

AT HOME AND ABROAD.

NEW YORK, April 1.—Frederick St. George Booth-Tucker, recently appointed by General Booth as commander of the Salvation army in the United States to succeed Ballington Booth, arrived tonight on the steamship *Maestic*. He was met at the dock by a group of Salvation army officers and informed that his baby boy, Bramwell, was dead, and that his wife was ill. The new commander proceeded at once to the bedside of Mrs. Booth-Tucker.

Mr. Tucker was born in India. He studied law and was admitted to the bar in England. Returning to India he achieved prominence in his profession and was made a judge. He became interested in the work of the Salvation army, and formed what is now known as the East Indian branch of that organization.

In the evening Commander Booth-Tucker went to the national headquarters of the Salvation army, where he greeted a throng of enthusiastic members of the organization. After an informal introduction by Commander Careleton and the attendant greetings, Mr. Booth-Tucker said:

"My policy shall be one of love and not of aggressiveness. I shall do in the sphere of my new command as I have done in India. I will follow on the fashion of the American people, whom General Booth so dearly loves and admires.

"The Salvation army has got to that stage now that if the leaders were to run away the women in the slums would take up the deserted flag and proceed with the good work, aided by God and proceeding effectively today in every nation in the world.

"In regard to the transfer of the property and the legal obstacles which seem to beset myself and Mrs. Tucker, and in order that it might be overcome I am going to be naturalized as soon as possible, and will immediately bring myself into line with the law of the country.

"I think the least Ballington Booth might have done was to grant an interview to his own sister. It seems so unreasonable to us to have him ask that witnesses should be present.

"I have come to America with a very deep sense of the honor and responsibility which has been placed upon me. Every scrap of influence, power, brain, body, and heart I will lay at America's feet, and hope that what I am not now America will soon make me, an adopted son. I shall sit at her feet and shall not be above learning every day of my life."

WASHINGTON, April 1.—The message from Havana giving the details of the killing of five prisoners by the garrote raised a cry of horror in Washington. Senor Dupuy de Lome, the Spanish minister, admitted that the men had been killed but declared that the form of punishment was the one prescribed by Spanish law. He said the men were negroes and had been guilty of a most atrocious crime in hanging a merchant at Guira Melens, and in killing a small boy at the same place. He said the details of the execution had been exaggerated.

The reports to the Cuban in Washington declare that the horrible execution

of the five men at Havana is but a sample of the atrocious cruelties of Captain General Weyler in Cuba. They declare that they have information indicating that such cruelties are practiced nearly every day in Cuba, and that they are so horrible as to be beyond comprehension.

Senor Quesada, who represents the Cuban party in Washington, said such incidents as the one reported today only gave a vague idea of the reign of terror that is now in progress on the island. He continued:

"Atrocities are being committed every week in Cuba that surpass in cruelty the worst Armenian outrages, over which such a storm of popular indignation was raised in this country. The cruelties reported in the execution will be denied by the Spanish authorities and the denial will be believed by the American people because they cannot conceive how such crimes can be committed by a civilized nation. The Spanish authorities are conducting in Cuba today exactly the same sort of warfare that the Apache Indians in Arizona waged twenty years ago on the frontier. They are mutilating their victims in exactly the same way and are using the most barbarous methods of warfare."

Senor Quesada said he had no doubt that the five men put to death had been guilty of some offense against the Spanish rule and that perhaps their offenses merited the death penalty, but no matter what their offense was, they were entitled to a reasonably humane punishment. The fact that they were put to death in itself is not revolting, nor that they may have deserved it, but that they were tortured in the most barbarous manner should arouse the indignation of all civilization.

He continued: "We do not ask the American people to look to the events of the present war to form their conclusions about Spanish cruelty. It is a matter of history and the history that records just such cruelties was not written by Cubans or by Spaniards, but by Englishmen and Frenchmen. We can well understand that any reports the Cubans may spread in the United States at this time about Spanish cruelties will be looked upon as prejudiced and unfair. For that reason we have not attempted to keep the American people advised of their atrocities. The Spanish are in control on the island of Cuba and they exercise a censorship over the telegraph and mail that prevents a true statement of the affairs there being known, but the truth will come out generally and the people of this country will put a stop to the warfare in time.

"When Spain sent Weyler to Cuba it was hoped his presence in Cuba would terrorize the Cubans and that he would put a speedy end to the war the minute he put his foot on the island. He made his reputation in Barcelona, where he crushed out the anarchists. His control of Cuba, however, was a grave mistake, because his methods of warfare will become known in time and civilized people will not tolerate him."

CITY OF MEXICO, April 1.—The

most important part of the President's message, delivered today at the opening of Congress, is an allusion to the Anglo-Venezuelan controversy and President Cleveland's message to Congress. This part of the Mexican president's message is as follows: "With our northern neighbors our intercourse is of the same friendly and cordial character as our diplomatic and other relations have been for some years past. Naturally, evocation of that doctrine which condemns all attempts at European usurpation and tendencies to modify republican institutions of the new world in a monarchical direction, aroused great enthusiasm among the free nations of this continent, and gave occasion for demonstrations of sympathy, both popular and governmental.

"Invitations of an international character were not lacking that the Mexican government should at once state its opinion in so grave a matter, but the executive considered that haste was not proper in expressing an opinion on a subject which involved not only the Monroe doctrine, but also its application to the controversy between Great Britain and Venezuela. As we were not acquainted with that question as well, perhaps, as the United States was, we were not in a position to assume the claims of England necessarily constitute an attempt at usurpation.

"Nor could we consider that every boundary dispute afforded ground for application of the wide doctrine in question. On the other hand, the simple fact that England had refused to submit to arbitration her claims to a part of the disputed territory, while accepting it for the rest, was not in our opinion sufficient ground for unfavorable presumptions, seeing that the Mexican government has declared on more than one occasion that it will not accept arbitration for certain territorial questions especially affecting the honor of the nation. For these reasons I declined to make any public statement on the proposition in regard to the question that affected the interests and the most delicate sentiments of three nations equally entitled to our respect. I simply stated that I was in favor of the Monroe doctrine, rightly interpreted, but that I did not know whether it was applicable to the concrete case in question. Now that, happily, the crisis has passed which seemed to threaten war between the two great nations into which the Anglo-Saxon race is divided, and now our sister republic, Venezuela, is carrying on at Washington peaceful negotiations with her powerful adversary, it may not be out of place to accede to the desires of these persons who have requested the Mexican government to state her opinion with regard to the Monroe doctrine.

"The Mexican government cannot but declare its partiality for a doctrine which condemns as criminal any attacks on the part of the monarchies of Europe against the republics of America, against the independent nations of this continent, now all subject to the popular form of government. The whole of our history, and especially the struggle of our people to shake off the yoke of a foreign empire, which is European both in its origin, form and resources, and the torrents of blood shed in that struggle, are sufficient testimony to the world of our