

ALEC BELL IS ALIVE

After Long Silence, He Writes From Los Angeles.

BRAIN FEVER AND BLINDNESS

Worry Over Financial Losses Drove Him to a Sick Bed—Unconscious for Long Time, and Then Lost His Sight.

Alec K. Bell, who disappeared so mysteriously two months ago, has been heard from. Two letters from him arrived in Portland yesterday, one to his fiancée and one to his mother, Mrs. A. R. Bell. They were written in Los Angeles January 14, just two months from the date of the last prior tidings from him. He says he will return to Portland when his health shall have been sufficiently restored, and intimates that the illness which he contracted was a consequence of brain fever that held him unconscious for several weeks are given in explanation of his strange silence.

Mr. Bell had been in ill health for some weeks before leaving Portland, having been confined to his bed by a malady that to a great extent baffled his physician. After his disappearance, the doctor said that he had the appearance of a man who was greatly worried over something. No one knew the condition of his business affairs, but it now turns out that practically all his worldly possessions have been swept away by the failure of a man with whom he had large business relations in California. Mr. Bell forced this before he was able to leave Portland, and it told heavily upon him in his weak physical condition. When he reached San Francisco he found some confirmation of his fears, but the man with whom he dealt had considerable property in Los Angeles, and there was hope that he might be able to make himself whole out of that. He had not decided to go to Los Angeles when he wrote home from San Francisco. But when he found out the situation of affairs there, he hurried off to Los Angeles to see what he could do to save himself. When he began his investigations there, the worst seemed confirmed, and the shock on his overworked mind was too much, and from that time he was blank to him for several weeks. When he recovered consciousness he found himself in a San Francisco lodging-house, where the landlady said he had been delivered by a traveling friend some weeks before.

Mr. Bell was then totally blind, and was in a very gloomy state of mind—too gloomy to write home. The difficulty with his eyes soon partly yielded to medical treatment, and he returned to Los Angeles to complete the investigation he had previously begun into the affairs of his debtor. There was no relief for his business affairs there, but his eyes and general health so far improved that he had concluded to write home; therefore, these messages, which came like tidings from the dead. He was still very weak, but he wrote, but he did not tell any more to interrupt the treatment for his eyes, and he thought the sunny climate there agreed with him, and that he would best remain there until he should measurably recover his health.

He appreciates the distress and annoyance his disappearance must have caused his relatives and friends here, and expresses the deepest regret in that regard. It is apparent that his heavy financial loss at a time when he was physically weak, which bore upon him the more heavily because he shared the information with one, occasioned the mental blank from which he has just emerged. His letters make this much clear. This business difficulty coming upon him just at the time when he was so weak, made for his wedding atung him deeper than it would at any other time.

"His letters convince us that he has recovered his mental faculties, and that he is now in a position to tell us the truth about the case last evening. We are confident that he will soon be back with us. He was a very shy, retiring man, and none of us knew much about his business affairs. Now that we know what has happened, we do not much wonder at its effect upon him. Of course, we were all delighted to get those letters from him."

LOCAL UNIONS PLEDGE AID

Will Send Assistance to Distressed San Francisco Brethren.

The weekly meeting of the Federated Trades Council last night was attended by an unusually large number of delegates. Ed Rosenberg, secretary of the San Francisco Labor Council, was present and delivered a short address. Mr. Rosenberg is on his way home from Tacoma, where, at the request of the Congress, he went to attend the convention of trades unions of Washington, at which the State Federation of Labor was organized. He spoke of the object of the Federation, which was to bring together the unions of Washington and to work for the enactment of needed labor laws.

