Bharp Letter from ex-Secretary Welles to Secretary Robeson The Promotion of Naval Officers - Secretary Robeson's Report Attacked as Containing Misstatement

Harrond, Jan. 10, 1870.—Hon. George M. Robeson, Secretary of the Navy—Sir:—In your annual report as Secretary of the Navy, on the 1st of December, 1869, is the following paragraph: -

In the year 1865 a board, composed of admirals who had commanded squadrons during the war, with Admiral Farragut as President, was convened by the Secretary of the Navy, to re-port the names of such officers as they deemed worthy of advancement under the act of April 21, 1864. The board, after careful consideration, made a report strictly according to the letter of their instructions, and their selections would, it is believed, have been satisfactory to the navy at large. The recommendations of the board were, however, not acquiesced in, and the ad vancement was made quite independently of their action. The result is that many officers consider themselves unjustly treated, and a feeling of discontent exists most undesirable in the service. Some of the cases affected by this action have already been acted on by the administration. But it is felt that the real merit of each case can only be properly judged of by those who were personally cognizant of all its circumstances, and that too many considerations would be lost sight of in the lapse of time to permit of direct action by the department without

the risk of further mistakes. It is suggested that the department be authorized to appoint a board of officers removed by high rank from all personal interest on this question, to examine the cases complained of, and to report their conclusions for such action by the Executive and Congress as to them may seem proper.

This paragraph is such a perversion of the facts and circumstances relating to the advancement of the officers at the close of the war, and betrays such an absence of correct information on the subject, that I was surprised it should have found a place in an official document of the character of an annual report of the Secretary of the Navy. I was unwilling to believe that you had intentionally and intelligently misrepresented the facts, and I knew that no one of the Board of Admirals could communicate the proceedings of the board which I had convened to assist me with their opinions, except by a breach of trust. I therefore came to the conclusion that you had not personally given the subject that attention which it deserved, and that you had been imposed upon by some one un-

worthy of confidence. I did not regret to learn soon after that the House of Representatives called on you by resolution for the report to which you had invited their attention, and I was interested to see the response you would make to that call. While waiting for this response I received from Mr. Offley, Chief Clerk of the Navy Department, a brief note stating that a thorough search had been made for the report in question, but it was not to be found on the files of the department, and asking me if I had it or a copy in my possession. I replied at once that I was in possession of neither the original nor a copy, but that I had a tabular statement of the recommendations, and informed him the board had been convened informally and confidentially to assist, not to control me, that their recommendations were not obligatory, had no legal validity, were without responsibility, and, being merely confidential expressions of opinion, it was a question whether they should go on the files of the department. I expressed my surprise that you should have assumed to state in your official report the contents of a document or documents which you had never seen, and represent what was satisfactory in the proceedings of the board and what action of mine gave discontent, when you had no knowledge on the subject, had never read the proceedings of the Board of Admirals, and were ignorant of the principles on which I acted. I requested him to submit my letter to you. Mr. Offley acknowledged the receipt of my letter on the 22d of December; said he had submitted it to you, and that it was in your possession. Washington correspondent of the New York Herald, on the 23d of December, the day

Several days ago the House passed a resolu-tion calling upon the Secretary of the Navy for the record of the proceedings of the Board of Admirals appointed two or three years ago by the Secretary of the Navy to examine and designate officers of the navy for promotion. It seems there was some irregularity about the manner in which this board made its recommendations, and there is a great deal of complaint that officers were promoted without regard to their war record and other qualifications. The Naval Committee of the House propose to overhaul the matter. Search was made at the Navy Department for the record of the board's proceedings, but it could not be found. Finally it was ascertained that it had been carried off by the late Secretary Welles when he ried off by the late Secretary Welles when he made his exit from the department. Secretary Robeson directed Mr. Offley, the Chief Clerk, to address a note to Mr. Welles, setting forth that the document had been called for by resolution of Congress, and asking him to return it. In reply to this Mr. Offley to-day received a letter from Mr. Welles, wherein he abuses the present Secretary of the Navy in round terms for interfering with what he calls his (Welles) private affairs. That record says Welles was private affairs. That record, says Welles, was private. It was never intended to be made public, and he refuses to surrender it. The officials of the Navy Department say that it was as much a part of the files and records of the department as an order is, and that Mr. Welles had no right to remove it. It is supposed that he had some personal matter in view when he carried it off.

that paper the following statement:-

Now it is not true that I carried off the report; it is not true that I abused you for interfering in my private affairs; it is not true that I have refused to surrender the proceedings. These gross, palpable, intentional mis-statements in the letter of the Herald correspondent are very much in character with the paragraph in your paper which I have quoted. The correspondent of the *Herald* received his information from some source; and as my letter, which is referred to and so much falsi fied, was in your possession, I am left in little doubt as to that source.

