

BERING SEA DISPUTE

The Question Far From Being Settled.

The Recent Correspondence on the Subject.

Neither Nation is Willing to Make Concessions.

A Wordy War Carried on by Secretary Blaine and the British Government.

Associated Press Dispatches.

WASHINGTON, July 23.—The president today sent to the house of representatives, in answer to the resolution introduced by Representative Hitt, the official correspondence between the government and Great Britain touching the seal fisheries of Bering sea. In his accompanying letter of transmittal to the president, Secretary Blaine, under date of Bar Harbor, July 19th, regarding the delay in transmission, which the president directed on the 17th instant, says the correspondence is still in progress.

The correspondence includes thirty separate papers, beginning with a letter from Edwards, first secretary of legation and charge d'affaires after Minister West's recall, dated August 24, 1889, and closing with one from Secretary Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefote, British minister, dated July 19, 1890.

The Opening Letter.

The opening letter from Edwards says he is instructed by his government to call attention to the fact that repeated rumors had reached the British government that British vessels had been searched and seized by United States cruisers in Bering sea outside the three-mile limit, and asks the United States to send stringent instructions to its officers to prevent the possibility of such occurrences taking place, in accordance with the assurance of Secretary Bayard that pending negotiations no such interference should take place; and adding that Sir Julian Pauncefote, on his return to Washington, would be prepared to discuss the whole question.

Mr. Blaine's Reply.

To this Blaine replied on the same day, that the same rumors, probably based on truth, had reached the government of the United States, but that up to date there had been no official communication received on the subject. He adds: "It has been, and is the earnest desire of the president of the United States to have such an adjustment as shall remove all possible ground of misunderstanding with her majesty's government concerning the existing troubles in Bering sea; and the president believes the responsibility for delay in adjustment cannot be properly charged to the government of the United States. In the opinion of the president the points at issue between the two governments are capable of prompt adjustment on a basis entirely honorable to both."

A Request Unanswered.

On September 12th, last, Edwards asked when he might expect an answer to the request his government made August 24th, that instructions be sent to Alaska to prevent the probability of the seizure of British ships in Bering sea. He says: "The recent reports of seizures having taken place are causing much excitement both in England and Canada."

Mr. Blaine, on September 4th, replied that he supposed her majesty's government was satisfied of the president's earnest desire to come to a friendly agreement; that official instructions to Sir Julian Pauncefote to proceed immediately after his arrival in October to a full discussion of the question, removed all necessity for preliminary correspondence touching its merits. "A categorical response would have been, and still is, impracticable, unjust to this government and misleading to the government of her majesty. Therefore in the judgment of the president, the whole subject could more wisely be remanded to the formal discussion so near at hand. It is proper, however, to add that any instructions sent to Bering sea at the time of your original request, would fail to reach those waters before the departure of the vessels of the United States."

The next communication is a telegram from Lord Salisbury to Edwards favoring the proposed international agreement for a closed season on the sealing grounds.

In another letter to Edwards, October 24, the marquis transmits copies of affidavits bearing on the seizure of the British sealers, Black Diamond and Triumph, by the United States revenue cutter Rush. He says: "It is apparent from these affidavits that the vessels were seized at a distance from land far in excess of the limit of the maritime jurisdiction which any nation can claim by international law. Cases similar in these respects were those of the ships Caroline, Onward and Thornton, seized by a vessel of the United States outside her territorial waters in the summer of 1887."

He adds that the illegality of this was brought to the attention of the United States, and though no official reply was made, Bayard gave unofficial assurance that no more seizures would be made pending negotiation, and says: "But in view of the unexpected renewal of seizures, of which her majesty's government has previously complained, it is my duty to protest against them and state that, in the opinion of her majesty's government, they are wholly unjustified by international law."

CONTRA BONOS MORES.

Mr. Blaine Scores the Heinous Pursuit of the Poachers.

