

WIDESPREAD RICHES.

The correspondent of the Toronto Globe, who recently made a tour of this province, became acquainted with a fact of which not many people in the West have been aware, namely, that mineral riches are not confined to two or three small districts. Writing from Victoria he says: "It is somewhat surprising to leave the great gold and silver districts of West Kootenay, to come hundreds of miles further west, to bear in Vancouver of the great development in Cariboo, and then to reach Victoria only to find the people all apparently more or less interested in the development of yet another gold-bearing region. This proves only what I have previously stated—that the whole province is teeming with mineral riches, which sooner or later will flow in streams of wealth, not through British Columbia alone, but through the whole of Canada. The discovery of rich deposits of the yellow metal in so many sections of this province at the same time shows unusual activity on the part of prospectors. This is but the natural consequence of the successes of Kootenay and Cariboo, and another natural consequence of these same successes is the fact that capitalists and the public generally now listen with some attention to the reports of discoveries in other quarters of British Columbia, whereas a year or two ago even a few months ago they would have fallen on deaf ears." The correspondent proceeds to sketch the island discoveries, those of the Goldstream and Leech river districts, Alberni and Texada. Doubtless a good many of the Globe's readers will be somewhat surprised by the information he furnishes, and the interest awakened by the Kootenay excitement will naturally make them minds more receptive to such information. The results of such spreading of knowledge cannot be otherwise than satisfactory. There is little doubt that in time to come eastern and outside capital will find profitable investment in developing the wealth that lies imbedded in the rocks of Vancouver Island.

HIS OWN ADMISSIONS.

Dr. Duncan and the Colonist seem to forget that there are on record some admissions made by the former in regard to his office. When the board of health inquired into the case, Dr. Duncan made a statement, part of which was as follows:

"When he first saw the two suspects he told them that they would simply be taken to the hospital, disinfected and allowed to go. During his absence from the room where he found them, one of the suspects broke out and went into another room, where there was another man. This made three suspects and the patient, all of whom were sent to the hospital. The suspects were disinfected and put into a pure building, and the regular caretaker, Mr. Shaw, being required to nurse the patient, Mr. Heathorn was engaged as caretaker. On the 23rd, Heathorn and Morton expressed the desire to go and visit, and he coming to the conclusion that there was no danger, granted the request. If he had given the matter a second thought he would have acted otherwise, as the mayor had ordered him to keep them confined. He apologized to the mayor for acting contrary to his orders. The two men were told to go directly to the station and return immediately. Morton did return within an hour, but Heathorn was away until next morning."

To any person who reads this it is perfectly plain that both Mayor Beaven and Dr. Duncan thought Morton had been exposed to smallpox contagion, and that there would be danger to the public health in allowing him to be at large. If they did not think so they acted like arant fools in having him placed in quarantine. It does not matter what subsequent discoveries are alleged; the fact remains that the mayor and the doctor declared by their actions that they thought there was danger to the public in allowing the man his liberty. Therefore in granting him permission to go out and vote Dr. Duncan wilfully sinned against the public safety. Why did he order Morton to return immediately if he thought there was no danger in his being abroad? Dr. Duncan now produces a statement from Morton to the effect that he voted for Dr. Milne and Mr. Templeman, but that is only an afterthought. The doctor supposed when he allowed Morton to go to the poll that his vote would be cast for Messrs. Earle and Prior. If he had thought otherwise he would not have allowed him to go.

WHELAN'S \$5000.

