

AMUSEMENTS.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

WELLS' ACADEMY OF MUSIC.
October 24, and During the Week.
First performance of the season.

(Special Correspondence of the Republican.)

OUR NEW YORK LETTER.

Senator Conkling in New York.
His Position on the Common School Question—A Clear and Sharp Issue Made Between the Republicans and the Confederate-Catholic-Democratic Party.

The mail will bring you the full report of Senator Conkling's speech at Albany. It is confined mostly to State issues, but one feature of the speech deals with a leading and all-absorbing national issue. The State issue of interest because they have an indirect bearing on the contest of 1876.

The national issue having a more direct bearing on both State and national interests, will, of course, prove most interesting to the country at large. I propose briefly to allude in this letter to both sides of Mr. Conkling's speech. The position and influence of the New York Senator justify me in thus surrendering this letter to him.

Before taking up the speech let us glance at the Senator himself. Conkling is a courageous, pronounced, clear-headed, far-sighted Republican. Furthermore, he is a warm and trusted friend of the national administration. For these reasons his utterances are regarded with unusual interest by political leaders of all parties. The advent of Conkling as a popular leader in the present campaign, therefore, to use a common expression, "means business."

The fact that he has concluded to enter the arena of public debate is significant. The fact that the people crowd to hear him is still more significant. The fact that in his opening speech, while dealing with purely local questions, he steps aside to strike the keynote of the great contest of 1876, shows that there is "warm water" ahead if Conkling lives. When he gives "notice" that the Republican party will stand by the common schools of Protestant America, "against all comers now and hereafter," there is a sweep given to the issue now joined in New York which embraces more than appears upon the surface.

In dealing with the purely local issues involved in the present State canvass, Mr. Conkling assumes the aggressive and makes the accusation of fraud and corruption so plain against the so-called reformers of the so-called Democracy that these gentlemen will find it hard work to defend themselves from the attack. The "reformers" were not prepared for this. They expected to see Conkling stand hat in hand and enter upon a long explanatory apology in behalf of the party, the President and himself. They were, of course, amazed to find themselves arraigned before the public and held to a strict accountability for their past acts. We all know how foolish it is for a man who lives in a glass house to throw stones. This folly is illustrated in the case of Tammany thus turning reformer, and Fernando Wood turning "Conservative." Conkling has demonstrated the absolute absurdity of this Democratic make-practice and the destruction of glass in consequence. It is not necessary to enter upon this portion of the debate in detail. To do so would be to fill your paper, and these details after all could possess no great interest for the great majority of your readers. It is when Mr. Conkling strikes the common school question that the heart blood of this great canvass begins to stir, and beat, and throb and glow.

In reproducing this part of the Senator's speech I will give him the advantage of his own language, correcting only such inaccuracies as are plainly manifest upon the face of the printed report as it lies before me.

"At the foundation of safe and regulated liberty and self-government," said Mr. Conkling, "lies popular education. The common school is at once the bulwark and corner stone of our national edifice. The common school is for no one nationality or sect, race or class more than another. The common school is for the benefit of all, and must be supported by the just taxation of all and maintained as a system one and entire. The Republican State Convention of New York, standing on this platform, has entered a protest against all attempts by any sect to divide the school fund or to divert it to sectarian, race or class education. In other States the Republicans have taken the same ground, and the Republican party is thus pledged everywhere throughout the Union to guard and protect the common schools as the bulwark of our liberties and national unity. This attitude of the Republican party is timely. It is devoutly to be hoped by all good citizens that all religious issues may be kept out of American politics, but while this is our desire, we can not conceal from ourselves the fact that movements are on foot in which an alliance, dangerous to our free institutions, is sought between political parties and religious creeds. We can not longer close our eyes to the fact that organized hostility to our common school system is making its appearance simultaneously in different States. We see this in far off Texas. We see it in other States of the South. We see its developments in Ohio. We have seen these same portentous developments in the cities of this State and in the halls of our Legislature. We see also that the Democratic papers in this State are entirely silent in regard to these facts and developments. This silence is ominous. But this silence of the Democratic party in regard to the common school question should not surprise us. It should teach the country that the Republican party, and the Republican party alone, is to stand for the common school system of the United States. We therefore put 'free schools' on our banner, and we mean to keep these words there as notice that the common school system in this State and throughout the Union will be defended against all comers, now and hereafter."

There is a ring in this proclamation—a path and meaning in the language which will produce effect upon the voters of New York. It shows us that Conkling is "in the training" for a gladiatorial fight with the Northern Democracy and its Roman Jesuit and Southern Confederate allies, on the common school question.

The Shipmasters and the Cotton Exchange.

Some time since the Cotton Exchange resolved, for the interests of all concerned as was then understood, to appoint inspectors whose duties were to examine every bale of cotton before or after it was on the ship or levee. In the course of his performance of his duties one of the inspectors visited Captain Langdon's ship, the Mary E. Riggs, and such a misunderstanding came about that the inspector was put off the vessel. The Cotton Exchange, thereupon, passed a series of resolutions, October 20, declaring that the inspectors should report the names of all masters who refused to furnish daily reports of cotton received, or furnish facilities; that the names of those complained of be posted on the boards of the Exchange, and that any one interfering with inspectors should be prosecuted.

