CHINESE LEGISLATION.

Vest Divests it of Misapprehensions.

HOW HARRISON VOTED.

The Whole Republican Party Shown to be Rotten on Its Chinese Record.

On this coast at least the question of Chinese exclusion ought to cut a figure scarcely second to that of Tariff Reform. In spite of a very culpable lukewarmness in the first stages of the discussion the Republican party in California and in general west of the mountains, later on developed a warm interest in this policy—that is so far as professions go. Indeed politicians of that party make the claim that their people are as strongly anti-Chinese as are ours. Then comes the attitude of their candidate for the Presidency as to this matter. Mr. De Young of the *Chronicle* at the time of General Harrison's nomination loudly proclaimed that he could not be elected because of his record on this question. Many and vigorous attempts have since been made to show that Mr. De Young was wrong. The Republican press goes further, and now sets up the claim that the party and candidate are sounder on the Chinese matter than are the Democratic party and its candidate. Senator Vest, in his speech in the Senate the other day appealed to the records on this point. His treatment of the question is exhaustive. Here it is. We hope every Democratic will cut this from the HERALD, carefully preserve it, and settle absolutely the status of our party and of the Republican party when ever this Chinese business is called up. The article is long, but no one will regret the perusal of its every line unless it be a Harrison Republican.

My principal object in now addressing the Senate is to show by the record beyond any doubt or question that all the opposition to legislation intended to prevent Chinese immigration has come from the Republican party, and from distinguished Republicans, including their candidate for the Presidency, Gen. Benjamin Harrison, of Indiana.

On February 24, 1882, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill "to execute certain treaty stipulations with the Chinese," reported favorably by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and which provided as as follows:

That from and after the expiration of ninety days next after the passage of this act, and until the expiration of twenty years next after the passage of this act, the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States be, and the same is hereby, suspended; and during such suspension it shall not be lawful for any Chinese laborer to come, or, having come after the expiration of said ninety days, to remain, within the United States.

SEC. 2. That any master of any vessel, of whatever nationality, who shall knowingly on such vessels bring within the jurisdiction of the United States, and permit to be landed, any Chinese laborer from any foreign port or place, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 for each and every such Chinese laborer so brought, and may be also imprisoned for a term not exceeding one year.

SEC. 3. That the two foregoing sections shall not apply to Chinese laborers who were in the United States on the 7th day of November, 1880.

The first amendment proposed was that of Mr. Grover, a Democratic Senator from Oregon, on February 28, 1882:

That the words "Chinese laborers" wherever used in this act shall be construed to mean both skilled and unskilled laborers, and Chinese employed in mining.

On March 9, 1882, this amendment was adopted by the following vote:

Yeas—Messrs. Beck, Bayard, Call, Cameron of Wisconsin, Cockrell, Coke, Fair, Farley, Garland, George, Gorman, Harris, Jackson, Jonas, Jones of Nevada, Maxey, Miller of California, Morgan, Pugh, Ransom, Slater, Vance, Vest, Voorhees, Walker.

Twenty-three Democrats and two Republicans.

Nays—Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Blair, Brown, Conger, Davis of Illinois, Dawes, Edmunds, Frye, Hale, Hill of Colorado, Hoar, Ingalls, Lapham, McDill, McMillen, Miller of New York, Mitchell, Morrill, Saunders, Sawyer, Teller.

Twenty-one Republicans and one Democrat.

The next amendment of importance was offered by Senator Ingalls (Republican), providing that—

FROM and after the expiration of ninety days next after the passage of this act, and until the expiration of ten years next after the passage of this act, the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States be, and the same is hereby suspended.

On March 8, 1882, this amendment was rejected by the following vote:

Yeas—Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Blair, Brown, Cockrell, Conger, Davis of Illinois, Dawes, Edmunds, Frye, Harris, Hoar, Ingalls, Jackson, Lapham, McDill, McMillan, Mitchell, Morrill, Saunders, Sewell, Sherman, Teller.

Nineteen Republicans and four Democrats.

