimo to strengthen all the labor necessary to put in frame "the hull of an ironclad monitor, in accordance with your drawings and specifications, for the sum of $130,000, over the frame, sam board strakes, keelsons, floors, deck beams, stanchions, &c.," making the structure complete in all respects, except the riveting, in readiness to receive the internal and external plating, and in readiness for the internal fittings, deck plating, side armor, &c.; to take down the same and to mark, pack, and ship it to the United States Navy Yard, Mare Island, California, for the sum of $135,000, is received.

This proposition is accepted, with the mutual understanding that the work to be performed by you embraces stem and stern posts, the interostal plates, with all necessary passages for watercourses and ventilation, all ledges and carlines for hatches, deck pipes, and turrets, for turret bolts and chains, all work for propeller shaft connected with the frame of the vessel, and all other work, except the internal and external plating.

To point with metallic paint or red lead all work required the same composing the frame of the vessel, or the repairing the Monadnock, double-turreted monitor. The iron that you will furnish for this work will be the best quality charcoal iron, and have a tensile strength of 60,000 pounds per square inch, for which the Government will pay by delivering to you three pounds of old or scrap iron for each pound of new iron used.

The entire work above contracted to be completed and all the parts shipped as above provided within four months from this date. It being neither understood as a part of this agreement that you will send a suitable and skilled person to California to give the proper instructions and superintend the erection of the structure when it arrives there, such person to be paid by you.

Please acknowledge receipt of a duplicate of this proposition.

Very respectually, your obedient servant,

I. HANSCOM, Chief of Bureau.

MR. THOS. F. ROWLAND, Greenpoint, New York.

No intimation is anywhere given (but the contrary is asserted) that proposals were invited for the construction of this vessel. In short, this contractor was authorized, in accordance with his own drawings and specifications, carrying into effect, at the Government expense, his own ideas of naval architecture, to construct at his own price and time a vessel for the United States Navy. Reference to the agreement will show that it provided for the taking apart, marking, packing, and shipping this vessel to Mare Island Navy Yard, California. Upon the arrival of the parts at California the Navy Department invited proposals for certain described work to be performed, and Phineas Burgess being the lowest responsible bidder, the work was given to him under a form of agreement possessing all the attributes of a legal contract, including bonds for the faithful performance on the part of the contractor. This and a subsequent contract made with Phineas Burgess appears to have been the first, but not the only legal contract made by the Navy Department touching the construction of these four monitors.

The contracts with Phineas Burgess bore date severally Sept. 18, 1875, for $22,350, and Oct. 2, 1875, for $18,500 for labor alone—all material to be furnished by the Government.

The claim on the part of the contractors that the terms and conditions of the several contracts before stated touching the construction of these four iron monitors have been fulfilled appears to be verified by the action of the Navy Department in auditing and paying the bills, although certified to in part by an officer who was not within three thousand miles of the work.

The work having been performed and money paid, it is therefore idle, at this late day, to discuss the forms and methods by which it was accomplished, except to advise the Senate of the utter recklessness and disregard by the Navy Department of all proper safeguards for the protection of the Government in respect of plans and specifications, and want of vigilance of supervision in laying the foundation of ships of war, which, when they are completed, would cost the Government many millions of dollars. This fact, so apparent, should of itself be influential, if not absolutely decisive, in causing the Senate to withhold appropriations of money for the completion of these monitors until it can be intelligently ascertained how, if at all, it can be safely and profitably applied.

In this connection the committee beg leave to call attention to the fact that with the execution of the Puritan, of which mention will hereafter be made, not one of these monitors has ever been completed in accordance with any board of naval officers in respect of their efficiency when completed.

But there are yet other contracts to be considered. On March 3, 1877, contracts, so called, were made by the Navy Department for work to be done by Thomas F. Rowland on the hull, outfittings, exclusive of machinery, of these four ironclads, amounting in the aggregate to millions of dollars. Each of these contracts contained a provision that no portion of the money should be paid until appropriated by Congress. As there was no money appropriated by Congress subject to the order of the law to be applied to payments for work done under the contracts made subsequent to March 1, 1877, these contracts were suspended by the present Secretary of the Navy on March 16, 1877, and the order of suspension has not been revoked.

