



WORSE THAN SIBERIA.

Startling Revelations of the Treatment of Political Prisoners in Chatham.

They Are Irish and Must Not Complain—John Daly's Story—Poisoned With Belladonna, but No One to Blame—Freedom of Jailed If He Would Betray Farnell—Fitzgerald's Visits—A Fearful Tale.

The Tory sheets of England have been bearing Mr. Gladstone because he said that the treatment of Irish political prisoners by the English government was worse than the treatment of the slaves in Siberia by the government in Russia. How nearly correct Mr. Gladstone may be seen by the report of the commission of inquiry on the treatment of the prisoners in Chatham jail, from which we make some extracts out of the statement of John Daly, imprisoned for treason felony. The document occupies ten closely printed columns of the report, and the references to his treatment extend over the period ranging from his first entrance to the prison on Aug. 6, '84, to the inception of the inquiry:

On first entering the prison, John Daly states, he was put on tailoring work, and subsequently to the cleaning of shanks, hand-cuffs, etc., which continued for seven out of nine months' probation, the remainder being occupied in oakum picking. During all that time he should have had an hour's walking exercise daily, but instead was compelled to work in the ground yards connected with the penitentiary. About the eighth month of his probation he complained to the doctor of losing the use of his legs for want of exercise, and after that he was granted an hour's walking exercise daily. In November, '84, and between 6 and 7 o'clock a.m., Warden Dargan accused him in his cell of making a noise with a tin ware, but this Daly denied. Next the warden reported him on the ground that he was "telegraphing" by means of the noise to the man in the next cell. This Daly states was absolutely untrue, and for it he was subjected to two days' bread and water. On Jan. 2, Warden Bass again charged him with "telegraphing," and making use of an offensive expression, had him reported, and for which he was again put on two days' bread and water. About this time John Daly complained to the two officers in charge of not being allowed either salt or a spoon to season or eat the gruel he got, and remarking it was un-Christian-like, one of the officers, Parker, replied, "Do you call yourself a Christian?" to which Daly made no answer, whereupon the same officer used another and more violent observation. On a subsequent occasion another warden accused him of humming, which Daly denied, and next day being charged with insolently banging the door, which he also denied, he was subjected to two days' bread and water. In March he was given a needle and thread with which to sew buttons on his clothes, and being then one ounce short in the quantity of oakum he had picked, he got

TWO DAYS' BREAD AND WATER, and, strange to say, this was a day or two after he had complained to the doctor of not getting exercise. All this time and subsequently his life and that of his fellow-prisoners was made miserable through the conduct of the officers on night duty, who seemed to amuse themselves banging the trap doors of the cells, which made a horrible noise, so much so that it was impossible to sleep, except when one became exhausted. Daly continues: "In April, '85, was put on the work at the carpenter's shop, and I soon found out what a wretched time I was in for from the officer in charge, who, either from instructions or personal dislike, showed a marked difference in his conduct towards myself and the other prisoners, Gallagher and Burton excepted." Referring then to the early days of his imprisonment, in '85, John Daly says: "An officer, Mr. Memery, came to my cell with a dose of physic, but I told him, being all right, I did not want it. He then shouted to Warden Bass that I was not going to have it, and Bass shouted back, 'Make him take it, you.' Whereupon Memery assured me I would have to take the physic or his 'ceah.' I took the physic, and after vomiting it escaped the purging. The next day I remarked the matter to the then assistant-warden, who laughed and seemed to think it a good joke. I subsequently brought the matter under the notice of the doctor, with the result that the man who did not give me the physic was punished. Another doctor said to me the less complaints you have to make to me the less complaints you have to make to the officers the better for yourself." In the carpenter's shop, John Daly writes, his life continued to be made very miserable, independent of having the hardest work allotted to him, and being subjected to foul and insulting language. One item of the work he had to do was to carry on his back large deers and frames, which were made very heavy by the quantity of iron in them. "These I had to carry a distance of forty or fifty yards, and at night when going to bed I found my shirt stuck to my back with

blood, for which he got two days' bread and water, and subsequently, asking the governor why he had not been visited by his sister, he replied: "You see you got into trouble, and it had to countermand the order." That is to say, an order, supposed to be sent to his sister in Limerick on March 15, was countermanded, because he got into trouble six weeks later.

