Navy Department, 28th March, 1862.

Sir:

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of yours of the 26th Inst. and do not propose to argue, nor indeed to express an opinion in the case of W. T. Bartlett.

You remark however that: "Early in the present session I called on you and told you that I was satisfied that great injustice had been done to Mr. Bartlett, and requested you to send his name to the Senate that it might be fully examined and passed upon, first by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, and then by the whole Senate. This you declined to do and added that if the Committee would take the responsibility of examining the case and would recommend such a course, Mr. Bartlett's name should be sent into the Senate. Having this assurance, I retired from the Navy Department and communicated..."
"communicated the same to the Committee of the Senate and also to Mr. Bartlett."

I recollect in one of the conversations that we had on this subject you expressed your conviction that if Mr. Bartlett’s case would come before the Senate, his restoration would be ordered. In the course of that conversation, while I declined to send in his name, it was suggested that the Senate might institute an investigation without action by the Department, and I would in that event send to that body any and all testimony relating to him in our possession.

It certainly was not my intention at any time to intimate that I would commit the Department or the administration in this matter by a nomination on the action of the committee, a majority of it, and I exceedingly regret that I should have been misunderstood.

I am respectfully,

Your Ob. Serv.

[Signature]

Hon. John P. Hale,
Chairman Naval Committee,
U.S. Senate.