Tory papers have been endeavoring to find some satisfaction for their vindictive hatred of Mr. Tarte in that gentleman's acknowledgment that he handled \$5000 of Contractor Whelan's money while he was a member of the Tory party. If he had remained a member of that party our now virtuous contemporaries would have seen nothing wrong in his conduct, since the \$5000 was expended for the good of the Tory cause. But circumstances have changed the color of their spectacles very materially, and they now see appalling rascality in what would have been quite innocent in their sight if Mr. Tarte had only remained a Tory. And what is there so heinous in the action Mr. Tarte took? Even the Tory Montreal Gazette is constrained to admit that he profited not personally by the Whelan deal, and it even accepts his statement that he knew nothing of the ultimate source of the money. The Herald in its turn gives this summary of the matter, which agrees with the Gazette's as to facts, though not as to deductions:

"J. P. Whelan, the contractor, had a claim for \$140,000 odd against the provincial government, of which Mr. Mercer was at that time head. Mr. Whelan

was rated as a subscriber in large amounts to the campaign funds of the government. It was determined that his claim should be settled and Mr. Tarte who was at that time a prominent member of the Conservative party in the province, Mr. Tarte being its nominal head, was approached for information as to the course which the opposition would follow in respect of the vote. Mr. Tarte consulted Mr. Talbot, who said that as Mr. Whelan had been so large a subscriber to the government campaign fund, it might be to the advantage of the opposition to allow the vote to pass, the apparent inference being that in such case Mr. Whelan's willingness to contribute might be lessened. This statement having been communicated to the agent of the Government, Mr. Tarte received the \$5000 in question, a contribution by the campaign managers for the government to the funds in the hands of the campaign managers for the opposition. The vote was passed without opposition. Mr. Tarte applied the whole \$5000 to the purposes of the Conservative party.

"Mr. Tarte declares that if he had known that the \$5000 had come from Whelan he would have had nothing to do with it, a declaration which must be accepted. It is to be remembered that Mr. Tarte was at that time a prominent member of the Conservative party and that the transaction in question was such as has figured frequently in records of the politics of the province. Since his leaving the Conservative party, indeed since his discovery of the rifling of the Dominion treasury by the Hon. Mr. Blake, he has rendered the cause of good government such signal service as to have fairly entitled him to a place of honor among the avowed champions of that cause. No one who knows the man has any reason to doubt the truth of the statement that he profited personally by the transaction in question. His sworn statement that he did not do so is accepted by the Gazette without question, and since the Gazette has been the most influential in the fomenting of suspicion as to Mr. Tarte's personal standing in the matter, it is to be predicted that his personal honor will be no longer subject to attack in any respectable quarter."

It is said that certain Dominion government officials are growing wings and will be flying before Christmas.

R. G. Dun & Co's table of failures in Canada during the third quarter of 1896, compared with the same period in 1895, shows a small decrease (3) in the number, but an increase in the liabilities of about half a million. For the first nine months of 1896 there was an increase over the first nine months of 1895 of 212 in the number and \$2,556,843 in the amount of liabilities of insolvents. The following is the table:

Ontario	186	\$1,001,108	\$1,215,634
Quebec	171	1,390,990	2,022,655
N. B.	13	400,000	300,000
Nova Scotia	50	107,600	150,500
P. E. Island	18	52,779	103,700
Nfld.	3	8,888	6,000
Total	429	\$2,995,496	\$3,924,257
Total 1895	432	2,512,881	3,360,218
Nine Mo. 1896	151	\$9,396,936	\$12,485,046
Nine Mo. 1895	139	7,992,290	9,928,210
Nfld. 1896	5	\$18,500	\$22,698
Nfld. 1895	3	18,442	26,076

RAILWAY TO KOOTENAY.

The Kamloops Sentinel endorses the "People's Railway" project. Such a road, it says, would be of tremendous advantage to the country, as it would be not more than half the length of the C. P. R. to the coast and would open up the splendid mineral district to the south of Kamloops. Our contemporary advocates that a line from Kamloops, running south to connect with the projected railway, be insisted upon as a part of the scheme. This suggestion, we believe, has been anticipated by all promoters. The extension of that branch to the Cariboo country should also receive serious consideration, for it must now, after thirty years' experience, be manifest to every old-timer that the northern half of British Columbia will never be developed without railways. To embody Cariboo extension as part of the scheme, would, perhaps, be an undertaking too formidable to be carried out in two years, but the construction of a road to the golden hills of Cariboo must of necessity form part of any well-planned railway policy; and sooner or later it will be built. Upon the completion of the proposed Kootenay line and its successful operation, a Cariboo branch will become a question demanding immediate attention; but for the present we must bend our energies to the accomplishment of that which is most needed. Kootenay is the present objective point, and to Kootenay we must go with a railway. Other projects—and there are many—can wait until this one, the saving of the trade of the province for the people of the province, is assured. There will be work in British Columbia for the next ten years for a government of earnest business men, presided over by a statesman who has the courage to take the tide at the flood and lead the province on to fortune. We are entering upon a new era, and if we as a people are to prove equal to the responsibilities that are being so rapidly forced upon us, we must adopt a definite and a progressive policy and carry it out with vigor.

