LOS ANGELES DAILY HERALD.

VOL. XXVI. FRIDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 4, 1887. NO. 106.

THE COAST.

Wetmore on the Sweet Wine Bill.

WE GET ADDITIONAL JUDGES.

Senate Discusses the Irrigation Bill—A Husband Kills His Wife and Suicides.

[Special to the Herald by the Associated Press]

SAN FRANCISCO, February 3.—The fear that the sweet wine bill now in the House Conference Committee may, through the influence of Eastern grain distillers, be reported back adversely, causes much anxiety to wine makers of California. The *Bulletin* this evening publishes a letter from C. A. Wetmore, President of the National Viticultural Association, and Chief Executive Viticultural officer of California, on the subject. The bill provides that the tax of 90 cents a gallon be remitted on such grape spirit as is used in fortifying sweet wines. Wetmore in his letter says: "If the bill passes winemakers can use grape spirits as cheaply as grain spirits, and will consequently prefer the former. It will also remove the prohibition against exportation, and our producers will be able to enter into competition with foreign countries whose exported products are untaxed. There will also be less competition between California brandy and pure whisky from Kentucky. For this latter reason Kentucky distillers favor the sweet wine bill; whereas, for a similar reason, Ohio and Illinois distillers oppose it, as it will tend to slightly diminish their market. Wetmore says California winemakers, in desiring to have Congress pass this bill, are not seeking to oppose Eastern grain distillers in their legitimate trade. They simply ask that the wine industry of this State should be so dealt with as will permit winemakers to produce the best possible article for public consumption. They are even willing to aid Eastern grain distillers to obtain a reduction of the tax on grain spirit, when used in arts and other purposes outside of wine uses. Wetmore further writes: "It is reliably stated that a pool of compounders has been created, backed by a large sum of money, not so much to beat the sweet wine bill and its twin sister the Green spurious wine tax bill but to enforce if possible an amendment permitting the free use of grain, as well as grape spirits, in fortifying wines. The object of this movement is to give the genuine wine maker as well as the compounder, the choice between grain alcohol at 10 to 14 cents per gallon and grape brandy of suitable quality at $1 to $1.25 per gallon. If they should succeed sweet wine making would be utterly demoralized. Now that this bill is before the House in conference with the Senate committee the absence of some experienced wine maker from California is severely felt, as the pool is at work and disseminating false information as to the objects of the bill. It is well therefore to correct misapprehensions as to the objects of the bill. The first one to correct is the statement that the bill will operate solely for the benefit of California, excluding Eastern wine makers because they do not distil brandy. On the contrary, the bill was particularly framed so as to satisfy the interests of both sections. One part provides that a maker of pure, sweet wine who is also a distiller of grape brandy may use such brandy free within the limitations named. Another provides for the wine maker who is not a distiller by permitting the withdrawal from bond free of tax for similar purposes. Whether this bill is passed or not, special bonded warehouses for grape brandy will be established in the East so that there will be no lack of facilities. This entire subject was investigated by the leading New York wine makers, and their full consent was given to the movement. One of them, Mr. Dewey, even desiring to go further and prohibit the use of grain alcohol. Let it be understood distinctly, that when it is said Eastern wine makers are opposed to this measure, the statement refers only to compounders of artificial wines, unless there may be some who are misinformed. Of the members of the council of National Vitcultural Associations who have in the East been specially consulted, the following are known to be positively in favor of the measure: Mr. Barder and Davis, of Hammondsport; Mr. Dewey and Mr. Clayton, New York; Mr. Pearson, New Jersey; Mr. Green, North Carolina, and others, who by their past actions indicate their goodwill."

A FRIGHTFUL TRAGEDY.

A Man Shoots His Wife and Himself.

SAN FRANCISCO, February 3.—This morning at 10 o'clock a frightful tragedy took place at 119 Fifth street. Catherine Fettes was shot and killed by her husband, Andrew Fettes, who immediately afterwards sent a bullet crashing into his own brain. They had not been living together for some time past. The woman was shot in a beer saloon which she kept to support herself and her four children, the husband not having provided for them for some years past. Jealousy is supposed to have been the motive for the murder.

THE RAIN.

It Falls at Several Points in the State.

SANTA ROSA, February 3.—Rain has been falling north and east of here today and there has been a light sprinkle here since 5 P. M. There is a strong southwest wind and indications are for a wet night.