During the years of '86 and '87 Daly, from the physical suffering he had been enduring, became very weak in health, and in March, '87, had an independent medical examination granted by the home secretary in response to a statement made Mr. William Abraham, M.P. On the morning of the examination he was in bed in the infirmary, and sometimes brought the doctors came the principal warden brought him a large pot of hot coffee, which he requested him to drink. This Daly declined to do, stating that he would wait till a little later on, but "the warden would have him drink it right away," and watch him till he had drunk it. "Now," writes John Daly, "I had been looking forward to this examination with a view of making a full statement to the gentlemen of the treatment I had received, but I was not able to say what I intended, and the only way I can account for it is that there must have been something in the coffee which dulled my intellect for the time being."

After referring at length to the medical department and the treatment he was receiving from the doctors, and which, according to the statement, was intermittent and neglectful in character, John Daly states in about November, '89, having complained of his feet, from which he had been a great sufferer, he was treated week after week one way or another, but got little or no relief. On Nov. 18, Dr. Visey saw him, and told him to continue the powder he had got, and he would also put him on medicine, and on that date also, at 1 o'clock, he gave him the first dose. "The effect of this," John Daly says, "was for my face to flush,

with slight pain in the stomach. I drank a large quantity of water. About 5 o'clock Commissioner Dargan opened the trap door of the cell, and said: 'Daly, you have enough of the powder.' I said, 'Yes, thank you, and Mr. Dargan, will you please mention to the doctor that this medicine has a very strange effect on me. It has caused me most violent thirst.' Dargan found fault with the manner in which he was addressed when he was not titled 'Sir.' His knowledge of drugs, continues the narrative, "should have told him there must have been something wrong with the medicine, but Mr. Dargan did not convey the message to the doctor." Daly suffered considerably, and taking a third dose next day experienced the symptoms described: burning of the face, thirst, the intensity of which cannot be described, loss of sight and shooting pains. This third dose intensified his condition, leaving him unable to walk, and with loss of speech, he had to be taken between two men up-stairs to the infirmary.

Daly, for the inquiry, then submitted the following questions: "Was it belladonna I received? Would the symptoms described be produced by belladonna, and if so, what quantity must the eight-ounce bottle have contained, and if that quantity was likely to be put in a mistake by a proper compounded or otherwise?" Having referred in detail to the general prison treatment, John Daly mentions the following facts, which, he says, will serve to throw light on the dangers he is exposed to: On Feb. 19 a prisoner in the workshop put a small bit of newspaper cutting into his hand—out to clean that a prisoner could not have done it. He had only a bare glimpse of it, but could see Sir Henry James, M.P. at Barry, and the names of Parnell and Davitt, no date, and he destroyed it immediately, as he believed it was a trap. On the following Thursday the same prisoner gave him another portion of a newspaper, remarking to be careful of it. This man he knew wanted to betray him.

Speaking of the visitors he had received, Daly mentioned a man who represented the Times, who offered him freedom if he would give damaging evidence against Parnell before the special commission. The inquiry then proceeded: Chairman—What was the next visit you had after that gentleman? I had a visit then from Mr. Pigott of Dublin, but that was at my own request—at least, Mr. Pigott made application to the governor to visit me, and asked me if I had any objections to see Pigott. I asked for a week to consider, because at that time I was expecting a visit from young Jones, and when he did not turn up at the end of the week I told the governor that he might give an order to Pigott.

Mr. Drummond—DID YOU KNOW PIGOTT? I had known him for years. I visited him once in prison, and I thought it was in the way of a return of my kindness his visiting me now, but I found out that that was not so. The Chairman—He visited you? Yes. He did not mention the name of the Times gentleman, but I have learned since that he was upon the same business as the Times gentleman.

You say you requested Jones to ask the Limerick people to get the government to grant an inquiry? To call a meeting of the citizens to ask the government to grant an inquiry into our treatment. I asked nothing more than an inquiry by men who were dispassionate and perfectly in a position to inquire conscientiously and dispassionately into the treatment.

Mr. Drummond—With regard to your Times visitor, what passed between you? Was there anything special? Yes, there was something very special passed between us. Chairman—And then you have since had a visit from your sister? Yes. And you have been told that you would not be allowed another visit from Jones? It was told that I would not be allowed another visit from Jones nor receive letters from him nor visit letters to him.