The Sentinel does not approve of the proposal in a board of trade resolution, to make a schedule of rates common to the four cities, and characterizes such a condition as "hogwash." Our contemporary must not permit the despicable sin of sectionalism, which we all must wish to see dead and buried, to influence its actions or its criticisms. Victoria is heartily in sympathy with the projected railway and will cheerfully bear her share of the burden that necessarily must be imposed upon the province to build it. To give her merchants the same freight rates as the merchants of the other cities, is not placing the latter at any disadvantage. To ask that which is not "hogwash," to refuse it, might be.

The undertaking will be a large one and it will require united effort if it is to succeed. Therefore, don't let us throw any rocks at each other.

INLAND FISHERIES

Ruling of Supreme Court of Canada on Dominion and Provincial Jurisdiction.

Generally in Favor of Provinces—Case to be Appealed to the Privy Council.

Ottawa, Oct. 13.—The question of jurisdiction over fisheries and the status of the provinces and the Dominion in inland non-navigable waters, decided today by the supreme court of Canada, is one of the greatest importance and will be appealed for the decision of the judicial committee of the privy council in England when the matter will be finally set at rest. The question first arose in the case of the Queen vs. Robertson, decided by the supreme court of Canada in 1883. That was a case where the right of the minister of marine and fisheries to lease a portion of the Miramichi river for the purpose of fishing was challenged, Mr. C. A. Robertson being interrupted in the enjoyment of his fishing. The court held that the general law of the Dominion was not applicable to the Miramichi river, but that a license granted by the minister of marine and fisheries was void because the law only authorized the granting of licenses to fish in navigable waters, and in this case the exclusive right of fishing belonged to the owners of the end through which that portion of the Miramichi flows. It was also held that a license by the federal authorities to fish in streams running through provincial property would be illegal. This judgment led the provinces to assert their rights and the friendly reference to the supreme court of Canada was the result.

In the argument before the court in 1895 Mr. Christopher Robinson, representing the Dominion and the senior counsel for Ontario was Mr. Edward Blake. It was contended on behalf of the Dominion that section 91 of the British North America Act vested in the Dominion parliament authority to legislate respecting the sea coast and inland fisheries, and that the right of control, including the issue of licenses for fishing privileges that were vested in the Dominion government, which claimed the ownership of the beds of all rivers, tidal or non-tidal, navigable or non-navigable, ungranted at the time of the passing of the British North America Act, also the ownership of the beds of so much waters of lakes as were occupied by improvements forming part of the public works of any of the provinces in 1867 and also the ownership of the beds of the fresh water lakes, more especially by the chain of great lakes. Great stress was laid on the fact that the exclusive power to make laws in respect to navigation was vested in the Dominion and that the Dominion had the right of reference to navigable rivers forming part of the boundary between the Dominion and the United States and the same international reason applied to the great lakes and it was pointed out that fishing privileges had been granted by the supreme court of the United States to come within the term of "high seas."

It was submitted that if the beds of such lakes are held to be vested in the Dominion, the Dominion claimed the exclusive jurisdiction not only over the regulation, protection and preservation of fisheries but over "fisheries." The right to authorize any direct taxation, "fishery" and it was held that this was property subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion in the same way as other property is subject to provincial jurisdiction. The Dominion contended that over fishing in all waters the Dominion parliament may exercise complete control and that the provinces could not issue fishing licenses even for the purpose of raising a revenue, which of course would be a violation of the Dominion's exclusive jurisdiction. It was submitted that the Dominion had no jurisdiction to enact the forty-seventh section of the Revised Statutes, chapter 44, so far as it purports to authorize the Dominion to make regulations for the regulation of fisheries in lands covered by water in harbors, rivers or other navigable waters in Ontario.