Correspondence between Blaine and the new British minister began January 22d, this year, with a very long letter from the secretary to Sir Julian Pauncefote. The secretary opened with an acknowledgment of the receipt of papers bearing on the seizures made by

the Rush. He says: "In the opinion of the president, the Canadian vessels arrested and detained in Bering sea, were engaged in a pursuit in itself *contra bonos mores*—a pursuit which necessarily involves serious and permanent injury to the rights of the government and people of the United States. To establish this ground it is not necessary to argue the question of the extent and nature of the sovereignty of this government over the waters of Bering sea. It is not necessary to explain, certainly not to define the powers and privileges ceded by his imperial majesty the emperor of Russia, in the treaty by which the Alaskan territory was transferred to the United States. The weighty considerations growing out of the acquisition of that territory, with all the rights on land and sea inseparably connected therewith, may be safely left out of view while the grounds are set forth upon which this government rests its justification for the action complained of by her majesty's government."

The secretary then speaks of the value of the seal fisheries which were controlled by Russia without interference or question until the cession of Alaska to the United States in 1867. This undisturbed possession continued to the United States until 1886, passing vessels abstaining from seal capture. He says that this uniform avoidance of all attempts to take fur seal in those waters had been a constant recognition of the right held and exercised, first by Russia, and subsequently by this government. It had also been a recognition of the fact now held beyond denial or doubt, that the taking of seals in the open sea rapidly leads to their extinction.

This in brief was the condition of the Alaska fur seal fisheries down to the year 1886. Precedents, customs and rights had been established and enjoyed either by Russia or the United States for nearly a century. The two nations were the only powers that owned a foot of land on the continent that bordered on the islands included within the Bering sea waters where seal resort. In this peaceful and secluded field of labor whose benefit was shared by the native Aleuts of the Pribilof islands, by the United States and by England, certain Canadian vessels in 1886 asserted their right to enter, and by a ruthless course destroy the fisheries, and with them destroy also the valuable industries resulting.

The government of the United States at once proceeded to check this movement, which unchecked was sure to do great and irreparable harm. It was a cause of unfeigned surprise to the United States that her majesty's government should immediately interfere to defend and encourage (surely to encourage by defending) the course of the Canadians in disturbing an industry which had been carefully developed for more than ninety years under the flags of Russia and the United States, developed in such a manner as not to interfere with public rights or the private industries of any people, or any other person.

Her majesty's government must question whether this pursuit can itself be regarded as *contra bonos mores*, unless and until, for special reasons, it has been agreed by international arrangement to forbid it.

So great has been the injury to the fisheries from the irregular and destructive slaughter of seals in the open waters of Bering sea by Canadian vessels that whereas the United States government had allowed one hundred thousand to be taken annually for a series of years, it was now compelled to reduce the number to sixty thousand. If four years of this violation of international law, and a neighbor's rights has reduced the annual slaughter of seals by forty per cent., it is easy to see how short a period will be required to work the total destruction of the fisheries. The ground upon which her majesty's government justifies, or at least defends, the course of Canadian vessels, rests upon the fact that they are committing their acts of destruction on the high seas, and is doubtful whether her majesty's government would abide by this rule if an attempt were made to interfere with the pearl fisheries of Ceylon, which extend more than twenty miles from the shore line, and have been enjoyed by England without molestation ever since their acquisition. So well recognized is the British ownership of those fisheries, regardless of the limit of the three-mile line, that her majesty's government has authorized to seal the pearl-fisheries right from year to year to the highest bidder. Nor is it credible that modes of fishing on the Grand Banks, altogether practicable but highly destructive, would be justified or even permitted by Great Britain on the plea that the vicious acts were committed more than three miles from shore.

He mentioned dynamite as one of those destructive methods. Does her majesty's government seriously maintain that the law of nations is powerless to prevent such violation of the common rights of man? Are the supporters of justice in all nations to be declared incompetent to prevent wrongs so odious and so destructive?

In the judgment of this government the law of the sea is not lawlessness. One step beyond that which her majesty's government has taken in this contention and piracy finds its jurisdiction.