As you have never seen the proceedings of the Board of Admirals and know not what their recommendations were, by what authority and on what data do you say "their selections would, it is believed, have been satisfactory to the navy at large?" By what authority do you say "the advancement was made quite independently of their action?" When I inform you that nearly one-half the officers would have been supersoded or have lost rank by the action of the Board of Admirals had not other action been taken, and that to enable me to carry into effect such of their recommendations as I approved without reducing others to a lower position on the register, I procured further legislation in 1866, you will perceive that neither of your statements

is correct. From the nature of the case, when a portion of the officers were to be superseded, and a large portion were to lose rank, it was impossible to have made selections which would be "satisfactory to the navy at large"—im-possible to avoid some discontent. On the other point, that of making advancements independently of the action of the board, I may say, as the proceedings will show, that

to their opinions, and in some cases deferred, perhaps too far, to their suggestions. In a large portion of the cases our views coincided, but there were instances where favoritism, prejudice, or mistaken judgment was apparent. There were other instances where I was in possession of information unknown to the admirals, and where I could put a more correct estimate than the board on services rendered. They were, perhaps excusably, partial to those who had served under them; and perhaps some of them were prejudiced against and failed to rightly appreciate those of other commands.

There were officers, also, who had acquitted themselves with credit, on other than squadron duty, whom I could not neglect. Nor could I with my ideas of duty, although you seem to suppose it proper, delegate to others authority which legally devolved on me and for which I was responsible. Few more un-pleasant duties devolved upon me during my administration of the department than the delicate and difficult one of selecting and promoting officers, however meritorious, over others who also had merit. I have been brought in intimate relations with naval officers of every grade in a trying and critical period of our history, had studied and learned the character of each, and felt a personal as well as official obligation to those who stood firmly by the flag and the Union when many of their associates deserted and others faltered. Some were necessarily to be superseded; but I could not willingly see any of these true and gallant men, after years of faithful war service, suffer loss of rank which they would consider degradation. But the proceedings and report of the Board of Admirals, which you represent as "satisfactory to the navy at large," took from nearly one-half the officers their rank and placed them lower upon the register. For this the board was not blamable. It was an inevitable result from an attempt to execute the acts of April, 1864, and January, 1865, authorizing promotions and advancements. While the award of merit to a portion of the officers was not undeserved, the implied censure or reflection upon the others was cruel, and would have been felt by them to be unjust. Knowing the worth, fidelity, and patriotism of most of the latter, although their career may not have been as brilliant nor their opportunities as favorable as those of some of their more fortunate brethren, I was not willing to be an instrument to mortify or degrade them by carrying into effect the recommendations of the Board of Admirals without an effort in their behalf. The whole subject was beset with difficulty and embarrassment, and such were my feelings towards the officers who would be humbled and wronged, my regard for the whole service, and my convictions of what was right, that I delayed action until the following year. The Board of Admirals was first convened early in 1865-there was a second session some months later-but the promotions and advancements were not made until after the passage of the act of July, 1866, nearly one and a half years later. In the meantime the Naval Committee and Congress, after being made acquainted with the circumstances, concurred with me as to the impolicy and injustice of reducing the rank of faithful officers. After much and mature deliberation the result was the "Act to define the number and regulate the appointment of officers in the navy and for other purposes," approved July 25, 1866. This act, passed morethan two years after the law of April, 1864, the only law on this subject with which you appear to be conversant, enlarged the number of each grade, relieved the department of its most serious embarrassments, and avoided the degradation of a large number of worthy officers from the rank which they had attained and of which they ought not, without fault, to be deprived. You make no allusion to this act of 1866, and seem not to be aware that its enlarged provisions, with the recommendations of the Board of Admirals, were the basis of my action and enabled the Government to do justice to the whole service. after you had possession of my letter, sent to

As soon as the law of 1866 was enacted l invited Admiral Farragut to Washington, and with him I took up and revised the whole register, having the proceedings of the Board of Admirals and the record of every officer before us. No other officer was summoned on this occasion, for I desired to avoid all favoritism and combinations such as have sometimes afflicted the navy. More than twenty years previously, when chief of a naval bureau, I had witnessed the pernicious effects of cliques and personal favoritisms in the service, and there were indications of a disposition in some quarters to revive the

Admiral Farragut was at the head of the service, and had never been connected with any of the cliques and combinations which had afflicted it, and which I had labored with some success to eradicate. I knew his impartiality, his devotion to the true interests of the country and the whole navy, that he was free from favoritism or prejudice, and that he was a safe and reliable counsellor who wanted a United States navy and not a personal navy. With him I went through the entire register, canvassed each individual case, and it was the wish and intention of both of us to do equal and exact justice to all; not that I expected to give satisfaction to every man, for that was an impossibility.