On this Captain Langdon wrote a sharp letter, which is published in the Price Current of the twenty-third instant. In it he says the inspector was tendered every facility, but failed to report a damaged bale to which his attention was called, and was then told he could do no more inspecting there. He then twitted the captain, whose vessel was chartered for a full cargo, that cotton shippers would not export by his vessel. The captain calls the attention of the Exchange to the fact that cotton on his vessel is not in its custody, but his, and that it has no jurisdiction over people who do not belong to it, nor have access to its rooms. The only safety of the master is to receive cotton in good order. Captain Langdon says:

"We shipmasters are desirous of co-operating with any respectable body that will assist in correcting abuses in the cotton trade—abuses which have, probably, failed heavier on the ship and with greater injustice than upon any other party; but we want to be made an element in the determination and vehemently protest against the insulting treatment that has been meted out to us by this board of your Exchange in their resolutions. In them we are charged with suspicion and denied the right of keeping to ourselves the ship's business, when in truth we have been injured by the ship's owners with a loss of our property, because they have faith in our ability and integrity."

Your resolutions would appear despotic, if it were not so well appreciated that the Cotton Exchange is utterly powerless to put them into execution. A few courteous expressions of regret at the controversy follow, and Captain Langdon's course is indorsed by the signatures of eighteen shipmasters and the approval of many others. Some action on the part of the Cotton Exchange being considered necessary, the president was instructed to write to Captain Langdon, and the letter, together with Captain Langdon's reply, are given below:

NEW ORLEANS, October 25, 1875. Captain Henry Langdon, Master of Ship Mary E. Riggs. DEAR SIR—Your communication of the twenty-first instant has been referred to me by the directors of the Exchange, that I might reply to the same.

In doing so I shall overlook certain expressions, which I assume would have been stricken out by you had you written less hastily. You have entirely misconceived the real intent of the Cotton Exchange in establishing the system of availing themselves of the services of inspectors, and there is no possible certain abuse which are of serious injury to all concerned in the cotton trade. We are well aware that any rules governing an important branch of trade, to be effective, must be founded upon principles of strict equity to all parties, and in framing the rules for government of levee inspection it was our intention to secure the interests of shipmasters and shippers as well as those of inspectors. If you will carefully read the regulations, which I hand you a copy, I think you will see that they properly carried out, such will be their practical effect.

It is true at the outset both inspectors and shipmasters are liable to misapprehension, and the one by the other. The true intent of the rules, and the one by over zealous discharge of their duties and the other by having conceived their rights to be infringed upon, may lead to disputes and contentions. I freely admit that an inspector can only act on board of a vessel with the consent of the master, and there is no necessity for his going on board except possibly to take an account of cotton carried on deck. As an inspector is not a party which would render it necessary for him to enter the hold of a ship. Upon the other hand the members of the Exchange claim that they have the right to send inspectors upon the levee for the purpose of seeing that the cotton if they send them there they must protect them in the proper discharge of their duties.

In the case specially referred to by you it would seem that your true course would have been to refuse to receive the bale that was alleged to have been damaged. An inspector or any other man may be in judgment in deciding whether a bale of cotton is damaged or not. The master or officer of a ship receiving cargo must be the sole judge as to whether such cargo is in good condition or not, and no one else can be enforced, compelling him to receive damaged goods and receipt for them as sound. The objects are plainly set forth in the rules and may be summed up as follows:

1. To protect from theft. 2. To see that cotton is properly stored. 3. To see that cotton is not being re-weighed. 4. To keep a record showing whether cotton was wet or dry when received, or whether it was wet or dry when taken on board. The practical effect of a proper enforcement of these rules will, it is hoped, greatly reduce the losses from what is called "country damage." In cases where cotton is sent down to a ship in a wet condition, the certificate of the Exchange will protect the ships. In cases where cotton is exposed to rain, or is rolled through the mud, the certificate will protect the shipper against loss clearly due to the neglect of the shipmaster. I would avail myself of this opportunity to call your attention and that of other shippers to the danger of damaging dry cotton by storing wet cotton in garages with it. In all such cases the shipper of dry cotton would have a valid claim for the injury done his property. In conclusion, I would assure you that while the Cotton Exchange will at all times hold itself in readiness to give careful consideration to any objections that may be urged against its rules, and will do its utmost to make them conform to the strictest principles of equity and fair dealing, it will not hesitate to adopt all necessary measures to enforce them. Very respectfully, JOHN PHELPS, President.

BY TELEGRAPH.

WASHINGTON.

The Enforcement Act. WASHINGTON, October 26.—The Star says the opinion on the constitutionality of the Enforcement Act is not now expected until the last of November. Treasurer Spinner's Account. Three years will probably elapse before there will be a settlement of Treasurer Spinner's account. New Ministers Received. The President received the new Chilean and Austrian ministers to-day. Another Treasury Theft. There is no doubt that \$2000 has been stolen from the redemption division of the Treasury's office. No arrests have been made.