This government has been ready to concede much in order to adjust all the differences of view, and in the judgment of the president the already proposed solution is not only equitable but generous. The president now awaits with deep interest not unmixt with solicitude, any proposition for the reasonable adjustment which her majesty's government may submit. Forcible resistance, to which this government is constrained in the Bering sea, is, in the president's judgment, demanded, not only by the necessity of defending the traditional and long established rights of the United States, but also the rights of good government and good morals the world over.

In this contention the government of the United States has no occasion and no desire to withdraw or modify the positions which it has at any time maintained against the claims of the imperial government of Russia. The United States will not withhold from any nation the privileges which it demanded for itself when Alaska was part of the Russian empire. Nor is the government of the United States disposed to exercise in those possessions any less power or authority than it was willing to concede to the imperial government of Russia when its sovereignty extended over them.

PAUNCEFOTE'S PLAN.

He Proposes a Commission of Experts to Solve the Difficulty.

On April 30th, Pauncefote wrote Blaine, in answer to his invitation for a counter proposal for a settlement, that as the sole object of the negotiations was the preservation of the fur seal species, regardless of its advantage to any particular nation or private interest, it would be strange if there should be a failure to devise means of solving the difficulties which had arisen. In view of the divergent views held, no solution would satisfy public opinion in Canada or Great Britain without a full inquiry by a mixed commission of experts. Meanwhile he was prepared to recommend to his government certain provisional and precautionary measures to remove apprehension of the depletion of the fur seal species, pending the report of the commission.

He then cites authority to show the vast number of the seals, and that it is on the increase. The minister then says: "But in order to quiet all apprehension on that score I would propose the following provisional regulations: 1. That pelagic sealing should be prohibited in Bering sea, the sea of Ochotsk and the adjoining waters during the months of May, June, October, November and December, which may be termed the 'migration periods' of the fur seal. 2. That all sealing vessels be prohibited from approaching the breeding islands within a radius of ten miles."

The minister then embodies a draft of an agreement for a mixed commission to cover these and other points and report.

SALISBURY'S THEORY.

He Undertakes to Refute Mr. Blaine's Argument.

The Marquis of Salisbury, under date of May 22d, in a letter to the British minister, after saying that the negotiations between Blaine and the minister afford strong reason to hope that the question is in a fair way towards satisfactory adjustment, undertakes in reply to Blaine's argument. Relative to the statement that seizures are justified by the fact they are engaged in a pursuit *contra bonos mores*, the marquis says: "It is obvious that two questions are involved: First, whether the pursuit and killing of fur seals in certain parts of the open sea is, from the point of view of international morality, an offence *contra bonos mores*; secondly, whether, if such be the case, this fact justifies the seizure on the high seas, and the subsequent confiscation, in time of peace, of private vessels of a friendly nation."

He says further: "It is an axiom of international maritime law that such action is only admissible, in case of a treaty, or in pursuance of a special international agreement. This principle has been universally admitted by jurists, and was very distinctly laid down by President Tyler in a special message to congress, dated the 27th of February, 1843, when, after acknowledging the right to detain and search a vessel on suspicion of piracy, he goes on to say: 'With this single exception of piracy, has, in time of peace, any authority to detain the ships of another upon the high seas upon any pretence whatever outside of its territorial jurisdiction.'"

"Now the pursuit of seals in the open sea, under whatever circumstances, has never hitherto been considered piracy by any civilized nation. Nor even if the United States had gone so far as to make the killing of fur seals piracy by their municipal laws, would this have justified them in punishing offences against such a law committed by any persons other than their own citizens outside of the territorial jurisdiction of the United States. In the case of the slave trade, a practice which the civilized world agreed to look upon with abhorrence, the right of arresting vessels of another country, was exercised only by a special international agreement, and no one government has been allowed that general control of morals in this respect which Mr. Blaine claims on behalf of the United States, in regard to seal hunting. But her majesty's government must question whether this pursuit can itself be regarded as *contra bonos mores* unless, and until, for special reasons, it has been agreed by international arrangements to forbid it.

"Fur seals are indisputably animals *ferae naturae* and have universally been regarded by jurists as *res nullius* until caught. No persons, therefore, can have property in them until he has actually reduced them into possession by capture. It requires something more than a mere declaration that the government or citizens of the United States, or any other countries interested in the seal trade, are losers by a certain course of proceeding, to render that course an immoral one.