Chairman—It there anything else that you wish to call the attention of the visitors to? I wish to call attention to my being brought in contact with that gentleman from the Times newspaper. At the time I protested against what I was subjected to, I protested against it now, not against his having permission to visit, but in regard to what he proposed to do. He proposed terms to me, which would commit my name to infamy forever; which would

DAMN ME, BODY, MIND AND MEMORY, in the mind of my country. You rejected those terms? I rejected them, and I said that I protested against them, and I thought it unfair for anyone under her majesty's government to be subjected to such an ordeal as that ordeal was. Did this gentleman offer you freedom? Yes; the deputy-governor was present, and he knew the language that was made use of. The language that was made use of was that he was in a position to state to me that any person who would give evidence upon the inquiry which would enable the government to trace crimes which had been committed in Ireland to land leaguers, to Parnell, that any person who could give evidence of that kind would receive a letter or certificate of protection. Now it would be perfectly nonsense to say that a certificate of protection in Chatham prison is at all necessary. What was implied consequently must have been that I would be outside Chatham prison.

The construction I put upon it was—"If you become an informer you will get a certificate of protection to save you from the vengeance of the dynamiters and land leaguers, and you will be able to walk as a free man about the country with a certificate of indemnity in your pocket." Now, I do not think I am exaggerating or putting a false construction upon the thing by arriving at that conclusion. My answer to him will, I think, justify my conviction at the time. My answer was—"If one word of mine in support of what you state would let me march a free man out of that gate I refuse to speak that one word, and I will remain here until I rot." Then I afterwards said I protested against the government permitting or subjecting me to such treatment. It was hard, I thought, to be kept a prisoner for years and to suffer what I have suffered, but I argued that I should be allowed to endure my sufferings in peace without their striving to destroy my reputation. Then I said, "Nothing would induce me to give one word not for me. Then he said,

"WE WILL USE FORCE." He used the expression deliberately in the hearing of Major Clayton that force would be used to take me to London and give evidence. Major Clayton was there? Yes, and he gave the answer back, "Then use force, and that will compel him." Soon after that Mr. Pigott came, and he followed it up in a milder method. He supported the statement of the previous gentleman by saying, "I would not come here to propose to you to do anything unless it was for your own future wellbeing—that is, for your own good." I knew in my heart that Richard Pigott was telling a lie, but I did not pretend to say anything of the kind. Now I know why the other gentleman came. I asked him who was it that suggested to him to come and see me? He said my name had been traced through a lot of those crimes in Ireland, that I had been connected with them. Now there is no necessity for me to say more so except my conscientious feeling that it was not true, I also knew that it was upon Pigott's suggestion that he came here.

How do you know that? That Mr. Pigott knew there was no love between myself and Mr. Parnell, and Pigott thought that whatever feeling there was between myself and Mr. Parnell would induce me to avail myself of the chance of liberty by endeavoring to trace Phoenix Park murderers and the murderers ascribed to the Land League. I had a later visit from Inspector Littlechild, who came to try to undo the work of his two predecessors, and he honestly admitted to me that they were a pair of bunglers and that they did not know anything about the work they took in hand. Daly gave a long catalogue of his ill-treatment. The description of the filthy scenes which surrounded his daily life for several months are too horrible for publication in a newspaper, and the vile language which was forced upon his ears, and part of which he was constrained to repeat to the visitors, cannot for the same reason be given to the public.

Parnell and the National League. LINCOLN, Neb., May 29.—President Fitzgerald, of the Irish National League, received the following cablegram to-day:—Your action postponing convention has my entire approval, and if cablegram had reached me in time I should have advised recent meeting of council. (Signed) PARNELL. Fitzgerald is in communication with the Irish leader, and is urging the need of a convention of the American League. Parnell expresses confidence in the present national officers, but the attacks upon the organization cause him grave anxiety, as he fears it is the aim of others in this country to get the league under their control for objects not favorable to the Irish cause. Fitzgerald hopes to be able at an early date to name a definite time for the convention, and has strong hopes of securing the attendance of John Dillon, Timothy Harrington and William O'Brien.

Tenants' Defence Fund Closed. The Irish Tenants' Defence Association closed its subscription lists on Thursday, May 15, with the sum of \$300,000. This association was started about six months ago, for the purpose of protecting tenants threatened by the landlord's conspiracies, of which the infamous Smith-Barry syndicate is a fair example, for the assertion of the right of freedom of speech and public meeting, and for the securing of Irish work-

men of the same right and facility to combine and organize as are enjoyed by English workmen under the Trades Union enactment. The association, it will be remembered, was founded by Messrs. Parnell, Davitt, O'Brien, Dillon and other Irish leaders, and endorsed by the Irish bishops and almost the whole of the clergy were among the most ardent contributors to its funds. The sum above-mentioned is a very creditable result for six months' work, and had done much to mitigate the hardships of the wholesale evictions in Donegal, Cork, and elsewhere as well as to encourage in the case of tenant evictions such splendid success as those embodied in the thriving town of New Tipperary.