In behalf of the provinces, the argument of Mr. Blake may be taken as representing the main points. He submitted that the beds of all waters not granted before Confederation are, under the British North America Act, the property of the province. The question of public harbors was dealt with separately, and it was contended that the proprietary right of the Dominion in public harbors exists only in such harbors as were the property of the province at Confederation and had by previous legislation been declared to be public harbors and provincial property. It was further contended that there is no need of any proprietary right by the Dominion in the bed of harbors, or of other navigable waters, in order to maintain the effectiveness of the legislative powers for the purposes of navigation. The distinction was drawn between the franchise of the port which is common to all subjects and the property of its soil.

The following is an extract from the judgment of the present chief justice of the supreme court in the case of the Queen vs. Robertson:

"No principle of law can be better established than the rule which ascribes the ownership of the soil and bed of a non-navigable river prima facie to riparian proprietors of the opposite banks. And again:

"It results from the proprietorship of the riparian owner of the soil in the bed of the river that he has the exclusive right of fishing in so much of the bed of the river as belongs to him, and this is not a riparian right in the nature of easement, but is strictly a right of property."

On the question as to where the jurisdiction rests to authorize fishing, the case for the provinces is well founded on the judgment of the late Chief Justice Ritchie in the case of the Queen vs. Robertson. He said:

"I cannot discover the slightest trace of an intention on the part of the Imperial parliament to convey to the Dominion government any property, whether in the nature of a right of fishing in the beds of streams or in the fisheries included in the ownership thereof, or to confer on the Dominion parliament power to appropriate or dispose of them, and receive therefor large rentals; but

on the contrary, I find all the property it was intended to vest in the Dominion specifically set forth."

The provinces also claimed the right to make provisions to protect the interests as proprietors and the interest of the private owners in respect of fish.

The following questions were submitted to His Excellency the Governor-General in Council for the purpose of determining the questions in this case:

1. Did the beds of all lakes, rivers, public harbors and other waters or any of them, situate within the territorial limits of the several provinces, and not granted before Confederation, become under the British North America Act property of the Dominion or the property of the province in which the same are situate, and is there in that respect, any and what distinction between the various classes of waters, whether salt waters or fresh waters, tidal or non-tidal, navigable or non-navigable, or other rivers, or between waters directly and immediately connected with the sea coast and waters not so connected, or between other waters and waters separating (and so far as they do separate) the Dominion from the territory of a foreign nation?

2. Is the act of the Dominion parliament, Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 44, entitled "An Act respecting certain works constructed on or over navigable waters," an act which the Dominion parliament had the jurisdiction to pass either in whole or in part?
3. If not, in case the bed and banks of a lake or navigable river belong to a province and the Dominion has the right of land extending into the lake or river for the purpose of there being built thereon a wharf, warehouse or the like, has the Dominion a right to build thereon accordingly, subject to the work not interfering with the navigation of the lake or river?

4. In case the bed of a public harbor or any portion of the bed of a public harbor at the time of confederation had not been granted by the Crown, has the province a like jurisdiction in regard to the making a grant as and for the purpose of passing paragraph stated, subject to not thereby interfering with navigation, or other full use of the harbor as a harbor, and subject to any Dominion legislation within the competence of the Dominion parliament?

5. Have the Dominion provinces before Confederation an exclusive right of fishing in non-navigable lakes, rivers, streams and waters, the beds of which have been granted to them by the Crown?
6. Has the Dominion parliament the jurisdiction to authorize the giving by license or otherwise to lessees, licensees, or other grantees, the right of fishing in such waters as mentioned in the last question, or any and which of them?

7. Has the Dominion parliament exclusive jurisdiction to regulate or otherwise to license or otherwise to lessees, licensees, or other grantees, the right of fishing in such waters as mentioned in the last question, or any and which of them?