"Her majesty's government would deeply regret that the pursuit of fur seals on the high seas by British vessels should involve even the slightest injury to the people of the United States. If the case be proved they will be ready to consider what measures can be properly taken for the remedy of such injury, but they would be unable on that ground to depart from the principle on which free commerce on the high seas depends."

Respecting Blaine's statement of the exclusive monopoly enjoyed by Russia, the marquis quotes from John Quincy Adams's letter to the United States minister in Russia (which nation in 1821 prohibited all foreign vessels from approaching within 100 miles from the coast of the Bering sea, from the straits to the 57th degree of north latitude), to the effect that the United States could admit no part of these claims. He also cites the case of the United States brig Lariat to show that the right of fishing was asserted included the right of killing fur-bearing animals. The brig was forced by an armed Russian naval vessel to leave the waters.

He also argues from a speech of Sumner when introducing the question of the purchase of Alaska to congress, that it is equally clear that the United States government did not regard themselves as purchasing a monopoly. Having dealt with fur-bearing animals, he went on to treat of the fisheries, and after alluding to the presence of different species of whales in the vicinity of the Aleutian islands, said: "No sea is now a *mare clausum*. All of these may be pursued by ships under any flag, except directly on the coast or within territorial limits."

The marquis also says Blaine must be misinformed respecting the uninterrupted possession of the United States

from 1867 to 1886, and submits extracts from reports of United States officers to show that during that time British vessels engaged at intervals in fur seal fisheries, with the cognizance of the United States government. He further states that whalers have not heretofore engaged in sealing because of the lack of time and funds it unnecessary to deal with the question of the extinction of the fur seal through pelagic sealing, as it is proposed to examine the subject by a committee appointed by the two governments. He admits that if all such sealing were stopped the seal would multiply at an even more extraordinary rate than at present, but cannot admit that this is sufficient ground to justify the United States in forcibly denying other nations any share in this industry in waters which, by the recognized law of nations, are now free to all the world.

CURT MESSAGES.

Pauncefote and Blaine Exchange Spunky Epistles.

The next letter in the series is from the British minister to Blaine, under date of March 23d. The minister says, as the secretary has confirmed the newspaper statement that revenue cutters have been ordered to Bering sea to seize foreign vessels, he is instructed to say that a formal protest against such interference with British vessels will be forwarded without delay.

Blaine's response, three days later, is even more brief, being a simple acknowledgment of the receipt of the letter. Later, however, on the 29th, he wrote Sir Julian that in turn he is instructed by the president to protest against the course of the British government in authorizing, encouraging and protecting vessels which are not only interfering with American rights in Bering sea, but which are doing violence as well to the rights of the civilized world.

The president, he says, is surprised that such a protest should be authorized by the British minister, especially because the declaration of a convention of his lordship would seem to render it impossible. The secretary then rapidly sketches the history of the negotiations under the previous administration, and says: "You will observe that from the 11th of November, 1887, to the 3d of April, 1888, Lord Salisbury had in every form of speech assented to the necessity of a closed season for the protection of the seals. These assurances were given to the American minister and to the Russian ambassador, and on more than one occasion to the two of them together. The United States had no reason, therefore, to doubt that the whole dispute touching the seal fisheries was practically settled."

Continuing, Secretary Blaine states five days after that assurance Lord Salisbury said that neither an act of parliament nor an order of council could be affected until Canada is heard from. Mr. Phelps, in his dispatch September 12th, reported: "His lordship stated that the Canadian government objected to any such restrictions, and until its consent could be obtained, her majesty's government was not willing to enter into a convention." Says the secretary: "This government cannot but feel that Lord Salisbury would have dealt more frankly in the beginning had he so informed Minister Phelps. The British government would assuredly and rightfully complain if an agreement between her and a representative of the United States should without notice be broken off by the United States on the ground that the state of California was not willing it should be completed.

