

will deliver it to the Government Board of the Drainage Directors in January, 1898. It was agreed with the contractors that the portion of the canal between the City of Mexico and the 20th kilometre, which is comparatively difficult, because the ground is very loose, and the excavations to be made yet do not exceed 200,000 cubic metres, will be made directly by the Board as soon as the other portion of the canal has been finished; this last section of the work is expected to be finished in June, 1898, when the waters of the City of Mexico will leave the valley by the drainage works here mentioned.

The canal and six-mile tunnel through the mountain range have a total length approaching thirty-seven miles. The present works will take rank with the great achievements of modern times, just as the immense "cut" of Nochistongo, their unsuccessful predecessor, was the leader among ancient earthworks in all the world. The completed system will have cost \$20,000,000.

I have dwelt on these works at some length, because their importance to the City of Mexico can hardly be overestimated. Instead of being one of the healthiest cities in the world, as it should be with its magnificent climate and situation, Mexico, unfortunately, has a terribly heavy death-rate, due principally to want of drainage and generally bad sanitary condition. When the existing danger of floods is removed, and the sanitary evils are remedied by a proper system of drainage, the increased security that will be enjoyed by life and property will certainly have its effect on the prosperity of the city. Property will rise in value, the population will grow with rapidity, not to mention the tide of tourists that will set in from the United States, and this will mean larger revenues for the municipality.

I could not well finish this paper without paying General Diaz, President of Mexico, a just tribute for the great interest he has taken in having this gigantic work brought to a close during his administration. To his exertions in this regard, and to his commanding position in Mexico, more than to anything else, this happy result, now in sight, is due. So after a weary search of centuries for relief, the beautiful Valley of Mexico will gain its deliverance not only from the engulfing floods, but from the sanitary evils which have long resulted from defective drainage.

Contract for the Sewage System of the City of Mexico.—The complement of the drainage works is the construction of a proper sewage system in the City of Mexico, which will carry all its refuse out of the Valley of Mexico, and on June 8, 1898, a contract was signed at the City of Mexico by the Drainage Board with Messrs. Vezin & Co., of Paris, to do such work.

HISTORICAL NOTES ON MEXICO.

Mr. Walter S. Logan, a prominent lawyer of New York, with business interests in Mexico, chiefly in the State of Sonora, and a personal friend of mine, read a paper entitled "A Mexican Lawsuit" before the Law Department of the American Social Science Association, at their annual meeting at Saratoga, on the 5th of September, 1895, and requested me to be present at the same. I received at the same time an invitation to attend that meeting, which I suppose I owed to Mr. Logan, from Professor Francis Wayland, President of the Law Department of that Association. Wishing to oblige Mr. Logan, and at the same time to hear his paper read, for I had no doubt that it would do justice to Mexico, as Mr. Logan is friendly to that country, I determined to attend the meeting, and I reached Saratoga late on the afternoon of the day on which it was to be held. I found at the hotel at which Mr. Logan and most of the other gentlemen of the Association were stopping, and where I myself lodged, a printed notice that Mr. Logan would read his paper that evening, and that I would make some remarks afterwards. I was considerably disturbed by this, as it is always difficult for a diplomatic representative of a foreign country to speak in public, and I was not prepared to speak before so enlightened an audience.

At the appointed time we went to the meeting, and Mr. Logan read his paper. While he was reading it I noted certain incorrect statements made, in good faith, no doubt, by Mr. Logan, but which presented Mexico in a rather unfavorable light. I found myself in a very difficult position, because, considering myself as Mr. Logan's guest, I did not think it would be proper for me to criticise his paper; but, at the same time, being the official representative of Mexico, I could hardly permit his mistakes to pass unnoticed. I was placed in the same position as the guest who, while present at a dinner to which he had been invited, should hear his host make incorrect and even uncomplimentary remarks about his house or his family, although made unintentionally. No matter how bad taste such conduct showed if made intentionally, it would be still worse taste for the guest to notice

such remarks. After some consideration, however, I concluded to avail myself of the opportunity which was given me to speak after Mr. Logan's paper was read, for the purpose of correcting some of the principal mistakes which he had made. When my turn came I embraced the opportunity to correct, in as careful, considerate, and polite a manner towards Mr. Logan, as was possible for me to do, what I considered were his chief mistakes.

At Mr. Logan's request, made to me just before he read his paper, I made some general remarks about the philosophy of the revolutions in Mexico, for the purpose of showing that the Mexican people were not actually inclined to revolt, that there had been ample cause for revolutions in the past; but that such causes had now disappeared, and it was not likely that any more disturbances would take place.

On all suitable opportunities which have been presented to me during my official residence in this country, I have tried to impress the same views in as concise and clear a manner as it was possible for me to do. On several occasions, and in different addresses delivered before distinguished audiences at public banquets and other places, I have presented these same views in the shape that it was possible to do in ten or fifteen minutes' time. I append to this paper a few of the addresses I have made with that purpose, beginning with one delivered in New York in 1864, and ending with another delivered in 1892 in the same city.