AT CLOVERDALE.

CLOVERDALE, February 3.—Rain commenced falling here at 2 P. M. to-day. The wind is south and indications are that we will have a heavy downpour. Grain and grass are looking splendidly; farmers are ahead with their work, and the rain can do nothing but good.

AT HEALDSBURG.

HEALDSBURG, February 3.—A light rain began falling about noon to-day and still continues. There is every indication of a heavy storm.

AT UKIAH.

UKIAH, February 3.—It has been showering here at intervals for the last three days, and is raining steadily now. Crops promise well.

AT SAN FRANCISCO.

SAN FRANCISCO, February 3.—It is raining slightly and a stiff south wind is blowing. Indications are good for a heavy rain storm.

THE LEGISLATURE.

SENATE.

SACRAMENTO, February 3.—The Senate met at 11 o'clock, the first matter taken up, being Bowers' bill to repeal Sec. 1422 of the Civil Code relating to riparian rights. Bowers made an argument in favor of the passage of the measure. He said the entire delegation of both parties from Southern California was elected because it was understood that every man of them would favor the repeal of Sec. 1422. He believed the presence of the Democratic majority in the Legislature was due solely to the position of the party on this question and he warned the Democrats that if they permitted the session to end without taking action, their banners next year would be trailing in the dust. Bowers then went on to show the effect of riparianism on the agricultural interests of the State, concluding by arguing that the repeal of Sec 1422 would be the entering wedge to the destruction of this doctrine.

In the Senate this afternoon, on motion of White, the bill allowing Los Angeles county two additional Superior Judges, was taken up and passed. This is the first bill that has finally passed both Houses. It will be transmitted to the Governor immediately.

Moffit's bill, appropriating $25,000 for contingent expenses of the Senate, was finally passed.

The consideration of the bill is to repeal Section 1422 of the Civil Code was resumed. White, of Los Angeles, made a long, legal argument in favor of its passage. He said he was not silly enough to think that the law, as declared by the Supreme Court, could be upset by legislative enactment. As this repeal took from no man his rights, therefore, he was in favor of passing the bill. McKinstry's decision he considered one of the ablest ever emanating from the Supreme Court as the law then stood, but he was in favor of changing the law for the future. He quoted from the Democratic platform to show that a majority of the Senators had been pledged to repeal this section.

Conklin opposed the bill on the ground that the section was in harmony with the constitution and laws and he could not see why they desired to repeal it unless it gave them something.

Langford opposed the passage of the bill and Goucher favored it.

Clunie said the people of his district wanted irrigation but not at the expense of any class. He was in favor of the appointment of a commission to inquire into the subject and report some feasible method of settling the question. The bill, by consent, was read the second time and its further discussion postponed until Tuesday next at 2 o'clock.

THE ASSEMBLY.

Wright presented a petition from the people of Stanislaus county, asking that suitable irrigation measures be enacted this session. It had about 500 signatures.

THE SWEET WINE BILL.

The Eastern Wine Makers Will Oppose It.

WASHINGTON, February 3.—The conference on the Sweet Wine bill had a meeting yesterday to consider the measure. It was at once developed that Senator Harris was opposed to the sweet wine provision on the ground that it gave the California sweet wine-makers an advantage of ninety cents a gallon over eastern sweet wine-makers. Grape spirits cannot be distilled from the offal of eastern grapes after the juice has been extracted, because of the light quantity of saccharine matter it carries. Sweet wine made in the east must be fortified with neutral spirits, and the internal tax would remain on these. Eastern men will agree to the Sweet Wine bill if it is amended to permit the use of any kind of spirits to fortify wines. Otherwise they will oppose it. The conference, after discussing the matter, adjourned without calling a vote on the measure. Another meeting will be held in a few days.

DEMOCRATS WIN.

Contested Seats in the New Mexico Legislature.

SANTA FE, N. M., February 3.—In the Territorial Legislature here to-day the House by a vote of fourteen to ten decided by resolution in favor of the Democratic members from Taos county whose seats were contested by the Republicans, three Republicans voting with the Democrats. It is reported that Sanchez Y. Sanchez, a Republican who voted with the Democrats, was taken out to the penitentiary to-day to see his friend Dubois who is confined there, and a specific promise was made to him that Dubois would be released if he would vote with the Democrats in this contest. It is openly charged and talked on the streets that money was freely used to secure votes. Kuchenbacker and Marcy are the other two Republicans who vote with the Democrats.