HYPNOTISM AND SPIRITUALISM.

What the Attitude of the Church is in Reference to them.

Recent experiments in hypnotism by Prof. Esdaile, of Bombay, tend to prove that the ascendancy of one mind over another, even when sleep has not been produced by hypnotism, may be such as to take from the person so influenced by "suggestion" the moral responsibility of certain actions, hitherto to a great deal of controversy, not only of a scientific, but also of a theological nature. In connection with this perplexing subject, to which so much attention is now being given, an ecclesiastical high authority, who wishes, however, that his name should be kept out of the discussion, has just made a communication to a representative of the *Irish Times* that may be of interest to many Catholics who are in doubt as to the attitude of the Church with reference to hypnotism. This authority, after recalling the terms of the Encyclical of 1858, which, without condemning the practice of magnetism (as hypnotism was then called), so long as it was kept strictly within the bounds of the physical laws and was used for a good purpose, spoke at length of the conference recently given by Pere R. P. Lemaigne, of the Society of Jesus, in the Church of St. Merri, and summed up his own and the Society's views on this subject as follows:—"If you wish to obtain for the sick person the sleep that will restore his strength or calm a certain crisis, the use of magnetism is not forbidden. But to send a subject to sleep in order to obtain an abusive authority over him, to lead him to commit sins, to induce him to do anything against his own free will, or to induce him to do anything which is in his own best interests, if your father is in heaven, are practices which the Church condemns. In these cases we have an application of physical means to effects which go beyond the operation of natural causes.—*Cler. Liverpool Catholic Times.*"

Archbishop Fabre on Sunday Desecration.

The following circular from Archbishop Fabre to the clergy was read in the churches last Sunday:—We must absolutely, my dear fellow-laborers, cease against the unfortunate tendency manifested by our midst to transform Sunday and religious holidays into days of public amusements and even into days of disorder. Until a few years ago the regular observance of the Lord's day was a characteristic trait of our country; but, if we do not beware, we are on the way to lose this good reputation. The duty imposed upon us is to make every effort to maintain this reputation, and to preserve together with the Christian spirit of the population, the graces which the Lord promises in abundance to the nations who keep and respect his day. In my circulars, Nos. 29, 54 and others I called your attention to political meetings, excursions and pleasure parties, theatricals and plays, bazaars, lotteries, etc., all of which are things which must be banished from our midst on Sundays and religious holidays. I repeat to-day all that was laid down in those different letters; I strongly insist from the pulpit that no excursions from one city or parish to another be organized on Sundays or religious holidays, and that no public amusements, theatricals or military parades. It is more especially to be desired that there be no renewal of certain performances given in the past on religious holidays, in which, for the amusement of the spectators, the life of some audacious persons was endangered. Games of this kind, calculated to draw crowds, have resulted too often in keeping the people away from the churches, and are little in accord with good morals, and are, moreover, absolutely opposed to the holiness of the Lord's day, and our duty also opposes them with all our force."

The Scotch-Irish Congress.

PITTSBURG, May 29.—The second great Scotch-Irish congress of America opened in Mechanics Hall to-day, with probably one thousand delegates and visitors from all parts of the United States and Canada. Robert Banner, of New York, president of the association, called the congress to order. The vast auditorium was then well filled, and the scene presented was inspiring. Addresses of welcome were delivered by Governor Beaver and Meyer Gourlay. There had been a wonderful growth of the society during the past year.

Farmers Ill-Treat Laborers.

Michael Davitt has written a letter in which he expresses disgust at the treatment which a number of tenant farmers in Ireland accord to laborers in their employ. The farmers even more than the usual selfishness, and an attempt to sell the land question by transferring the ownership of land from the landlords to the farmers would only perpetuate and intensify agrarian discontent.

A Valuable Painting.

Lady Butler has put down \$10,000 as the price of her great picture representing an Irish evicton scene. It is at present on exhibition in the Royal Academy, London, where it has created as great a sensation as her celebrated "Kell Gall."

A Perplexed Preacher.