8. Has the Dominion parliament jurisdiction to regulate or otherwise to lessees, licensees, or other grantees, the right of fishing in such waters as mentioned in the last question, or any and which of them?

9. If the Dominion parliament has jurisdiction to regulate or otherwise to lessees, licensees, or other grantees, the right of fishing in such waters as mentioned in the last question, or any and which of them, has the Dominion parliament jurisdiction to regulate or otherwise to lessees, licensees, or other grantees, the right of fishing in such waters as mentioned in the last question, or any and which of them?

10. Has the Dominion parliament jurisdiction to regulate or otherwise to lessees, licensees, or other grantees, the right of fishing in such waters as mentioned in the last question, or any and which of them?

11. Had the Dominion parliament jurisdiction to regulate or otherwise to lessees, licensees, or other grantees, the right of fishing in such waters as mentioned in the last question, or any and which of them?

12. If not, has the Dominion parliament jurisdiction to regulate or otherwise to lessees, licensees, or other grantees, the right of fishing in such waters as mentioned in the last question, or any and which of them?

13. Had the legislature of Ontario the jurisdiction to enact sections 1375 and 1376, inclusive, of the revised statutes of Ontario, chapter 24, entitled "An Act respecting the sale and management of public lands," and sections 5 and 13, both inclusive, of the Ontario Act of 1892, entitled "An Act for the protection of the provincial fisheries," or any, and which of such sections, or any and what parts thereof respectively?

14. Had the legislature of Quebec jurisdiction to enact sections 1375 and 1376, inclusive, of the revised statutes of Quebec, or any and which of the said sections, or any and what parts thereof respectively?

15. Has a province jurisdiction to legislate in regard to providing fishways for dams, sluices and other constructions, and otherwise to regulate and protect fisheries within the province, subject to and so far as may consist with any laws passed by the Dominion parliament within its constitutional competence?

16. Had riparian proprietors before Confederation an exclusive right of fishing in navigable non-tidal lakes, rivers, streams and waters, the beds of which had not been granted to them by the Crown?

17. Had riparian proprietors before Confederation an exclusive right of fishing in navigable non-tidal lakes, rivers, streams and waters, the beds of which had not been granted to them by the Crown?

18. Had the Dominion parliament jurisdiction to regulate or otherwise to lessees, licensees, or other grantees, the right of fishing in such waters as mentioned in the last question, or any and which of them?

that there were shades of difference in the opinions of the court, but a general agreement among the majority, consisting of Chief Justice Strong, Justices Taschereau, King and Girouard. The questions were answered as follows:

1. The beds of public harbors belong to the Dominion.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Determined by answer to No. 1.
5. Yes.
6. 7, 8, No.
9. The Dominion has no such jurisdiction.
10. and 11. Yes.
12. The jurisdiction of the Dominion is limited to the passing of general laws, 13, 14, 15 and 16. Yes.
17. Yes.

The case is so complicated that it is difficult to say off hand what the effect of the judgment is, except that it is generally in favor of the provinces. The lands of public harbors are declared to belong to the Dominion, and as a consequence, the right of fishing therein belongs to the Dominion. The Dominion has also control of water within the Indian reserves. The Dominion has no power to grant a lease for fishing in any part of the Dominion. In tidal waters neither the Dominion nor the provinces has any power to restrict the public right of fishing, but the better use of the regulating here as elsewhere. The Ontario fishery act is good and the Dominion fishery act almost wholly bad. The judgment confirms the judgment in the Queen vs. Robertson, with respect to non-navigable waters, and extends the same rule of law to apply to navigable rivers and great lakes, the beds of which are wholly within the provinces, the right to fishing therein being a public right, subject to provincial legislation. The Dominion is confined to powers of conservancy and the regulation of fisheries, and the Dominion has power to enact the imposition of a general license upon all persons fishing, but such license cannot be restricted to any particular locality. The Dominion power is general and cannot give license for a particular lake or river. The provinces, while not getting all they ask, are, nevertheless, given by this judgment, much of the jurisdiction and authority exercised by the Dominion.

