

would I fear appear too much like trampling upon a fallen foe but in a few Words I will say to you, the more I see of him & know of him the less do I like or admire him, his conduct is far more like that of a spoiled child thwarted than of a Great Man under Misfortune, and (what will perhaps surprise you as much as it has me) his Manners are particularly low & bad and nothing can exceed the apparent capriciousness & overbearing ill nature with which he treats those French Persons who have shewn their attachment to him by accompanying him hither & who continue to flatter him & cringe to him in a way that is neither to be understood nor seen without feelings of disgust & contempt by Englishmen.

Adieu My dear Sir Alexander. I am sorry to say this Miserable Rock offers nothing likely to prove acceptable to you but if I can serve you in aught when I return to *Cavendish Square* pray believe the Pleasure I should have in executing your Commands.

I beg my best Respects & Regards to Lady Campbell and that you will believe the real Esteem with which I ever am, My dear General

Most faithfully & truly yours

G. COCKBURN.

This will be conveyed to you by the *Icarus* Brig of War, which Vessel I send to remain with you until a better Vessel may arrive from England to take your part of the Station—the Commander of the *Icarus* has (certainly very improperly) brought his Wife with him from England & she cruizes with him in the Brig as however the fault is not hers poor Woman, and she appears to be very quiet and respectable I venture to ask of Lady Campbell & yourself to shew her any Countenance or Civilities which may be in your power without inconvenience.

General Grant's Veto of the «Inflation Bill.»

THE brief note by EX-Minister John A. Kasson, in the April CENTURY, touching General Grant's veto of the «Inflation Bill,» has called to my mind a statement of some importance made to me upon the same subject by the Hon. John A. J. Creswell of Maryland. I had not supposed that the incident referred to was unfamiliar to historical students. If it is, General Creswell's statement will certainly throw some additional light upon it. It will be remembered that General Creswell was Postmaster-General at the time, and it may be added that among his many high gifts marked ability as a lawyer and strength as a financier were included. I chanced to come into familiar acquaintance with him through the fact that he was the general counsel for the government before the court of Alabama claims, of which I was a member. His statement, which I think must be taken as altogether reliable, is somewhat at variance, but not strangely so, with Mr. Kasson's statement of what General Grant said.

General Creswell informed me that while President Grant did not submit the «Inflation Bill» to the consideration of the cabinet as a body, he did talk with the different members about it. At the close of one of the meetings the President requested General Creswell to remain. When they were alone the bill was discussed, the President saying that although he had thought much upon the subject, he had been unable to come to

a conclusion as to the true line of his duty. General Creswell urged him to veto the bill. The President replied that he was inclined to do so, but the pressure for approval of the measure, on the ground of party necessity, was greater than he had ever before experienced. He said that all but two members of his cabinet advised him to find reasons for signing the bill, and urged that a veto would imperil the prosperity of the country and perhaps wreck the party which had twice elected him. After considerable discussion the President said that his disposition of the measure would doubtless be the most important act of his administration; that in the midst of all the various contentions it was apparent that he must decide the matter for himself; that his judgment was opposed to the bill, and he thought he would veto it, although the weight of official recommendation was in its favor. He said he would have to see what he could do in the way of writing a message before the next cabinet meeting, and requested the Postmaster-General to come to him an hour in advance of the next meeting to see what he should produce.

When General Creswell called prior to the next meeting, the President took from his desk and read a very carefully written memorandum setting forth the considerations which had led him reluctantly to determine to sign the bill, and asked the cabinet officer how he liked it, and if he did not think that, all things considered, he had reached the wisest conclusion. Upon being met with expressions of surprise and regret, he took from his desk another paper and read it. It was the since famous veto message. General Creswell said with enthusiasm: «Mr. President, if you will use that, it will put the substantial sense of the country under lasting obligations to you.» «No matter what it does,» was the reply, «it is the only thing I can write upon the subject and satisfy my judgment and conscience, and I shall adhere to it.» He then explained that he had sometimes found that he could come to the safest conclusions by writing for himself the strongest possible paper on each side of controverted questions, and that he had worked until late into the previous night applying that test to the «Inflation Bill.» He said that at first he had given himself up to the thought that he would sign the bill and file with it an explanatory memorandum. He had made this as strong and logical as he could. Then he turned to the other side, and set to work to write the most convincing veto message of which he was capable. The result left no doubt in his mind as to which side had the weight of reason and argument. He felt sure of the right course, and, regardless of clamor and abuse, he would have pleasure in pursuing it.

This doubtless shows the operation of General Grant's mind, and the facts as to what he did in this connection, more fully than his statement to Mr. Kasson. It also shows that Mr. Kasson is in error in supposing that he destroyed the one document before preparing the other, and that he prepared and kept them *for comparison*, which seems to me to be the point of the whole matter, and that he showed both to at least one person. Indeed, both documents may yet be in existence. The difference between the two statements is not great, however, and is easily explained.