Young Hearst's Fiancee.

SAN FRANCISCO, February 3.—A special dispatch to the *Bulletin* from New York, quoting from a London dispatch, says: Miss Calhoun, the fiancee of Senator Hearst's son, has engaged passage on a Cunard Line steamer, and will sail for New York on Saturday. She bade fair to become an ornament to the London stage, from which she has retired to marry young Hearst.

THE PARENTS OPPOSE IT.

WASHINGTON, February 3.—The *Daily Post* says: The report which reached here from London yesterday that Miss Calhoun, the American actress, is to marry William Hearst, son of the California Senator, has created something of a sensation in society circles. Both Mr. and Mrs. Hearst are strongly opposed to the marriage and will use all honorable means to prevent it. Young Hearst is now a student at Harvard College.

Railroad Rates.

SAN FRANCISCO, February 3.—There are now two first-class limited rates to New York. The Atlantic and Pacific rate sheet, which went into effect January 24th, makes the rate $79.85. The rate sheet just issued by the Southern Pacific Company makes the New York limited rate $81, or $1.15 higher than the Atlantic and Pacific rate. To Missouri river points the competing lines make the same rate and the rates are identical to Chicago. The advance made by the Southern Pacific is attributed to the new scale of pro-rating in the East. The Southern Pacific has advanced the Boston rate, first-class limited, to $83 from the old rate of $80.35.

EASTERN.

Dr. McGlynn's Reply to Bishop Corrigan.

THE APACHES IN FLORIDA.

Indiana Republicans to Contest Turpie's Election—Talk of an Extra Session.

[Special to the Herald by the Associated Press]

NEW YORK, February 3.—The forthcoming issue of the *Standard*, Henry George's newspaper, will contain the reply of Rev. Dr. McGlynn, the deposed priest of St. Stephens church, to the public statement upon the famous controversery made by Archbishop Corrigan a few days ago. Dr. McGlynn's reply fills six columns of the *Standard*. He begins as follows: "The letter of August 1882 from Cardinal Simeoni to which Archbishop Corrigan refers, I am not able to find, but it is true, as he states, that this letter complained of my land league speeches as 'containing propositions openly contrary to the teachings of the Catholic Church.' The Doctrines thus stigmatized were those I have held and taught before and since, namely, that all men are equally entitled to the use of the general bounties of nature, including land as well as sunlight, air and water and that human laws ought to be so changed as to conform to this dictate of national justice. I affirm that while acknowledging the right of exclusive ownership in all that is produced by human industry, I would at the same time compel those who enjoy exclusively a large or choice portion of the bounties of nature to pay to the community an equivalent in taxation to the full amount of the rental value.

It is absolutely false, although stated by Archbishop Corrigan on the authority of Cardinal McCloskey, that I "recognized my errors and professed to be sorry for them." On the contrary, in my interview with Cardinal McCloskey, I reaffirmed the doctrine and explained it and defended it from misunderstandings and misapprehensions. I told him substantially that I knew my theology well enough not to sin against it ignorantly, and that I loved my religion too well to sin against it wilfully. I voluntarily promised to abstain from making Land League speeches; not because I acknowledged the right of any one to forbid me, but because I knew well the power of my ecclesiastical superiors to impair and almost destroy my usefulness in the ministry of Christ's church, to which I had consecrated my life."

Dr. McGlynn then gives at length two letters from the Propaganda, one under date of September 12, 1882, directing the suspension and disciplining of Dr. McGlynn for Land League speeches; the other under date of May 10, 1883, calling attention to the fact that though McGlynn had modified his tone he was still speaking in favor of "Irish revolution," and one from Vicar-General Quinn to McGlynn dated May 21, conveying a request that he should not attend a certain Land League meeting. This meeting, McGlynn states, was to be addressed by Alexander Sullivan, the newly elected President. McGlynn asserts that he had not expressed any intention of attending it and that other priests were similarly warned.