As the responsibility of the promotions was with me, and as in some instances I knew of services rendered with which he was not acquainted, I acted on my own convictions, in conformity with his expressed wish and our mutual understanding before the register was taken up. Whatever errors, therefore, were committed, I am responsible for, and not Admiral Farragut. I mention the fact of consulting that distinguished officer in the final revision of the promotions because your report makes no mention of it and conveys a false impression of the whole subject. I regretted that the time allotted us to accomolish this work after the passage of the act of 1866 was so brief; but it was near the close of the session, and only three days were given us to make the review. The promotions and advancements thus made continued undisturbed while I was in the department, except in one instance, when the battle record of of the officers did not reach the department until after the nominations were made and

confirmed. You state that "some of the cases affected by this action have already been acted on by the administration," and urge this as a reason why you should "be authorized to appoint a board of officers" in order that "each case may be properly judged." The imputation that the cases have not been "properly judged" is made without any knowledge of the facts, for when called upon for the pro-ceedings of the Board of Admirals it is admitted you have not seen them, and you make no mention of the consultation with Admiral

Farragut at the close. As to appointing a board of officers to re-examine a subject that was disposed of nearly four years ago, you have the autho-rity to convene such a board without Congressional action, and the board can report

while, as was my duty, I acted on my own orally or in writing, but after all, the matter convictions, I gave weight and consideration is purely executive, not legislative. No Congressional action was taken, nor was any board of officers convened in the "cases already acted on by the administration."
Such a board at this day would create discontent, and afford an epportunity for a master spirit to exercise partiality and form a clique devoted to his personal interests, if so inclined.

I am aware of but two cases which have been "acted on by this administration." That you may have the full benefit of the action in these cases, I shall give you the facts of

each, as they have been made exceptional. Captain T. H. Slevens had a fair war record, although his efficiency may have been sometimes impaired by his habits, a fact which had its influence with the Board of Admirals and with the department also when the promotions were under consideration. He was registered No. 24 on the grade of com-manders when the Board of Admirals was convened, and they recommended not only that he should not be advanced, but that he should be put back one number on the list, and be registered No. 25. But I, instead of reducing him in rank below 24, was enabled by the act of 1866 to advance him to 10. He was one who considered himself "unjustly treated," and he applied to Congress for redress. His case was referred to the Naval Committee, who examined the subject and reported against him. Congress concurred in that report. Last spring the President, notwithstanding the proceedings of the Board of Admirals, the action of the Navy Department, the adverse report of the Naval Committee and of Congress, promoted him to a higher position on the list of captains.

The other and the only other officer who has been taken from the position assigned him and in like manner promoted is Captain Thomas H. Patterson, a brother-in-law of Vice-Admiral Porter.

Captain Patterson was No. 25 on the register as commander. He had no battle record, and the Board of Admirals recommended that he should be reduced to rank No. 28. I advanced him to No. 11. These two officers were last spring taken from their position on the register and promoted simultaneously over eighteen captains, most of them exemplary, efficient, and gallant officers, with an honorable record for heroic service. I am aware of no reason why exceptions should have been made in favor of these two officers. They constitute, I believe, the whole of what you call "some of the cases" which "have

been already acted on by the administration.' This letter has been drawn from me in consequence of an application from the department for information, and of the use which has been made of my reply. I had not proposed, nor do I now propose, to comment on the numerous errors which pervade your report, obviously intended, in many instances, to reflect on the previous adminis-tration of the department. Some of your statements are, however, as open to criticism and quite as exceptionable as the paragraph in relation to the advancement of officers. Without any general review, duty to myself requires, perhaps, that I should, when writing you, advert to one or two points. Among the subjects which you make prominent is the amount of work which has been accomplished in repairing vessels, changing their character and giving them ship rig, and the great economy resulting therefrom, as compared with what you call the "old system." You fail to state, however, the amount of money which has been and is being expended to effect these changes. We both know it exceeds by millions the appropriations made by Congress for repairs; and on this question of expending money when Congress has refused to make appropriations we have differed. Congress was informed by me of the condition of our yards and vessels. and that repairs were needed; but refused to appropriate the funds for these repairs. I would not, after this refusal, invade the Treasury, in defiance of the legislative branch of the Government, and take unappropriated funds. The repairs and refitments of vessels were consequently limited to the few ships required to maintain the squadrons in force. Congress was advised of this fact, and I, in my annual report, in December, 1868, stated:-