A Protestant clergyman in Norwich, Conn., says the *Catholic Advocate*, the Rev. E. W. Jenkins, is afflicted in spirit. He has a grievance; it is eating into his heart; he is

unable to obtain redress. It is interesting to note what is the cause of his mental suffering. It is that the school teacher in one of the public schools in Norwich persists in reading every day for her pupils chapters from the Old Testament, portions of which deal with matters which he deems as unfitting to read before youth. His reverence would be satisfied if the teacher—female—selected for personal chapters from the New Testament, but against the books of the Old Law he feels bound to make a determined stand. The absurdity of this is apparent when we recollect that this Protestant clergyman insists that the Bible and the Bible only is the sole source of his religion and that it should be read by every one, from cover to cover—except where his church has mutilated it—and that from its contents each worthy Protestant is at liberty to draw whatever conclusions he wishes to formulate; whatever code of faith and morals he desires. The Rev. Mr. Jenkins' action is as reasonable as the assertion that the Church of God was founded on the Sacred Scriptures which—as far as the New Testament relates—were not written for many years after its foundation.

THE IRISH LEADER'S PLAN.

How Mr. Parnell Would Solve the Land Question.

Now that we have before us the full text of the Land Bill which Mr. Parnell proposed as a substitute for Mr. Balfour's measure, we can understand the surprise and perplexity which it excited on the part of his own followers as well as his political opponents. It is not true, however, that he declared himself in favor of retaining landlords in Ireland and opposed to the creation of a peasant proprietary. What he said was that it is better for the present to retain the landlords, provided the rents of all the poorer tenants are materially reduced, than to accept the partial and unfair application of the purchase principle recommended by the Salisbury Government. In that way general and immediate relief could be secured, while the definite transformation of tenants into owners would be reserved for a Home Rule Parliament sitting at Dublin.

The obvious objections to Mr. Balfour's proposal are, first, that the sum appropriated to land purchase is not large enough to convert more than a quarter of the Irish tenants into owners; secondly, that the sum to be distributed among large tenants as well as small, although only the latter suffer severely from the existing agrarian conditions; thirdly, that to benefit one-fourth of the tenants the whole local credit of Irish districts are exhausted, so that further relief is almost impossible. It is also urged against Mr. Balfour's Bill that it offers landlords larger prices for their estates than could be obtained in the open market. It is true that those tenants covered by the provisions of the measure, if they choose to accept exorbitant terms and punctually return to the Government in annual instalments the purchase money advanced, will, at the end of forty-nine years, become owners in fee of their holdings. Suppose, however, that long before the lapse of half a century Ireland should have a separate Parliament, which would convert the remaining three-fourths of the tenants into owners on much more favorable terms; then those who had availed themselves of Mr. Balfour's offer, would be apt to repent of their bargain, and might refuse to pay the unliquidated instalments of their purchase money.

Starting, then, with the assumption that any land measure likely to be passed by the present Parliament will be tentative and partial, Mr. Parnell would have such funds as the Government is willing to appropriate placed where they will do most good. He proposes, accordingly, that instead of lending some \$200,000,000 to one-fourth of the tenants (including the most prosperous, who need no help), the British Treasury should lend \$135,000,000 to the landlords for the removal of their most onerous encumbrances, on condition that they sent to an immediate reduction of thirty per cent. on all rents under \$260 a year. Under this programme the relief afforded would go to those who need it most, and would be distributed all over Ireland. Moreover, the Government, instead of exhausting the local Irish credit as security for the repayment of advances, would not be bound to leave the local credit available for future comprehensive schemes of land purchase. Meanwhile, all rents under \$250 a year having been cut down about one-third, the value of landlords' estates, and, consequently, the prices to be ultimately paid for them, would be correspondingly lowered. In a word, the poorer tenants, whose representative Mr. Parnell is, would obtain forthwith and gratuitously a large measure of relief, and would also be assured that when their holdings were eventually sold to them, they would get them at much cheaper rates than are now offered by Mr. Balfour.

This scheme seems intelligible enough when its details can be studied on paper, although Mr. Gladstone avowed his inability to understand it, as orally outlined. It seems, however, not to have been received with favor by the Irish National party, for which reason Mr. Parnell will refrain, it is reported, from discussing it in the committee stage on which Mr. Balfour's measure has now entered. The Opposition will, therefore, confine themselves to the grounds of objection indicated above, together with the fundamental arguments brought forward by Mr. Gladstone, first, that the present House of Commons has no mandate to enact a land purchase law for Ireland, the constituencies having declared against the Liberal proposals to that end at the last general election; and, secondly, that Parliament has no moral right to force an agrarian measure upon Ireland, against which the spokesmen of three-fourths of her population protest. We are not unlikely, however, to hear more of Mr. Parnell's propositions by and by, for, as Mr. Morley has said, the Irish leader has the knack of propounding ideas which are accepted the day after to-morrow.—*N. Y. Sun.*

A SAN FRANCISCO HORROR.