Mr. Rosenberg also explained the settlement of the transportation workers' strike in San Francisco and the causes that led up to it, stating that while the detailed terms of the settlement were never given out, the present status of organized labor in the Bay City is: The Brotherhood of Teamsters, which was attacked by the Employers' Association with the intention of disrupting it, is at present at work as recognized union men, and union conditions are guaranteed for one year. The trades that supported the Brotherhood are in the same condition. He also said that since the transportation workers' strike the supply blockade used by the Employers' Association to intimidate and ruin union employees has been broken. Since October 3, the date of the settlement of the strike, 1200 ironworkers have gained a nine-hour day and increased pay. The Union, Hudson and a few others are still on the strike inaugurated last May. The speaker made a plea for financial support for their needs as funds of the San Francisco unions are low.

As to the condition of the Portland unions, Secretary Rosenberg could not say much, except that union signs in the windows and the large attendance certainly showed that the local bodies were in a strong and healthy condition. When Mr. Rosenberg concluded, the council appointed a committee of 12 to secure funds for the San Francisco unions. The committee consists of Messrs. Morgan, Bailey, Duke, Harry, Lange, Gehringer, Bird, McKenney, Mickle, Beutrich, Lawton and others.

The Shipbuilders' and Riggers' Union was admitted to membership, making 50 unions affiliated with the council. Delegates Bailey made a brief report of his mission to the Charter Commission, as published yesterday, and the council adjourned.

Pinia, Duty.

Chicago Letter.

"Republican Senators frankly admit," says a Washington dispatch, "that to allow the Payne tariff bill to become a law would give just cause for complaint by the Filipinos, that since becoming citizens of American territory they have been discriminated against rather than benefited by the United States Government."

That the unjust measure which the Republican majority in the House adopted

will be radically amended in the Senate there is now little doubt. Already signs indicate that the Taft Commission's suggestion to reduce the duties on rates on Philippine products 50 per cent.

Some Senators, it is true, are trying to figure out tariff rates that will not place the Filipinos in a worse position than foreigners who trade with us. These men apparently aim to put our new people on the same plane with foreign nations. But such quibbling over a plain duty is of no practical value in convincing the Filipinos of our good faith. The Senate is bound to take the policy of the Taft Commission if it would stand fast for National self-interest, duty and honor.

While there may be many reasons, connected with our treaty agreements with Spain, for not granting the Philippines free access to our markets, the free trade is the goal toward which our legislation for them obviously must tend. The good sense of the American people permits them to aim at no other goal, for thus alone can the Philippines be made prosperous, loyal and American.

The Senate can repair the House's error, and the House majority has still time for repentance. And if any Republican member of either body is still disposed to lend a favoring ear to greedy special interests he would do well to remember Porto Rico.

The so-called Republican leaders of the Payne class cannot fool the American people. When they attempt it they invoke a vengeance no less sure because it is sometimes slow.

GAMBLING CHARGES FAIL

Jury Frees Chinese and Japanese Arrested in Raids.

Two Chinese, John Tom and Ting Jim, and four Japanese, B. Oetia, S. Starikawa, Joe Eleta and Y. Harria, were tried and acquitted yesterday by a jury in Judge McGowan's court on charges of gambling. An attempt was made by the state to prove that the men were engaged in playing the game of twenty-one in a house on Couch street. Officers Griffith and Frank Patton, who made the arrests, testified that no playing was going on when they were in the room. The men stopped as soon as their entrance was noticed, and they took money on the table. Officer Roberts said the table could be used to play twenty-one, stud poker, or any other game.

Captain W. J. Riley, who was one of the jurors, asked for information as to how the game of twenty-one is played. Judge George confessed his ignorance upon the subject, and remarked: "That is for the jury to determine. They have heard the evidence in the case."

The jury was out some time before returning a verdict.

GRANTS FOUR DIVORCES

Judge Fraser Issues Decrees Dissolving Matrimonial Bonds.

Four divorces were granted by Judge Fraser yesterday.

Florence L. McFadden was divorced from Leonard McFadden, and was restored to her maiden name, Weber. There is one child, a boy aged 2½ years, who has been adopted by the mother of the plaintiff.