Nays—Messrs. Bayard, Beck, Call, Cameron of Wisconsin, Coke, Fair, Farley, Garland, George, Hale, Hampton, Hill of Colorado, Jonas, Jones of Nevada, McPherson, Maxey, Miller of California, Miller of New York, Morgan, Ransom, Slater, Vest, Walker.

Eighteen Democrats and five Republicans.

By this vote all except five Republican Senators declared that Chinese immigration should be permitted after ten years, while every Democratic Senator except four voted to prohibit such immigration for twenty years. General Harrison was paired with Senator Maxey, the former being for the amendment.

The next important amendment was proposed by Senator Hoar (Republican), as follows:

That this bill shall not apply any skilled laborer who shall establish that he comes to this country without any contract by which his labor is the property of any person other than himself.

Upon the adoption of this amendment the vote was:

Yeas—Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Brown, Conger, Davis of Illinois, Dawes, Edmunds, Frye, Hale, Harrison, Hoar, Ingalls, McDill, McMillan, Mahone, Mitchell, Morrill.

Sixteen Republicans and 1 Democratic.

Nays—Messrs. Bayard, Beck, Call, Cockrell, Coke, Fair, Farley, George, Groome, Harris, Hampton, Jackson, Jonas, Jones of Nevada, Maxey, Miller of California, Miller of New York, Morgan, Plumb, Pugh, Ransom, Saunders, Slater, Teller, Vance, Vest, Walker.

Twenty-two Democrats and 6 Republicans.

It will be noticed that the plain effect of this amendment, for which the Republican candidate for President voted, was to admit into competition with American labor Chinese skilled labor, unless it could be shown that it was brought here by contract. Its adoption would have practically destroyed the bill.

Senator Hoar (Republican), who opposed the bill persistently in all its stages then offered an amendment providing—

That any laborer who shall receive a certificate from the United States Consul at the port where he shall embark that he is a citizen coming to this country at his own expense, and by his own free will, and has established such fact to the satisfaction of such Consul, shall not be affected by this bill.

The amendment, it will be noticed permitted Chinese labor to come into competition with American labor, provided the consul should certify that the laborer was coming here at his own expense.

The vote in the Senate upon this amendment was:

Yeas—Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Brown, Conger, Davis of Illinois, Dawes, Frye, Hale, Harrison, Hoar, Ingalls, Jackson, McDill, McMillan, Mahone, Mitchell, Morrill, Plumb, Saunders.

Seventeen Republicans and 2 Democrats.

Nays—Messrs. Bayard, Beck, Call, Cockrell, Coke, Fair, Farley, George, Groome, Hampton, Harris, Jonas, Jones of Nevada, Maxey, Miller of California, Miller of New York, Morgan, Pugh, Ransom, Slater, Teller, Vance, Walker.

Nineteen Democrats and 4 Republicans.

It will be noticed that here again the Republican candidate for President placed himself upon record in favor of allowing Chinese labor to compete with American labor, if the Chinaman could only procure a certificate from a consul that he had himself paid for his passage to this country. In other words, whenever a Chinaman, no matter how degraded or brutal, could beg or borrow, or steal enough money to pay his passage, and should go to a United States consul and make exhibit of that sum and obtain his certificate, he could then land upon our shores and compete with the American laborer.

It is within my personal knowledge that General Harrison knew from actual observation much more of the Chinese question than many of his colleagues, for he had before giving his vote often visited Helena, Montana, his son being United States Assayer at that place, and had there seen the Chinese quarters, with all the curious habits of this strange people. The plea of ignorance in behalf of General Harrison is, therefore, under the circumstances, an attack upon his intelligence both as a public man and an individual, which constitutes a reflection upon the party presenting him as their candidate for the highest office within the gift of the American people.

An amendment to the bill offered by Senator Farley (Democrat) provided:

That hereafter no State Court or Court of the United States shall admit Chinese to citizenship; and all laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

On March 9, 1882, a vote was taken in the Senate upon this amendment, with the following result:

YEAS—Messrs. Bayard, Beck, Call, Cameron, of Wisconsin, Cockrell, Cole, Fair, Farley, Garland, George, Gorman, Harris, Jackson, Jonas, Jones of Nevada, Maxey, Miller of California, Morgan, Pendleton, Pugh, Slater, Vest, Voorhees, Walker.