In reply to the complaint from Rome of May, 1883, McGlynn wrote to Cardinal McCloskey: "I regret very much that the Cardinal Prefect has found new cause for displeasure. The report in some Boston journal of a meeting must have been that held in this city in February last, which was not a land league meeting such as I had voluntarily promised you not to attend, but was for the relief of people suffering from famine in Ireland, and was held by a union of Irish county societies under the name of the Irish Confederation of America. I find in the journal the account of sending the money raised at that meeting, with a letter to Bishop Nulty, showing it was used to relieve distress in Ireland. I enclose this article, and I beg you to consider it part of the letter. In speaking for the relief of the distressed, I alluded to the injustice which is the cause of it, and urged the duty of redressing such injustice.

In this I thought I was but favoring that demand for justice to Ireland, which was made by O'Connell and the bishops and priests of Ireland, and by many of our own, especially Archbishop Hughes and which has been, I think, commonplace in St. Patrick's Day sermons. I shall henceforth refuse to take part in any such meeting even though it be for charitable objects.

McGlynn then quotes his letter, giving reasons for not taking the proffered summer vacation trip to Rome to represent his case in person, saying that it would interrupt plans for reducing his church debt, gives the text of his statement, his well known views on the land question published in the *Tablet*, holding that he was in accord with the father of the church whose language he quotes. This brought out a note from the Archbishop, as follows:

NEW YORK, July 2nd, 1883.

Reverend Dear Doctor:

The Cardinal has received a copy of this week's *Tablet* containing your promised statement. He desires me to ask whether you accept this article as a correct exposition of your views. He also thinks it well to call attention to the fact that the passages attributed to St. Ambrose and St. Clement are commonly considered spurious, and that St. Augustine in the passage alluded to is arguing ad hominem, that heretics can allege no right to church property.

I am Reverend, dear Doctor, very truly yours, in Christ.

(Signed) M. A. CORRIGAN,
Coadjutor.

I answered as follows:

NEW YORK, 1883.

Most Reverend and dear Archbishop: I had sent for a copy of the *Tablet* with the intention of sending the promised statement to the Cardinal and Archbishop and had just received it when I received your letter. I enclose for the Cardinal a slip of the *Tablet* containing the statement. I am responsible for the article and I accept it as a correct exposition of my views. I am responsible for making the quotations from others to illustrate the truth that property, especially in land, has its duties as well as its rights. But beyond this I leave all responsibility for the passages, omitting purposely to translate them, to the authors themselves and to corpus juris and to eminent writers by whom and by which the passages from St. Clement and from St. Ambrose are accepted as genuine.

I remain, most reverend dear archbishop, with best wishes,

Very sincerely your ob'dt servant,
(Signed,) EDWARD MCGLYNN.

To the most Revered Archbishop Carrigan.

Before going further I would state that among those who denounced me to Rome for my land league speech were Bishops Gilmour, of Cleveland, and Chatard, of Indianapolis, the former the author and the latter the apologist, of the famous or infamous Cincinnati pastoral letter, which was in a great measure a deliberate thesis against Thomas Jefferson's declaration of independence.

He then says: "On the 15th of March, of last year I went at the request of Archbishop Corrigan to Washington, to recommend to President Cleveland, Brigadier-General John Newton, of the Engineers, for a vacant Major Generalship. On my return, I found a letter from Archbishop Corrigan, which I here publish:

The Bishop of Brooklyn has called to direct attention to the enclosed circular in which you are announced to speak at a meeting presided over by Henry Ward Beecher. As the meeting is to be held in his diocese, the Bishop objects vehemently to a Catholic Priest publicly appearing in such company, inasmuch as he conceives that great disedification and scandal will be the result. At his request I make his views known to you, and I am forced to say that I, too, would feel humiliated to find a priest of the arch diocese openly associate with a man of such an unhappy reputation as Mr. Beecher or Howard Crosby, who only last year insulted us all by saying that our country would rise against the Romanists and crush them into dust, because we simply asked that our poor children be permitted according to the constitution to worship God with liberty of conscience.

I am, Reverend Dear Doctor,

Very truly yours,
(Signed) M. A. CORRIGAN."