Mrs. McFadden testified that she was married to the defendant in Portland, October 1, 1888, and that he willfully deserted her in July, 1900. Her husband had been out such a strong case of cruel treatment against her husband, Henry Robert, that the court interrupted her while she was testifying, saying that she had told any more to interrupt the treatment for his eyes, and he thought the sunny climate there agreed with him, and that he would best remain there until he should measurably recover his health.

Henrietta Connor was granted a divorce from William Connor, who was formerly a Constable in Portland. He is now a constable in the city of Portland. The divorce was granted on the ground that she was deserted by her husband in October, 1899. They were divorced about four years ago, and remarried on October 8, 1899.

Herman was divorced from John Herman on the ground that he was deserted by his wife in October, 1899. Mrs. Herman testified that her husband made a practice of staying out late at night, gambling, and when he came home he was drunk and would not go and support herself. She said he failed to support her properly. They were married in 1882.

WILL OF CATHERINE BURKE.

Property Worth \$50,000 Is Bequeathed to Heirs.

The will of Catherine Burke, deceased, was admitted to probate in the County Court yesterday. The estate is valued at \$50,000. Andrew C. Smith is named as executor, and Carlissa C. Wiley executed, without bonds, and they are directed by the court to administer the estate as trustees for Carlissa C. Wiley, Margaretta Wiley, Joseph Edward Wiley and Eunice C. Wiley, grand-children of the testatrix, until they reach the age of 21 years. The property is then to be distributed to the grand-children, share and share alike.

Eunice C. Wiley is now 21 years old. She is a native of Ireland, and received her education at the Central New York school. She was married to Joseph Edward Wiley, and they had three children, all of whom are now living. She was a devoted mother, and a thoroughly true and devoted wife. She died of cancer of the stomach, and her death was a great loss to her family.

Margaret M. Wiley was appointed guardian of Joseph E. and Eunice C. Wiley, minors.

Guardian for Blinn S. Bryant.

Judge Calkins yesterday appointed Robert G. Morrow guardian of Blinn S. Bryant, a minor, in the matter of the investigation of the accounts of A. C. Emmons and S. Barker, as executors of the estate of Ida M. Bryant, deceased.

Some time ago Mrs. Julia E. Blinn, the grandmother of the minor, petitioned for the appointment of A. E. Jackson as guardian, and then a petition was filed charging the executors with mismanagement of the estate. Judge Calkins vacated his former order, that he might appoint a disinterested person, and named R. G. Morrow.

New Suit Filed.

Court Moot Hoot, No. 1. Foresters of America, has filed suit in the State Circuit Court against William McLeod for possession of four lots in Fernwood. McLeod bought the property at a tax sale, and the plaintiff tenders the taxes due and interest.

J. C. Beck, as assignee for a number of claimants, has filed an attachment suit in the State Circuit Court against Hop Chong & Co. to recover \$500 alleged to be due for services rendered by the assignors in packing fish at Bristol Bay, Alaska.

Sealed Verdict in Skelton Case.

The jury in the suit of Joseph Skelton against the City of Portland to recover damages on account of the taking of his property for the widening of Penitence avenue, returned a sealed verdict at 2:30 o'clock last night.

Court Notes.

Two cases against William Grimes for selling liquor without license were tried Monday by Judge Fraser.

John W. Farquhar was appointed administrator of the estate of Henry C. Cooper, deceased, which is valued at \$50.

Will positively cure sick headache and prevent its return. It is not talk, but truth, Carter's Little Liver Pills. One pill a dose. Try them.

Wise Bros, dentists. Both phones. The waiting.

JUSTICE FOR SAMPSON

HIS CAUSE IS ELOQUENTLY PLEADED BY MR. MOORES.

Served His Country Ably for 42 Years, to Be Reviled and Derided in His Old Age.