Democrats, 26; Republicans, 3.

NAYS—Messrs. Aldrich, Anthony, Blair, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Davis of Illinois, Dawes, Frye, Harrisan, Hawley, Hill of Colorado, Hoar, Ingalls, McMillan, Mahone, Miller of New York, Mitchell, Morrill, Platt, Plumb, Saunders, Sawyer, Sewell, Sherman, Teller, Windom.

Republicans, 25; Democrats, none.

It will be seen from this vote that every Republican Senator, including General Harrison, except three, voted against considering the question of prohibiting Chinese immigration in preference to other business, whilst every Democratic Senator voted in favor of such consideration.

The next motion by the enemies of the bill was that of Senator Sherman (Republican) to refer the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and upon this the vote was as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Aldrich, Anthony, Blair, Dawes, Fry, Harrison, Hawley, Hill of Colorado, Hoar, Kellogg, McMillan, Miller of New York, Mitchell, Merrill, Platt, Sawyer, Sherman, Windom.

Republicans, 18; Democrats, none.

NAYS—Messrs. Bayard, Call, Cameron of Wisconsin, Cochran, Coke, Davis of Illinois, Davis of West Virginia, Fair, Farley, Gorman, Grover, Groome, Hampton, Harris, Ingalls, Jackson, Johnston, Jones of Nevada, Lamar, McPherson, Maxey, Miller of California, Morgan, Pendleton, Pugh, Slater, Vance, Walker, Williams.

Democrats, 21; Republicans, 4.

The House bill had been framed from three bills introduced by Mr. Page (Republican) and Messrs. Willis and Berry (Democrats). In the Page bill the time during which Chinese immigration was prohibited was fixed at ten years, whilst in the Willis bill it was placed at fifteen years, and in the Berry bill at sixteen years. The first serious collision in the Senate between the friends and enemies of the measure occurred on the question of striking out the fourteenth section of the bill, as was recommended by the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The section reads as follows:

That hereafter no State Court or Court of the United States shall admit Chinese to citizenship; and all laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

Upon the question of striking out the vote was as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Anthony, Blair, Conger, Davis, of Illinois; Dawes, Frye, Hale, Harrison, Hawley, Hoar, Ingalls, Kellogg, Lapham, McDill, McMillan, Miller, of New York, Morrill, Platt, Plumb, Rollins, Saunders, Sawyer, Van Wyck, Windom.

Republicans, 26; Democrats, none.

NAYS—Messrs. Bayard, Beck, Butler, Call, Cameron, of Wisconsin, Chilcott, Coke, Davis, of West Virginia, Fair, Farley, George, Gorman, Groome, Grover, Hampton, Hill, of Colorado, Jackson, Johnston, Jonas, Jones, of Florida, Jones, of Nevada, McPherson, Maxey, Miller, of California, Morgan, Pendleton, Pugh, Slater, Vest, Voorhees, Walker, Williams.

Democrats, 27; Republicans, 5.

It is proper in this connection to state that when the bill came into the Senate, Senator Edmunds (Republican) moved to strike out section 14, as retained in the bill by the vote just given in Committee of the Whole, and substitute the following:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to change the existing naturalization laws so so as to permit Chinese persons to citizenship.

Upon this motion the vote in the Senate was as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Allison, Blair, Conger, Davis of Illinois, Dawes, Edmunds, Fry, Harrison, Hawley, Hill of Colorado, Lapham, McMillan, Miller of New York, Morrill, Platt, Saunders, Van Wyck.

Republicans, 17; Democrats, none.

NAYS—Messrs. Beck, Butler, Call, Cameron of Wisconsin, Chilcott, Coke, Fair, Farley, Garland, George, Grover, Hampton, Harris, Johnston, Jonas, Jones of Nevada, Maxey, Miller of California, Morgan, Pendleton, Pugh, Slater, Vance, Walker, Williams.

Democrats, 21; Republicans, 4.

The vote of General Harrison was recorded against the section prohibiting Chinese naturalization and in favor of the substitute offered by Mr. Edmunds, which simply left the matter of Chinese citizenship to the courts, without any interference by Congress as to their jurisdiction or discretion.