The honorable Secretary of the Navy, in his annual report of the 30th of November, 1877, says:

I deemed it best to suspend these contracts, inasmuch as I regarded them as not authorized by law, and to submit to Congress to decide whether they shall be recognized, and, if recognized, and these vessels are to be completed, in what manner it shall be done. Finding no present appropriation applicable to the purpose, I do not regard the Department as possessing any discretionary power in reference to them, except to see that the interest the Government has in them is properly protected.

PURITAN.

The wisdom of the present Secretary of the Navy in suspending the said contracts of the 3d of March, 1877, is sufficiently demonstrated in the reports of the three several boards of survey upon the Puritan, which may be classed thus:

The Board of Naval Officers, of which Rear-Admiral Mulany was President, consisting of two naval officers, three naval constructors, and three engineers, was convened at Chester on the 12th of June, 1877, by order of the Secretary of the Navy, dated the 7th of June, 1877. The date of their report is Aug. 21, 1877. They made the most searching examination and inquiry into all the requirements of the vessel that could be obtained, and after deducting 37 per cent. from the thickness of the armor plating originally intended, wholly at the expense of the military efficiency of the vessel, it was found the actual weight of the vessel when completed would leave the gunwale half an inch under water. It will thus be seen that the very careful and elaborate calculation on the actual vessel by a competent board shows the Puritan to be a total failure.

The second report substantially confirms that of the first board, condemning the vessel, and is mainly directed to showing how the weights might be reduced, but, as we have already stated, wholly at the expense of the military efficiency of the vessel.

The third examination was made by John Lenthal, Naval Constructor, and B. F. Isherwood, Chief Engineer United States Navy. These distinguished officers were instructed to report their professional opinions and judgments upon the following points:

Were such plans and specifications properly drawn, and at proper time, and so as, first, to secure an efficient and complete vessel of war of that class; and, second, so as to guard and protect the interest of the Government; and, third, will said vessel, built according to original plans and specifications, or subsequent changes made therein, be an efficient one?

This highly interesting and instructive report will be found in full in the records of the Navy Department; but in order to complete the chain of evidence we copy their conclusions:

There only remains for us to say, in answer to the questions specifically asked by the honorable chairman of the Naval Committee of the House of Representatives, that our professional opinions and judgments are:

First—Neither plans nor specifications were drawn for the construction of the Puritan, nor were any measures adopted to ascertain whether, when built, she would sink or swim. The failure or success of a first-class national ironclad was thus put to the hazards of mere chance.

Second—This vessel, as far as constructed, and if finished as contemplated, is a total failure, nor can any changes now practicable make her efficient—meaning by that term, equally with foreign ironclads of the same size and type.

Third—No measures were taken to protect the Government interest either in the cost of building the vessel or in securing efficiency for her when built. Unsolicited proposals were made by the contractor, in the absence of plans, specifications, and without any definition of the kind, quantity, or quality of work to be done, to build an ironclad vessel (not a finished round ship of war), and such proposals were accepted and work commenced without inquiry, competition, or advertisement, and without the knowledge of the Government. The general statement that the new Puritan was to be like a second-rate vessel was far from being a sufficient basis for such a contract, construction or to measure the quantity of work. Such a statement, in fact, only shows that the two classes of vessels were those of the same type, and the competent naval board have shown the entire uselessness of a contract founded on such dimensions and cost without the study and preparation of every part; nor would any officer of the Government, capable of its interest, have contracted in such a manner, except in the presence of a public competition.

The manner in which the new Puritan was built is a flagrant exhibition of gross ignorance and culpable carelessness.

The original Puritan, of which nothing is left save the miserable abortion which now bears her name, was designed in 1862 by John Ericsson, who was also the contractor for her construction, was a formidable iron monitor 341 feet in length, 50 feet in breadth, and 22 feet in depth. She had two turrets 24 feet in inside diameter, with a turret-shell 15 inches thick, entirely of iron, and a pilot house 12 inches thick, also of iron. The side armor was laminated, and composed of six iron plates each 1 inch thick, reënforced additionally with iron stringers 8½ inches thick, fully inserted in an oak backing 27 inches thick. This thickness of armor and backing was maintained from stem to stern. She carried four 16-inch guns.

