

the Rio Grande we felt ourselves secure under the stars and stripes of the American republic. But alas, we soon realized that the same power which had driven us from our native land also ruled the American states. Our papers were suppressed and we were tracked from place to place by the spies of the Mexican government, reinforced by American detectives, also in its employ. In due time we were arrested upon baseless charges. Some of my comrades have been in jail almost two years. This seems very strange in a land of freedom. Why is trial denied them? I do not know and no one can tell me. In my own case I was arrested upon the charge of having violated the neutrality laws. Being a poor man I had but small chance to make any defense. It seems that a poor man here fares about the same as he does everywhere. The trial was soon over. The judge sentenced me to a term of two years and a half in the federal prison at Leavenworth. Very few knew anything about it at the time. But since then many thousands now know about it and are actively interested in seeing that justice is done. It is well known that the judge who tried me admitted that he was prejudiced, trying to excuse himself upon the ground that he was bound to destroy the opposition to the Diaz administration. This shows how he feels, and of course, my sentence was a foregone conclusion. The people of this country can hardly imagine the terrible condition of the millions of peons in Mexico, the men, women and children who are half naked, hungry, in filth and disease, and who are the unhappy victims of the present administration. No man can look upon these dreadful scenes and not feel his blood rising within him. But to take a stand against the bureaucracy, with Diaz at its head, which is robbing the people and causing all their misery and suffering, is to be charged with being a traitor to the country. My comrades and I are guilty of no other crime than that we have opposed this despotic administration and have sympathized with and endeavored to help our suffering countrymen. Citizens of the United States, this is all the crime we are guilty of. If for this we are to be sentenced to penitentiary in the great American republic it may seem very strange and very sad to us, but we will make no complaint. For my part I would rather remain here the rest of my days than to abandon my principles and forsake my oppressed and despairing fellow men. I must not close without expressing my sincere thanks to the sympathizing friends in this country who have taken my case in hand and are appealing my case to a higher court. Whatever the outcome may be I shall remember them with gratitude. They have never seen me but they appreciate the cause I am striving to serve, and their sympathy and support is that of comrades who recognize no boundary line between nations when human beings are in distress. The unfortunate experience which has come to me will be made up for many fold if the Mexican people and the American people are drawn closer to each other in the great struggle which is agitating all nations and which can never end until despotism in every form has been destroyed and human brotherhood prevails throughout the earth."

HERE IS A fine story from life told in an Associated Press dispatch under date of Dayton, O., April 8: "Rather than run down a little girl who was in their path James L. Dinsmore and F. O. Probasco turned their automobile down a thirty-foot embankment and plunged into the waters of Miami river. The men were driving the car along the top of the levee only eight feet wide, when the child was seen a few feet ahead of the car. Probasco, who was driving, said: 'Is it the child or the river, Jim?' Dinsmore replied: 'The river for ours.' Although the river was at a high stage and the current swift, both men escaped injuries."

IN THE CURRENT publications of Lincoln matter will be found an interesting discussion between the Nashville American and Henry Watterson of the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal. The Nashville American said: "Henry Watterson, in his contribution to the Cosmopolitan Magazine, giving an estimate of Lincoln, repeats his former assertion that at the famous Hampton Roads conference 'Lincoln took the slim, pale-faced, consumptive man aside, and, pointing to a sheet of paper he had in his hand, said: 'Stephens, let me write 'Union' at the top of the page and you may write below whatever you please.'" This assertion made by Mr. Watterson some years ago aroused some spirited

discussion and was strongly controverted by leading ex-confederates. The late Judge Reagan of Texas, the then surviving member of the confederate cabinet, who was in a position to have heard of this remarkable proposition if it had been made, was confident that nothing of the kind had ever occurred. On what authority Mr. Watterson persists in this statement is not clear, and it is not taken as history by those most familiar with the times and conditions when it is reported to have occurred. The Hampton Roads conference was abortive because the confederate commissioners went with instructions to accept no terms not based on the recognition of the confederacy, and Mr. Lincoln was equally determined to insist on maintaining the union. This antagonism prevented any serious discussion, and though the picturesque incident Mr. Watterson insists upon was entirely possible, it was not reported at the time and can hardly be accepted without better authority than has been produced to sustain it. Mr. Stephens lived for some time after the civil war and wrote much, but he did not mention such an incident. There is no doubt that Mr. Lincoln was prepared to offer liberal terms at the Hampton Roads conference if the southern commissioners had been empowered to receive them. In the light of subsequent events it is regrettable that some agreement had not been reached; but for the sake of accuracy Mr. Watterson should produce some substantial evidence that his pretty Lincoln story is authentic."