In conclusion he proposes in behalf of the president that her majesty's government agree not to permit vessels to enter Bering sea this season in order that time may be secured for negotiations that shall not be disturbed by untoward events, or unduly influenced by popular agitation."

On July 2nd the secretary writes Sir Julian that the president believes arbitration cannot be concluded in time for this season, and suggests that Lord Salisbury make for a single season the regulation which in 1888 he offered to make permanent, as a step which will certainly lead to a friendly agreement. To this the minister replied that on June 3d a further examination of the question has satisfied his lordship that an extreme measure as that proposed in 1888 goes far beyond the requirements of the case. There would be no legal power to enforce the observance of such an agreement on British vessels.

Secretary Blaine, replying June 4th, says the "extreme measure came from Lord Salisbury himself, and concludes: "The president does not conceal his disappointment that even for the sake of securing impartial arbitration her majesty's government is not willing to suspend for a single season the practice which Lord Salisbury described in 1888 as 'the wanton destruction of a valuable industry,' and which this government has uniformly regarded as an unprovoked invasion of its established rights."

On June 9th Sir Julian Pauncefote presents the copy of a telegram from Salisbury, in which he regretted that the president should think him wanting in conciliation, but that it is beyond the power of his government to exclude British or Canadian ships from any portion of the high seas, even for an hour, without legislative enactment. In his reply on the 11th, Secretary Blaine says this government would be satisfied if Lord Salisbury would by proclamation simply request British vessels to abstain from entering Bering sea for the present season, in order to give full time for impartial negotiation.

Sir Julian, on June 11th, writes Blaine that he has informed Lord Salisbury that Secretary Blaine could not give assurance that British sealing vessels would not be interfered with during the negotiations, and expresses the hope that the decision is not final, and that while there is yet time the commanders of the United States revenue cruisers will be instructed to abstain.

BRITAIN'S PROTEST.

Formal Notice Served on Uncle Sam to Keep Hands Off.

On June 14th, however, the minister, with regret at failing to secure a favorable reply, presents the formal protest of the British government. In the protest he says in part: "The British government cannot admit the right of the United States of their own sole motion to restrict the freedom of navigation of the Bering sea nor to enforce municipal legislation

against British vessels on the high seas. Her Britannic majesty's government is, therefore, unable to pass over without notice the public announcement of the intention on the part of the United States to renew its acts of interference with British vessels in navigation outside the territorial waters of the United States, of which they had previously to complain. The minister is, in consequence, instructed formally to protest against such interference, and to declare that her Britannic majesty's government must hold the government of the United States responsible for the consequences that may ensue from acts which are contrary to the established principles of international law."

The minister, next, on June 27th, replies to Secretary Blaine's proposition looking to a proclamation by her majesty's government that British vessels shall not enter Bering sea the coming season. The minister writes that Lord Salisbury says the request presents constitutional difficulties which would preclude her majesty's government from acceding to it, except as a part of a general scheme for the settlement of the controversy, and certain conditions of which are that the governments agree forthwith to refer to arbitration, the question of the legality of the action of the United States in seizing or otherwise interfering with British vessels engaged in Bering sea, outside of territorial waters during 1888 and '89; that pending the award all interference with British sealing vessels absolutely cease; that the United States, if the award should be adverse to them, will compensate British subjects for losses which they may sustain by reason of their compliance with the British proclamation.

In the next communication, dated the first of the present month, Lord Salisbury, referring to Blaine's criticisms upon the abrupt close of the London negotiations, quotes from the statement made to him by United States Minister Phelps, as follows: "Under the peculiar political circumstances of America at this moment," said Phelps, "with a general election pending, it would be of little use, and, indeed, hardly practicable, to conduct any negotiations on an issue before the election had taken place."

BLAINE'S INTERROGATIONS.

Some Powers Put to the British Premier by the Man from Maine.