OREGON CITY.—(To the Editor.)—A

welcome announcement was that which recently appeared in your columns, saying that the Sampson-Schley controversy was now a closed incident. During all the heat of this controversy Schley had had no lack of champions. Sampson had few. Now that the incident is closed, and the American people have blown off all their surplus steam, it is possible that Schley, great as he is, is not an absolutely flawless hero, and isn't it possible Sampson is not the monster he let our passions, our resentments and our prejudices hold such complete and permanent sway as to reject or distort all the evidence we don't like, and magnify beyond all reason that which we do like? The following extract from an editorial in the Portland Telegram is a fair sample of the judicial spirit with which the relative merits of Sampson and Schley have been considered. Referring to Sampson, this paper says:

"He is a skulker, a dodger, a recreant. He is, or pretends to be, sick; the truth is, he is sick of the truth. He accepted a blown-horn armor plate. He skulked in a storm. He wasn't present at Santiago. The only victory he ever won was the vanquishing of his own conscience. All this would never have been said; would have been unnecessary or improper to say, if Sampson had been capable of showing a boyish honor or a man's common sense. But he is neither. He is a snob and a slanderer, and he cannot blame people if they consider him a coward. He is at least a proven snob."

An Astoria paper, commenting on the finding of Admirals Benham and Ramsey as members of the court of inquiry, prints their names without the use of any capital letters and refers to them as "villains" and "asses." While Hearst devotes the space in the Examiner that less than 10 months ago was sacred to cartoons of McKinley as an absurd pigmy and Roosevelt as a little boy, all hair and teeth and goggles, astride a horse-borne or a man behind the gun, and Cervera, grand old man as ever trod the deck of a ship, are all in eclipse, while Sampson, in brain and body, and at the close of a long career, is left to the service of his country, finds himself stripped of all his laurels, and the target of every penny-a-liner in the country, because he was not a hero.

Jack Phillips, and Bob Evans, and Captain Clark, and the rest of the crew, grand old man as ever trod the deck of a ship, are all in eclipse, while Sampson, in brain and body, and at the close of a long career, is left to the service of his country, finds himself stripped of all his laurels, and the target of every penny-a-liner in the country, because he was not a hero.

It was an absolutely accurate statement of the man determined to discredit him, it was not a mere descriptive designation, but an attempt to appropriate to himself all the credit of the victory.

As a few months ago, when he was on the scene with the infamous charge that Schley proved himself "a coward, a catfish and a poltroon," followed by the still more infamous charge that Sampson had endorsed and approved the charge, it is a naval officer or a naval officer at Washington that is ever present in the vision of the man whose mania is the scenting of the Spanish vessel at anchor near the wharves of the present system. If it is a laborer at Vancouver Barracks, or the Presidio, or Fort Sheridan, should write a libel upon any military officer the same would trace it at once to some "military cabal" at Washington.

Marley's charge that no one ever in-dorsed or believed, results in the court of inquiry, that Schley, Benham and Ramsey, all naval officers of high rank and all men of high character, that they were entirely acceptable to Admiral Schley and his counsel. The result of this inquiry has been published, and no careless men in forming their judgments, where their prejudices have been aroused, that they do not realize how little difference there is in judgment rendered by Dewey and that rendered by Ramsey and Benham. Men who have not spent five minutes sifting and sifting the evidence of the case, and who could not possibly formulate a clear and logical statement of it, are voluble in praise of Dewey and in denunciation of Ramsey and Benham, yet upon the only question at issue, the conduct of the battle, they are all agreed.

There is no particular interest in the whole court, referring to Schley, unites in saying: "His conduct during the battle of July 3, 1898, was of a high order."

And yet, in his own person, his subordinate officers and men to fight courageously."

Instead of dissenting from the majority in the court of inquiry, Schley agreed with them in the majority of their findings. He should not have delayed the squadron for the Eagle; that he should not have made the retrograde turn westward with his squadron; that he should have promptly obeyed the Navy Department order of May 25; that he should have endeavored to capture or destroy the Spanish vessel at anchor near the wharves of the present system. If it is a laborer at Vancouver Barracks, or the Presidio, or Fort Sheridan, should write a libel upon any military officer the same would trace it at once to some "military cabal" at Washington.