In the debate upon the Farley amendment, in 1882, it was stated by Senator Farley, and admitted by the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Sherman), and will not be denied now, that Chinese had been admitted to citizenship by the courts of Massachusetts, and it was to condemn in unmistakable terms such action either by Federal or State tribunals that the amendment was offered.

It was not known then to the friends of the pending bill that in 1876, when Gen. Harrison was the Republican candidate for Governor of Indiana, the Superior Court of Indianapolis had, on motion of Mr. Miller, his law partner, naturalized seven Chinamen, who cast their votes at the next election for Gen. Harrison and the Republican State ticket. It is not a matter of surprise that with this practical result of Chinese citizenship in his recent experience the Republican candidate for the Presidency voted against the provision in the act of 1882 prohibiting Chinese naturalization.

The next struggle between the friends and opponents of the House bill was over the fifteenth section, which the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations recommended to be stricken out, and which provided "that the words 'Chinese laborers,' wherever used in this act, shall be construed to mean both skilled and unskilled laborers, and Chinese employed in mining." It was upon this question that Gen. Harrison made his only appearance in the debate of 1882, and it will not surprise those acquainted with his record and opinions on Chinese immigration to find that he opposed the fifteenth section, which specifically enumerated the classes of Chinese to be excluded, and contended earnestly against any legislation construing or affecting the treaty in which the term "Chinese laborers" had been used.

President Arthur in his veto message had, as I have shown, accepted that construction of the word "laborers" in the treaty which conferred upon Chinese subjects coming to the United States as laborers, students, merchants, or from curiosity the privileges accorded to citizens of the most favored Nation, and that all others were excluded. But Gen. Harrison said:

In the treaty the word "laborers" is used. I take it that it is not in the power of Congress to enlarge the meaning of that word. Whenever it meant in the treaty it would mean the same thing as used in law. We cannot make it mean more than that. Therefore, why not let it stand in the law as in the treaty, and let the use of that word include what it will?

It is difficult to belive that a lawyer of General Harrison's standing meant that Congress had no power to construe or even to abrogate a treaty. The Supreme Court of the United States in several cases, and especially in the Cherokee tobacco cases [2 Wallace], has emphatically declared that Congress has the power, and I assume therefore that his real objection to the legislation construing the word "laborers," as used in the treaty, came from the unwillingness "to let go of the old idea," as he expressed it in his letter to Mr. Brant of St. Louis, "that this was the free home of all comers." As Senator Grover very properly said, both the President and the commission who made the treaty considered the section struck out by the committee the proper construction of the term "laborers," and it is absolutely necessary, in order to avoid an avalanche of Chinese upon our shores, to put the matter beyond doubt.

To this General Harrison replied with a sneering allusion to a will case he had once tried, when the lawyer on the other side had claimed to know what the will meant, because he had written it, and he continued to insist that the term "laborers" should be left alone, to be construed by the officers enforcing the law.

On the question of striking out in committee the fifteenth section of the bill, the vote was as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Aldrich, Allison, Anthony, Blair, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Chilcott, Conger, Davis of Illinois, Dawes, Frye, Hale, Harrison, Hawley, Hill of Colorado, Hoar, Ingalls, Kellogg, Lapham, McDill, McMilan, Miller of New York, Morrill, Platt, Plumb, Rollins, Sawyer, Saunders, Van Vyck, Windom.

Republicans, 29: Democrats, none.

NAYS—Messrs. Bayard, Beck, Butler, Call, Cameron of Wisconsin, Coke, Davis of West Virginia, Fair, Farley, George, Grover, Hampton, Jackson, Johnston, Jonas, Jones of Nevada, McPherson, Maxey, Miller of California, Morgan, Pendleton, Pugh, Slater, Vest, Voorhees, Walker, Williams.

Democrats, 25; Republicans, 3.

When the bill came into the Senate a vote was taken on concurring in the action of the Committee of the Whole striking out the fifteenth section, and resulted as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Allison, Blair, Conger, Davis of Illinois, Dawes, Edmunds, Frye, Harrison, Hawley, Hill of Colorado, Hoar, Ingalls, Lapham, McMillan, Miller of New York, Morrill, Platt, Saunders, Sherman, Van Wyck.