On the last of June Secretary Blaine addressed to the British minister a very long letter in answer to Lord Salisbury's communication, in which the latter stated that Secretary John Quincy Adams protested against Russia's claims to the exclusive jurisdiction of Bering sea. Secretary Blaine says: "The quotation which Lord Salisbury makes is unfortunately a most defective, erroneous and misleading one. The conclusion is separated from the premises. A comma is turned into a period, and an important qualification as to time is entirely erased without even a suggestion that it had ever formed part of the original text, and out of eighty-four words logically and inseparably connected, thirty-five are dropped from Mr. Adams's paragraph in Lord Salisbury's quotation."

The secretary said further: "Neither by the treaty with Russia in 1825, nor by its renewal in 1843, nor by its second renewal in 1859, did Great Britain gain any right to take seals in Bering sea. In fact, those treaties were a prohibition upon her which she steadily respected so long as Alaska was a Russian province. It is for Great Britain now to show that by what law she gained rights in that sea after the transfer of its sovereignty to the United States. During all the time between the treaty of 1825 and the cession to the United States in 1867, Great Britain never affirmed the rights of her subjects to capture fur seal in Bering sea, and as a matter of fact her subjects did not during that period attempt to catch seals in Bering sea. I am justified, therefore, in repeating the questions which I addressed to her majesty's government on the 22d of January, and which still remain unanswered, viz: Whence did the ships of Canada derive the right to do in 1886 that which they had refrained from doing for nearly ninety years? Upon what grounds did her majesty's government defend in the year 1886 a course of conduct in Bering sea which had been carefully avoided ever since the discovery of that sea? By what reasoning did her majesty's government conclude that an act may be committed with impunity against the rights of the United States which had never been attempted against the same rights when held by the Russian empire?"

THE LAST LETTER.

Blaine Accuses Lord Salisbury of Juggling with Facts.

The thirtieth and last letter of the correspondence, which would, if printed entire, fill over twenty newspaper columns, was addressed by Mr. Blaine to Sir Julian Pauncefote from Bar Harbor last Saturday. In it the secretary says: "I am instructed by the president to say that the United States is willing to consider all the proceedings of April 16, 1888, as canceled, so that an American right may be concerned. This government will ask Great Britain to adhere to the agreement made between Lord Salisbury and Mr. Phelps on the 25th of February, 1888. That was an agreement made directly between the two governments and did not include the right of Russia. Asking Lord Salisbury to adhere to the agreement of February 25th, we leave the agreement of April 16th to be maintained, if maintained at all, by Russia, for whose cause and for whose advantage it was particularly designed."

Blaine also refers to Lord Salisbury's statement that the political event in the United States had caused the interruption of negotiations, and not a Canadian objection, and closes the voluminous correspondence as follows: "I am justified in assuming that Lord Salisbury cannot recur to the remark of Mr. Phelps as one of the reasons for breaking off the negotiations, because negotiation was in actual progress for more than four months after the remark was made, and Mr. Phelps himself took a large part in it. Upon this recital of facts I am unable to recall or in any way to qualify the statement which I made in my note of June 4th, to the effect that Lord Salisbury abruptly closed the negotiation because the Canadian government objected, and that he assigned

no other reason whatever. Lord Salisbury expressed the belief that even if the views I have taken of these transactions are accurate, they would not bear out the argument which I founded upon them. The argument to which Lord Salisbury refers is, I presume, the remonstrance which I made, by direction of the president, against the change of policy by her majesty's government without notice and against the wish of the United States. The interposition of the wishes of the British province against the conclusion of a convention between two nations, which, according to Mr. Phelps, had been virtually agreed upon except as to details, was in the president's belief a grave injustice to the government of the United States."

MISSED THE MARK.

A Little Boy Fatally Shot at Coronado Beach.

SAN DIEGO, July 23.—The little son of J. A. Mathewson, a groceryman, of Coronado Beach, was seriously, and perhaps fatally, shot today. Two boys were practicing with a target rifle, and in firing at a target, the bullet missed the mark; striking a picket in a fence, it sped onward and entered the breast of the little fellow, who was playing in some bushes near by. An examination showed that the bullet had passed through his stomach and lodged in his back, from where it was removed. His chances for recovery are considered very doubtful.

SUICIDE AND SUICIDE.