Marley's charge that no one ever in-dorsed or believed, results in the court of inquiry, that Schley, Benham and Ramsey, all naval officers of high rank and all men of high character, that they were entirely acceptable to Admiral Schley and his counsel. The result of this inquiry has been published, and no careless men in forming their judgments, where their prejudices have been aroused, that they do not realize how little difference there is in judgment rendered by Dewey and that rendered by Ramsey and Benham. Men who have not spent five minutes sifting and sifting the evidence of the case, and who could not possibly formulate a clear and logical statement of it, are voluble in praise of Dewey and in denunciation of Ramsey and Benham, yet upon the only question at issue, the conduct of the battle, they are all agreed.

There is no particular interest in the whole court, referring to Schley, unites in saying: "His conduct during the battle of July 3, 1898, was of a high order."

And yet, in his own person, his subordinate officers and men to fight courageously."

Instead of dissenting from the majority in the court of inquiry, Schley agreed with them in the majority of their findings. He should not have delayed the squadron for the Eagle; that he should not have made the retrograde turn westward with his squadron; that he should have promptly obeyed the Navy Department order of May 25; that he should have endeavored to capture or destroy the Spanish vessel at anchor near the wharves of the present system. If it is a laborer at Vancouver Barracks, or the Presidio, or Fort Sheridan, should write a libel upon any military officer the same would trace it at once to some "military cabal" at Washington.

Marley's charge that no one ever in-dorsed or believed, results in the court of inquiry, that Schley, Benham and Ramsey, all naval officers of high rank and all men of high character, that they were entirely acceptable to Admiral Schley and his counsel. The result of this inquiry has been published, and no careless men in forming their judgments, where their prejudices have been aroused, that they do not realize how little difference there is in judgment rendered by Dewey and that rendered by Ramsey and Benham. Men who have not spent five minutes sifting and sifting the evidence of the case, and who could not possibly formulate a clear and logical statement of it, are voluble in praise of Dewey and in denunciation of Ramsey and Benham, yet upon the only question at issue, the conduct of the battle, they are all agreed.

There is no particular interest in the whole court, referring to Schley, unites in saying: "His conduct during the battle of July 3, 1898, was of a high order."

And yet, in his own person, his subordinate officers and men to fight courageously."

Instead of dissenting from the majority in the court of inquiry, Schley agreed with them in the majority of their findings. He should not have delayed the squadron for the Eagle; that he should not have made the retrograde turn westward with his squadron; that he should have promptly obeyed the Navy Department order of May 25; that he should have endeavored to capture or destroy the Spanish vessel at anchor near the wharves of the present system. If it is a laborer at Vancouver Barracks, or the Presidio, or Fort Sheridan, should write a libel upon any military officer the same would trace it at once to some "military cabal" at Washington.

Marley's charge that no one ever in-dorsed or believed, results in the court of inquiry, that Schley, Benham and Ramsey, all naval officers of high rank and all men of high character, that they were entirely acceptable to Admiral Schley and his counsel. The result of this inquiry has been published, and no careless men in forming their judgments, where their prejudices have been aroused, that they do not realize how little difference there is in judgment rendered by Dewey and that rendered by Ramsey and Benham. Men who have not spent five minutes sifting and sifting the evidence of the case, and who could not possibly formulate a clear and logical statement of it, are voluble in praise of Dewey and in denunciation of Ramsey and Benham, yet upon the only question at issue, the conduct of the battle, they are all agreed.

There is no particular interest in the whole court, referring to Schley, unites in saying: "His conduct during the battle of July 3, 1898, was of a high order."

And yet, in his own person, his subordinate officers and men to fight courageously."