Republicans, 20; Democrats, none.

NAYS—Messrs. Beck, Butler, Call, Cameron of Wisconsin, Chilcott, Coke, Fair, Farley, Garland, George, Glover, Hampton, Harris, Johnston, Jonas, Jones of Nevada, Maxey, Miller of California, Morgan Pendleton, Pugh, Slater, Vance, Walker, Williams.

Democrats, 22; Republicans, 3.

Senator Edmunds (Republican) then moved to insert the following:

The words "Chinese laborers," wherever used in this act, shall be construed to mean persons usually engaged in manual labor.

Upon this motion the vote was as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Allison, Blair Conger, Davis of Illinois, Dawes, Edmunds, Frye, Harrison, Hawley, Hill of Colorado, Lapham, McMillan, Miller of New York, Morrill, Platt, Saunder, Van Wyck.

Republicans, 17; Democrats, none.

NAYS—Messrs. Beck, Butler, Call, Cameron of Wisconsin, Chilcott, Coke, Fair, Farley, Garland, George, Grover, Hampton, Harris, Johnston, Jonas, Jones of Nevada, Maxey, Miller of California, Morgan, Pendleton, Pugh, Slater, Vance, Walker, Williams.

Democrats, 21; Republicans 4.

If consistent with his argument previously made, General Harrison ought to have opposed the Edmunds amendment, because it sought to construe the word "laborers" as used in the treaty, and he had strenuously insisted that the meaning of this phrase in the treaty should not be disturbed; but he voted on this as on every other occasion with the opponents of restrictive legislation against Chinese immigration and to embarrass the pending bill.

On the passage of the bill as amended, and as it became a law, the vote was as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Beck, Butler, Call, Cameron of Wisconsin, Chilcott, Coke, Davis of Illinois, Fair, Farley, Garland, George, Grover, Hale, Hampton, Harris, Hill of Colorado, Johnston, Jonas, Jones of Nevada, Maxey, Miller of California, Miller of New York, Morgan, Pendleton, Pugh, Saunders, Slater, Vance, Van Wyck, Vest, Walker, Williams.

Democrats, 22; Republicans, 10.

NAYS—Messrs. Allison, Blair, Conger, Dawes, Edmunds, Frye, Harrison, Hawley, Hoar, Ingalls, Lapham, McMillan, Morrill, Platt, Sherman.

Republicans, 15; Democrats none.

The Republican candidate for the Presidency opposed at every stage, and in every way possible, the legislation against Chinese immigration. If he had succeeded, the law on the statute-books would not exist. For the truth of this statement I appeal to the record now placed before every American citizen.

In the debate of 1882 the Senator from Massachussets (Mr. Hoar), who led the opponents of the bill against the Chinese immigration, declared the same doctrine in the following words:

The insertion of the phrase "the pursuit of happiness" in the enumeration of the natural rights for securing which government is ordained, and the denial of which constitutes just cause for its overthrow, was intended as an explicit affirmation that the right of every human being who obeys the equal laws to go everywhere on the surface of the earth that his welfare may require is beyond the rightful control of government. It is a birthright derived immediately from Him "who made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation." He made, so our fathers held, of one blood all the nations of men. He gave them the whole face of the earth whereon to dwell.

In his letter of February, 23, 1888, to Rev. J. S. Brant, of St. Louis, General Harrison gives the real cause of his opposition to the bills restricting Chinese immigration, in the following sentence:

It seemed to me then to be in violation of our treaty with China, and it was a little hard for me to let go of the old idea that this was the free home to all comers.

For myself, I deny now, as I did in the debate of 1882, that the idea of giving up the right to control immigration as we think proper has been ever entertained by the American people.

There is no inherent right in any foreigner to become either a citizen or denizen of this country. That is a question for us to determine, and us alone. I said then as I say now:

To the thrifty German, the generous and gallant Celt, the hardy Scandinavian, to all who come to share the responsibilities and work out the problem of our civilization and destiny, to all who seek home and shelter in our vast domain, fling wide the portals; but to the people that come not for homes or shelter but only for gain, who have no share in our destiny, no love for our institutions, no reverence for our religion, we have the right to say and do say, "You have no lot or part in this great matter."