REPLYING TO the American Mr. Watterson said: "It is simply shocking that an intelligent newspaper should make such a publication as this. Mr. Watterson did publish his authorization abundantly and repeatedly. He got the story originally from Mr. Stephens himself. It was directly corroborated by at least four credible witnesses—General John B. Gordon, Mr. Stephens' close friend and neighbor; Mr. Felix G. de Fontaine, the famous southern war correspondent, with whom Mr. Stephens passed the night in Richmond after he came up from Hampton Roads; the Rev. Dr. Green, for many years Mr. Stephens' pastor, and the Hon. Evan P. Howell, of Atlanta—to each and all of whom—as to very many others—Mr. Stephens related it. The testimony of these gentlemen, coupled with the joint resolution to be passed by congress appropriating \$400,000,000 to be paid the south for the slaves, which still stands in Mr. Lincoln's handwriting; Mr. Watterson published in answer to the attacks made upon him having nothing but negations to support them, and yet the American—the Courier-Journal's next-door neighbor—forgets everything except Mr. Reagan's statement that Mr. Stephens did not tell him, and demands that 'Mr. Watterson shall produce some substantial evidence that his pretty Lincoln story is authentic.' Such a gratuitous butting into a closed incident and chapter seems about as far as the mean and litigious historic spirit can go, short of personal and professional defamation. Mr. Watterson never made an issue of veracity in his life, nor a statement of fact he was not prepared to prove before a court of law. The American owes him an apology."

A READER OF the New York Tribune writes to that paper to say: "Your Washington correspondent is mistaken in his assertion which appears in your columns that Andrew Stevenson and Joseph G. Cannon are the only men that have been elected four times speaker of our national house of representatives. Henry Clay was elected speaker of that body six times, by the Twelfth, Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, Sixteenth and Eighteenth congresses. Everybody is entitled to his due; nobody is entitled to any more."

REFERRING TO the late Admiral Cervera, the Spanish fighter, who died recently at Puerto Real, Cadiz, Admiral Winfield Scott Schley pays this tribute: "I have felt deeply grieved since I first heard the reports that this gallant officer was ill. I have always had the greatest respect for him, and even in his misfortune one could see that he was a brave and gallant officer and one willing to make any sacrifice for his country. I have always considered Admiral Cervera as a man of excellent judgment and, I might add, that during the disastrous battle he used the best means to stave off the inevitable. His letters, since published, have shown to the world that he understood the difficulties under which he was laboring as none of the other Spanish

officers did. At the battle of Santiago I consider that he did the best thing in bringing his fleet out, despite the fact that his fleet was destroyed. If he had deserted General Linares he would probably have been accused of cowardice by his countrymen; if he had remained in the harbor after he got there he would have been accused of allowing himself to be caught in a trap. Consequently, he did the best thing in making a sortie with his vessels. All who knew Admiral Cervera had only the kindest words for him. He made a lasting impression on us all."

HERE IS A good story from life told in a Louisville, Ky., dispatch to the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner: "A special from New Orleans says that John Bellis of that city, who is heir to a \$100,000 estate, left by his aunt, Mrs. Lizzie Watson of Louisville, has announced that he will surrender any claim he might have on the estate in favor of his two foster cousins, Mrs. Thomas Swan, wife of the assistant general passenger agent of the Rio Grande railroad at Denver, and Mrs. George Venus, wife of a New Orleans business man. Mrs. Swan and Mrs. Venus had been reared as daughters by Mrs. Watson, and it was not until after her death that they learned that they had been adopted by her when infants. Mrs. Watson was a sister of Bellis' father. Bellis says he has a good business and is comfortably fixed and believes it right that Mrs. Watson's estate should go to the children she adopted, though he is really next of kin and the legal heir."

THE PHILADELPHIA North American, a republican paper that preaches against republican doctrine and policies between campaigns and supports the republican ticket during election contests, prints a two column attack upon George T. Oliver, Pennsylvania's new senator. The North American says: "Pennsylvania owes an apology to the United States senate, though no apology can have much weight, because it is the second unworthy member inflicted by this state upon the senate within a month. Oliver is wholly unfit and unequipped for the place. It would be difficult to find a man of affairs more devoid of the qualifications requisite for an able and useful senator." Here the North American seeks to wash its hands of both the United States senators but it is in part responsible for Penrose and Oliver just as it is responsible for Cannon and Cannonism, against which it has launched such hysterical assaults. If the North American would but print a few lines of plain, square talk while the campaign is on then its two column denunciations of republican leaders and republican policies would not prompt men to doubt its sincerity."

THE WASHINGTON correspondent for the Omaha World-Herald says: "Perhaps the least desirable watch of the capitol police during the closing days of the session is that of guarding the mace in the house when a recess is taken over night. The mace, familiarly known as 'the buzzard,' is the American eagle in silver on the top of a rod, and it is always raised at the speaker's right hand when the house is in session. When the house goes into committee of the whole the mace is lowered. As time becomes precious toward the end of each session the house saves time by recessing until 11 or perhaps 10 the next morning instead of adjourning, in which case they would not meet until 12. An hour or two for work is thus gained, besides doing away with the reading of the journal each day and other routine business and thereby saving more time. The legislation enacted at such sessions is dated as of the day the house last met after an adjournment and all these recessed sessions are considered as a part of that 'legislative day,' so that a congressman often has to make considerable inquiry to learn whether it is Monday or Friday, legislatively. When the house is recessed the mace must stay in position, or all the legislation of the legislative day in progress is void. A guard is then set to keep watch over the 'buzzard' lest he fly away with the work that congress has done. Of course, if the guard removes the bird from his perch and puts him to roost in the cloak room, while he himself takes a nap there, the legislation still stands, provided he's at his post in the morning and nobody find it out. The office of the sergeant-at-arms admits that this has probably been done, though of course they know nothing of it, and it would cause an awful bother if they should."