In reply Dr. McGlynn reports upon favorable results of his mission in behalf of General Newton, and adds: "It pained me to learn from you that you feel humiliated by my openly associating with Mr. Beecher, who was to preside, and even with Mr. Howard Crosby, but as you did not forbid me to go, probably doubting your right to do so, nor even advise me in such delicate circumstances to break my engagement, and as you mailed your letter "private," I would have had to cause a public scandal by breaking so important an engagement without being at liberty to give the reasons. Scandal would have been much increased by more or less accurate surmises as to the cause, and no doubt by the speedy publication of the true cause, which publication, no matter how great might be my reticence, would probably come about through the indiscretion of friends of Bishop Laughtin himself. I therefore determined to keep my engagement all the more readily, as I was confident both from several past experiences of my own in similar matters, your apprehensions and those of the Bishop of Brooklyn would not be verified. As a matter of fact, my presence on that platform drew from both Mr. Beecher and Dr. Crosby strong and eloquent testimony in favor of the Catholic Church. My joining with these men was to promote the cause of law, in the interest of morality and temperance, and in keeping with the spirit of the Council of Baltimore, which was quoted with great approval by Dr. Crosby. I felt that in doing this I surely was not making any compromise with the alleged faults in Mr. Beecher's private character, nor with Dr. Crosby's utterances on the Freedom of Worship bill. Besides we would do well to remember that a jury after a long trial failed to find the allegations against Mr. Beecher true, and that it is a wise maxim both in church and State and in society which says, "De locum poenitentiae." We should also remember that Mr. Beecher is to-day regarded as one of the greatest and most illustrious of Americans and that his advocacy of any good cause is a tower of strength to it. As to Dr. Crosby, he will not improbably lose a good deal of his asperity in consequence of such meetings as that between him and me last evening, and that between him and Father Walworth a few weeks ago in Albany in the interest of the Excise bill. It may be well in similar matters to remember the recent example of the Pope, who sent to an arch-persecutor of the Church doctrines, the order of Christ, and of whom the newspapers said a few days ago that he had sent a special courier to thank Bismarck for some complimentary remarks made in an after-dinner speech.

With reference to the letter about political speeches sent by Archbishop on Aug. 21st last, he says: "The only political gathering that I can remember at which I spoke shortly before the date of Archbishop Carrigan's letter of Aug. 21st, was a great labor demonstration July 5th, in Union Square in favor of Gladstone and Parnell during the Parliamentary election. I confess it, did not occur to me that any one would at that date hold me bound by the voluntary promise I had made three or four years before, since Rome itself had been forced to change its attitude towards the Irish question and since even Archbishop Corrigan had at least deemed it politic no longer to oppose the movement in aid of the land of his parents. The Archbishop's letter does not "deprecate interference in politics in general."

It alludes to some of the priests of St. Stephens church attending the ecclesiastical retreat to which I also as usual had been invited, and says: "During the retreat I hope you will think over your relations with Henry George (according to newspaper reports) and I could feel much easier in conscience if you would leave aside anything that may not be unto edification in a Catholic priest. I mean anything that would seem to coincide with Socialism. I am, dear Doctor, very faithfully yours, (signed) M. A. CORRIGAN.

Besides the hint given in the above letter of the Archbishop, I received intimations coming from him that there was danger of a serious collision between the authorities of the diocese and myself because of my advocacy of the doctrines of Mr. George. Then follows the account of the interview between Mr. George and Archbishop Corrigan which Mr. George considered fruitless. Receiving information that the Archbishops' council was to be summoned that day to suspend McGlynn, he having been forbidden next day to attend Henry George's meeting, he says: "I felt it to be my duty to disregard this prohibition and on the day of the meeting I sent to the Archbishop a letter which I cannot find in which I said that as I had made the engagement before receiving his letter and had been very extensively advertised to speak my failure to keep the engagement would precipitate public scandal and be of grave injury to the cause. It would be in the nature of a breach of contract which I did not feel at liberty to make and something very different from what it would have been had I simply declined when invited to attend the meeting, that I therefore thought it better to keep my engagement, while assuring him that I would respect his prohibition during the rest of Mr. George's canvass." His suspension occurred next day.

WHY HE DIDN'T GO TO ROME.

Then follows the conference during George's campaign, most of which was given in the statement of Archbishop Corrigan. It includes a note from the Archbishop enclosing the second command from Cardinal Simeoni for Dr. McGlynn to go to Rome, and a request from the Archbishop to be informed definitely whether Dr. McGlynn intended to obey the summons. In his preliminary answer to the published statements of the Archbishop Dr. McGlynn complained that his answer to this demand was garbled. Dr. McGlynn gives the text reply as follows, himself omitting as will be seen some of his reasons furnished in it for not obeying the mandate of the Propaganda:

Most revered and dear archbishop:—I find that I shall not be able to go to Rome. There are several personal reasons, any of which must be sufficient. I have had reason to feel concerned about my health for some time and my physicians order me not to undertake the journey. (Here follow other reasons.) You have not told me why I am summoned to Rome, but I can gather from your telegram to the *Tribune*, that it is because I am an advocate of certain doctrines about the ownership of lands. This I can gather also from your letter just before you procured the telegram from Rome. You said in that letter that the result would have been more satisfactory if in my card to the *Tribune* I had retracted the latter portion of the *Tribune* report in which I had been made to reaffirm said doctrines about land. As I cannot go to Rome to give an account of my doctrine about land I would say that I have made it clear in speeches, in reported interviews and in published articles and I repeat here I have taught and shall continue to teach in speeches and writings as long as I live that land is rightfully the property of the people in common and that the private ownership of land is against natural justice, no matter by what civil or ecclesiastical law it may be sanctioned and I would bring about instantly if I could such a change of law all the world over as would confiscate private property in land without one penny of compensation to miscalled owners. In the Archbishop's published statement he gives only the latter portion of this letter, beginning with the words "my doctrine about land." The reader may well wonder that the Archbishop, while stating that I said I could not go to Rome, suppressed all of the reasons which I gave for my inability to go, and also the reason which I gave for reaffirming my doctrinal position. Dr. McGlynn concludes as follows: "Reaffirming what I said in my letter to the Archbishop sent by the hand of Mr. Henry George, that in becoming a priest I did not evade the duties nor surrender the rights of man and citizen. I deny the right of Bishop, Propaganda or Pope to punish me for my actions as a man and citizen in the late municipal canvass, or in other political movements. I deny their right to censure me or to punish me for my opinions in political economy, unless they can show that these opinions are clearly contrary to the teachings of the Christian religion. This they have not shown, and I know they cannot show it. I have not appealed to Rome from the judgment of the Archbishop, and I have no desire to do so. I deny the right of Bishop, Propaganda or Pope to order me to Rome. The vow of obedience of the priest, of which so many absurd things have been said within the last few weeks, is simply a promise to obey the church authorities in matters concerning the priests duties of religion. It was monstrous to imagine that this promise had not clear and well defined limitations. My obligation taken as a student of the Propaganda was not as some seem to imagine, to go wherever and do whatever that institution should see fit to command, but simply to return to my native place and there devote myself to the ministry of religion. In an interview published in the *World* during the late municipal canvass I took occasion from Monsignor Preston's political letter to admonish him and other ecclesiastical dignitaries of the grave danger of repeating the folly and shame of condemning scientific truth as religious heresy, a shame, a folly, of which their predecessors had been guilty in condemning Galileo and Carpenicus. It seems that they are fated to repeat this crime and blunder and add another to the many reasons that have made men look upon ecclesiastical authority as one of the greatest foes of scientific progress, of national development and of rational liberty, and in a large part a hindrance rather than a help in the way of bringing to the whole world the light and the purity and the comfort that comes from the teachings and the ministration of Christ.

(Signed) EDWARD MCGLYNN.

Archbishop Corrigan sailed for Havana this afternoon before Dr. McGlynn's answer was made public.

INDIANA REPUBLICANS.

They will Contest Senator Turpie's Election.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind., February 3.—The Republicans do not admit the legality of Turpie's election to the United States Senate, or that the work of the joint convention was perfected in the proceedings of Wednesday. On the other hand the Democrats claim that the record is valid and the joint convention adjourned yesterday *sine die*. In accordance with the motion of Representative Gardiner, which the Republicans say prevailed, the joint convention re-assembled to-day noon with all the Democratic and seven Republican Senators absent. Speaker Sopre presided, and the Clerk of the House called the roll of both Houses. Ten Senators and fifty-six Representatives of the Republican side answered, but the Democratic side was silent. They were regarded as absentees until the roll of that class was read, when the Speaker announced the presence of each one, but as not answering. Representative Gardiner then presented a preamble and resolution, reciting the illegality of the election of Turpie and the pretended adjournment of the joint convention *sine die*, and calling for an investigation, in order to prepare material of a contest to be presented to the United States Senate. The resolution provided for the appointment of a committee of five, to pursue this investigation and to prepare a memorial. This was agreed to and the session adjourned.

The Diphtheria.

SAN FRANCISCO, February 3.—Seven cases of diphtheria were reported to-day.

FOREIGN.