All who remember General Grant's manner of speech may readily believe that when he said the veto message was «the only thing I can write upon the subject and satisfy my judgment and conscience,» it was not necessary for him to add, «and I shall adhere to it,» before the matter was completely determined so far as his administration was concerned. His countrymen know much of *General Grant*, but I surmise they have much yet to learn concerning the singular purity and balance of mind, the independence and wisdom of judgment, and the quiet force of character of *President Grant*.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS. *Andrew S. Draper.*

Anecdotes of Lincoln and Grant.

I. LINCOLN'S READINESS.

I HAVE not hitherto happened to read or hear of the following relating to Lincoln. It seems very characteristic, and worthy of preservation. I give it just as it was told to me by one who was present and heard Lincoln at the time.

In March, 1860, after his famous Cooper Union speech, Lincoln spoke in the town hall at Meriden, Connecticut. The hall was packed with people. Men were there from New Haven, where he had spoken the evening before, among them, on the front row, being President Woolsey of Yale. Discussion as to whether, if elected, a Republican could be inaugurated had been current. During the speech at Meriden a man seated on one of the window-sills at the side of the hall, in a piping voice interrupted Lincoln with: «Do you believe, Mr. Lincoln, that if the Republicans should elect a President they would be able to inaugurate him?» For an instant it was as if a blight had fallen on the audience; then there was a storm of hisses, and cries of «Put him out!» etc. They did not want to face that situation. But Lincoln, straightening himself to his full height, and pointing to the man, soon showed that he wanted to take care of him; and the crowd observed absolute silence as Lincoln, beginning calmly, and with a bit of the Western drawl unique to his audience, but closing with the fire and force that matched the cut of his words and the strength of his logic, answered:

«I reckon, friend, that if there are *votes* enough to elect a Republican President, there 'll be *men* enough to *put him in.*» The audience literally «rose to its feet,» cheering and shouting; and none jumped quicker or higher than President Woolsey. That settled that question once for all in Meriden; and it is said that not a man who then heard Lincoln but was determined not only to vote for him, but to help «put him in,» if necessary.

John P. Bartlett.

II. GENERAL GRANT'S CIGAR.

SHORTLY after General Grant took command of all the armies of the United States he was in Washington. Dr. Daniel Simmons, of 97 Lee Avenue, Brooklyn, was then in the army, serving as corporal in Company A of the First Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, having been transferred from the 83d Regiment New York Volunteers, and was on duty at Washington. He was in command of the guard stationed at the headquarters of General Halleck.

Smoking was very offensive to General Halleck, and he ordered Corporal Simmons to instruct the guard on duty not to allow any one who was smoking to enter. The guard was so instructed. Very soon after the order was issued, General Grant visited General Halleck's office, and the soldier on duty informed him of the order, and said he could not enter while smoking, and General Grant threw away his cigar.

General Grant no doubt mentioned this incident to General Halleck, for he at once sent for Corporal Simmons, and as he entered the room General Halleck said:

«Do you know this gentleman?» looking toward General Grant.

Corporal Simmons replied, «No.»

General Halleck then said that he was General Grant, and that the soldier on duty in the hall had compelled him to throw away his cigar before he would allow him to enter.

Corporal Simmons replied that that was according to the orders from that office to him, and that he gave that order to the guard.

General Halleck then said that the order, so far as it would affect General Grant, must be countermanded.

General Grant at once said:

«No; there is no good reason why General Grant should not comply with orders, and the man on duty did just right.» He then said, directing his remarks to General Halleck: «I hope you will not change your order.»

Corporal Simmons says the order was not changed, and that he afterward saw General Grant visit the office on several occasions, always without his cigar.

B.

The Social Menace of Specialism.

UNDER the stress of a competition unequaled anywhere else, the everlasting American desire to «get ahead,» success has come to mean an ability to do a limited kind of work better than any one else can do it. The price of that success is constant, all-absorbing devotion to that one kind of work, in most cases to the exclusion of all other kinds and of all other subjects of interest, except in rare moments of relaxation, grudgingly self-conceded. The result is often atrophy of the unused faculties, as Darwin, through exclusive devotion to scientific investigation, lost, as he himself confesses, his early appreciation for poetry.

Specialism does not stop when one has become a specialist. For one must, as a corollary of its principal proposition, «call in a specialist,» whether it be a matter of theological dogma, art criticism, sanitary reform, advertising method, or even amusement—from baseball to dining. Thus it is that when we give a private dinner we often call in some professional purveyor of amusement—a singer, or dancer, or reader, or magician—to add the lacking touch of completeness; and when we give a public or club dinner, we do not do our own talking, but fall back upon a specialist to talk to us and for us—a professional «after-dinner orator,» who makes a business of providing for such occasions the maximum of humor (or «good stories») and the minimum of instruction (or serious eloquence). What an aptly descriptive term, as marking the status of the modern elaborate dinner, is the phrase, so common in large cities: «Why, he's a professional diner-out!» And what an aggrega-