Instead of dissenting from the majority in the court of inquiry, Schley agreed with them in the majority of their findings. He should not have delayed the squadron for the Eagle; that he should not have made the retrograde turn westward with his squadron; that he should have promptly obeyed the Navy Department order of May 25; that he should have endeavored to capture or destroy the Spanish vessel at anchor near the wharves of the present system. If it is a laborer at Vancouver Barracks, or the Presidio, or Fort Sheridan, should write a libel upon any military officer the same would trace it at once to some "military cabal" at Washington.

Marley's charge that no one ever in-dorsed or believed, results in the court of inquiry, that Schley, Benham and Ramsey, all naval officers of high rank and all men of high character, that they were entirely acceptable to Admiral Schley and his counsel. The result of this inquiry has been published, and no careless men in forming their judgments, where their prejudices have been aroused, that they do not realize how little difference there is in judgment rendered by Dewey and that rendered by Ramsey and Benham. Men who have not spent five minutes sifting and sifting the evidence of the case, and who could not possibly formulate a clear and logical statement of it, are voluble in praise of Dewey and in denunciation of Ramsey and Benham, yet upon the only question at issue, the conduct of the battle, they are all agreed.

There is no particular interest in the whole court, referring to Schley, unites in saying: "His conduct during the battle of July 3, 1898, was of a high order."

And yet, in his own person, his subordinate officers and men to fight courageously."

Instead of dissenting from the majority in the court of inquiry, Schley agreed with them in the majority of their findings. He should not have delayed the squadron for the Eagle; that he should not have made the retrograde turn westward with his squadron; that he should have promptly obeyed the Navy Department order of May 25; that he should have endeavored to capture or destroy the Spanish vessel at anchor near the wharves of the present system. If it is a laborer at Vancouver Barracks, or the Presidio, or Fort Sheridan, should write a libel upon any military officer the same would trace it at once to some "military cabal" at Washington.

Marley's charge that no one ever in-dorsed or believed, results in the court of inquiry, that Schley, Benham and Ramsey, all naval officers of high rank and all men of high character, that they were entirely acceptable to Admiral Schley and his counsel. The result of this inquiry has been published, and no careless men in forming their judgments, where their prejudices have been aroused, that they do not realize how little difference there is in judgment rendered by Dewey and that rendered by Ramsey and Benham. Men who have not spent five minutes sifting and sifting the evidence of the case, and who could not possibly formulate a clear and logical statement of it, are voluble in praise of Dewey and in denunciation of Ramsey and Benham, yet upon the only question at issue, the conduct of the battle, they are all agreed.

There is no particular interest in the whole court, referring to Schley, unites in saying: "His conduct during the battle of July 3, 1898, was of a high order."

And yet, in his own person, his subordinate officers and men to fight courageously."

Instead of dissenting from the majority in the court of inquiry, Schley agreed with them in the majority of their findings. He should not have delayed the squadron for the Eagle; that he should not have made the retrograde turn westward with his squadron; that he should have promptly obeyed the Navy Department order of May 25; that he should have endeavored to capture or destroy the Spanish vessel at anchor near the wharves of the present system. If it is a laborer at Vancouver Barracks, or the Presidio, or Fort Sheridan, should write a libel upon any military officer the same would trace it at once to some "military cabal" at Washington.

Marley's charge that no one ever in-dorsed or believed, results in the court of inquiry, that Schley, Benham and Ramsey, all naval officers of high rank and all men of high character, that they were entirely acceptable to Admiral Schley and his counsel. The result of this inquiry has been published, and no careless men in forming their judgments, where their prejudices have been aroused, that they do not realize how little difference there is in judgment rendered by Dewey and that rendered by Ramsey and Benham. Men who have not spent five minutes sifting and sifting the evidence of the case, and who could not possibly formulate a clear and logical statement of it, are voluble in praise of Dewey and in denunciation of Ramsey and Benham, yet upon the only question at issue, the conduct of the battle, they are all agreed.

There is no particular interest in the whole court, referring to Schley, unites in saying: "His conduct during the battle of July 3, 1898, was of a high order."