To preserve and protect the vessels and other property at our navy yards is a duty prompted by economy and dictated by a proper regard for the public interest. Work should not be wholly suspended on the ships which have been commenced and are yet unfinished, but they should be completed and gradually launched and brought into service as they may be wanted. If properly protected they can remain on the stocks for years without injury after the hulls are finished. Each vessel, when she returns from a cruise, should be at once repaired and placed in an efficient condition. Hulls and engines, after long service in different climates, become worn and injured, and, if neglected, will rapidly decay. It cannot be true economy to withhold appropriations essential for full and thorough repairs, for completing improvements which have been commenced, and for protecting and affording facilities necessary to the good order, proper condition and efficiency of the navy yards and navy establishments. In some respects the public interest has been made to suffer for c interest has been made to suffer from neglect or refusal to make sufficient appropria tions for the purposes herein indicated, and it is earnestly recommended that such omission be hereafter avoided.

I had, three years ago, seen the disposition to curtail naval estimates and appropriations without discrimination, and, to prevent injury to the public service in consequence of withholding the means necessary for needful repairs, I, on the 14th February, 1868, addressed a special communication to the Naval Committee, urging, while reduction might be made in some appropriations, that "appropriations may be made for repairs, in accordance with the estimates furnished," and closed my statement with the following remarks:-

I have deemed it my duty to call your attention, as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, to the impolicy of impairing and crippling the public service, as proposed in the bill reported by the appropriation committee. The department has no personal ends to serve in seeking to have suitable appropriations made. Only the best good of the country and the keep-Only the best good of the country and the keeping of that arm of the military service with whose administration I am charged in condition to maintain everywhere and upon all occasions the honor of our flag and the interests of our country have been considered. If Congress withholds the means and the power and efficiency of the American navy are thereby im-paired, I shall at least have the satisfaction of reflecting that it is through no neglect of mine; and if upon a change of administration it shall be said, as was remarked soon after the last ministerial change in Great Britain, that "the present Government upon taking office were alarmed when they saw the appearance of de-crepitude which our national defenses bore; everything had been apparently pared down to the exact border line dividing efficiency from inefficiency," I shall feel that no part of the censure attaches to me and those associated with me in the administration of this depart-

My representations that year were not regarded, and, as a consequence, repairs and improvements were to a considerable extent suspended. A year after, and only a few weeks before leaving the department, I, in view of the injury to the vessels and property in the yards, by reason of the inability to make

needful repairs from want of funds, again called the attention of the Naval Committee and Congress to the facts. It was my wish that those who superseded me should be relieved of the difficulties and embarrassments which I had experienced for three years, and I closed a very full and explicit communication, of the 29th of January, one year ago, as

In order to ascertain how this immense and promised saving in feul is to be effected, it will be necessary to knew how much coal is consumed per annum, and at what cost. I have no account of the amount of coal annually consumed in any one year, although I know about the quantity required for the pavy, and can state the exact estimates for which appropriations have been asked since the return of peace.

In my report, December, 1867, the esti-mates for the then ensuing year were for 32,000 tons. The following year, December, 1868, the estimates were for the next ensuing year 30,000 tons. A consumption of about 30,000 tons, or an average of 500 tons per steamer-the estimate of the equipment bureau-met the wants of the service under the "old system," as you term it. A contract was made in May, 1868—the last of which I have memoranda—for 10,000 tons in Philadelphia at \$3.33 per ton. But this was probably at a less rate than the average purchases, which are about four dollars; but even at five dollars, which is sometimes paid, the cost for 30,000 tons-a year's consumption-would be \$150,000. This is the sum total required for coal for steamers annually in time of peace; and from this amount, in consequence of having "given full sail power and having re-rigged" the steamers at great expense, you pledge yourself and declare "it can be shown by figures" that you will make "a saving of more than \$2,000,000 per annum" in the "single item of coal alone, as consumed under the old system.

Sir, let me tell you that the interest of the money which has been expended by the Navy Department in excess of the appropriations since the 4th of March, much of it in changing the character of our naval vessels, with out the knowledge or consent of Congress and I apprehend without consulting the naval constructors-the interest of the money on the excess of the expenditures over the appropriations since the 4th of March would vastly more than pay for the coal annually consumed by all the steamers in all our squad rons. The whole estimate for coal, transportation, storage, labor, etc., by the equipment bureau was \$480,000.