Germany Getting Her Reserves Together.

UNSETTLED STATE OF MARKETS

A Panicky Feeling Both in London and Paris—Massowah in Danger.

[Special to the Herald by the Associated Press]

NEW YORK, February 3.—A *Times* special from London says: Although the scare yesterday was the worst since the rumors began to circulate, it is not comparable probably with the panic in store for next week, when the German reserves in the seven western divisions, numbering 72,000 men, will pin on their colors. It was not generally known that the movement was so imminent, and it is believed it will create an excitable impression on France. Despite all pacific assurances from Paris, I got a statement confirming Saturday's report that arms, men and munitions of war are being shoved eastward. This renders more substantial the floating suspicions that Boulanger is getting ready. Belief in war has become such an universal thing that one of the evening papers has an editorial saying there will be peace and everybody talks about the article as a singular thing. Paris now for the first time really believes that war is inevitable, and private letters from Berlin and Hanover report general preparations among the officers to provide for the safety of their families early in the spring.

FOREIGN MARKET.

Stock Excitement in London and Paris.

LONDON, February 3.—There was intense excitement on the stock exchange all the afternoon and at the close of the market a panicky feeling prevailed. The unfavorable state of the market was due cheifly to the reports of heavy failures on the Paris Bourse and to the rumor, yet uncomfirmed, that a large banking house at Berlin had collapsed.

Consols opened at 100-9 16 for money, and 100⅜ for account; and closed 99⅞ for money and 100 for account.

PARIS, February 3.—Three per cents rentes have fallen to 75 francs 59 centimes. This shows a net decline during the past year of 6 francs and 22½ centimes, 5 francs 55 centimes of this amount has been lost during the past two weeks.

1:30 P. M.—Three per cent rentes declined to-day and are now quoted at 77 francs, a fall of 1 franc, 45 centimes, from closing quotations of yesterday at 2:30 P. M. Three per cent rentes have now fallen to 76 francs, 80 centimes. There is almost an entire suspension of operations on the Bourses.

Massowah in Danger.

PARIS, February 3.—The *Republic Francaise* publishes a dispatch from Suez which states that in the battles between Abyssinians and Italians near Massowah, January 25th, the Abyssinians captured all of the guns possessed by the Italians. It also says that of 600 Italians engaged in the fight not more than 50 escaped. The dispatch adds that the Italians evacuated all advanced positions. The Abyssinians have already attacked and carried the first line of the Italian intrenchments around Massowah. The latter success was achieved by the Abyssinians the day after the destruction of the Italian forces in the field. The latest intelligence indicates that it is doubtful whether the Italians will be able to hold Massowah until the arrival of reinforcements.

Forbidding the Exportation of Horses.

ST. PETERSBURG, February 3.—The government has forbidden the exportation of horses from Russia.

THE APACHES.

How Nicely they are Treated in Florida.

WASHINGTON, Feburary 3.—The response of the Secretary of the Interior to the Senate resolution calling for information regarding the Apaches as Fort Marion, Florida, shows that all of the youths among these Indians between the age of twelve and twenty-two years, numbering forty-two, have been transferred to and placed under educational and industrial training at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and that upon the recommendation of officers of the army in charge of the confined Indians, provision has been made for the education of sixty of the younger children by sisters of charity at St. Augustine, Fla., at an expense of $75 per quarter. The reply is accompanied by a communication from Dr. C. B. Agnew, of Florida, asking that the department erect school buildings for the education of all the Apaches, and offering in the name of the "St. Augustine Indian Aid Society" to procure teachers for the school free of cost. The reply of the department to these communications is also submitted and shows grave doubts as to the advisability of pursuing this course and that the department had no authority to expend money for the erection of the desired buildings.

AN EXTRA SESSION.

Talk of Calling One on the Revenue Bill.

WASINGTON, February 3.—It is the general impression in the House that all efforts to harmonize upon a revenue bill this session will fail, and that no measure whatever will pass through the House. The movements of the Randall men will go on until checked by some action of the House, but whether that will lead to any legislation is doubted. What it is expected to result in by some of those most interested in the question is an extra session of Congress. A very well informed tariff reformer said he expected an extra session to be called to meet in October. Other members expressed the same opinion. Meanwhile it is expected that the surplus now in the treasury will be greatly reduced by calls of bonds that may be redeemed and by payments on the Mexican and Three Months' Service pension bills. It is believed that no estimate anywhere approaching the amount of these pensions has yet been made. The talk of an extra session, however, is not met with a favorable response at the White House.