And yet, in his own person, his subordinate officers and men to fight courageously."

Instead of dissenting from the majority in the court of inquiry, Schley agreed with them in the majority of their findings. He should not have delayed the squadron for the Eagle; that he should not have made the retrograde turn westward with his squadron; that he should have promptly obeyed the Navy Department order of May 25; that he should have endeavored to capture or destroy the Spanish vessel at anchor near the wharves of the present system. If it is a laborer at Vancouver Barracks, or the Presidio, or Fort Sheridan, should write a libel upon any military officer the same would trace it at once to some "military cabal" at Washington.

Marley's charge that no one ever in-dorsed or believed, results in the court of inquiry, that Schley, Benham and Ramsey, all naval officers of high rank and all men of high character, that they were entirely acceptable to Admiral Schley and his counsel. The result of this inquiry has been published, and no careless men in forming their judgments, where their prejudices have been aroused, that they do not realize how little difference there is in judgment rendered by Dewey and that rendered by Ramsey and Benham. Men who have not spent five minutes sifting and sifting the evidence of the case, and who could not possibly formulate a clear and logical statement of it, are voluble in praise of Dewey and in denunciation of Ramsey and Benham, yet upon the only question at issue, the conduct of the battle, they are all agreed.

There is no particular interest in the whole court, referring to Schley, unites in saying: "His conduct during the battle of July 3, 1898, was of a high order."

And yet, in his own person, his subordinate officers and men to fight courageously."

Instead of dissenting from the majority in the court of inquiry, Schley agreed with them in the majority of their findings. He should not have delayed the squadron for the Eagle; that he should not have made the retrograde turn westward with his squadron; that he should have promptly obeyed the Navy Department order of May 25; that he should have endeavored to capture or destroy the Spanish vessel at anchor near the wharves of the present system. If it is a laborer at Vancouver Barracks, or the Presidio, or Fort Sheridan, should write a libel upon any military officer the same would trace it at once to some "military cabal" at Washington.

Marley's charge that no one ever in-dorsed or believed, results in the court of inquiry, that Schley, Benham and Ramsey, all naval officers of high rank and all men of high character, that they were entirely acceptable to Admiral Schley and his counsel. The result of this inquiry has been published, and no careless men in forming their judgments, where their prejudices have been aroused, that they do not realize how little difference there is in judgment rendered by Dewey and that rendered by Ramsey and Benham. Men who have not spent five minutes sifting and sifting the evidence of the case, and who could not possibly formulate a clear and logical statement of it, are voluble in praise of Dewey and in denunciation of Ramsey and Benham, yet upon the only question at issue, the conduct of the battle, they are all agreed.

There is no particular interest in the whole court, referring to Schley, unites in saying: "His conduct during the battle of July 3, 1898, was of a high order."

And yet, in his own person, his subordinate officers and men to fight courageously."

Instead of dissenting from the majority in the court of inquiry, Schley agreed with them in the majority of their findings. He should not have delayed the squadron for the Eagle; that he should not have made the retrograde turn westward with his squadron; that he should have promptly obeyed the Navy Department order of May 25; that he should have endeavored to capture or destroy the Spanish vessel at anchor near the wharves of the present system. If it is a laborer at Vancouver Barracks, or the Presidio, or Fort Sheridan, should write a libel upon any military officer the same would trace it at once to some "military cabal" at Washington.

Marley's charge that no one ever in-dorsed or believed, results in the court of inquiry, that Schley, Benham and Ramsey, all naval officers of high rank and all men of high character, that they were entirely acceptable to Admiral Schley and his counsel. The result of this inquiry has been published, and no careless men in forming their judgments, where their prejudices have been aroused, that they do not realize how little difference there is in judgment rendered by Dewey and that rendered by Ramsey and Benham. Men who have not spent five minutes sifting and sifting the evidence of the case, and who could not possibly formulate a clear and logical statement of it, are voluble in praise of Dewey and in denunciation of Ramsey and Benham, yet upon the only question at issue, the conduct of the battle, they are all agreed.