I have not yet had the pleasure of seeing the estimates of the Navy Department in detail for the ensuing year, submitted to the present Congress. When they are published shall be able to ascertain what reduction you have made or propose to make in the quantity of coal consumed, after the large expenditure in changing the character of the vessels, giving them "full sail power" and 'ship rig." Just so much as your estimate is less than 30,000 tons will be the saving effected. If you have estimated for that quantity or a larger quantity, it will be conclusive that you have no confidence in your own statement or in your questionable improvements. I am satisfied in this case, as well as in that of the advancement of officers and other particulars, you have failed to make personal investigation, as is expected of one in so responsible a position, and that you have, in fact, no reliable data for many of your statements. I do not charge you with designedly practising an imposition on Congress and the country, but you have permit-ted yourself to be imposed upon by a prompter who is careless of facts and makes

reckless assertions. There is an obscurity in your financial exhibit to which, while writing, I call your attention, although there may have been de sign in making it obscure. The statement of expenses and estimates is not an exhibit of the fiscal year, as is usual, but is a blending of fractions of two years and two administrations, and furnishes no definite or satisfactory information of the transactions of the department. You omit to state what were the expenditures for the fiscal year which terminates on the 30th of June Von omit to state the unexpended balances in the Treasury on the 1st of July, or what were the available resources for the current year at that date.

The appropriations for the last fiscal year were \$17,356,350 18, but the expenditure exceeded that amount several millions of dollars. How much that excess is you do not state, and it cannot be known without the usual exhibit, which is studiously suppressed. An attempt is made to divert attention by a statement that \$27,880,658 was expended up to the 1st of December, but the Treasury year neither commences nor closes in Decem per. The appropriations by Congress extend from the 1st of July to the 30th of June of the following year, when the Treasury balances are struck. Why have we not the usual exhibit for the fiscal year? The country is entitled to it. The failure to present it and the substitute in its stead of parts of two fiscal years and of two administrations is not a satisfactory exhibit.

The statement that "\$7,799,373 has been refunded to the Treasury" does not make the exhibit less obscure Has such an amount been overdrawn? If so, for what purpose? And from what fund or appropriation was this sum—equal to about one-half of the entire naval appropriations for the current year—refunded? If it is made up of transfers or payments from one bureau to another, as presented in what is called an "exhibit of expenditures," on the thirty-seventh page, it amounts to nothing; for what you call "re-funding" is an absolute expenditure.

If those who succeed me are embarrassed for the want of vessels or means it shall be through no fault of mine; for it has been my endeavor that the wants of the service and the true interests of the country should be faithfully presented to Congress.

In my annual report, as well as in special communications of the Naval Department and in this letter, my object has been and is the welfare of the service. It is a satisfaction to know that the department is not responsible for the perishing and non-efficient condition of our naval vessels which remain at the wharves unfitted and unrepaired for service.

These records are on the records of the department, and if you have not read them l respectfully commend them to your perusal. Congress, though fully informed of the condition of the vessels and their deterioration, refused to make the required appropriations, and I, with my convictions of duty, had but one course to pursue, which was to limit the repairs within the means provided.

A different course has been pursued since March last, and you think results will "fully justify the wisdom of its policy." I acted on no such principle. The wisdom and correctness of the recommendations in my annual report and in the communications to the Naval Committee and Congress I have never doubted. Your action has been in conformity to [my recommendations, so far as needful repairs have been made, but I would not willingly expend the public money, as has been done for the last eight mouths, without au-thority of law, certainly not in large expendi-

but the department seems at present to be governed by no such restraints. You make no allusion to my several recommendations to Congress, but state that you have proceeded "to restore our small force to an effective condition" in "the shortest possible time;" and in an appendix you enumerate eighty-six vessels repaired and refitted for sea. A large number of the vessels thus enurserated, which you take credit for having refitted, are new and have never made a cruise

Your justification and great claim for these expenditures, made independently of Congress, consist in the vast saving of "fuel."
Vessels, you say, have been "given full sail power and rerigged," so that they are independent of steam. "Orders have been issued to the commandants of squadrons, directing them not to permit the consumption of coal for any purpose which could be as well per-formed by sail." This is a mere repetition of an old regulation issued in 1865, after the close of the war, and rigidly enforced, to which, however, you make no allusion, leaving it to be inferred that it is a new regulation, now for the first time issued.