Some time after the Saratoga meeting had taken place I received from the American Social Science Association the stenographic notes of my remarks, accompanied by the request—made also by Mr. Logan, who published his remarks and mine in a special pamphlet—that I should correct mine for publication. With some reluctance I consented to revise them, but after they were published I saw that I had not done justice to the two subjects on which I had spoken, and that it would be expedient to revise my remarks and amplify them, so as to make two separate papers, one on the "Philosophy of the Mexican Revolutions," and the other on the "Criminal Jurisprudence of Mexico." I therefore prepared two articles, and they were published, the former in the January, and the latter in the July, 1895, number of the *North American Review*. Even after the publication in that Review I thought it advisable to further amplify and revise both articles, finally assuming the form in which they now appear.

In the meanwhile, Dr. Ricardo Becerra, a very distinguished man of letters from Colombia, South America, who for several years represented his country at Washington, and who is now living at Caracas, Venezuela, wrote recently a biography of General Don Francisco de Miranda, the principal promoter of the independence of the Spanish colonies of South America. I found in Dr. Becerra's book valuable information, that had not come to my knowledge before, about the

work done in Europe in the latter part of the eighteenth century by native Americans and Spanish Jesuits, whom the father of the then reigning King of Spain had expelled from his dominions in America, to establish the independence of the Spanish colonies on this continent. I found that the promoters of that cause claimed to act in behalf of all the Spanish colonies of America, including Mexico, and as I was sure that Mexico had not been represented at the meetings which were held in Europe in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, I determined to rectify that statement, and with that purpose in view I wrote an article to vindicate the historical truth in regard to that important event in Spanish-American history.

When I began to write my paper I found that the course which the United States pursued towards the revolted colonies of Spain during their struggle for independence had a close connection with my subject, and about the same time, on January 11, 1897, Senator Hale, of Maine, presented to the Senate a paper entitled "Power to Recognize the Independence of a New State," which was published by order of the Senate, as Senate Document No. 56, Fifty-fourth Congress, Second Session. That paper, which I understood had been prepared at the State Department, contained a concise statement of the policy of the United States Government towards the Spanish-American republics, written especially with a view to support the contention that such recognition is an executive prerogative, and does not rest with Congress, and showing at the same time that the United States has always acted with deliberation in the recognition of belligerent rights or independence of a new foreign State, and tried to comply faithfully with her international obligations, a fact which shows that the policy of the present and last administrations regarding the disturbances in Cuba is in accordance with the precedents established by the fathers of the country at the beginning of the century. I found a great deal of valuable information collected in that paper, which I include in my article.

Reviewing the subject, I also found that the United States had prevented Mexico and Colombia from carrying to Cuba in 1825 the war against Spain, which in all probability might have resulted in the independence of that island, and thinking that that was a pertinent subject, I also embraced it in my paper.

I entitled my paper "The Origin of Mexican Independence," which I considered an appropriate title, but when I sent it to the editor of the *North American Review* for publication, he suggested a more pretentious one, namely, "The United States and the Liberation of the Spanish-American Colonies," and out of deference to his greater knowledge and experience I consented to make the change. This pretentious title caused wider circulation of some of the passages of the article than would otherwise have been the case, as it was telegraphed

all over the country that I had written a paper censuring the United States for not having assisted the Spanish colonies in their war for independence, and for not having permitted Mexico and Colombia to make Cuba independent, when my article did not contain a word of censure against the United States Government, and was only a brief statement of historical facts with quotations from high American authorities. I thought that the reason for this misunderstanding was the fact that my paper had not been read in its entirety by those who telegraph to us press extracts from the same, but only such extracts from it as were thought to be of importance, and thus its object was misapprehended. I was under the impression that anybody who read carefully the whole text could find nothing incorrect or improper in it, much less disrespectful, either to the United States or to the Spanish Government.

I was therefore somewhat surprised when I saw that a man of Senator Money's great abilities shared such views, which he expressed in an answer to my article published in the *North American Review*, for September, 1897, under the title of "The United States and the Spanish-American Colonies. A Reply." In that paper Senator Money stated that my assertions were incorrect, and that the United States had materially and morally assisted in the liberation of the Spanish-American Republics. It afforded me great pleasure to have the opportunity of making clear that my statements were correct, and that my article did not contain a word of censure against the Government of the United States, and with that purpose in view I published in the November number of the *North American Review* a rejoinder to Senator Money's article, amplifying what I had said in my first article, and showing, in my opinion in a very clear and conclusive manner, the correctness of my former statements.

I would much prefer to insert in this volume Senator Money's answer as well as my rejoinder, but as that would take a great deal of space and the question is not of such momentous importance as to warrant it, I have added to my first article such portions contained in the second as I think would make it more complete and clear, and consider in a few foot-notes some of Senator Money's principal objections.

As the paper relating to the origin of Mexican independence, which I have now entitled "Genesis of Mexican Independence," refers to a period which precedes our revolutions, I will insert it first, and it will be followed by the other entitled "Philosophy of the Mexican Revolutions."

PART I.

GENESIS OF MEXICAN
INDEPENDENCE.