A Carload of Passengers Plunged Through an Open Bridge.

The Number of Dead May Reach 25—The Danger Signal Was Up, but a Curve Hid It.

SAN FRANCISCO, May 30.—One of the most horrible railway accidents ever known in California occurred at 1.40 p.m. to-day, when the local train connecting at Oakland with the ferry boats from San Francisco ran through an open drawbridge over the San Antonio creek, at Webster street, Oakland. The yacht *Janita* had passed through the draw when the train appeared going in the direction of Alameda and the drawbridge. The keeper tried to close the bridge, but it was too late, and the engine with its tender and first car, which was filled with passengers, plunged into the river which was here quite deep.

Engineer Sam Dunn and Fireman O'Brien went down with the engine. The former, when he saw the bridge did not close, reversed the lever, but the momentum of the engine was too great to be stopped in time. The weight of the engine and the first car broke the coupling and left the other two cars standing on the track. These were carried a third of the way across the bridge and stopped, but the jar was sufficient to break open the front of the car, and many passengers were thrown into the water.

THE WORK OF RESCUE.

The first car, which had followed the engine, soon rose and such of the passengers as had escaped were poked up by yachts and boats which gathered at the scene. The trainmen and the rest of the passengers aided in the work of rescue and when the wrecking train arrived from Oakland the car was drawn to shore and the boats began dragging the wreck for bodies. The train was in charge of Conductor Korach and an extra crew, probably twenty-five persons had met their death. The top of the passenger car was open as seen as it was raised clear of the water, and the work of removing the bodies commenced, being taken out in quick succession. Engineer Dunn and his fireman were both saved. Three women and three girls were taken from the water alive and removed to the receiving hospital. Another young lady died soon after being taken from the water.

IDENTIFYING THE VICTIMS.

The new of the accident created intense excitement in Oakland and thousands of people flocked to the morgue and to the scene of the wreck. The bodies were laid out as soon as removed to wait identification. The body of E. Robinson, which was among those taken from the hole out in the roof of the car, was among the first removed and was taken in charge by Coroner Evans. The bodies of six men and two women were brought in soon after, some of the bodies being at first left at the receiving hospital where the injured were also taken. Some thirteen bodies lay on the floor and the marble slabs of the morgue awaiting identification. Many heartrending scenes were witnessed as the friends came forward to claim their dead.

LIST OF THE DEAD.

The list of the identified is as follows:—Martin Kelly, of Oakland, assistant chief wharfinger for the state. A. H. Austin, of Austin & Phelps, San Francisco. Miss Florence Austin. Mrs. Bryan O'Connor, widow of the deceased member of the firm of O'Connor, Moffatt & Co., San Francisco. J. B. Ewing, sewing machine agent, Oakland. E. R. Robinson, San Francisco. Luigi Malati, San Francisco. Capt. John Dwyer, Sacramento. Mr. Williams, San Francisco. H. W. Auld [colored], Honolulu. The two Misses Kennan, San Francisco. The thirteen bodies was that of a Japanese boy supposed to be H. Malerat, of San Francisco.

HIGH SPEED BOUND A CURVE.

The cars of the Narrow Gauge road seat about fifty people, and the seats are very close together. Conservative estimates place the number of the people in the car at about thirty, thirteen of whom lost their lives. The water over which the bridge is built is an estuary of San Francisco bay, and is called Oakland Creek. A strong current runs in the stream which at the point of the accident is about 300 feet wide and 20 feet deep. Both sides of the creek are lined with shipping, and boatmen from the vessel were of great assistance in rescuing those who escaped from the car. The draw bridge is about 100 feet long, and just before the bridge from San Francisco got on the bridge they have to come around a sharp curve and usually travel at a high rate of speed.

THE DANGER SIGNAL WAS FLYING.

A passenger train crosses the bridge every half hour during the day, and when the bridge is open the keeper is supposed to signal by hoisting a red flag. J. N. Dunlop, the bridge tender, says the red danger flag was flying. The bridge was swung open for the yacht *Janita* to pass. The boat had just gone through and the bridge was being swung back when the train ran off. It supposes the engineer did not see the signal on account of the curve. The stories of the engineer and fireman have not been obtained, as they disappeared as soon as rescued.

AN ANNIVERSARY SERVICE.

Was chanted in St. Patrick's Church for the repose of the soul of William Dowling on Tuesday the 29th of May. R.I.P.