On the ninth page you make the extraordi-

nary statement: It can be shown by figures that this system giving and requiring the general use of full sall power, beside its effect to make sallors of both officers and men, will, on the vessels intended to be kept in commission, (calculating that they cruise but two-thirds of the time), make, in the item of coal alone, as consumed under the old system, a saving of more than \$2,000,000 per

Much has been said within the last six or eight months of the marvellous saving effected in the consumption and cost of fuel under the new management of the Navy Department, and now in your official report you give assurance that there is to be "in the item of coal alone, as consumed under the old system, a saving of more than \$2,000,000 per annum." If any such remarkable saving has been made or is to be made, great credit is certainly due to those who have effected it, and great culpability should attach to the administration of the department under the "old system," if guilty of the imputed waste. I hold myself responsible for my acts, and you are responsible for the verity of your statements.

The whole statement needs explanation. The refunding fiction makes confusion, and is doubtless one of the reasons why the department evades a statement of the condition of affairs at the close of the fiscal year, in accordance with usage.

The estimate submitted by me for naval expenses in December, 1868, amounted to \$20,993,614. Congress reduced them \$5,-122,882, and appropriated \$15,870,531. Your estimates for the ensuing year are for

\$28,205,671, or \$7,212,256 more than was asked by me, and \$12,335,135 more than Congress would authorize one year ago.

This does not indicate retrenchment, a reduction of expenses, or greater economy, although you represent that the expenditures made since March are by "the books of the Treasury" less than the corresponding months one year ago, when old war contracts were being closed up and expenditures were not called "refunding," and although you declare you can show "by figures" a saving of more than \$2,000,000 per annum in the item of coal alone.

This letter has already extended beyond the limits intended, and without commenting on or criticizing other numerous errors, fal-lacies, and exceptional matters, I shall close with the expression of a wish that in your future reports, or communications to newspaper correspondents relating to me or my action, you will personally investigate and possess yourself of facts and avoid misstatements and misrepresentations.

My letter to Mr. Offley was so distorted and falsified and its contents so soon made public after it passed into your possession, that I shall, to prevent further false interpretations, and for my own protection, make this letter to you public. Very respectfully, GIDEON WELLES.

WINES AND LIQUORS.

## HER MAJESTY CHAMPAGNE.

DUNTON & LUSSON. 215 SOUTH FRONT STREET.

THE ATTENTION OF THE TRADE IS solicited to the following very Choice Wines, etc., DUNTON & LUSSON,

215 SOUTH FRONT STREET.

OHAMPAGNES.—Agents for her Majesty, Due de Montebelle, Carte Blere, Carte Blanche, and Charles Farre's Grand Vin Eugene, and Vin Imperial, M. Klee-man & Oo., of Mayence, Sparkling Moselle and RHINE Farre's Grand vill Logsing, Moselle and RHINE man & Co., of Mayence, Sparkling Moselle and RHINE WINES.

MADEIRAS.—Old Island, South Side Reserve.
SHERRIES.—F. Rudolp'se, Amentillado, Topaz, Vallette, Pale and Golden Bar, Cr. wa, etc.
PORTS.—Vinho Velho Real, Vallette, and Orown.
CLARETS.—Promis Aine & Cie., Montferrand and Bordeaux, Clarets and Santerne Wines
GIN.—"Meder Swan."
BRANDIES.—Hennessey, Otard, Dupuy & Co.'s various vintages.

CARSTAIRS & MCCALL

Nos. 126 WALNUT and 21 GRANITE Streets. Importers of BRANDIES, WINES, GIN, OLIVE OIL, ETC., COMMISSION MERCHANTS

For the sale of PURE OLD RYE, WHEAT, AND BOURBON WHISKIES. 5 25 205 CABSTAIRS' OLIVE OIL-AN INVOICE Of the above for sale by CARSTAIRS & McCALL, 528 2p5 Nos. 126 WALNUT and 21 GRANITE Sta

> FURNITURE. RICHMOND & CO., FIRST-CLASS

## FURNITURE WAREROOMS.

No. 45 SOUTH SECOND STREET.

EAST SIDE, ABOVE OHESNUT. PHILADELPHIA.

LEGAL NOTICES.

IN THE ORPHANS' COURT FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA.

Estate of JOHN H. DRAPER, deceased.

The Auditor appointed by the Court to audit, settle, and adjust the account of EDMUND DRAPER and ROBERT DRAPER, trustees of JOHN H. DRAPER, and to report distribution of the balance in the hands of the accountant, will meet the parties interested, for the purpose of his appointment, on MONDAY, January 24, 1870, at 4 o'clock P. M., at his office, southeast corner of WALNUT and SIXTH Streets (second floor), in the city of Philadelphia.