This vessel was received, under an act of Congress, in an unfinished state, and by House of Representatives Executive Document No. 280, of the second session of the Fortieth Congress, it appears there depth one foot, and substituting the time of her reception, $1,974,622.93.

On Nov. 29, 1873, Mr. Thomas Rowland, the well-known builder of iron ships at Brooklyn, proposed to the Navy Department to complete the Puritan, hull, machinery, and all appurtenances, ready in every respect for service, increasing the depth one foot, and substituting iron beams and decks, for the sum of $353,000, receiving in addition the old material left after completion.

On Feb. 3, 1876, the old Puritan was towed to the works of John Roach, at Chester, Pa., by order of I. Hanscom, Chief of Bureau, dated Jan. 29, 1876, which directs that the Puritan be turned over to John Roach for the purpose of being *rebuilt* by him at his yard at Chester, Pa., "which please have done." This order was addressed to Capt. C. H. Wells, United States Navy, Commandant Navy Yard, League Island.

Strange as it may seem, in March following Mr. Hanscom, Chief of Bureau, he can find no order on the records authorizing it, began to *break up* the vessel, and his bill for that labor is dated Sept. 2, 1876, and amounts to $6,000, being for cutting up 1,000 tons of iron at $6 per ton, or 660 tons less than the weight put in the vessel in the hull and six armor plates.

Additional light is thrown upon this question by the following order of I. Hanscom, Chief of Bureau, dated Feb. 5, 1876, to Edward Hartt, Naval Constructor, and the report of Constructors Hartt, Fernald, and Hoover, to said Hanscom, dated Feb. 14, 1876, to which is added a summary by Lenthall and Isherwood:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR, Feb. 5, 1876.

SIR: A board consisting of yourself, as senior officer, and Naval Constructor Frank L. Fernald and Assistant Naval Constructor John B. Hoover, is hereby appointed to examine the hull of the iron-clad steamer Puritan and ascertain the merits of that vessel and recommend what, in the opinion of the board, should be done to insure her the necessary displacement to carry four fifteen-inch guns, or their equal in turrets, and have a protection in armor plating equal to fourteen inches of solid iron; Draught of water to be not over seventeen feet, with thirty-six-inch freeboard; and to have steam power sufficient to propel her twelve knots for at least twelve consecutive hours, and carry coal for six days' full steaming; forty-two hundred and six tons being the present displacement, the board will estimate the cost, in addition to the materials which may arise from the hull if broken up, to complete the vessel for sea. Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

I. HANSCOM, Chief of Bureau.

Naval Constructor EDWARD HARTT, U. S. N., Bingham House, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., Feb. 14, 1876.

SIR: In obedience to your order of the 5th instant, we have examined the hull of the ironclad Puritan, and submit the following report:

We find the iron portion of the hull nearly completed; side armor on; all of the main deck and a portion of berth deck laid; the armor on the sides is very badly decayed; boilers in, and, as far as we are enabled to judge, about two-thirds of the weight of the engines on board, and the main shaft and propeller; lower engines and part of the turret gear. Her draught of water in this condition is ten feet forward and eighteen feet ten inches aft, with a displacement to this draught of about 2,800 tons.

We estimate the weight yet to go on board to complete her for sea, according to present plan, at about 1,000 tons, including the armor, making a total displacement of 4,800 tons, which will require a mean draught of 20 feet 8 inches, or thereabouts, leaving a freeboard of only 18 inches, with a surplus displacement of about 600 tons. A thorough examination of her shows the thickness of side armor to 14 inches, and to add another turret with two 15-inch guns, with ammunition for the same, and to provide room for the necessary number of men to work the extra guns, and also storage for additional provisions, stores, &c., corresponding thereto, without making very extensive changes in the original design and construction of the present hull at a very large expense.

The extreme length of the Puritan 332 feet, together with her heavy draught of water, small armament, and limited defensive power, precludes the possibility of her being a seagoing vessel, which we understand to be the necessary qualification of a first-class ironclad. We do not think she would draw less water, more speed, or be handier in her movements.

We are therefore constrained to believe that it is inexpedient to expend any more money upon this vessel, but that it is for the best interest of the Government to rebuild her, and to use such portion of the old material as may be deemed suitable.