DEMOCRATIC Anti-Chinese Meeting TO-NIGHT,

AT THE DEMOCRATIC GRAND STAND,

Corner Franklin and New High Streets.

The Meeting will be addressed by

HON. R. F. DEL VALLE,
HON. STEPHEN M. WHITE,
COL. J. J. AYERS.

All Democrats Rally! Rally!! Rally!!!

By order of the County Central Committee,

EUGENE GERMAIN, Chairman.

DEMOCRATIC VOTERS!

You Must be on the New Great Register.

The following notice has been published by the County Clerk:

OFFICE OF COUNTY CLERK,
Los Angeles, Cal., Aug. 29, 1888.

DEAR SIR—Section 1,227, Political Code, provides, among other things, viz: "No person shall be allowed to vote whose name is not on said register in use at the Precinct." You are requested to at once register all persons entitled to the same, and on October 2nd, 1888, deliver the names so registered at this office. The same Code requires the County Clerk on the first Monday in October to prepare a list of voters for printing. Copies of which will be distributed to the various officers of election, for use by said officers on election day, and as the time granted by Section 1,115 is limited, it is imperative that you should promptly comply with this request. Very respectfully,

C. H. DUNSMOOR, County Clerk.

Since the new registration began in March last according to the orders of the Board of Supervisors, the names of 24,000 electors have been put on the list. The Great Register will go to the printers on the 2d of October. All voters not already on the new roll opened in March last should enroll themselves at once. Remember all registrations prior to March 1, 1888, are canceled. All voters must register for the coming election.

A Conductor's Register.

A few days ago one of the conductors in the employ of the Main street and Agricultural Park line of street cars informed Superintendent Loricke that his bell-bunch had been stolen. An employee of the name of Daniel O'Lynn was suspected of having done the deed through spite. The superintendent and the foreman, A. A. Cleveland, and a couple of other employees went to O'Lynn's house to investigate. O'Lynn, it is alleged, admitted them, and took the register out of a trunk, but at the same time produced a six-shooter, with which he kept them all at bay until he managed to get out of a window and some distance away. He was hotly pursued, and at one time was compelled to use threats with his gun to prevent his capture. This took place Thursday. Yesterday afternoon one of Constable Aguirre's deputies arrested O'Lynn on Main street and brought before Judge Taney, who put him under bonds to appear on the charge of petit larceny on the 17th. The register was in his possession when he was captured.

University Place.

The following resolution, unanimously passed by the Quarterly Conference of University Church, on Wednesday evening, speaks for itself:

Resolved, That this Quarterly Conference, appreciating the efficient and successful labors of our beloved pastor, hereby express our earnest wishes, which we believe to be the earnest desire of our church and congregation, that Dr. T. C. Warner be returned to this charge for the ensuing year, and that the Presiding Elder be required to carry out our wishes in this matter.

Bogus Censustakers.

Quite a number of citizens are complaining of the method which is being taken by Republican canvassers of the city. It is stated that these canvassers visit houses during the absence of the men from their homes, and pretend to be obtaining information for a census. They generally wind up their questions by asking if the men of the house are Republicans, and if they are, by advising the ladies to use their influence to have them register. The complainants object to their homes being invaded in this manner.

A Distinguished Visitor.

Rev. Dr. Ashmore, the celebrated Baptist Missionary to China, is in the city on his way East, being a guest of Mr. G. F. McLellan. He will preach at the First Baptist Church on Sunday morning. On Monday at 2 P. M., at the same place, the Doctor will hold a meeting for conference with the Baptist ministers and laymen of this city and vicinity, to consider questions pertaining to the mission work of the church. Dr. Ashmore is a man held in very high esteem, both by his own people and all Christians, and the Baptists of this section are fortunate in having an opportunity to do him honor.

To Wed.

The following were yesterday licensed to wed:

Charles Coleman Smithson, of San Bernardino, and Mary E. Ellis, of Pomona.

H. H. Bry and Rose E. L. Chrisman, of Los Angeles.