A Despondent Ohio Man's Melancholy Crime.

WHEELING, W. Va., July 23.—This morning Mandaville Ault, deputy recorder of Belmont county, Ohio, under a temporary fit of insanity caused by the death of his child and sickness, shot himself through the head with a revolver. The ball passed through his skull without doing serious damage. He immediately turned and shot his wife standing near, killing her instantly; then went to his father's barn and hanged himself. The tragedy occurred at Ault's home near Centerville.

CASES DISMISSED.

The San Diego Shrivley Contest Falls Through.

SAN DIEGO, July 23.—The Russell vs. McDowell contest case ended today by the attorney for the prosecution offering a motion to dismiss the case. McDowell is thus confirmed sheriff of San Diego county.

Charley Lee, who assaulted with a deadly weapon on the person of Wing Sing, was dismissed this afternoon. Sing, the case has been in court, Wing Sing has been identified as the Chinaman wanted in Sacramento for committing a murder there two years ago. He will leave in the morning for that city, accompanied by an officer.

San Jose's Candidate.

STOCKTON, July 23.—The Democratic county convention today nominated county officers and assemblymen, and elected fifteen delegates to the state convention, who are pledged to support A. C. Paulsell for governor.

Meetings of Archbishops.

BOSTON, July 23.—The archbishops of the United States assembled for their annual meeting today in St. John's seminary at Brighton.

Orange County Facts and Figures.

By permission of Mr. Fred C. Smythe, our genial county assessor, I am permitted to give to the readers of the Herald some reliable, official facts and figures. I believe that every tax-payer and resident of our new county will be pleased to gain this information. The assessment rolls contain items assessed as follows:

425,683 acres of land, assessed at	\$4,557,975
Improvements on acre property	594,100
City and town lots	1,596,217
Improvements on city and town lots	1,019,570
Personal property	1,126,575
Money on hand, solvent credits, etc.	99,685
Total assessment	\$9,293,972
To this can be added railroad assessment, about	625,000
This makes over nine and one-half million dollars, and the tax-payers were assessed lower than last year.	
Personal property belonging to parties who own no real estate amounted to	\$256,036, and upon this amount the assessor collected \$4,002.58 general tax, and \$289.13 special tax.
There are 1,000,000 fruit trees growing in Orange county.	
4,644 horses, valued at	\$197,450
200 mules, valued at	8,630
1,000 sewing machines, valued at	12,000
163,963 sheep, valued at	156,700
6,900 lambs, valued at	4,300
120 ostriches, valued at	6,475
Musical instruments, valued at	30,755
5,082 boxes poultry, valued at	49,400
4,753 stoc cattle, valued at	55,050
2,530 cows, valued at	55,000
2,190 calves, valued at	25,000
1,250 colts, valued at	25,000
2,600 geese, valued at	7,400

The deputies have completed the work of assessing. About \$300,000 worth of property has been assessed to unknown owners.—(Geo. A. Mosbaugh in Santa Ana Herald.)

A Prospect for Oil at Chino.

At a depth of something over 550 feet the Chino Oil Company has very strong indications of oil. A substance has been encountered similar to that found in the now famous Puente wells in the same range of hills only a few miles to the northwest. Superintendent Proffitt stopped work the other day, and has since been making preparations for the expected oil, which he feels quite sure is very close to the bottom of the well. A present employee of the Chino company has worked on the Puente well, and he has no doubt oil is there. The judgment of practical explorers in the same oil belt ought to be reliable; therefore, if nothing unexpected happens to the boring apparatus, the Champion hopes to report an oil-producing well in the Chino hills next week.—(Chino Champion.)

The Farmers' Alliance.

Down in North Carolina first blood is to be secured for the Farmers' Alliance men, who easily put through their congressional candidate in a Democratic convention at Greensboro. The candidate is familiarly referred to as "Uncle Baldy Williams," and he is certified to be a right-down, practical farmer, with hayseed in his hair and oats in his whiskers. The politicians who trim with every wind that blows will make no mistake in keeping their eyes on the Farmers' Alliance.—(Philadelphia Record.)