There is no particular interest in the whole court, referring to Schley, unites in saying: "His conduct during the battle of July 3, 1898, was of a high order."

And yet, in his own person, his subordinate officers and men to fight courageously."

Instead of dissenting from the majority in the court of inquiry, Schley agreed with them in the majority of their findings. He should not have delayed the squadron for the Eagle; that he should not have made the retrograde turn westward with his squadron; that he should have promptly obeyed the Navy Department order of May 25; that he should have endeavored to capture or destroy the Spanish vessel at anchor near the wharves of the present system. If it is a laborer at Vancouver Barracks, or the Presidio, or Fort Sheridan, should write a libel upon any military officer the same would trace it at once to some "military cabal" at Washington.

Marley's charge that no one ever in-dorsed or believed, results in the court of inquiry, that Schley, Benham and Ramsey, all naval officers of high rank and all men of high character, that they were entirely acceptable to Admiral Schley and his counsel. The result of this inquiry has been published, and no careless men in forming their judgments, where their prejudices have been aroused, that they do not realize how little difference there is in judgment rendered by Dewey and that rendered by Ramsey and Benham. Men who have not spent five minutes sifting and sifting the evidence of the case, and who could not possibly formulate a clear and logical statement of it, are voluble in praise of Dewey and in denunciation of Ramsey and Benham, yet upon the only question at issue, the conduct of the battle, they are all agreed.

There is no particular interest in the whole court, referring to Schley, unites in saying: "His conduct during the battle of July 3, 1898, was of a high order."

And yet, in his own person, his subordinate officers and men to fight courageously."

Instead of dissenting from the majority in the court of inquiry, Schley agreed with them in the majority of their findings. He should not have delayed the squadron for the Eagle; that he should not have made the retrograde turn westward with his squadron; that he should have promptly obeyed the Navy Department order of May 25; that he should have endeavored to capture or destroy the Spanish vessel at anchor near the wharves of the present system. If it is a laborer at Vancouver Barracks, or the Presidio, or Fort Sheridan, should write a libel upon any military officer the same would trace it at once to some "military cabal" at Washington.

Marley's charge that no one ever in-dorsed or believed, results in the court of inquiry, that Schley, Benham and Ramsey, all naval officers of high rank and all men of high character, that they were entirely acceptable to Admiral Schley and his counsel. The result of this inquiry has been published, and no careless men in forming their judgments, where their prejudices have been aroused, that they do not realize how little difference there is in judgment rendered by Dewey and that rendered by Ramsey and Benham. Men who have not spent five minutes sifting and sifting the evidence of the case, and who could not possibly formulate a clear and logical statement of it, are voluble in praise of Dewey and in denunciation of Ramsey and Benham, yet upon the only question at issue, the conduct of the battle, they are all agreed.

There is no particular interest in the whole court, referring to Schley, unites in saying: "His conduct during the battle of July 3, 1898, was of a high order."

And yet, in his own person, his subordinate officers and men to fight courageously."

Instead of dissenting from the majority in the court of inquiry, Schley agreed with them in the majority of their findings. He should not have delayed the squadron for the Eagle; that he should not have made the retrograde turn westward with his squadron; that he should have promptly obeyed the Navy Department order of May 25; that he should have endeavored to capture or destroy the Spanish vessel at anchor near the wharves of the present system. If it is a laborer at Vancouver Barracks, or the Presidio, or Fort Sheridan, should write a libel upon any military officer the same would trace it at once to some "military cabal" at Washington.

Marley's charge that no one ever in-dorsed or believed, results in the court of inquiry, that Schley, Benham and Ramsey, all naval officers of high rank and all men of high character, that they were entirely acceptable to Admiral Schley and his counsel. The result of this inquiry has been published, and no careless men in forming their judgments, where their prejudices have been aroused, that they do not realize how little