112 wfmf8t\*

Auditor. 1 12 wfmf5t\*

ESTATE OF WILLIAM CHRISTIE, DE-CRASED.

Letters of Administration d. b. n. c. f. a. upon the estate of the above-named decedent having been granted to the undersigned, all persons indebted to the said sutate are requested to make payment, and those having claims or demands against the same to make known the same with-out delay, to

No. 1615 GIRARD Avanue;

SAMUEL C. PERKINS, No. 627 WALNUT Street.

O'NE DOLLAR GOODS FOR 95 CENTS EMPIRE SLATE MANTEL WORKS.-J. B. PROPOSALS.

DROPOSALS FOR STAMPED ENVELOPES AND WRAPPERS

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, Scaled Proposals will be received until 3 P. M. on the 1st day of MARCH, 1870, for furnishing all the "Stamped Envelopes" and "Newspaper Wrappers" which this Department may require during a period of four years, commencing 1st of July, 1870, via s.

STAMPED ENVELOPES. 1. Note size, 2% by 4% inches, of paper.
No. 2. Ordinary letter size, 3 1-16 by 5% inches, of white, buff, canary, or cream-colored paper, or in such proportion of either as may be required.
No. 2. Full letter size (ungummed on flap, for circulars), 3% by 5% inches, of the same colors as No. 2, and under a like condition as to the proportion of each.

tion of each.

No. 4. Full letter size, 34 by 5% inches, of same colors as No. 2, and under a like condition as to the oroportion of each.

No. 5. Extra letter size (ungummed on flap, for irculars), 33, by 64, inches, of same colors as No. 4, and under a like condition as to the proportion of

each.

No. 6. Extra letter size, \$1% by \$1% inches, of same colors as No. 2, and under a like condition as to the proportion of each.

No. 7. Official size, \$3% by \$3% inches, of same colors as No. 2, and under a like condition as to the proportion of each.

No. 8. Extra official size, 41% by \$2% inches, of same colors as No. 2, and under a like condition as to the proportion of each.

NEWSPAPER WRAPPERS,

6% by \$1% inches, of buff or manilla paper.

NEWSPAPER WRAPPERS,

NEWSPAPER WRAPPERS,

All the above envelopes and wrappers to be embossed with postage stamps of such denominations,
styles, and colors, and to bear such printing on the
face, and to be made in the most thorough manner,
of paper of approved quality, manufactured specially
for the purpose, with such water marks or other devices to prevent imitation as the Postmaster-General
may direct. The envelopes to be thoroughly and perfectly gummed, the gumming on the flap of each (except for circulars) to be put on not less than haif an inch in width the entire length. The wrappers to be gummed not less than three-fourths of an inch in width except the ord

in width the entire length. The wrappers to be gummed not less than three-fourths of an inch in width across the end.

All envelopes and wrappers must be banded in parcels of twenty-five, and packed in strong pasteboard or straw boxes, each to contain not less than two hundred and fifty of the letter or extra letter size, and one hundred each of the official or extra official size, separately. The newspaper wrappers to be packed in boxes to contain not less than two hundred and fifty each. The boxes are to be wrapped and sealed, or securely fastened in strong manilla paper, so as to safely bear transportation by mail for delivery to postmasters. When two thousand or more envelopes are required to fill the order of a postmaster, the straw or pasteboard boxes containing the same must be packed in strong wooden cases, well strapped with hoop-iron, and addressed; but when less than two thousand are required, proper labels of direction, to be furnished by an agent of the Department, must be placed upon each package by the contractor. Wooden cases, containing envelopes or wrappers to be transported by water routes, must be provided with suitable water-proofing. The whole to be done under the inspection and direction of an agent of the Department.

The envelopes and wrappers must be furnished

The envelopes and wrappers must be furnished The envelopes and wrappers must be furnished and delivered with all reasonable despatch, complete in all respects, ready for use, and in such quantities as may be required to fill the daily orders of postmasters; the deliveries to be made either at the Post Office of an agent duly authorized to inspect and receive the same; the place of delivery to be at the option of the Postmaster-General, and the cost of delivering as well as all expense of packing, addressing, labeling, and water-proofing, to be paid by the contractor.

Bidders are notified that the Department will re-

dressing, labeling, and water-proofing, to be paid by the contractor.

Bidders are notified that the Department will require, as a condition of the contract that the envelopes and wrappers shall be manufactured and stored in such manner as to ensure security against loss by fire or theft. The manufactory must at all times be subject to the inspection of an agent of the Department, who will require the stipulations of the contract to be faithfully observed.