It is our opinion that the dimensions of a vessel, to meet the requirements contained in your letter, should be about as follows: Length, 60 feet; depth, 23 feet from top of main deck planing (at sides) to base line, and to have a displacement of at least 6,000 tons to a draught of 18 feet, and to be similar in design to the Terror and class, now rebuilding, but of increased structural strength, in order to carry heavier armor.

We estimate the cost of such a vessel, exclusive of the material left in the present hull, at $1,100,000, and also exclusive of the armament and stores of all kinds, but otherwise ready for sea, at $1,305,000.

We are, very respectfully, your obedient servants,

EDWARD HARTT, Naval Constructor.
F. L. FERNALD, Naval Constructor.
JOHN B. HOOVER, Assistant Naval Constructor.
Naval Constructor ISAIAH HANSCOM, Chief of Bureau Construction and Repair, Washington, D. C.

SUMMARY OF MESSRS. LENTHALL & ISHERWOOD.

From the foregoing order of Mr. Hanscom, dated the 5th of February, 1876, to a board of naval constructors, it appears that not until about fourteen months after the accident to the Puritan did it occur to the Department to ascertain whether the old unfinished Puritan could be completed with solid side armor fourteen inches thick, and adequate machinery sufficient to propel her at twelve knots per hour for at least twelve consecutive hours, carrying coal for six days' full steaming, and mounting four 15-inch guns in her turrets. The inquiry, if it can be elevated, regarded as the chief defect in the vessel a thickness of fourteen inches of the side armor, while the much larger vessel he was then building by her side to supersede her was to have only twelve inches in the thickness of side armor.

In the foregoing report of the Board of Naval Constructors dated Feb. 14, 1876, made in response to Mr. Hanscom's order of Feb. 5, 1876, it is stated that the old Puritan, completed as originally intended, would have a freeboard of 18 inches, but could not carry the additional weights proposed by Mr. Hanscom; the board therefore concluded, in view of the foregoing, to recommend the building of a new vessel that would meet the requirements in the above order of Mr. Hanscom. By a singular coincidence this Board recommended for the new vessel then before them the identical length, breadth, depth, and displacement to a specified draught of water of the new Puritan, for which Mr. Hanscom had made a contract about fourteen months previous, and whose construction had so far progressed that large bills had been presented and paid for labor alone.

The length, 280 feet, which the Board suggests for the new Puritan, is twenty feet more than that proposed by Mr. Roach, in his original offer of Dec. 3, 1874, and is precisely the length of the new vessel then actually in process of construction. And, more singular still, this Board recommends a depth of vessel exactly the same as that to which the new Puritan had been increased, long after her building had commenced and previous to this time, just as though the suggestions had been furnished to the Board for this occasion. Such coincidences cannot be accidental, and must have been designed to meet special purposes, which seem to be the enforcement of the new vessel, with its covert alterations, and the condemnation of the old one.

Notwithstanding the direction of Mr. Hanscom in his letter of instructions dated Feb. 5, 1876, the Board, in their reply, say: "It is unreasonable to suppose that if the force say alterations are made, in order to enable her to carry the additional weights, she would draw less water, have more speed, or be handier in her movements." To this the Board might have added, they were absurd.

The above stinging criticism on the methods employed, without color of law, to condemn the old and contract for the new Puritan, is taken bodily from the most excellent report of Messrs. Lenthall & Isherwood.

Name of vessel.	Original cost.	Cost of alterations.	Amount of proceeds.	Disposition of proceeds.	To whom.	Materials disposed of.	Amount and price.
Terror	$1,156,323 86	$84,655 99	$26,792 00	Used in building new Amphitrite.	Harlan & Hollingsworth Co.	1,644,720 lbs. iron, at 1½c	$26,792 00
Miantonomoh	1,310,773 05	24,067 61	24,038 80	Used in building Puritan and Monadnock.	John Roach	1,375,340 lbs. iron, at 1½c	24,038 80
Puritan	1,974,622 93	6,000 00	22,951 20	do	do	1,308,040 lbs. iron, at 1½c	22,951 20
Amphitrite	1,016,071 19	13,504 72	21,204 20	do	do	1,242,480 lbs. iron, at 1½c	21,204 20
			16,946 40	do	do	1,034,400 lbs. iron, at 1½c	16,946 40
			4,000 00	do	do	244,000 lbs. iron, at 1½c	4,000 00
			2,500 00	do	do	152,500 lbs. iron, at 1½c	2,500 00
			24,345 25	Used in building new Terror.	Harlan & Hollingsworth Co.	1,486,120 lbs. iron, at 1½c	24,345 25
			8,000 00	do	do	488,000 lbs. iron, at 1½c	8,000 00
			22,773 20	do	do	1,389,440 lbs. iron, at 1½c	22,773 20