NEW YORK.

Involuntary Bankruptcy. NEW YORK, October 26.—An involuntary petition in bankruptcy was filed on Saturday in the United States District Court against the New York and Erie Railroad Company, representing \$600,000. The total unsecured indebtedness is about \$1,500,000. Failures. Disney & Hatch, leather dealers, have suspended. No statement of their affairs has yet been made. The failure was owing to loss by fire of their tannery at New Mills, Pennsylvania, and to bad debts during the year ending September 30. Oscar Deke, tea and spice importer, also suspended. It is thought the suspension is only temporary. S. Bennett, C. Co. made an assignment for the benefit of their creditors. Archibald Baxter & Co., who recently failed, were yesterday secured by the board of managers of the Erie Railroad. Exchange for conduct inconsistent with the just and equitable principles of trade in connection with their suspension.

WESTERN WHISKY.

The Louisville Commercial mentions the transfer of internal revenue supervisor, which gives General W. J. Brady charge of the supervising district which includes this State, and orders Colonel P. B. Hunt to the Ohio and Indiana district. The Commercial says: Colonel Hunt leaves this district in good shape. He has put a stop to distilling in New Orleans, where there should be no distilling, and he has thoroughly overhauled the whole business of the district, which is nearly all cases in conformity with law. This, of course, is complimentary to Colonel Hunt, though we believe all distilleries were looked up here by Special Agent Brooks, while the district was under the supervision of Mr. Cobb, and long before Colonel Hunt was appointed. There is no defense to be made for those who make crooked whisky; those who violate the law must suffer its penalties; the laws regulating the distillation of whisky may be unjust, severe, tyrannical; that is not for the law breakers to decide. If the Commercial had stated that there should be no illicit distilling, it would have uttered a popular desire. When it says there should be no distilling in New Orleans, it only breathes the prayer of West-run producers against the business of this city. The world would undoubtedly be better off if the manufacture of whisky was discontinued in every place. The Western wish that whisky shall not be made here is not so much in the interest of temperance reform as it is that, with no competitor in home production, New Orleans may become a better market for the foreign stuff made in Indiana, Kentucky and Ohio. It cannot be charged that government officers lend themselves to the unworthy purposes of supporting manufacturers in one place and facilitating whisky making in another. The supervisor assumes that all distillers are dishonest. With the knowledge that Louisiana has not nationalized herself with the reputation of being a law abiding State, and that the Democratic citizens of New Orleans do not particularly thirst to pay the public debt incurred by the war against Southern Democracy and secession, the revenue officers may reasonably be expected to heed somewhat to the old Western cry that crooked whisky is made here whenever distilleries are allowed to work.

New Orleans has already too much to contend with to be attractive to capitalists, who hear reports of epidemics of White Leagues, of a party standing ready to overthrow the State government, of monopolies secured by Democratic lobbies, of high city taxes, of Democratic City Administrators selling the public franchises and establishing a lottery bond scheme, and other current charges which do not decrease as they travel; but it is a little too much to have a Kentucky paper coolly and piously assert that distilling should not be allowed in New Orleans, and to put a supervisor on the back because he may be disposed to think so too. If our people must drink whisky, we wish them to encourage home industry in their drinking. If whisky can be made honestly and at the same time profitably, our distillers can prove it. Bourbon may be very good, but when else, it is not so good. Our rag-money dealers of the West may say that Louisiana should be allowed to raise corn and make park whisky, but our people have always been sending their money away to buy food. The manufacture of whisky is about the only enterprise in New Orleans which ever produced goods for shipment to other points. Captain S. W. Hammond succeeded in making an alcohol here which became known in all States for its excellence; it was in constant transportation and demand; being reported to France in barrels and coming back in cognize bottles. When that stopped New Orleans lost and manufacturers at other points gained. Kentucky is not sorry.

DESTRUCTION OF THE TOWNS OF ANGLE, MISSISSIPPI, BY FIRE.

MEMPHIS, October 26.—The Appeal's Mississippi special says: Last night at twelve o'clock a fire was discovered in the rear part of Dunaway's store, which spread rapidly and soon destroyed the business portion of the town, causing great loss to the people of that place. After the fire was given up, citizens turned out to assist in preventing the fire from spreading, but there being a heavy wind the little fire could be done to arrest the headway of the flames, the entire business was consumed. By hard work the flames were prevented from crossing the street to the residence portion of the place, which would have caused much greater loss and much suffering. L. M. Deering's grocery store, with stock valued at \$2000, is a total loss; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000; F. N. Jones' grocery, \$1500; C. W. Dunaway's two stores, with stock valued at \$4000, together with the books and \$2000 personal property, all lost; Henry Kelly's dry goods, \$2000; A. Kelly & Co. drug and grocery store, loss \$3000; Max Levy's dry goods, \$2000;