The dies for embessing the postage scamps on the envelopes and wrappers are to be executed to the satisfaction of the Postmaster-General, in the best style, and they are to be provided, renewed, and kept in order at the expense of the contractor. The department reserves the right of requiring new dies for any stamps, or denominations of stamps not now used,, and any changes of dies or colors shall be made without extra charge.

Specimens of the stamped envelopes and wrappers now in use may be seen at any of the principal post offices, but these specimens are not to be regarded as the style and quality fixed by the department as a standard for the new contract; bidders are therefore invited to submit samples of other and different qualities and styles, including the paper proposed as well as the manufactured envelopes, wrappers, and boxes, and make their bids accordingly.

The contract will be awarded to the bidder whose

The contract will be awarded to the bidder whose proposal, although it be not the lower, is considered most advantageous to the Department, taking into account the prices, quality of the samples, workmanship, and the sufficiency and ability of the bidder to manufacture and deliver the envelopes and wrappers in accordance with the terms of this advertisement; and no proposal will be considered unless accompanied by a sufficient and satisfactory guarantee. The Postmaster-General also reserves the right to reject any and all bids, if in his judgment the interests of the Government require it. require it.

Before closing a contract the successful bidder may be required to prepare new dies, and submit impressions thereof. The USE OF THE PRESENT DIES MAY OR HAY NOT BE CONTINUED.

Bonds, with approved and sufficient sureties, in the sum of \$200,000, will be required for the faithful performance of the contract, as required by the seventeenth section of the act of Congress, approved the 26th of August, 1842, and payments under said contract will be made quarterly, after proper adjustment of accounts.

justment of accounts.

justment of accounts.

The Postmaster-General reserves to himself the right to annul the contract whenever the same, or any part thereof, is offered for sale for the purpose of speculation; and under no circumstances will a transfer of the contract be allowed or sanctioned to any party who shall be, in the opinion of the Postmaster-General, less able to fulfill the conditions thereof than the original contractor. The right is also reserved to annul the contract for a failure to perform faithfully any of its stipulations.

The number of envelopes of different sizes, and of wrappers issued to Postmasters during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1869, was as follows, viz.:

No, 1. Note size—1,114,000.

No. 2. Ordinary letter size; (not 'aeretofore used).

No. 8. Full letter size, (ungumeted, for circulars) No. 4. Full letter size—67,367,500. No. 5. Extra letter size, (ungummed, for circulars)

-843,560.
No. 6. Extra letter size—4 204,500
No. 7. Official size—604,650.
No. 8. Extra official size—1700.
Wrappers—3,595,250.
Bids should be securely enveloped and scaled, marked "Proposals for Stamped Envelopes and Wrappers," and address-d to the Third Assistant Postmaster-General, Post Office Department, Washington D. C. ington, D. C.

JOHN A. J. CRESWELL, Postmaster General. 1 11 codtM1 PROPOSALS FOR PURCHASE OF RIPLED

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,
NAVY DEPARTMENT,
WASHINGTON CITTY, JADUARY 4, 1870.
Sealed Proposals for the purchase of 30-pounder and 20-pounder Parrott Rifles, with Carriages, Implements, and Projectiles, now on hand in the Navy Yards at Portsmouth, N. H.; Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, and Norfolk, will be received at this Bureau until 12 o'clock noon, January 31, 1870.

In the aggregate there are about 390 Guns, 354 Carriages, and 96, 157 Projectiles. Schedules in detail of the articles at each yard will be furnished on application to this Bureau.

the articles at each yard will be furnished on application to this Bureau.

Bidders will state the number of guns, carriages, implements, and projectiles they desire to purchase at each yard separately, specifying the calibre of gun, kind of carriage, whether broadside or pivot, and the kind of projectiles.

The guns, etc., will be delivered at the respective navy yards, and must be removed by the purchaser or purchasers within ten days after the acceptance of his or their bid. But no deliveries will be made of any article until the parties purchasing shall have deposited with the paymaster of the navy yard the full amount of the purchase money in each case.

Many of the guns are new, and all are service-able. Bidders will therefore offer accordingly. No offer for these articles as old iron or wood will be In Bureau reserves the right to reject any or all

bids which it may not consider to the interest of the Government to accept.

Proposals should be endorsed on the envelope "Proposals for Purchase of Rified Cannon, etc."

A. LUDLOW CASE,

18 ws7t

Chief of Burgau.

STEVENSON, BRO., & CO. OILS,