

wards received from Mr. H. Laird, who, by the permission of the Admiralty, and invitation of Captain Burgoyne, went in the ship on her first cruise, confirmed the opinion already formed—that under a prossure of sail she would be as stiff as other ironclad vessels of recent construction. The opinion was further strengthened by the reports of Admiral Sir S. Robinson, Admiral Sir T. Symonds, Captain Commerrell, and Captain Burgoyne. Since the recent discussion about the *Captain*, some further calculations have been made to try and explain what seemed to us before to be impossible. They were made only on one calculated centre of gravity, not having received from the Admiralty the results of their experiments of trying the ship by weights, and therefore cannot be looked upon as being so accurate as those made with those calculations. As notice was only received late on Saturday for witness and others of the firm to attend on Thursday, therefore had only time to collect all the plans, letters, and memoranda relating to the design of the ship, and not time to have copies made. The calculations which were submitted in July, 1866, with the designs, include those generally made for a ship designed by the firm in the first instance; and when submitted by Captain Coles to the Admiralty, it was understood that they met with their approval, and were similar to those particulars in the case of other designs which had been submitted to the Admiralty. The calculations of stability up to 7 and ten degrees were the only other steps that were taken to ascertain the stability of the ship. The actual design for the sails were sent in with the original design, and, although slightly modified in the proportion of spars, yet the area of sails remain actually the same. In conversation as to pressing the *Captain* under sail, witness has alluded to the gunwale as being a limit, but without mentioning the particular angle, as it generally varied slightly with the draught of water of the ship; but the impression generally was that it would be seldom necessary to press the ship so far, although all felt there was considerable reserve beyond this. Had more than once spoken on the subject with Capt. Burgoyne, but only as conversation. Remembers, on one of the trial trips under steam, he had a similar conversation with Capt. Coles. The *Captain* was not considered by Messrs. Laird to be built entirely on the responsibility of themselves and Captain Coles; and a letter from the Secretary of the Admiralty, and forwarded to us with a wish for our co-operation in carrying into effect their Lordships' wishes, will show why Messrs. Laird considered they were not entirely responsible. In the letter referred to the objected portions were the right reserved by their Lordships to enter into a contract, and if they saw objection they would decline to enter into it, etc., as set forth fully in the summary, page 8. It would appear from these letters that the design was submitted to their Lordships for their approval, and it was only on their approval that they undertook to proceed further in the matter, and to receive tenders for her construction. This was the view taken by Messrs. Laird. Messrs. Laird consider that their responsibility in the first instance was to prepare a design in conjunction, and to submit that design through him to the Admiralty for their approval, on the understanding that should their Lordships be able to approve of the design, and should they receive such a tender as they would be justified in accepting, they would then be prepared to submit to Parliament, next year, estimates for building such a vessel; and Messrs. Laird considered, in the

words of their Lordships' letter to Captain Coles, that unless they approved of the design they would have asked us to give a tender for the vessel, and from the fact of their asking for the tender gave their sanction to the plans and specifications proposed. Several other letters were read, one from the Admiralty to Messrs. Laird embodying the claim to be made in the contract, holding them and Captain Coles responsible; the reply to which was, their willingness to build the ship on the terms quoted. Another related to the supervision which Captain Coles was to give to the building of the ship. Witness never made an exact estimate of the difference of weight, and believes that the inspector used to send to the Admiralty from time to time the weight of all the iron used, as given by Messrs. Laird up to the time of the ship being floated out of dock. When it became apparent to witness that the weight would exceed that which was expected, on discovering this fact he informed Captain Coles of it, and an officer from the Controller's Department who was present at the time drew up a statement to be submitted to the Controller of the Navy. Messrs. Laird considered the responsibility as to the design of the ship between themselves and Captain Coles on the one hand, and the Lords of the Admiralty on the other, to be joint. No doubt the calculations as to the cause of the want of stability have been prepared with the usual skill of the Admiralty officials. If witness had known by calculation that the stability of the *Captain* vanished at an inclination of 54 degrees, he would not have felt any uneasiness for her as a seagoing ship. Her masts and yards were much larger than had been fitted for some of the earlier ironclads, but about the same tons per foot of section. Tripod was a system that answered well for the support of the masts, and when applied to turret ships has the advantage of offering less obstruction to the angles of fire to the rigging. Witness has prepared designs for another low freeboard turret-ship, similar in type to the *Captain*, but with the addition of armored breastwork at the fore-castle and poop, and would have carried sails of a full-rigged ship. He had every confidence in the *Captain*, and did not consider her low freeboard would make it necessary to have her spars smaller than they were fitted; but in the preparation of the plan of the spars Captain Coles, from his knowledge on the subject, necessarily took a prominent part, and Messrs. Laird did not see the necessity of remonstrating with him, nor were they at all apprehensive as to any danger. It appears that on the day of the disaster the inclination of the ship seemed to be greater than it had been observed under similar circumstances as to sail and wind; but from what cause that arose witness is at a loss to say. The immersion of the ship of twenty-two inches, for stability, decreased it slightly, but to that extent he should contemplate that the ship would be steadier and roll less.