PAYMENT D—STATEMENT OF DEPRECIATION OF STATE AND DEPRECIATION OF PROCEEDS, &c., SINCE JULY 1, 1871.

The amount of proceeds does not include the materials retained by the Government, and used in navy yards and rebuilding ships.

The appraised value of nine of these ships is on file. There is no record of any of them being condemned.

The work ordered by the department, and contracted for, to be performed by John Roach, as per letter of I. Hanscom, Chief of Bureau, dated April 7, 1873, marked explicit, addressed to John Roach, Esq., Chester, Pa., and the answer to this letter by John Roach, dated April 10, 1875, is treated as *repairs* to the double-turreted monitor Puritan, meaning, of course, the old Puritan. Except to continue longer the deception, and in deference to the wishes of the Government, and always bringing murder out, we can scarcely conceive the propriety of such a course. Acting, however, according to the letter of record testimony, we call it repairs, although the new Puritan was commenced at the old keel, and contains only such portions of the old vessel as have been generously bestowed on the Government, and proceed upon the light given to compute the cost of the present Puritan to the Government, if completed, under all of Mr. Roach's agreements.

Original cost of Puritan, under repairs, $1,974,622.01; repairs settled for to date, with John Roach, $491,030; cost of completion under Roach contracts of March 3, 1877, $1,621,342; making a total cost of $4,086,994.01 for a vessel which three competent boards of naval officers tell us, if completed in accordance with original plans and specifications, will not float.

The committee recommend that no money be appropriated by Congress for the completion of these monitors under contracts now made or to be made, until the efficiency of said vessels, when completed, shall have been ascertained by a competent board of naval officers appointed by the Secretary of the Navy for that purpose, and the report thereon submitted to Congress.

To carry into effect this recommendation the committee ask the concurrence of the Senate in the following House resolution:

Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Navy to organize a board to inquire into the present condition of the double-turreted monitors, and the propriety and cost of completing said vessels:

Resolved, &c., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby directed to organize a board to consist of not less than five nor more than seven officers of the United States navy, selected at his discretion from the active and retired list, which board shall be organized immediately after the passage of this resolution, and shall be charged with the duty of thoroughly examining in person the double-turreted monitors, with a view of determining, first, whether it is to the interest of the Government to complete said vessels, to wit: the Puritan, the Monadnock, the Amphitrite, and the Terror; second, if so, whether it is to the interest of the Government to complete them according to the existing plans, models, and agreements, third, if any change is demanded in order to make said vessels more efficient as war vessels, to inquire into the extent and character as well as cost of such modifications, and also inquire into any other fact material to each of these questions; and of all which they will make report to the Secretary of the Navy, who shall at once transmit the same with his opinions thereon to Congress.

The resolution was amended on motion of Mr. McPherson by striking out the proviso that "none of the board shall be of lower rank than captain," there being not enough naval constructors of that rank to compose the board.

The joint resolution was then read a third time and passed.

SEEKING PARTY HARMONY.

The Democratic Union Club Promises to Support the Cincinnati Nominee.

The Democratic Union Club held a meeting in their rooms last night, at which a number of new members were elected, among them Mr. Hugh J. Jewett, President of the New York, Lake Erie and Western Railroad, and Mr. John F. Carroll. Ex-Judge J. C. Spencer presided.