BANK OF B. C. IN TACOMA.
Manager Simon Interviewed and Explains Reasons for Closing.

Mr. J. Simon, manager of the Bank of British Columbia at Tacoma, when asked what reasons could be given for withdrawing the agency from Tacoma and Seattle, said:

"That matter is settled in London, and of course we don't know what the exact reasons may be, but I presume the directors have decided to use the better use of their money elsewhere. It is well known that banking in this part of the country has not been profitable for the last few years, and I do not see any brilliant prospect in that line for the immediate future. I know we have endeavored to run the business here on business principles and to make it profitable, while serving our patrons in the best manner possible, yet I can't say that the business at present warrants the company in keeping the bank open."

"When will the office be closed and the company withdrawn from this city?"
"That will depend on how soon we are able to clean up our business with our customers and others. As soon as we had finished that it was decided to close the first opportunity to advise our customers in order that they may make such arrangements as they may desire to close their accounts with us. As soon as we had finished that it was decided to close the company will withdraw."

"The bank was established eight years ago in Tacoma and has always had a large share of the foreign shipping business, handling the exchange for the wheat and lumber shipments, and also of the Northern Pacific Steamship Company's business. The bank has been established for the same length of time."

Mr. Simon has been in the employ of the company for many years, coming from San Francisco, to which place he was sent on several occasions, where he was engaged for several years, after leaving an apprenticeship in a bank in his native town in Scotland.

"Not that I know of, I hardly think so. The company has a branch at Nelson, established to meet the demands of the Rossland mining district, but I do not think any of the branches there will be discontinued or any new ones established."

"Are those branches more profitable than the Tacoma and Seattle branches?"
"I don't know, but I don't suppose the business was near the expense to run them that it does here. Their expenses are very light."

"Has the political situation anything to do with the withdrawal of your company?"
"Well, to tell the truth, I know nothing about that. It is a matter that is settled by the company, and I am not in a position to know what their reasons may be."

SCHOOL INQUIRY.
Investigation Continued by the Special Committee.

The North Ward school investigation was resumed on Saturday evening, R. S. Day, a partner of Mr. Soule at the time the contract was awarded, was the first witness. He testified that on the 15th of September, 1893, he left the office and did not return, and the partnership was dissolved on December 31st of the same year. He did not have anything to do with the construction of the building. He superintended the filling in of the yard by Mr. Soule, and Mr. Soule, who was then absent in Cariboo, Mr. Eford, one of the company's agents, asked him for a certificate for the final payment of 25 per cent, but he declined, not having the necessary authority from Mr. Soule to do so. Mr. Eford afterwards returned and informed him that Chairman Hayward had been asked to issue the certificate. Mr. Day went to see Mr. Hayward and he learned the same thing from him. He then issued the certificate, signing it C. J. Soule, per R. S. Day, and he was afterwards informed that the certificate was not valid.

Mr. Day gave corroborative evidence regarding the steel girders, and also stated that the building had dropped down the side of the hill, and that he had been informed of the trouble to the displacement of the timber. He reported this to Mr. Hayward and at his request wrote to the contractors asking that they should look to making the necessary repairs. They promised to do so, but did not and he they did nothing.

In answer to Chairman Marchant, Mr. Soule stated that the iron steel girders were manufactured at Orangethorpe, Ontario, and were according to specifications.

R. B. Bayne, architect since 1891, stated that he had visited the North Ward school building in company with Mr. Day. He affirmed what he had written regarding the safety of the roof and which had already been published. He did not think of the roof as being in any danger.

Chairman Hayward of the Board of School Trustees, detailed how the plans were obtained and selections made. All the plans were referred to R. Mackay Soule and Day's plans were awarded first place and the trustees acquiesced in this decision. The plans were referred to Building Inspector Northcott to see if they complied with the building regulations. No tenders would have been accepted by the board unless the inspector was satisfied.