The Court then rose.

(To be continued.)

A Quaker was examined before the Board of Excise concerning certain duties, when the Commissioners, thinking themselves disrespectfully treated by his thee-ing and thou-ing, one of them, with a stern countenance, asked him, "Pray, sir, do you know what we sit here for?" "Yea," replied Nathan "I do: some of you for five thousand, some for eight thousand, and others for ten thousand dollars a year."

## PRESIDENT GRANT AND THE CANADIAN RAILWAYS.

(From the London Railway News.)

That portion of the Message of President Grant which refers to the relations with the Imperial Government and with Canada, will not, we feel confident, be generally endorsed by those citizens of the United States who are capable of taking a calm and dispassionate view of the questions in dispute between the two countries. The charges made against the Imperial Government are in direct opposition to the real facts of the case; while with respect to Canada there is not a single allegation which is made the subject of complaint that is not the direct consequence of the act of the United States Government itself in repealing the Reciprocity Treaty in 1865. President Grant, referring to the despatches as to the *Alabama* question, says:—

"The Cabinet at London, so far as its views have been expressed, does not seem willing to concede that the British Ministry was guilty of any negligence, or had done or permitted any act during the war of which the United States have just cause of complaint."

The answer to this is that our Government did actually sign a treaty, the provisions of which were cordially approved by the Government at Washington. The Minister of the United States by whom that treaty was concluded was thanked by Mr. Seward "for the perseverance and fidelity with which he had attended to the instructions of this department;" and later, Mr. Seward conveyed to Mr. Reverdy Johnson "the assurance of the President of his high satisfaction with the manner in which he had conducted these important negotiations." In one of his letters of instruction Mr. Seward says: "The decision of the Convention depends not exclusively upon the nature of its provisions, but depends very much also upon the tone, the temper and the spirit which prevades it." Upon this matter of tone and temper Mr. Reverdy Johnson writes: "Both Lord Stanley and Lord Clarendon yielded a very ready and cheerful assent to our proposition to submit all the questions involved in the *Alabama* claims, not ever having expressed a desire during the negotiations to exclude any one of them; and in this I am satisfied (as they must be) that they but conformed to the public sentiment of the nation and to their own wishes." In another despatch he writes. "I cannot conclude this communication without bearing testimony to the frank and friendly manner in which I have been met by Lords Stanley and Clarendon, and to the very sincere desire which they exhibited throughout our negotiations to settle any dispute between the two nations upon terms just and honorable to each." In the face of the evidence of our willingness to treat upon all matters in dispute shown by the signature to the treaty negotiated by the Minister of the United States, and of the testimony to the good feeling of this country borne by Mr. Reverdy Johnson in his official despatches, we find President Grant now complaining that "not an inference can be drawn from the treaty to remove the sense of unfriendliness of the course of Great Britain in our struggle for existence." We should have thought that the very fact of our agreeing to refer all questions to the decision of a court approved by the Government at Washington itself,