Mr. E. E. Anderson, Chairman of the Executive Committee, presented for adoption a series of resolutions. The two last resolutions are as follows:

That the candidate for the highest executive office in the gift of the people should be a man whose convictions and service attest his faith in and devotion to Democratic principles. He must be a man of sufficient nerve and courage to fitly represent and defend the liberties of individuals and the rights of the States against the dangers of an ever-increasing centralization of power. And he must be one whose exalted patriotism and faith in the eternal and integral preservation of the union of these States is as conspicuous as his ability, endowed with all the powers conferred by the Constitution and all its amendments, shall be unquestioned. But above all things, his character must be absolutely spotless and free from the suspicion of blemish. An imputation of wrongdoing, whether well-founded or not, is believed in inperils success. Let the Convention nominate such a man, and the Democratic party will see to it that he shall be elected and shall be inaugurated.

That it is the object and purpose of this Democratic Union to arrest the progress of the nation toward centralization in violation of the fundamental law, and restore sound constitutional government by an honest and capable Democratic administration, and to this end to secure the nomination of such candidates by the national Convention for President and Vice-President as are herein suggested.

And when that Convention shall have nominated candidates it will be the duty of every Democrat to aid and advance their election and inauguration by all the means within its power.

Mr. Averill suggested that the prescription of the resolutions in regard to a candidate is one which no candidate in either party would be able to fill.

Mr. Anderson replied that he knew of one man who would do so—a Democrat—one whom he had in mind when these resolutions were framed, but there was no use in nominating candidates now. If it was the time to say it, he would say that the alphabet of all the virtues would spell the name of Samuel Jones Tilden.

Ex-Judge Spencer spoke in favor of the resolutions. A protracted discussion ensued upon that portion of the resolutions pledging this organization to support any candidate nominated by the Cincinnati Convention.

Orlando B. Stewart protested that he could see no necessity for such a pledge in advance. If he were to subscribe to such a pledge he would feel himself bound by it, even if he knew that the person nominated was one who would properly and certainly be sunk under one hundred thousand majority against him. He thought it would be enough to resolve in favor of harmony in the State of New York.

Mr. W. Van Wyck wanted the word "such" introduced between "have nominated" and "candidates" in the last resolution.

Mr. E. E. Anderson hoped that would not be pressed, as that word "such" had already been fought over for ten days; whereupon the amendment was promptly withdrawn.

The resolutions were adopted.

Mr. R. A. Van Wyck offered the following:

Resolved, That a committee of fifteen be appointed to confer with the Democratic organizations of the city for the purpose of securing, if possible, a united Democratic delegation from each Assembly district in this city to the coming Democratic State Convention to be held for the purpose of selecting delegates to the Democratic National Convention to be held at Cincinnati on June 22, 1880.

Mr. Wm. J. King wished to know whether it was intended that this club should endeavor to have delegates of its own.

Mr. E. E. Anderson replied in the negative. He said that they wished to obtain the holding of joint primaries of the Democracy and procure harmony. He hadn't much hope of it, but still that was what was wanted.

The resolution was adopted, and the acting Chairman was authorized to appoint the committee.

Mr. Aug. T. Docharty offered the following:

Resolved, That the Executive Committee be authorized to organize branches of this union in any and all the Assembly districts of the city of New York.

Mr. Averill suggested that the resolution should read "in all if any," instead of "in any and all."

The resolution was adopted.

The acting Chairman named as the committee of fifteen the following gentlemen: E. Ellery Anderson, Orlando B. Potter, John F. Devolin, Luke F. Cozans, John Hardy, R. A. Van Wyck, A. J. Vanderpoel, Erastus Brooks, Bryan Reilly, Geo. W. Wingate, Aug. T. Docharty, Geo. W. McLean, John Hayes, Geo. F. Langbein, Horatio F. Averill.

Mr. Kane moved that five names unconnected with either party be added to the committee, which was carried.

"Does Orlando B. Potter belong to any existing Democratic organization?" asked the Chairman.

"Why, he's Chairman of Tammany's Executive Committee!" exclaimed a member.

"Indeed!" ejaculated the Chairman, with great astonishment.

Then, by nomination of members, the following five gentlemen were added to the Committee: Edward J. McGean, Nelson Smith, John E. Bozeley, John Pyne, and Thomas J. Barr.

Standing committees were appointed, and a public meeting ordered to be called.

A meeting of the Committee of Twenty-one was ordered for next Thursday afternoon.

GLAD TIDINGS FOR THE LIQUOR TRADE.

