

Mexicano Central ferro-carril? That was plain enough for any man that understood the language. He didn't understand, for he shook his head and walked on. After a while I met a negro and said "Habla V. espanol?" He said "Si." I said: "Show me al chimenea de la locomotiva?" He said, "What locomotive do you want to see?" Then we both laughed, and he told me where to find the depot of the Mexican Central.

The first time I visited Jaurez I could not help but notice the large number of people that were crossing from one city to the other. At first I thought likely that some celebration or something of unusual interest was bringing the people out, but in subsequent days I noticed the crowd was not diminished. Afterwards I referred to the fact in the presence of several gentlemen and was told that the tariff was responsible for it; that over on the Mexican side a large number of articles, such as cigars, silk handkerchiefs, etc., can be bought for about half what they can on the American side. As a consequence, when the residents of El Paso want anything of the articles mentioned they stroll over to Jaurez and get them, returning with their pockets filled.

The first time I crossed the Rio Grande I was very much disappointed with that noble stream. On our maps it is laid down as one of the continental rivers, and I half expected to see steamboats running on it. Imagine my surprise when crossing it to see only a shallow little stream over which I could step almost any place, and which would not fill an average irrigation ditch. A week later the same stream had increased in volume until it could have floated the largest steamer. The reason was that the rainy season had commenced and the floods were coming down from the mountains.

JOEL RICKS.

Written for this Paper.

### STEVENSON'S LETTER.

CHICAGO, Oct. 21, 1893.—While at Gallatin, Davis county, Mo., I called upon Major McGee, who is still living at Gallatin and is the oldest gentleman of the Mormon days and the only one I could find who lived there at the time of the robberies of Davies county. The major is about 78 years old and is now a healthy looking man. He is quite actively engaged as notary public and appears jolly. Speaking about the "Mormon war" he says there is not one house now standing that existed at that time. He has a piece of one log house that was not finished and the only one which remained. The piece of the log he intended to have made up into walking canes, as mementoes of those times. He speaks of the Prophet Joseph as a gentleman in every respect. Said he: "The Mormons took me prisoner and thereby I became acquainted with Joseph Smith. I thought much of him. The Mormons treated me first-rate, but the prejudice of those times raged against them beyond bounds. "Only think," said the Major, "it is fifty-five years ago since I was a prisoner among the Mormons." He was pleased to learn of the Mormons building up the West and of the great display at the World's Fair—with the choir; it was a marvel to many and was the general topic of the country.

I obtained some papers concerning a suit entered by Bishop Edward Partridge against a large number of citizens of Jackson county, who tarred and feathered him on the public square at Independence, Jackson county, in 1833, when the mob intended to drive the Mormon people out of the country. At the time Bishop Partridge was taken the mob also arrested a companion of his, Brother Allen by name. Both were tarred and feathered. Here is an exact copy of the answer made in court by one of the parties engaged in the commission of the outrage:

Robert Johnson—impleaded with others—vs Edward Partridge, trespass: And the said Robert Johnson comes, and defends the force and injury, when etc., and says: as to the assaulting and taking and carrying the said Edward Partridge into a public place, in the town of Independence, and before a large concourse of people, indignantly and abusively beating him, the said plaintiff, and as to the striking, pulling him about and throwing him upon the ground, and as to the kicking and striking the said plaintiff a great many violent blows, and as to the putting on the body of the said body a large quantity of pitch and tar, rolling in and covering his body with feathers, and then turning him loose among a large concourse of people, and as to the rending, tearing and damaging the clothes of the said plaintiff, as is stated and set forth in the declaration, the said plaintiff ought not to have or maintain his aforesaid action therefore against him, because he says that the said plaintiff just before the said time, when etc., in the said declaration mentioned, at the county of Jackson aforesaid, with force and arms, etc., made an assault upon him, the said defendant, and would then and there have beat, bruised and ill-treated him, the said defendant, if he had not immediately defended himself against the said plaintiff; wherefore, he, the said defendant, did then and there defend himself against the said plaintiff, as he lawfully might, for the cause aforesaid, and in so doing did necessarily and unavoidably a little pull and haul about before a large concourse of people, and thereby then and there, in self-defense, did indignantly treat the said plaintiff by striking, kicking, striking, throwing him upon the ground, and did then and there, for the cause aforesaid, a little rend, tear and damage the clothes of the said plaintiff, and there being then and there upon the ground, where the said defendant was so compelled, in self-defense as aforesaid, to throw down the body of the defendant as aforesaid, a large quantity of tar, pitch and feathers, by means whereof the said plaintiff became a little covered and besmeared with tar, pitch and feathers, as stated in the said declaration mentioned, during an unnecessary damage to the said plaintiff on the occasion as aforesaid, and so the said defendant says that if any hurt or damage then and there happened to the said plaintiff, or his wearing apparel, the same was occasioned by the assault so made by the said plaintiff upon the said defendant, in the necessary defense of him the said defendant, against the said plaintiff, which are

the said supposed trespasses in the introductory part of this plea mentioned, and whereof, the said plaintiff has complained against him the said defendant, and this he is ready to verify; therefore, he prays judgment, if the said plaintiff ought to have or maintain his aforesaid action therefor against him, etc.

Reynolds, Birch, Burden, Young, Hicks, Childs and Wilson, attorneys for defendant.

Robert Johnson impleaded with others vs. Edward Partridge, trespass.

And the said Robert Johnson comes and defends the force and injury, and says he is not guilty of the said supposed trespasses above laid to his charge, or any part thereof, in manner or form, as the said plaintiff has complained against him, and of this he puts himself upon the country, etc.

"Reynolds, Birch, Burden, Young, Hicks, Childs and Wilson, attorneys for defendant.

"Wells and Wood, attorneys for plaintiff."

On the back of this answer is written:

"Robert Johnson vs. E. Partridge, plea to open court, 29 October, 1834. Samuel C. Owens, Clerk."

I very much enjoyed my visit in Missouri and was treated with respect by all I met there. Now I am entering upon a new and changed scene—a visit to the Columbian World's Fair.

EDWARD STEVENSON.

Written for this Paper.

### GREAT BUT SHORT-SIGHTED CHICAGO

CHICAGO, Nov. 8, 1893.—Public sentiment in Chicago on the silver question, as reflected in the daily papers and the current talk of businessmen is decidedly adverse to bimetalism as understood in the west. They look upon the free coinage propaganda in the west as a merely selfish effort on the part of the silver kings to get an increased price for "pig silver," not deigning to dignify the white metal by calling it bullion. They see no reason whatever for putting silver on a basis different from that of iron, copper or aluminium. They refuse utterly to regard demonetization as the cause of the present depression of silver as compared with gold. They settle the question of price on the score of demand and supply, not recognizing the fact that monetization is the absolute condition of demand for either metal as money, and that without the money use of either metal its price would sink to the level of base metals. They refuse to recognize the fact that the elimination of silver reduces by one-half the value of real money, and that debts are doubled and prices reduced in a corresponding ratio by operation of economic law. They are indifferent to the fact that demonetization increases the burden of life upon those who are least able to bear the load that is already sinking them beneath the plane where the sunlight of the commonest and cheapest blessings of life can reach them. It is naught to them that a pernicious and surreptitious gold monometalism increases the economic disorders whereby the wealth of the country is being most inequitably distributed, the rich growing richer and the poor sinking into deeper and more hopeless poverty.