REAL ESTATE.

BRYAN & KELSEY,

26

West First Street.

$8000—Five (5) acres on State street, near Brooklyn avenue, and west of the Bird tract on Boyle Heights. This property lies just 1¼ miles from the postoffice, and makes 21 lots. The whole is now subdivided and staked off and streets graded on three sides. Only three blocks from Aliso street car line, and immediately on the projected line of the new Electric or Cable Road to be built from First street. This is a desirable property and will be offered in a body for a few days at $8000, on easy terms.

$7250—7¼ acres on Boyle Heights; $7250, fronting on Stevenson avenue.

$10,000—10 acres on Cypress avenue and just west of Budlong avenue; all in fruit trees and vines; improved, with a neat cottage; $10,000.

$7500—7½ acres on Budlong avenue, between Washington and Adams sts., adjoining property; $7500; being subdivided and laid with cement walks.

$12,000—20 acres on Vernon avenue, 3 miles from the postoffice. This is the cheapest tract offered in Los Angeles to-day. It is covered with orange trees and vineyard, and is 50 per cent. cheaper than any adjoining property; will sell 10 acres of it if desired; $600 per acre.

Fifteen Acres on Western Avenue,

Just west of the Howes tract,

$537 per acre.

Twenty Acres on Wilmington Ave

In Oranges and Vineyard.

Beautiful 6-room House,

Including Furniture, Agricultural Implements, two Horses and Carriage,

At the Remarkably Low Figure of $20,000

And on Easy Terms.

Or will subdivide to suit purchasers at reasonable prices.

A FEW CHEAP HOUSES!

WE HAVE TO OFFER.

If you see nothing to suit you, call on us, for we have many more on our books.

$5000—A beautiful house and 50-foot lot on Grand avenue, bet. Seventh and Eighth.

$3600—A neat cottage and 60 foot lot Olive, bet. Eleventh and Twelfth.

$8000—A fine two-story house and 60-foot lot on Olive, bet. Ninth and Tenth.

$9000—A lovely cottage home, finely furnished and all modern conveniences, on Hill street, bet. Ninth and Tenth.

$7500—A beautiful house of 7 rooms, bath, etc., on Hill street, bet. Seventh and Eighth.

$7500—Will buy a splendid two-story house on corner of Hill and Morris sts.

$2600—A neat cottage of 4 rooms, nicely furnished, on Flower street, near Eleventh.

$4250—A pretty cottage and large lot on Flower street, between Eighth and Ninth.

$4600—An elegant little home on Flower street, bet. Eighth and Ninth; fit for a prince.

VACANT LOTS.

$2100—Lot 105x98 northeast corner Grand avenue and Morris street.

$1750—Lot 50x150 on west side of Flower street, near Pico.

$4000—Four lots on Belmont avenue, midway between Temple street and Second street cable roads, and immediately on the line of the new dummy road, being fine, level, slightly lots.

$2500—Two lots on Bellevue avenue, near Montreal street; will sell separately.

$1800—Will buy two lots in the Fairmount tract, fronting on Ventura street, and each lot 60x177.

$1000—A beautiful lot in Cellis vineyard tract, near Washington street.

$1600—Half acre on Ocean street, nicely fenced and set to fruit.

$9000—Lot 120x167 corner of Flower and Eighth streets.

$3000—Two lots on east side of Flower street, in Cameron tract.

$3650—Nice lot on Main street, in Childs tract.

$1000—Lot in Bonnie Brae tract.

$700—Lot in Bonnie Brae tract.

$2100—Two lots in Bonnie Brae tract.

$1200—Nice lot in Bonnie Brae tract.

$850—Nice lot in Bonnie Brae tract.

$4200—Three lots on Nevada street, near Ninth.

Some Choice Lots

In the Woodworth tract,
In the Vignes and Prilchard tracts,
In the Urmston, Hodge, Park Villa,
Sherman, Fairview, Rivallo and Vignold,
Judson, Angeleño Heights, Park tracts.

Lots in all parts of the city, both on the hills and in the valley, on Boyle Heights and East Los Angeles for sale at bedrock prices.

BRYAN & KELSEY,

26 West First Street, Los Angeles.
je27-1m