How $30,000 in Cash Came to a Wholesale Merchant in Place of Six Barrels of "Blue Grass."

A report of some good luck having befallen Mr. George K. Davis, a wholesale liquor merchant, having been made matter of public gossip, he was found listlessly looking out of a window of his office on the first floor at 163 Chambers street, in this city. Upon closer scrutiny the reporter found that Mr. Davis's eyes were fixed upon the ever-changing panorama of trucks and wagons in the street below. The sudden purpose of his gaze aroused the curiosity of Mr. Davis's visitor, who ventured to inquire if it was that cart laden with six barrels of "Blue Grass," which was wrecked a block away, that Mr. Davis expected.

"Oh, dear, no," he replied, with a sarcastic twinkle in his left eye (the right one being still riveted on the sidewalk). "It's an express wagon that I am looking for. My story is short, and I don't mind telling it; for since I held the whole ticket which has already drawn the $30,000 capital in the March drawing of the Louisiana State Lottery Company, I find that all my friends, business acquaintances, and many public men have been regularly investing in the same way for many months. They have assured me that the most searching investigation only convinced them of the fairness with which the Louisiana State Lottery Company conducts all its business. I have frequently bought tickets, but in this last drawing I had only purchased two whole ones, paying $2 apiece for them, at the office of M. A. Dauphin. One of them, numbered 72,370, has drawn the capital prize of $30,000. I at once expressed that ticket for collection to New Orleans, and becoming a little anxious at not receiving the money as quickly as I anticipated, I went down to Adams Express Company to be reassured of the safety of my ticket. The manager of Adams told me that I need have no apprehension, as the Express Company would rather have a collection at the Louisiana State Lottery Company than on any bank, on account of the promptness with which the former paid all its claims. To allay my misgivings, however, the manager telegraphed to the New Orleans agency and showed me the reply three hours later, stating that the $30,000 had been paid by the lottery company in full, without deduction, on Monday March 15. The delay in the arrival of the money, the manager added, was due to the recent storms and floods in the South, and I might reasonably expect the cash any hour, hence that I am naturally looking after all Adams Express wagons which pass this way." Very soon afterward an Adams Express wagon rolled up to the door, and a few seconds later Mr. Davis was notified that a $30,000 package of greenbacks awaited his commands. The reporter, taking the hint, immediately withdrew to permit the happy owner to enjoy the enviable solitude of his single little fortune.—*New York World, March 28.*—*Adv.*

For Colds and Pulmonary Complaints, Use Ottlie's "Tasteless" Cod Liver Oil, with Lime and Wild Cherry. All druggists. Depot, 6 Bowery.—*Adv.*

AMUSEMENTS.

"Hearts of Oak" at the Fifth Avenue Theatre.

Mr. James A. Herne's "Hearts of Oak" is a remarkable play. It was produced last evening at the Fifth Avenue Theatre, and it afforded a great deal of amusement to a large audience. It is highly spectacular in its setting, wonderfully realistic in its accessories, slightly emaciated as to its plot, and painfully slender as to its literary quality. In the matter of spectacle it is startling, and the scene at Marblehead, with the incidental storm, is much the best managed stage sensation that has been in New York in some time. The sky effects are admirably managed, the lightning and the real rain a superb deception, and the swash of the breakers on the shore a masterpiece of the stage carpenter's art. It is true that the same realistic swash prevented much of the first act from being heard and that the breakers were difficult of deglutition until the storm was at its height; but neither of those considerations, nor even the somewhat erratic and leisurely flight of the lifesaving rocket from the mortar, impaired the enthusiasm of the audience in the least. The curtain had to be raised half a dozen times before they had had enough of it.

Another device of mechanical genius secured the audience immunity from a large proportion of the dialogue in the second act. It was a mill wheel, with real water and real machinery and real sacks of real flour; and the noise of the apparatus was counterfeited with such earnestness and sincerity that that of the actors was drowned.

The third act, however, was the triumph of the evening, for it introduced the youngest artist that our stage has known—an artist who won, almost at once, the sympathy of the entire house. It was a real baby. At first it was thought to be a new sort of property baby, but it shortly afforded the audience some characteristic proofs of its genuineness, and won a