Trustees did not interfere with the architect's plans, specifications or anything

in the matter of the boiler, which was done after the building was completed. He did not know how the clerk of the works came to write to the board, without consulting the architect. He thought Mr. Gray was a competent clerk of the works. He did not consider an insurance company a competent architect and the board. He could not say regarding the changes suggested in Mr. Gray's letter.

The investigation was adjourned until 3.30 Thursday afternoon.

HENRY ABBEY DEAD

The Well Known Theatrical Manager Passes Away in New York on Saturday.

He Handled Many of the Big Attractions That Came to America.

New York, Oct. 19.—Henry E. Abbey, of the theatrical firm of Abbey, Schofield & Graff died Saturday morning in his apartment at the Osborne Hotel, of a stomach ailment. With him at the time were his daughter, and Mrs. Monaghan, the manager of the amateur theatre in this city. Mrs. Abbey, who recently brought a divorce suit against him in Europe, Mr. Abbey has been ill for some time. Several months ago his condition was said to be serious, but after that came about 5 o'clock Friday afternoon, he was found dead in his bed, having died peacefully.

Mr. Abbey was credited with the success of the firm. He succeeded his father in a job of business there. In 1890 he became a partner in the firm, and in 1891 he was made manager. A year later Abbey took to the road. He first managed the World's Great Exhibition, then Edwin Adams, and later he was manager of Edwin Booth and Lotta. With the latter he is said to have made much money.

In 1876 Abbey assumed control of the Academy of Musical Comedy and took as a partner John B. Schofield, who is now a partner in the firm. A year later they acquired the management of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York. On October 30, 1882, he broke out in the theatre and died. Mrs. Langtry's American debut.

The firm of Abbey & Schofield has since managed the theatre, the Park and the Metropolitan. Mr. Abbey has been twice married. His first wife was Mary Anderson, a Lyceum theatre, in London.

Mr. Abbey was credited with the distinction of having restored Italian opera in this country. This attempt he was assisted by Maurice Strakosky. Their attempt was a disastrous failure. Abbey, in 1884, was at the head of the Metropolitan opera house that netted, it is said, \$30,000. In later years they met with a measure of financial success. In the last months ago the theatrical world was surprised to learn that the firm had been liquidated.

Mr. Abbey has had a long and successful career. He has handled many of the big attractions that have come to America. He has been a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

Henry E. Abbey started life in theatricals in a way particularly his own. He would handle on his own the most successful of the performances in the city. Booth's theatre, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

Mr. Abbey was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

Mr. Abbey was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

Mr. Abbey was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

Mr. Abbey was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

Mr. Abbey was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

Mr. Abbey was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

Mr. Abbey was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

Mr. Abbey was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

Mr. Abbey was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

Mr. Abbey was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

Mr. Abbey was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

Mr. Abbey was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

BY RAIN

Town of Alameda
Tornia Wh
Exist

Big Surprise to
Coasting Ste
They

Mines Flooded
Damage Don
the C

San Francisco, C
last trip of the Pa
Company's steamer
California, the

the vessel was sur
the ports they mak
wiped off the face
the ship reached the
Culicash in the stat
the mining town of
there on the Orizaba
zone, not a building

This was one of the
rible storm which the
composed of a series
Mainland coast of
ber 17 and 18. The

brought the first d
comprehensive ide
damage done by the
composed of a series
wave and cloud bl
ed down from the
and met the tidal w
by the sea and the
beached by the stre
the coast were floo
burst. Fortunately
slight and the Altit
in tons or ridely co
the water was up
Viewing the former
the gulf the most s
meet the view are
schooners Cometa
German barkentine
beached by the stre
At Mazatlan, the
the most remarkable
is observed. In t
street, more than
the water was up
keel. She rode in
and when it recede
dry. Mazatlan sto
well, but much dam
German bark, the
as to be well off
storm in the gulf o
port two days after
ments had subsided.
The San Vicente m
need in the storm
the surface by the
as Alameda is conce
thing to find itself
the third time the
lowered.

Mr. Abbey was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.

Mr. Abbey was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London. He was a successful manager of the Metropolitan Opera House, the Park and the Lyceum theatre, in London.